

TENTATIVE MINUTES

BOARD OF EDUCATION OF BALTIMORE COUNTY, MARYLAND

Wednesday, April 30, 2003

The Board of Education of Baltimore County, Maryland, met in open session at 5:45 p.m. at Greenwood. President Donald L. Arnold and the following Board members were present: Ms. Phyllis E. Ettinger, Mr. Thomas G. Grzymiski, Mr. John A. Hayden, III, Mr. Michael P. Kennedy, Ms. Janese Murray, Mr. James R. Sasiadek, and Mr. James E. Walker. In addition, Dr. Joe A. Hairston, Superintendent of Schools, and staff members were present.

Mr. Sasiadek immediately moved the Board go into closed session to discuss matters relative to negotiations pursuant to the Annotated Code of Maryland, State Government Article, §10-508(a)(9). The motion was seconded by Mr. Hayden and unanimously approved by the Board.

CLOSED SESSION MINUTES

Mr. Grimsley reviewed the statutory requirement to renegotiate with bargaining units when the fiscal authority does not approve enough funds to implement the negotiated agreement.

Ms. Burnopp outlined changes made by the County Executive to the Board's proposed budget.

Mr. Capozzi reported on a meeting between him and the coalition for the bargaining representatives to discuss the budgetary changes.

At 6:28 p.m., Ms. Ettinger moved to adjourn the closed session. The motion was seconded by Mr. Walker and approved by the Board.

REPORT OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION WORK SESSION

President Arnold called the work session to order at 6:40 p.m. In addition to President Arnold, the following Board members were in attendance: Ms. Sarah D. Bormel, Ms. Phyllis E. Ettinger, Mr. Thomas G. Grzymiski, Mr. John A. Hayden, III, Mr. Michael P. Kennedy, Ms. Janese Murray, Mr. James R. Sasiadek, Mr. Sanford V. Teplitzky, and Mr. James E. Walker. In addition, Dr. Joe A. Hairston, and staff members were present.

Mr. Arnold reminded the audience that the Board would not entertain public comment tonight, but later in the evening, a date would be announced to give members of the public an opportunity to comment on the plans to annex students at New Town

Elementary School. Members of the public were also informed they could contact Board members or the Board secretary with any comments.

Ms. Fromm reminded Board members that summary information on the initiatives was presented last week. Details and background information to support the initiatives were presented through a Power Point™. Data presented included:

- Past Annexing Samples
- Annexing Recommendations for New Town Elementary School
- Solutions Considered, But Not Recommended
- Administrative Process
- Maps Showing Annexed Areas
- Enrollment Projections of Impacted Schools
- Northwest Area Enrollment Data.

Ms. Ettinger expressed concern about the movement of special education children. She also noted that the data appears to indicate available space at Campfield Early Childhood Learning Center. Dr. Gehring stated the Office of Strategic Planning did look at Campfield, but New Town has seven (7) kindergarten classes, and it was the intent not to split kindergarten students because of the sibling issue.

Ms. Murray questioned what was meant by the County Executive's support of Woodholme Elementary School in his '04 budget message. Ms. Fromm responded that \$6.7 million in funding was pledged by the County Executive for construction of this new school. She noted that this is only a portion of the money needed. The state would also have to provide funds for the school's construction.

Mr. Kennedy voiced the concern of the New Town community that even with annexation, the school will continue to be overcrowded as new families move into the area. Ms. Fromm acknowledged there is still growth potential at New Town Elementary School, but felt the situation can be managed by the annexation proposal. He also shared concern that when new housing developments are built, County officials assume the schools will absorb the students into the existing schools. He challenged County officials to be more cognizant of the impact new developments have on area schools.

Mr. Grzyski inquired if annexed students become a part of the receiving school, to which Dr. Gehring responded that receiving schools will treat those students as their own.

Mr. Hayden stated he was happy to hear that staff is working more collaboratively with County officials identifying students. He shared Mr. Kennedy's concern about future planning. Mr. Hayden also noted that the State will not provide funding money for

new construction based on enrollment projections—the students must already be in place. Mr. Hayden also inquired about the use of a prototype school for Woodholme. Dr. Krempel stated that a prototype building, such as that used in the construction of Essex and Westchester Elementary Schools, would be used in the Woodholme project.

Ms. Bormel inquired about the addition of teaching staff in the receiving schools for the annexed students. Dr. Gehring responded there would be staffing shifts from the sending school to the receiving schools. Ms. Bormel also asked how long the annexation would last. Dr. Gehring responded that annexation of students would last until Woodholme Elementary School is built.

Ms. Ettinger asked if the Woodholme site had been inspected for potential site problems. Dr. Krempel stated that it had, and he did not foresee any problems with the site. He also added that being able to fast track this project is predicated upon funding.

Ms. Ettinger inquired about moving along the financial process. Dr. Hairston stated that is a legislative issue, and discussions with county and state legislators would have to take place.

Ms. Ettinger expressed concern that with the prospective development in New Town and surrounding areas, Fort Garrison and Summit Park Elementaries may be at or over capacity in 2006.

Ms. Ettinger shared her concern about parents' perceptions that they may have been left out of the process. Dr. Gehring stated that principals have shared information with parents and PTA's. Mr. Shah of Strategic Planning has also met with members of the PTA and parents. Letters have been sent to parents about the annexation to which there has been positive feedback. Dr. Gehring did note that there wasn't a process in place, as is the case for boundary changes.

Ms. Murray questioned if there was a maximum amount of time students could be annexed. Ms. Fromm stated there was not a specific period of time that students could be annexed and noted past history reflects multi-year annexation in some cases. Ms. Murray also shared Mr. Walker's concern about New Town still being severely overcrowded after annexation.

Mr. Sasiadek inquired about the number of special education students to be annexed. Ms. Satterfield noted that 14 students out of the current 24 students would be moved. Dr. Gehring noted that in moving these students, two classrooms (or about 70 seats) would become available. Mr. Sasiadek stated that it is important for these students to be in familiar surroundings.

With regard to meetings with parents, Mr. Sasiadek asked if principals have kept a record of major meetings with parent and community groups about this issue. Dr. Gehring reiterated that the process for annexation plans did not replicate the boundary process. Dr. Gehring offered to have principals gather that information for Mr. Sasiadek.

Mr. Teplitzky noted that this is a serious problem that needs dramatic action. He stated that the balance of funding needed for the construction of Woodholme will not be forthcoming this coming July 1st because of the current process. Mr. Teplitzky questioned whether the County Executive is willing to forward fund the money. He shared his concern that unrealistic expectations are being set for the public that a new elementary school will be built in two years. He commended staff for the work that went into developing the short-term solutions, but he suggested the Board should be discussing long-term issues.

Mr. Teplitzky asked about the role the receiving school principals will play in the annexation. The receiving school administrators present described what plans have been made and what meetings have or will take place to prepare for the annexed students. Finally, Mr. Teplitzky stated the community, the Board, and the local elected officials need to actively communicate with politicians about Woodholme funding.

Dr. Hairston commented that he considers New Town's situation an emergency. He stated that the community, the Board, and all interested parties need to be aggressive in seeking funding to build Woodholme.

Ms. Ettinger shared Mr. Teplitzky's concern about leaving parents with the misconception that a new school will be built in two years.

Mr. Arnold agreed with Mr. Teplitzky's and Ms. Ettinger's concerns. He stated that the Board would welcome the opportunity to work with the community, the County Executive, the County Council, the state, and with elected officials to explore alternatives to move the Woodholme project along in a timely manner.

In an effort to give the public an opportunity to comment on the annexation plans, Mr. Arnold announced a public hearing would be held on Wednesday, May 14th, at 7:30 p.m. at New Town Elementary School.

The work session concluded at 8:28 p.m.

At 8:42 p.m., the Board of Education of Baltimore County, Maryland, met in open session at the Greenwood Administration Building. In addition to President Donald Arnold, the following Board members were present: Ms. Phyllis E. Ettinger, Mr. Thomas G. Grzyski, Mr. John A. Hayden, III, Mr. Michael P. Kennedy, Ms. Janese Murray, Mr.

James R. Sasiadek, Mr. Sanford V. Teplitzky, and Mr. James E. Walker. Also present were Dr. Joe A. Hairston, Superintendent of Schools, and staff members.

Mr. Walker immediately moved that the Board go into closed session to discuss matters relative to negotiations pursuant to the Annotated Code of Maryland, State Government Article, §10-508(a)(9). The motion was seconded by Mr. Sasiadek and unanimously approved by the Board.

CLOSED SESSION MINUTES

Mr. Grimsley briefly summarized for the Board member absent earlier the discussion regarding renegotiations with the bargaining units.

Mr. Grimsley shared the groups' position on a particular issue and advised the Board of its options. After discussion, the Board advised Mr. Grimsley and Mr. Capozzi how to proceed.

At 8:55 p.m., Mr. Walker moved to adjourn the closed session. The motion was seconded by Mr. Sasiadek and approved by the Board.

Respectfully submitted,

Joe A. Hairston
Secretary-Treasurer