

APPROVED
44-1994

Rockville, Maryland
November 21, 1994

The Board of Education of Montgomery County met in regular session at the Carver Educational Services Center, Rockville, Maryland, on Monday, November 21, 1994, at 8:15 p.m.

ROLL CALL Present: Mrs. Carol Fanconi, President
 in the Chair
 Mr. Stephen Abrams
 Mrs. Frances Brenneman
 Dr. Alan Cheung
 Ms. Wendy Converse
 Mr. Blair G. Ewing
 Mrs. Beatrice Gordon
 Ms. Ana Sol Gutierrez

Absent: None

Others Present: Dr. Paul L. Vance, Superintendent
 Mrs. Katheryn W. Gemberling, Deputy
 Dr. H. Philip Rohr, Deputy
 Mr. Thomas S. Fess, Parliamentarian
 Mrs. Nancy King, Board Member-elect

Re: ANNOUNCEMENT

Mrs. Fanconi announced that the Board had been meeting in closed session on personnel and appeals.

RESOLUTION NO. 769-94 Re: BOARD AGENDA - NOVEMBER 21, 1994

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education approve its agenda for November 21, 1994, with the addition of November 29 to the resolution on closed session and the addition of another information item on the draft statement of the composition, mission, and charge of the Subcommittee on Long-range Planning.

RESOLUTION NO. 770-94 Re: COMMUNITY PARTNERSHIP CLEARINGHOUSE

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Mr. Abrams seconded by Dr. Cheung, the following resolution was adopted unanimously:

WHEREAS, The Alliance for Educational Excellence, under the leadership of Ms. Sharon Friedman, proposed and designed the Community Partnership Clearinghouse to involve community members in the education of children by disseminating information about school-community partnerships; and

WHEREAS, Mrs. Agnes Griffen, director of the Montgomery County Department of Libraries, agreed to place the school-community partnership information on the county's Public Access Catalogue, making the material accessible to every personal business or home computer; and

WHEREAS, The collaborative effort between the Alliance for Educational Excellence, The Montgomery County Department of Libraries, and Montgomery County Public Schools benefits students, staff and parents by providing the opportunity to enlist the expertise, good will, and concern of the community on behalf of the education of our children; and

WHEREAS, The Community Partnership Clearinghouse benefits the community by giving county businesses, organizations, and individual residents the opportunity to take part in the process of teaching and learning, thereby helping to ensure the continued quality of education of future citizens, employers and employees; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Board of Education recognize the important contributions of the Alliance for Educational Excellence and the Montgomery County Department of Libraries in establishing the Community Partnership Clearinghouse and express its gratitude to both organizations and their leadership for making this important investment in the education of the children of Montgomery County.

Re: PUBLIC COMMENTS

The following individuals appeared before the Board of Education:

1. Phyllis Parks Robinson, MCEA
2. Ruth Gainer, Montgomery County Art Educators Association
3. Joan Stoer, Art Teacher
4. Joe Pauley

RESOLUTION NO. 771-94 Re: UTILIZATION OF FY 1995 FUTURE SUPPORTED PROJECT FUNDS FOR IMPROVING THE MATHEMATICAL POWER OF ALL CHILDREN AND TEACHERS (PROJECT IMPACT)

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Mrs. Brenneman seconded by Mr. Abrams, the following resolution was adopted unanimously:

Resolved, That the superintendent of schools be authorized to receive and expend within the FY 1995 Provision for Future Supported Projects a grant award of \$209,471 from the National Science Foundation through the University of Maryland, for the program, Improving the Mathematical Power of All Children and Teachers (Project IMPACT), in the following categories:

<u>Category</u>	<u>Positions*</u>	<u>Amount</u>
2 Instructional Salaries	3.5	\$118,980
3 Other Instruct. Costs		47,773
10 Fixed Charges	—	<u>42,718</u>
Total	3.5	\$209,471

*3.0 Teachers (10-month) and .5 Secretary, Grade 12 (12-month)

and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to the county executive and the County Council.

RESOLUTION NO. 772-94 Re: UTILIZATION OF FY 1995 FUTURE
SUPPORTED PROJECT FUNDS FOR CHAPTER
1 PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT GRANT

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Mrs. Brenneman seconded by Mr. Abrams, the following resolution was adopted unanimously:

Resolved, That the superintendent of schools be authorized to receive and expend within the FY 1995 Provision for Future Supported Projects a grant award of \$1,540 from the federal government via the Maryland State Department of Education, under the ESEA, Chapter 1 Program Improvement Grant, to provide additional instructional materials at Montgomery Knolls Elementary School, in state category 3 - Other Instructional Costs; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to the county executive and the County Council.

RESOLUTION NO. 773-94 Re: UTILIZATION OF FY 1995 FUTURE
SUPPORTED PROJECT FUNDS FOR THE
LEAST RESTRICTIVE ENVIRONMENT (LRE)
INITIATIVE

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Mrs. Brenneman seconded by Mr. Abrams, the following resolution was adopted unanimously:

Resolved, That the superintendent of schools be authorized to receive and expend within the FY 1995 Provision for Future Supported Projects, a grant award of \$150,000 from the Maryland State Department of Education, under the federal Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, for the Least Restrictive Environment Initiative, in the following categories:

	<u>Category</u>	<u>Positions*</u>	<u>Amount</u>
4	Special Education	3.0	\$108,147
10	Fixed Charges	—	<u>41,853</u>
	Total	3.0	\$150,000

* 3.0 Teachers A-D (10 month)

and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the county executive and the County Council.

Dr. Cheung temporarily left the meeting at this point.

RESOLUTION NO. 774-94 Re: CHANGE ORDERS OVER \$25,000

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

WHEREAS, The Department of Facilities Management has received change order proposals that exceed \$25,000; and

WHEREAS, Staff and the project architects have reviewed these change orders and found them to be equitable; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Board of Education approve the following change orders for the amounts indicated:

Activity 1

Project: Damascus High School

Description: Replace a portion of the existing paving at the rear of the building.

Contractor: Kimmel & Kimmel, Inc.

Amount: \$38,873

Activity 2

Project: Damascus Middle School #2

Description: The geotechnical study for Damascus Middle School #2 identified rock at various locations on the site. The exact extent of the rock removal could not be determined until the surface soil was removed and the

November 21, 1994

individual subcontractors accomplished its work. The contract contained unit prices for rock removal. This change order is for rock removal for underground mechanical work beneath the ground floor slab in accordance with the contract unit prices.

Contractor: R. W. Warner, Inc.

Amount: \$62,662

RESOLUTION NO. 775-94 Re: ARCHITECTURAL APPOINTMENT -
NORTHEAST AREA HIGH SCHOOL

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

WHEREAS, It is necessary to appoint an architectural firm to provide professional and technical services during the design and construction phases of the new Northeast Area High School project; and

WHEREAS, Funds for architectural planning were appropriated as part of the FY 1995 Capital Budget; and

WHEREAS, The Architect Selection Committee, in accordance with procedures adopted by the Board of Education on May 13, 1986, identified Delmar Architects, P.A., as the most qualified firm to provide the necessary professional architectural and engineering services; and

WHEREAS, Staff has negotiated a fee for necessary architectural services; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Montgomery County Board of Education enter into a contractual agreement with the architectural firm of Delmar Architects, P.A., to provide professional architectural services for the new Northeast Area High School project for a fee of \$1,200,000, which is 5.5 percent of the estimated construction budget.

RESOLUTION NO. 776-94 Re: ENGINEERING SERVICES - ENERGY
MANAGEMENT AUTOMATION SYSTEMS

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

WHEREAS, Engineering services are required to perform energy audits, lighting surveys, and to assist in the design of various energy conservation measures; and

November 21, 1994

RESOLUTION NO. 778-94 Re: PERSONNEL APPOINTMENT

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

Resolved, That the following personnel appointment be approved:

<u>Appointment</u>	<u>Present Position</u>	<u>As</u>
B. Eileen Steinkraus	Acting Coordinator Montgomery Blair Magnet	Coordinator, Blair Magnet Montgomery Blair HS Grade N Effective: 11-22-94

RESOLUTION NO. 779-94 Re: PERSONNEL APPOINTMENT

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

Resolved, That the following personnel appointment be approved:

<u>Appointment</u>	<u>Present Position</u>	<u>As</u>
Robert T. Smeak	Acting Coordinator Takoma Park Magnet	Coordinator, Takoma Park Magnet Takoma Park MS Grade M Effective: 11-22-94

Re: ANNUAL REPORT OF THE CITIZENS
ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR FAMILY LIFE
AND HUMAN DEVELOPMENT

Mrs. Lani Seikaly, staff liaison, commented that last year was the first opportunity she had had to work with the committee. She had been most impressed both by the challenges of the decisions the committee had to make and by the serious and respectful manner in which they had handled the controversy around all of the issues. She introduced Mr. Clair Cripe, chair, as a person who had modeled that respect for every viewpoint for his fellow members.

Mr. Cripe reported that this was his third appearance before the Board and it would be his last because this was his fourth year on the committee. He greeted Ms. Converse who had been a student member of the committee last year.

Mr. Cripe explained that this year because of their volume of

work they added a January and September meeting. Again, the committee commented on the need for diversity in the committee membership. He thought this was something that would always have to be worked on. The student members of the committee were particularly helpful, and this year they had a male student member which they appreciated.

Mr. Cripe stated that a minority report had been submitted this year. There was a comment in that report on a concern about limitations on presentations during committee meetings. This was because of a concern about getting bogged down in very long presentations. Members had read articles and letters during these presentations; therefore, the committee adopted a rule for limitations on the time of presentations for individual members and for individual items under review.

In the minority report, there was a comment that the annual report did not include dissenting comments. As chair, he had not voted, but he had tried to be fair. Because of very strong views held by committee members, this strained their proceedings at times. In the past, they had included minority viewpoints in the committee report as well as the minority report. This year their report covered the actions of the committee that were supported by the entire committee or a majority of the committee. He took particular exception to the comments in the minority report that there was block voting and that members did not really evaluate the content of the materials. He took strong exception to this.

This was an insult to the members of the committee, and he had seen absolutely none of that in the four years he had been on the committee. He said that committee members voted their own views, and he invited Board members to look at the votes as listed in the report. There was no indication that any particular group was always voting en bloc.

Mr. Cripe reported that the main part of their business was instructional materials. This year they had spent a good deal of time on reviewing a new text and new course objectives for the health curriculum. In the latter case, they had been asked to make recommendations because they did not have authority to take action on those items.

In regard to Secrets, Mr. Cripe said that after some back and forth Secrets was referred to the committee even though it was not strictly a classroom instructional material. In their review process they approved the play, but they had been advised that in the year following the approval of Secrets it was presented in only one high school. He had written Dr. Vance to ask why this had happened and whether some action could be taken to encourage principals to have Secrets presented. This was a strong concern of the committee; therefore, he was bringing it to the Board's attention. Schools seemed to be backing away from a presentation that the committee thought was excellent regarding the danger of

AIDS and HIV.

Mrs. Fanconi thanked the committee for their very hard work, particularly this year when they covered a very large volume of work. She knew they had needed to update some of their older films. She appreciated that the committee had included the regulatory background showing that the committee was required by the state bylaw. She especially wanted to convey the Board's appreciation to the committee members who would be leaving.

Mrs. Gordon said the report had a section on instructions for universal precautions, and she asked the superintendent to address this issue when he prepared his response to the committee's recommendations. Mrs. Fanconi suggested that the medical advisory committee should be asked to provide its comments on this issue as well.

Ms. Gutierrez said the committee had pointed to the fact that materials had been approved and not purchased. She hoped that the superintendent's response would look at the budgetary issues implied in the non-ordering of these materials. She asked the superintendent to comment on his actions in response to the committee's request on Secrets. Dr. Vance replied that the showing of Secrets was an instructional material which required parental permission to view. The committee was asking the staff to reverse this and allow parents to opt out of the presentation. This was now under consideration.

Ms. Gutierrez thought that the controversy around the play had had a chilling effect and principals were not arranging for presentations. Dr. Vance replied that the guerilla warfare had stopped the play in its tracks and principals felt they were out there by themselves. He said they could let it be known publicly they supported their principals who had the superintendent's and the Board's authorization to show the presentation. Ms. Gutierrez asked about the possibility of showing a video on the MCPS television channel. Dr. Vance replied that they did have such a video.

Mr. Cripe expressed his appreciation for the comments. The committee had felt that Secrets was dead in the water. He thought that the one principal who offered the presentation should be commended. He hoped that what he was hearing now could be followed up on. If the principals knew that the Board and the superintendent supported them, he thought it would make a tremendous difference. Mrs. Fanconi suggested that Dr. Vance might want to include his verbal response in his written response and suggest the Board take formal action on that. She also asked about what other counties were doing in terms of the permission form and if MSDE had made any recommendations on how that permission ought to be gathered.

Mrs. Fanconi asked if the committee had any recommendations on increasing student and parent involvement. Mr. Cripe replied that they had discussed this, but they did not have any specific recommendations. This got into the whole area of evaluation and looking at the areas needing improvement in this part of the curriculum. They thought there needed to be more involvement of parents, teachers, and students and more feedback back and forth.

Ms. Deborah Linzer commented that collecting data was part of their legislative authority but had not been carried out. She would like the committee to find out what people in Montgomery County really wanted. Staff felt this could not be done because of their workload. As a committee member, she would like input and support from the Board. She did HIV-AIDS education work for the Whitman-Walker Clinic, and she felt that Washington was the epicenter of this epidemic and the ripple effect was reaching Montgomery County. She believed they would lose a generation of children if they did not do something.

Mrs. Fanconi suggested that staff ask what other counties were doing. She knew there was an annual conference where various people from around the state attended. She suggested that staff obtain the names of the chairs of the other county committees so that the MCPS committee could talk with them. She asked Board staff to work with the committee liaison and to have committee members attend the annual conference.

Mr. Ewing noted that in their report they spoke to a concern about committee membership and the need for broad representation, for example, a lack of representation from the Asian American community. There was a concern in the minority report about having more representation from people with conservative viewpoints. He asked if the committee had some specific recommendations for the Board.

Mr. Cripe replied that they had raised questions from time to time about the process, and it was mostly a mystery to him as to how the members were selected. He thought the representation on the committee was fairly representative of the county's views on traditional values and an abstinence-based program as opposed to a broader educational program on family life. While he represented a religious organization, he thought there was too much religious representation. He suggested that the Board seek out organizations representing minority to groups to see if they could nominate members. He felt they needed broader ethnic and cultural diversity on the committee, and in his four years on the committee there had been only one African American, one Asian American, and two male students. Mr. Ewing asked the superintendent to speak to the issue of membership and offer the Board some options in terms of changing the membership.

Mrs. King commended the committee members for a very tough

assignment. As a parent of a teenager, she would like to be informed if the permission slip process changed. She thought it was very important for students to go through the program, but she would want the option to have her child excused from the program if she wanted to do so. She said it would be a good way to reach more students by having them write a note if they did not want to be a part of the program. Mr. Cripe indicated that this was the committee's recommendation. When they had inquired about Secrets, one of the reasons for not offering it was that principals did not want the administrative burden of getting affirmative consent from every home for the children to attend. They were also advised that there was nothing in the state bylaw that required this, and other counties did it the other way in their showing of Secrets. The committee was asking why Montgomery County could not change. They proposed changing it from opting in to opting out.

Ms. Gutierrez asked that Board staff notify the Board of the openings on the committee and that the Board try to identify some minority candidates. Ms. Melissa Woods, staff assistant, replied that this committee had members from 17 organizations, and the organizations themselves nominated the members. The committee had only six community members and six students. Therefore, they could have selection and outreach for only those six slots. The applications were closed for December, but in the spring they could do a letter to organizations which could express the concerns of the committee about more equitable representative.

Mr. Cripe suggested that the Board review the list of organizations and perhaps substitute some other organizations to get representatives from cultural and minority groups. Mrs. Fanconi suggested the possibility of rotating organizations every couple of years to give them a wider representation.

In regard to the issue of affirmative or negative declaration, Mr. Abrams thought they needed to maintain that partnership between parents and the school system. Some parents felt strongly about this issue, and he would be hesitant not to respect their rights. If they planned to make this change, he would like to know the safeguards would be placed to ensure there was notification in advance. He did not think they had to be overly rigid on this, but precisely the reason this was in place was that other systems tended to pay more lip service than reality to parental involvement.

Mrs. Fanconi thanked the committee for their hard work and dedication and extended a special thanks to Mr. Cripe for his outstanding service.

Re: PRINCIPAL SELECTION PROCESS

Mrs. Gemberling introduced Dr. Elfreda Massie, associate superintendent for personnel services, Mr. Gary Levine, personnel assessment specialist, and Dr. Phinnize Fisher, associate superintendent for school administration. Mrs. Gemberling commented that the process in Montgomery County was unique. Other LEAs considered the MCPS process to be somewhat cumbersome and intrusive of the superintendent's prerogative. Quite a few years ago, the Board made the decision and established a process that was extremely inclusive and community driven. The community included parents, teaching staff, supporting staff, and secondary students. While it might not be the most efficient method because it took time, it was time well invested. When the final selection came to the Board, the staff believed the appointment represented the best input and the best match for the school community.

Dr. Rohr reported that the current process had been implemented successfully for two fiscal years, and during this time they had transferred 49 principals. It was one of a kind in Maryland, and it came about because of a great deal of community, staff, and student input.

Dr. Massie stated that when a vacancy occurred it normally took six to eight weeks for the process to be completed. Candidates for principal positions came from many sources. They could be current principals, elementary principal trainees, secondary assistant principals, experienced principals in other assignments, or outside candidates. When they considered outside applicants, they looked to experienced principals who had had experiences in school systems similar to MCPS. They tried to attract candidates who had demonstrated successful performance in those assignments.

First, the Office of School Administration collected the desired characteristics of a principal from staff, community, and students, if the vacancy was in a secondary school. The office then selected the interview panel. Personnel was involved in preparing materials for the rest of the process and in providing summary information from the community and from the background information of all candidates. The superintendent's appointments committee was composed of the superintendent, the deputies, the associate superintendents, the chief financial officer, the director of information, and the superintendent's assistant. This committee reviewed the characteristics and any unique needs presented by OSA or other executive staff members related to the school, the cluster, or MCPS as a whole. They then reviewed the background and credentials of all applying for the position. In addition to persons applying, they also discussed any sitting principals who met the characteristics identified for the school.

Interviews were held, and the results were taken back to the appointments committee for discussion. The candidate who was the choice of the interview panel was usually recommended by the superintendent to the Board of Education. Personnel Services and the appointments committee assured that not only if they had read information regarding the school and the candidates, but they also reviewed the process at the same time to be sure it had been objective, consistent, and fair.

Mr. Levine stated that in the late 1970's MCPS decided to pilot a process to get broader community and staff input into the principal selection process. This included having each group write up a list of the characteristics they wanted in a new principal. They decided the process was a success and fully implemented it. By 1984, the process included a formal survey instrument given to the community, the staff, and students in the case of a high school vacancy. This survey was extremely long and extremely difficult to complete. Given these problems, Personnel then contacted the leadership of the people administering the survey to talk about revising the instrument. They came up with a draft of the instrument which was reviewed by MCCPTA. In 1991 the new survey instrument was adopted, and it included a list of 13 leadership skills. In addition, people completing the survey had space to write in their comments.

Dr. Fisher observed that once a principal vacancy was declared the involvement of community and staff began. This same process was also used for the selection of special education principals. The associate superintendent called the leadership of the PTA to formally announce the vacancy, to explain the process, and to get input on the time line. Then OSA developed a time line and took it to the appointments committee for review and approval. The associate superintendent then contacted the school to arrange a meeting to administer the survey and to request volunteers for the interview panel. The associate superintendent worked with PTA to arrange a community meeting, usually during the evening. The PTA usually sent out at least two notices and posted flyers to get the word out about this meeting. At the community meeting, the process for filling the vacancy was explained, the survey was completed, and volunteers for the panel were solicited.

Personnel staff did a computerized analysis on the survey and OSA summarized the written comments. These results were taken to the appointments committee which matched the strengths of the applicants with the expressed needs of the local school community and determined which applicants would be referred for interview.

The number of applicants referred typically ranged from two to five. When the position was a promotion for any of the candidates, a structured interview process was used. If a lateral change for all candidates, a dialogue was used.

Dr. Fisher explained that a basic structured interview panel included two community members, two staff members, one principal, one Personnel representative, and the associate superintendent or director. A high school panel would include a student. This basic panel was enlarged as needed to represent the size and diversity of the school community. The panel always included equal numbers of school community and staff members. The structured interview was designed to ensure that all candidates were asked exactly the same questions and had equal opportunity to provide information about their knowledge, skills, abilities, and experiences. The interview questions were developed by OSA and were unique to the school and incorporated issues raised in the leadership survey.

The interview panel convened 30 minutes before the first candidate was scheduled. This time was used to review the process and to give community members time to review the interview questions and suggest modifications. A basic dialogue panel included four community members, four staff members, one Personnel representative, and the associate superintendent or director. The associate superintendent opened each dialogue with the same specific questions and then opens the floor for questions from the community. In both processes, each panelist rated each candidate independently. At the conclusion of the process, the Personnel representative collected all the materials in sealed envelopes. After the envelopes were turned in, a discussion was held to solicit feedback on the candidates and on the process. Personnel tallied the results of the process and took these to the appointments committee.

Dr. Massie introduced Ms. Martha Ribas, administrative and supervisory personnel assistant, who worked closely with the Board Office, OSA, and the superintendent's office on this process.

Mrs. Brenneman thanked staff for the presentation. She thought it was time to reconvene a group of people to see whether or not this process was too cumbersome. Although the process was inclusive of many people, including them was not always enough. There was sometimes the feeling that no one was listening to these people. She saw great improvements in the gathering of characteristics and the timeline to get more community involvement. Again, it sounded as if the weight of this fell on the PTA, and she asked whether it should be the responsibility of PTA to notify all parents.

Mrs. Brenneman reported that in her four years as a Board member only once did she see a community come in saying anything other than their first priority was high academic standards for their children. However, the staff did not usually say this. She suggested the possibility of two separate surveys. She knew that they were able to match up in-house people with the

characteristics, but she wondered what they did about people from the outside.

Dr. Massie replied that in the last two years they had had 85 to 100 outside candidates meeting the qualifications. First of all, they did some paper screening. The executive staff met in the spring of each year and interviewed 18 to 20 of the outside candidates. From that interview process, they explored the résumés and their background. If they were interested in a candidate, they did the follow-up before they considered referring them for a specific position. They tried to get as much information as possible, and this information was presented to the superintendent's appointments committee. They projected ahead with some of the vacancies they anticipate. They kept a list of approved candidates that they believe had some strengths or unique characteristics to consider when they had vacancies. When a vacancy occurred, they had a complete packet for all of the outside candidates, and they were considered for every vacancy along with MCPS candidates.

Mrs. Brenneman hoped that every principal interviewed would list high academic standards for children in their top priority. However, community people wondered how the characteristics were matched to the people selected to interview when the three or four people interviewed were so drastically different. Therefore, people wondered whether this was a set-up because there was only one candidate who matched what they were looking for. This got back to the question of whether the system worked if those characteristics were so similar and possessed by all candidates.

Dr. Cheung thought the process was sound because it was a very logical and systematic way of doing it. To him there were differences between characteristics, attributes, and performance skills. Talking to a number of headhunters, he said they talked about the vision of a leader as being very important. Another thing was transformation and instilling mutual trust which was very important.

Mr. Abrams left the meeting at this point.

Dr. Cheung said they frequently asked candidates about their mentors and why these people had been selected as mentors. If candidates did not have mentors, something was wrong. He had tried to follow Bob Katz in terms of conceptual skills. Among the desired skills were educational expertise and managerial skills. After these were evaluated, they looked at the vision. The candidate should be able to provide direction and be able to get the whole community to follow including staff. The last attribute was attitude which was so important in finding the best individuals.

Mrs. King reported that she had had the opportunity to be a part of one of the principal selection committees. She had been pleased to go back to the community to tell them that the process did work. One problem area occurred when openings came up in the summer, and they had to pull in community members. During these times, the community felt they did not have the opportunity to provide the right input.

Ms. Gutierrez stated that she shared many of Mrs. Brenneman's concerns. She proposed that the Board look at the process for possible improvements. It seemed to her that the superintendent was recommending no changes, but she thought there was room for improvement. She felt that the process could be more open and flexible. This would be more in tune with a national concern about who were the people coming into school systems. Dr. Cheung had talked about leadership and managerial skills, and at the state level there had been recommendations to look for other schools that would be valuable within the school system.

Ms. Gutierrez reported that she had participated in the recommending committee for the superintendent of the Chicago Public Schools. There was a very strong interest in looking at non-traditional candidates. They interviewed and recommended 10 people who were a good mixture of people from different backgrounds. As she read the MCPS process, she believed there were some specific limitations that did not provide opportunities for outside candidates. One issue was the five-day announcement period because according to the negotiated contract, positions must be advertised at least five working days. They could not expect that in five days they could get someone from the outside to know about it and prepare their requirements.

Ms. Gutierrez did not know how much flexibility they had in the basic requirements. If they were saying candidates must have successfully completed the internal Maryland Assessment Center, that automatically eliminated anyone who had not been in Maryland. She asked about mechanisms they could put in place to consider candidates as conditional until they met the certification requirements. She was not sure how much flexibility they had, but they should have as broad a pool as possible. She knew they did try to build an internal pool of candidates. She recalled several years back they had done an extensive outreach at the teacher level in the minority community. She thought that the new brochure was an excellent step.

In regard to the survey, Ms. Gutierrez said there should be some consideration where they were not locked into 13 skills or categories. Anytime they had a survey design which was absolutely limited, they were going to be limited in what kind of real input they might receive from the community. There had been cases where it was clear from the discussion that another issue

was important to the community, but there was no way of reflecting this within the 13 skills. They should add "other" to the list and have people fill in the blank or provide three additional slots for real input.

Ms. Gutierrez felt that the structured interviews were excellent because they provided equal treatment to everyone. However, she thought they might want to review their policy of having no discussion until after the ratings were complete. People should be able to share their views and point out particular strengths and weaknesses of a candidate. She thought that taking a position of saying that the system was working and should not be changed was not the right continuous improvement approach. A total quality approach meant that they should always look to improve their processes. They had need for a greater diversity at their administrative level, and she believed they had to look at changing the process to get a different result. She recommended that the next Board undertake a review or ask the superintendent to build into the process an ongoing evaluation and an ongoing mechanism where they would be able to modify the process as they went along so that it did not take a major action of the Board to improve the system.

Mr. Ewing said he wanted to start with the end of the process. The appointment was discussed during the closed session of the Board and later the same day the appointment was voted on and approved by the Board of Education. What this did was to lend credence to the view of the public that having participated in the school leadership needs survey, everything that happened subsequently happened in a black box. He explained that the Board received the superintendent's recommendation, and 99 percent of the time the Board did approve the superintendent's recommendation because the Board had confidence in the superintendent.

Mr. Ewing commented that the process was extensive and involved and comprehensive. It went far beyond in public involvement to what existed when he joined the Board. In that sense it is a great improvement. Personnel processes were inevitably and appropriately a combination of an examination of objective facts such as degrees and certification, etc. and judgments. He felt that by far the heaviest weight once they passed the threshold of basic qualifications was judgment. It seemed to him they ought to acknowledge that in their description of what they did. He thought that the description of it made it sound very objective and scientific. It wasn't, it couldn't be, and it probably shouldn't be. At several stages along the way, people were assembling all kinds of information about which they were making judgments in terms of the fit of this candidate for the school and community. If they did that they would have continuing complaints, but they would be less valid because people would know that the Board was saying this was a judgmental process.

Mr. Ewing said it would help if they made it clear in the leadership skills survey that these skills were not all inclusive and, in fact, there was probably some redundancy in the list and some things left out. It was also true that the list was all about processes. There was nothing there about products and end results or what the candidates had achieved. In addition, a principal could believe in participatory management and not do it. Mr. Ewing thought that the questions needed to be made clearer.

With respect to the structured interview and the dialogue, Mr. Ewing said as far as the Board was concerned, these were black boxes. They did not know what questions were asked and what they were intended to get at. It would be helpful if the Board knew something about what the structured interview questions looked like. He thought the Board ought to know something about the weighting of all of this information. For example, what was it that executive staff thought was really more important -- the fit, the knowledge, the skills, the abilities? It was a combination of these things and would vary from circumstance to circumstance, but he did not know much about the decision process that people used. He was not terribly upset about this because he knew they had good people on the appointments committee who applied their best judgment. However, he would like to know more about that decision process.

It seemed to Mr. Ewing that they were missing a systematic inquiry into the characteristics of the community into which this person was to go and the way in which the person fit that set of characteristics. He assumed they covered this in the interview or the dialogue, but he did not know that. He also thought there was some confusion about the leadership skills survey in the community. People in the community thought of this as deciding the matter. If they saw some discrepancy between the survey and the final selection, they felt, at the least, misinformed and, at the most, betrayed. He suggested that they make clear that this was only one piece of the process, and there was much more that must be done and must be done based on judgment.

Mr. Ewing remarked that the process was a solid one, and the problem was more a matter of communication with the public about what they had here. He hoped that the Board would discuss this issue again, and he encouraged the superintendent to think about the Board's comments.

Mrs. Gordon reported that she had participated in a selection using the old survey which had many problems. In regard to the opportunity to make written comments on the back of the new form, she realized someone did look at the comments but this was not often included in anything the Board or community saw. There were specific characteristics and issues that were very important

to that community, but they were not necessary included in the categories on the survey.

Mrs. Gordon said that Mrs. King had raised the issue of when principals left in the summer. She thought that the assumption was that people were not there, so there was less of an effort to do outreach. She hoped they would continue to look at that. Mrs. Brenneman had spoken about having a different survey for staff, and Mrs. Gordon suggested that they might want to explore this. She had participated as a parent and as a staff member, and her responses were extremely different in each case.

Mrs. Gordon agreed that they needed to have as much communication throughout the process as they could. She thought that the more discussion that took place, the more trust there was in the process. When participants were told not to discuss the interview, this set up even more distrust. The opportunity to have a brief discussion following the interview helped the participants that it was a viable process. They should keep this in mind, but they also should remember that they were dealing with someone's career and should not go into the community and share the results of the interview. On the other hand, they should go out into the community and say that the views of the community had been represented.

Mrs. Fanconi thanked the staff for their presentation. She said that the Board needed to be aware that they were at a critical point in the school system. They had a large number of people who were retiring in all areas, and they needed to look very carefully at the selection process and at the grooming process to make sure they had a good pool of people. They needed to look very carefully at the supports they put in for principals and at getting ideas from principals who had been in their jobs or a year or so. They needed to know what would have helped these principals and whether the principals felt they were a good match with the community.

Mrs. Fanconi thought that communities needed to know that this was a professional decision and a candidate might have applied to more than one school. She hoped that they would look at not only the selection process but the pool, the training, and the feedback from the principal and the community after the process had been completed. They had to look at outside candidates to make sure they were adequately prepared to take over a principalship in Montgomery County. They needed to continue to review the success of the outside candidates and to continue to grow their own to make sure they did get the best leadership possible.

Dr. Vance commented that the discussion and the responses from the Board this evening were very insightful. He hoped that they would continue this discussion because he knew there were other

stakeholders who should be involved in a public discussion with the Board and the superintendent. He felt that ideas discussed this evening had a great deal of merit.

RESOLUTION NO. 780-94 Re: SITE-BASED PARTICIPATORY MANAGEMENT
POLICY

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Dr. Cheung seconded by Mrs. Gordon, the following resolution was adopted with Dr. Cheung, Ms. Converse, Mr. Ewing, Mrs. Fanconi, Mrs. Gordon, and Ms. Gutierrez voting in the affirmative; Mrs. Brenneman abstaining:

WHEREAS, On June 28, 1994, the Board of Education received the annual report on the Site-based Participatory Management Policy and expanded the discussion to August 29, 1994; and

WHEREAS, The Site-based Participatory Management Advisory Committee recommended that an amendment be made to the policy; and

WHEREAS, The Board of Education took tentative action on the amendment and asked that it be sent out for public comment; and

WHEREAS, The policy showing the tentatively adopted amendment was sent out for public comment on September 15, 1994; and

WHEREAS, Comments have been received and summarized; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Board of Education take final action to amend Policy CFA, Site-based Participatory Management, as shown as follows:

C. POSITION

1. Definitions

- a. Site-based participatory management is the restructuring of decision-making and authority in schools and other worksites to ensure the active involvement and participation of administrators, teachers, support staff, parents, **community groups**, secondary school students....
- b. Constituent organizations refer to the countywide organizations that are the recognized representatives of teachers and other staff (Montgomery County Education Association), supporting services staff (Montgomery County Council of Supporting Services Employees),

administrators (Montgomery County Association of Administrative and Supervisory Personnel), parents (Montgomery County Council of Parent Teacher Associations, **and other parent organizations, e.g., AAP/CEC, Hispanic Alliance, etc.**), and...

- c. Local committees refer to the site-based participatory management committee at the local school or site. The local committee must have representation from all four constituency groups (five at the secondary level), **and other community groups that are described in Section C.1.d. of this policy.** Each site....
- 5. b. Ongoing training opportunities are provided for staff, parents, **and community groups**, in units that have adopted SPM
- 6. Application. A unit must apply to the facilitator and be selected by the SPMAC to participate in SPM. The application process will require a representative from each constituency and **community group** from the unit, to attend an information session.
- 7. c. (2) A process will be established in which contract waivers can be granted and approved by the Board of Education and the affected organization that is a party to the agreement. The development of this process for requesting waivers will include MCPS and representatives of each **of the members of the local committee.** These waivers...
- d. (4) members of a site-based participatory management committee represent a specific constituency, **or community group**, and remain accountable to their respective constituencies **or community groups**, for their....
- 8. a. In a local unit, a majority within **the Local Committee**, may determine to withdraw....

D. DESIRED OUTCOMES

This policy is designed to increase participation, cooperation, and collegiality among staff, parents, students, **and the community.** This is accomplished....

- F. 3. As part of that review process, or in the event that any policy changes are otherwise proposed, the Board

will invited each constituent organization **and members of the community**, to submit in writing its views on proposed policy changes. The Board will discuss any recommendations for changing the policy with all constituent organizations, **and the community**, and seek consensus on the proposed changes.

Re: BOARD/SUPERINTENDENT COMMENTS

1. Dr. Vance reported that the status report of the Corporate Partnership on Managerial Excellence was released this morning. That report cited aggressive implementation efforts on the part of MCPS to assess operations, cut costs, streamline procedures, and implement the recommendations of the partnership. The report also identified several important areas for continued improvement and strategic planning. MCPS continued to take advantage of the vast amount of expertise available to them through the partnership.

2. Dr. Vance indicated that the results of the 1994 senior exit survey were in and were encouraging for MCPS. He said that 80 percent of the more than 5,500 graduating seniors replying to the survey and indicated that MCPS had prepared them either exceptionally well or more than adequately for their future plans. MCPS students were accepted to colleges at a significantly higher rate than all other freshmen applying. For example, 54 percent of applicants were accepted for admission to Penn State University, but 98 percent of those applying from MCPS were accepted. At the University of Maryland, 90 percent of the MCPS students were accepted compared to 72 percent of those applying. He remarked that 90 percent of the graduates planned to attend either a two- or four-year college. Two thirds of the students expected to become professionals. He believed MCPS students were setting high expectations for themselves and had indicated that MCPS was providing them with a firm foundation for their future professional and academic life.

3. Dr. Vance also reported that he was proud of a number of their girls sports teams. B-CC girls hockey won the state co-championship, the girls cross country team at Damascus HS won the girls state championship, and the girls volley ball team at Quince Orchard made it to the state finals with a record of 18 wins and 2 losses.

4. Mrs. Fanconi said that in February, 1992 she sent a memo on school fees, and recently the Board received a report on the impact of fees on summer school. She suggested that Board members look at that report and to ask some additional questions. In 1992 they looked at how they could balance the loss of funds and having to eliminate programs with denying equal access to everyone when they charged fees. She was concerned because this

including consultation with counsel to obtain legal advice; and be it further

Resolved, That these meetings be conducted in Room 120 of the Carver Educational Services Center, Rockville, Maryland, as permitted under Section 4-106, Education Article of the Annotated Code of Maryland and State Government Article 10-501; and be it further

Resolved, That such meetings shall continue in closed session until the completion of business.

Re: REPORT ON CLOSED SESSIONS -
NOVEMBER 9, 11, AND 12, 1994

On October 24, 1994, by the unanimous vote of members present, the Board of Education voted to conduct a closed session on Wednesday, November 9, 1994, as permitted under Section 4-106, Education Article of the Annotated Code of Maryland and State Government Article 10-501.

The Montgomery County Board of Education met in closed session on Wednesday, November 9, 1994, from 9 a.m. to 9:55 a.m. and from 12:40 to 1:40 p.m. The meeting took place in the Room 120 of the Carver Educational Services Center, Rockville, Maryland.

The Board met to discuss the monthly personnel report and the appointment of a coordinator of community programs. Votes taken in closed session were confirmed in open session. The Board reviewed the monthly legal services report with its attorney. The Board discussed and voted on the conveyance of the Bradley MS school site to the county government and confirmed its vote in open session.

The Board also met to review BOE Appeals No. 94-22 and 1994-25 which were both dismissals. At noon, the Board met to consult with its attorneys regarding special education settlements.

In attendance at the closed session were Steve Abrams, Fran Brenneman, Ray Bryant, Alan Cheung, Blair Ewing, Dick Ekstrand, Carol Fanconi, Tom Fess, David Fischer, Hiawatha Fountain, Kathy Gemberling, Bea Gordon, Zvi Greismann, Ana Sol Gutierrez, David Hjortsberg, Nancy King, Elfreda Massie, Deanna Newman, Tom O'Toole, Brian Porter, Phil Rohr, Lois Stoner, Paul Vance, Joe Villani, Bill Wilder, Mary Lou Wood, and Melissa Woods.

On November 9, 1994, by the unanimous vote of members present, the Board of Education voted to conduct a closed session on Friday, November 11, and Saturday, November 12, 1994, as permitted under Section 4-106, Education Article of the Annotated Code of Maryland and State Government Article 10-501.

The Montgomery County Board of Education met in closed session on Friday, November 11, 1994, from 1 p.m. to 6:40 p.m. The meeting took place in the Maryland Inn, Annapolis, Maryland. The meeting continued in closed session on Saturday, November 12, 1994, from 8:10 a.m. to 12:15 p.m.

The Board met to discuss contract negotiations and establish positions and to consult with its attorney regarding those negotiations.

In attendance at the closed session were Steve Abrams, Larry Bowers, Fran Brenneman, Ray Bryant, Carole Burger, Blair Ewing, Carol Fanconi, Tom Fess, John Finan, David Fischer, Phinnize Fisher, Hiawatha Fountain, Kathy Gemberling, Bea Gordon, Ana Sol Gutierrez, Vicki Houck, Nancy King, Elfreda Massie, Brian Porter, Tom Reinert, Phil Rohr, Cindy Sullivan, Paul Vance, Mary Lou Wood, and Melissa Woods.

RESOLUTION NO. 782-94 Re: MEETING WITH MCCPTA

On motion of Mr. Ewing seconded by Ms. Gutierrez, the following resolution was adopted unanimously by members present:

Resolved, That the Board of Education schedule a meeting as soon as possible after the new Board members are sworn in with the MCCPTA executive board to discuss among other matters site-based management, long-range planning, budget format process, spending affordability, and other areas of concern to MCCPTA.

RESOLUTION NO. 783-94 Re: MONTGOMERY BLAIR HIGH SCHOOL PLAN

On motion of Mr. Ewing seconded by Mrs. Fanconi, the following resolution was adopted unanimously by members present:

Resolved, That the superintendent develop for Board review and consideration a written response to Board questions and concerns about the issues and processes relating to the development of the Blair High School plan presented to the Board on November 9, 1994.

RESOLUTION NO. 784-94 Re: DISCUSSION ON LACROSSE

On motion of Ms. Gutierrez seconded by Dr. Cheung, the following resolution was adopted with Mrs. Brenneman, Dr. Cheung, Ms. Converse, Mr. Ewing, and Ms. Gutierrez voting in the affirmative; Mrs. Gordon voting in the negative; Mrs. Fanconi abstaining:

Resolved, That the Board of Education schedule a discussion on the proposal made on November 9, 1994, on lacrosse.

RESOLUTION NO. 785-94 Re: BOE APPEAL NO. 1994-26

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education adopt its decision and order in BOE Appeal No. 1994-26, a tuition matter.

RESOLUTION NO. 786-94 Re: BOE APPEAL NO. 1994-28

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education adopt its decision and order in BOE Appeal 1994-28, a tuition matter.

Re: LEGISLATION

Mr. Fess reported that the County Affairs Committee produced unfavorable votes on MC-504-95, the additional elected member, and MC-505-95, increased salaries. They did support an extension of the sunset provision on MC-503-95, the extended student member voting rights. In the past the recommendations of the committee were strong indications of what the Delegation would do. Mrs. Lois Stoner, legislative aide, had suggested that Board members may wish to contact members of the Delegation.

Re: NEW BUSINESS

1. Mr. Ewing moved and Ms. Gutierrez seconded the following:

Resolved, That the Board of Education schedule further discussion on site-based management requesting that the superintendent bring the Board his recommendations with respect to the comments received and contained within his memorandum of November 21, 1994, and any further recommended changes that might be the result of any discussions he may have with MCEA.

2. Mr. Ewing moved and Dr. Cheung seconded the following:

Resolved, That the Board of Education request the superintendent to prepare for February 15, 1995, a policy analysis aimed at revising the policy on gifted and talented using as one reference point the draft policy now circulating.

Re: ITEMS OF INFORMATION

Board members received the following items of information:

1. FY 1995 Summer School Report
2. Cost Information on R&E Recommendations
3. Draft Statement of the Composition, Mission, and Charge of the Subcommittee on Long-range Planning.

RESOLUTION NO. 787-94 Re: ADJOURNMENT

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education adjourn its meeting at 11:05 p.m.

PRESIDENT

SECRETARY

PLV:mlw