

REPORT OF THE PROPOSED MASTER PLAN WORK SESSION OF THE
BOARD OF EDUCATION OF BALTIMORE COUNTY, MARYLAND

Tuesday, June 17, 2003

President Donald L. Arnold called the work session to order at 7:03 p.m. In addition to President Arnold, the following Board members were present: Ms. Sarah D. Bormel, Ms. Phyllis E. Ettinger, Mr. Thomas G. Grzyski, Dr. Warren C. Hayman, Ms. Jean M. H. Jung, Mr. Michael P. Kennedy, Ms. Janese Murray, and Mr. James E. Walker. Also present were Dr. Joe A. Hairston, Superintendent of Schools, staff members, and the media.

Mr. Arnold noted that on June 26th at 7:00 p.m. the Board would conduct a public hearing on the Master Plan. Members of the public were urged to see staff or Board members with any questions about the document.

Through a Power Point™ presentation, Ms. Audette provided a brief overview of legislation, the requirements, and guidelines to the Master Plan. Two pieces of legislation that impact the Master Plan are the *No Child Left Behind Act 2001* and the *Bridge to Excellence in Public Schools Act 2002*. The results to be achieved by these laws were listed. Ms. Audette reviewed the cross program themes that run through the Master Plan. The responsibilities of the school system and the Master Plan requirements were shared with the Board.

Dr. Hairston described the stakeholder and community involvement on the Oversight Committee. He noted that recommendations included in the document related to performance are aligned with the Maryland Visionary Panel, the *Bridge to Excellence*, and *No Child Left Behind*.

Mr. Hayden entered the room at 7:17 p.m.

Ms. Audette thanked members of the Oversight Committee, the staff, and the work groups for the many hours that went into the development of the Master Plan. She continued the presentation by reviewing the profile of school system requirements and the framework of the Master Plan, as well as the next steps for approval of the plan by the Board and submission to the State Department of Education.

Mr. Walker inquired as to who will make up the review team. Ms. Audette responded that the State Department has not yet made that decision, but various administrators from around the state will be selected to review local plans.

Ms. Ettinger inquired if the Master Plan will help the school system and the Board provide the framework and discussion for how the issue of attracting and retaining quality teachers is viewed in terms of resolution. Mr. Grimsley responded that since

there will be yearly review of the document, plans will evolve to address the issue of teacher recruitment and retention.

Ms. Ettinger offered comments with regard to fine arts, cross program themes, and community involvement in development of the plan.

Mr. Hayden suggested affirmative language in the document that would indicate the system is proposing new initiatives, rather than repeating internal programs.

With regard to ESOL, Mr. Grzymiski suggested a periodic review of demographics for languages, including language in the Executive Summary with regard to technology goals because of budget implications, and increased focus on IT in the area of business services and the support side of the system. Ms. Bailey stated that the Office of World Languages would conduct an analysis of the languages on a yearly basis.

Dr. Hayman noted a typographical error in the date listed for the public hearing in the Executive Summary as well as the absence of the date for Board approval. He also indicated the need to reference the reports that indicate the information described on Page 20 under “Needs Assessment.” Dr. Hayman shared his concern about the narrow definition of achievement/performance gap. Another concern shared by Dr. Hayman was the absence of information that would show what the system is doing in terms of recruitment to ensure that we meet the *No Child Left Behind* guidelines. He also suggested the inclusion of placement strategies to guarantee there is not a disparity in low performing schools in terms of high quality teachers. Dr. Hayman felt information needed to be included in the Master Plan regarding the system’s plan for professional development for current faculty as well as incoming faculty who may not meet the highly qualified standard.

Mr. Kennedy expressed concern about the system’s ability to hire highly qualified teachers as required by federal guidelines by 2005-2006. He noted that teachers may be certified but not “highly qualified.”

Ms. Ettinger noted that while the Master Plan is a requirement imposed upon the school system by the State, for Baltimore County Public Schools it is a continuation of the process started by Dr. Hairston with the *Blueprint for Progress*. She noted, however, that many of the performance goals have budgetary implications attached to them. Ms. Ettinger stated that it is essential that our County funding authorities and legislative delegation understand what we are doing so they can advocate for the needed funding and support. Finally, Ms. Ettinger noted a commitment to increase the participation rate in G/T programs in all schools, but the Plan appears to lack information about monitoring for compliance.

Ms. Bailey stated that Dr. Hairston has charged staff with developing a policy and rule related to G/T education. She also stated there will probably be information on monitoring and accountability included in the rule. Ms. Ettinger noted that monitoring will require central office staff, which is a funding issue.

Mr. Hayden stated another issue that should be addressed is the involvement of legislators and funding authorities in the process. He noted that full-day kindergarten will be imposed in a few years, which is a large space requirement. Mr. Hayden also stated he does not believe that local and state legislators fully understand the implications of this mandate.

Dr. Hayman responded that the Plan will be required to list budgets by individual programs and schools; therefore, the County will see the budgetary implications.

Mr. Grzynski suggested an explanation of each of the different programs offered throughout the system. He also expressed a desire for the Board to have information showing the percentage of schools offering certain programs, such as G/T, as well as a listing of the schools where these programs are offered.

Mr. Walker inquired if each school system's Master Plan would be submitted to the federal government. Ms. Audette stated that she did not believe this information would be submitted to the federal government.

Ms. Bormel stated that growth in fine arts should be included in the Master Plan, not just the continuation of existing programs.

Mr. Arnold announced that the Board will conduct a public hearing on the Master Plan on Thursday, June 26, at 7:00 p.m. There will also be an open/closed session meeting at 5:00 p.m. for the Board to discuss matters relative to negotiations.

The work session was adjourned at 8:13 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Joe A. Hairston
Secretary-Treasurer