MEETING OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION OF BALTIMORE COUNTY, MARYLAND

OPEN SESSION

Tuesday, October 22, 2002
5:00 P.M.-Closed Session, 7:30 P.M.-Open Session
Educational Support Services Building

I. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

II. SILENT MEDITATION IN REMEMBRANCE

III. AGENDA

Consideration of the agenda for Tuesday, October 22, 2002

IV. MINUTES

Consideration of the open and closed session minutes of September 24, 2002; Report of the Public Hearing, September 26, 2002; and Report of the Board of Education Work Session, September 30, 2002 — Exhibit A

V. RECOGNITION OF ADMINISTRATIVE APPOINTMENT FROM OCTOBER 10, 2002

VI. REPORTS

A. Annual Enrollment Report — (Mr. Barlow) (Mr. Harper) Exhibit B

B. Report on Independent Evaluation of New Elementary Reading Series — (Ms. McMahon) Exhibit C

VII. NEW BUSINESS

A. Consideration of consent to the following personnel matters: — (Mr. Grimsley)

1. Retirements — Exhibit D
2. Resignations — Exhibit E
3. Leaves of Absence — Exhibit F
4. Deceased — Exhibit G

B. Consideration of Ethics Review Panel reappointment — (Mr. Grimsley) Exhibit H

C. Consideration of consent to the following contract awards: — (Ms. Burnopp) (Mr. Gay) Exhibit I

VII. NEW BUSINESS (Cont.)

1. Contracted Services: Evaluation of Magnet School Programs – Additional Services

2. Curriculum Software Management Performance Series - Scantron

3. Contracted Services: Video, Digital, and Audio Networking Services – Five-Year Bid

4. Supply Contract: Interior and Exterior Paint

5. Supply Contract: Various Electrical Supplies – Three-Year Contract

D. Consideration of consent to the following Building Committee recommendations: (Building Committee)

1. Fee Acceptance – Inspection Services for Reroofing Projects – Various Schools — Exhibit J

2. Change Order – Fine Grading Package – New Town High School — Exhibit K

3. Change Order – Masonry Package – New Town High School — Exhibit L

4. Increase Contingency Authorization for Concrete Slab Reinforcement – Patapsco High School — Exhibit M

E. Consideration of the Comprehensive Maintenance Plan-Fiscal Year 2003 — Exhibit N

F. Consideration of Proposed Board Negotiating Teams for 2002-2003 (Mr. Grimsley) Exhibit O

VIII. ANNOUNCEMENTS

A

TENTATIVE MINUTES

BOARD OF EDUCATION OF BALTIMORE COUNTY, MARYLAND

Tuesday, September 24, 2002

The Board of Education of Baltimore County, Maryland, met in open session at 5:05 p.m. at Greenwood. President Donald L. Arnold and the following Board members were present: Ms. Sarah D. Bormel, Mr. Thomas G. Grzymski, Ms. Jean M. H. Jung, Mr. Michael P. Kennedy, Mr. James R. Sasiadek, and Mr. James E. Walker. In addition, Dr. Joe A. Hairston, Superintendent of Schools, and staff members were present.

Mr. Arnold advised Board members of the availability of a donated minivan to carpool to the state conference next month.

Board members were asked to contact Ms. Zepp regarding an upcoming function.

Mr. Arnold asked Board members who will be attending the State conference to consider getting together for a group dinner the first night.

Board members reviewed a list of proposed dinner groups to meet with during the coming school year. Suggestions were made, and Ms. Zepp and Mr. Arnold will develop a schedule for the meetings.

Mr. Arnold advised Board members that information on next spring's national conference will be available shortly and urged his colleagues to contact Ms. Zepp by November 1 if they plan to attend so housing can be arranged.

Dr. Hayman entered the room at 5:18 p.m.

Mr. Walker announced that Mr. Arnold will be among the honorees at January's Fullwood Benefit and Recognition Breakfast. He asked his fellow Board members to contact Ms. Zepp if they would like to attend.

At 5:20 p.m., Ms. Jung moved the Board go into closed session to consult with counsel to obtain legal advice and to discuss a matter pertaining to litigation pursuant to the Annotated Code of Maryland, State Government Article, §10-508(a)(7) and (a)(8). The motion was seconded by Mr. Sasiadek and unanimously approved by the Board.

CLOSED SESSION

Ms. Saffran-Brinks informed Board members of a matter currently being litigated.

Mr. Hayden entered the room at 5:24 p.m.; Mr. Teplitzky entered the room at 5:30 p.m.

Ms. Saffran-Brinks advised Board members on the law as it relates to a particular issue being considered by the Board.

CLOSED SESSION MINUTES (Cont.)

At 6:30 p.m., Ms. Jung moved to adjourn the closed session. The motion was seconded by Mr. Sasiadek and approved by the Board.

OPEN SESSION MINUTES

Mr. Arnold informed Board members he would make an announcement at tonight's meeting regarding the new procedures for the public comment portion of the meeting.

He also advised the Board that a group of individuals had signed up to address the Board on the subject of animal dissection in the classroom.

Mr. Arnold reminded Board members of Thursday's 6:30 p.m. public hearing on the proposed capital budget, and he reminded the members of Monday's 6:30 p.m. work session on the proposed capital budget. Several Board members expressed a desire to have a light dinner prior to the work session. Ms. Zepp will make the necessary arrangements.

Dr. Hairston reminded Board members of the dinner and program recognizing Maryland's Teacher of the Year this Friday.

Mr. Arnold advised Board members of an invitation from the Southeast Area Office to join the Southeast Area Council for dinner, prior to the pre-budget meeting, on October 15th. Board members are to contact Ms. Zepp if they are interested in attending.

At 6:37 p.m., Mr. Sasiadek moved to adjourn the open session for a brief dinner recess. The motion was seconded by Mr. Hayden and approved by the Board.

OPEN SESSION MINUTES

The Board of Education of Baltimore County, Maryland, reconvened in open session at 7:31 p.m. at Greenwood. President Donald L. Arnold and the following Board members were present: Ms. Sarah D. Bormel, Mr. Thomas G. Grzymski, Mr. John A. Hayden, III, Dr. Warren C. Hayman, Ms. Jean M. H. Jung, Mr. Michael P. Kennedy, Mr. James R. Sasiadek, Mr. Sanford V. Teplitzky, and Mr. James E. Walker. In addition, Dr. Joe A. Hairston, Superintendent of Schools; staff members; members of various civic, employee, and community organizations were present as was the media.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The open session commenced with the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag, which was led by a student from Towson University, and a period of silent meditation for those who have served education in the Baltimore County Public Schools.

OPEN SESSION MINUTES (Cont.)

Mr. Arnold informed the audience of the previous sessions in which Board members had participated earlier in the afternoon.

SPECIAL ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. Sasiadek presented Mr. Arnold with his Commission from Governor Parris Glendening. Dr. Hairston presented Mr. Arnold with a Certificate from Oxford University recognizing his participation in a conference this past summer that was attended by educators from the United States and Great Britain.

SUPERINTENDENT'S REPORT

Board members and the audience were informed of a recent Woodlawn High School graduate, Patricia Edmonds, who is now at the University of Virginia. Ms. Edmonds has a U.S. patent that was applied for while she attended Woodlawn.

Dr. Hairston noted recent visits to Stoneleigh Elementary School, Carroll Manor Elementary School, Randallstown High School, and Cockeysville Middle School.

The Superintendent announced that earlier in the day, he made a presentation before the State Board of Education with regard to Baltimore County Public Schools' partnership with The College Board. He stated the presentation was well received and that we are one of the few systems in the nation who are involved in a partnership with The College Board.

Finally, Dr. Hairston announced that staff would be coming back to the Board in the future with detailed information about the residency issue. Clarification will be provided with regard to policy and the steps to be taken to enforce our residency position.

RECOGNITION OF ADMINISTRATIVE APPOINTMENTS

Mr. Grimsley recognized the staff members whose appointments were approved at the September 9, 2002, Board meeting.

OLD BUSINESS

On motion of Mr. Walker, seconded by Mr. Sasiadek, the Board approved the proposed revisions to Policy 3122 – Classification of Expenditures.

REPORT

The Board received the following report:

REPORT (Cont.)

Report on the Fiscal Year 2004 Preliminary Capital Budget Recommendations—Mr. Arnold reminded the audience of the public hearing scheduled for Thursday, September 26th, at 6:30 p.m. at Greenwood, as well as the work session scheduled for Monday, September 30th, at 6:30 p.m. at Greenwood.

Board members raised questions/concerns to be answered at Monday's work session. Those questions or concerns included relieving overcrowding at Featherbed Lane Elementary School, building, site issues, and safety conditions at the school, the process used to determine what projects will appear for capital improvement, the selection process for Major Maintenance projects, and withdrawing and replacing items on the list.

Mr. Teplitzky urged caution not to disregard the policy established a few years ago as it relates to addressing school repairs. He noted that by using this approach, people know when their school's repairs will be made so that planning can take place.

PERSONNEL MATTERS

On motion of Mr. Teplitzky, seconded by Mr. Kennedy, the Board approved the personnel matters as presented on Exhibits C, D, E, and F. (Copies of the exhibits are attached to the formal minutes.)

CONTRACT AWARDS

Ms. Jung pulled items 4 and 7 for further discussion; Mr. Sasiadek pulled item 3. On motion of Mr. Kennedy, seconded by Mr. Walker, the Board approved items 1, 2, 5, and 6.

1. Equipment Contract: Tractors

2. Food Service: Kitchen Equipment

5. School Bus Tire Recapping – One-Year Extension

6. Special Education Augmentative Communication Devices

Item 3

Mr. Sasiadek expressed concern over the significantly higher figure listed under "Secondary" for the award bidder in Part One, Area I. Ms. Burnopp indicated "Elementary" and "Secondary" were considered together and indicated Purchasing would report back to the Board as to why it decided to have one vendor for both, rather than two separate vendors.

CONTRACT AWARDS (Cont.)

The Board decided to pull item 3 until further clarification is provided.

Item 4

Ms. Jung asked for an explanation of the realtor services to be provided, to which Mr. Fannon responded. Ms. Jung also inquired if the company will be working on a percentage, commission, or hourly rate, and if a commission rate had been established. Although Ms. Burnopp was not able to fully answer the question, Ms. Jung moved approval of item 7, with the request that a further explanation be provided. Mr. Grzymski seconded the motion, which was approved by the Board.

Mr. Hayden abstained from discussion and voting on this item.

4. Realtor Services – Two-Year Extension

Item 7

Ms. Jung asked for an explanation of Project Family Attendance Counseling Encouragement (FACE), which was provided by Dr. Vivian Ferguson. In response to a question by Dr. Hayman, Ms. Ferguson stated there is the potential for participation of up to 40 students at each of the six (6) identified schools. Dr. Hayman inquired as to whether monitoring of a child's attendance is part of the program. Dr. Ferguson stated that attendance before FACE, after FACE, and one year after FACE would be reviewed.

Ms. Bormel asked if the program was limited to just the six (6) identified schools. Dr. Ferguson responded that the decision to expand the program would be up to the Local Management Board.

Dr. Hayman expressed concern about possible inequity with regard to the number of students participating in each of the schools. Dr. Ferguson indicated the number of each school's participants will depend upon the needs of the school. There will be a total of 240 participants.

On motion of Mr. Kennedy, seconded by Mr. Sasiadek, the Board approved item 7.

7. Project FACE

BUILDING COMMITTEE

The Building Committee, represented by Mr. Kennedy, recommended approval of items 1 and 2. The Board approved these recommendations.

BUILDING COMMITTEE (Cont.)

1. Change Order – Major Maintenance Renovation Project – Timonium Elementary School

2. Increase Contingency Allocation for Major Maintenance Renovation Projects – McCormick and Seneca Elementary Schools

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Mr. Arnold made the following announcements:

- On Thursday, September 26, 2002, the Board will conduct a public hearing on the Fiscal Year 2004 Preliminary Capital Budget Recommendations at 6:30 P.M. at Greenwood.

- On Monday, September 30, 2002, the Board will hold a work session on the Fiscal Year 2004 Preliminary Capital Budget Recommendations at 6:30 P.M. at Greenwood.

- The next regularly scheduled meeting of the Board of Education will be held on Thursday, October 10, 2002, at Greenwood. The meeting will begin with a closed session at 5:00 p.m. After the Board adjourns to meet in closed session, followed by a brief dinner recess, the open meeting will reconvene at 7:30 p.m. The public is welcome at all open sessions.

INFORMATION

The Board received the following as information:

New Rule 3122 – Classification of Expenditures.

Mr. Arnold reminded speakers to refrain from discussing any matter that might come before the Board in the form of an appeal, as well as personnel matters.

Mr. Arnold explained the new procedures for public comment. Speakers will be called up two at a time--with the first speaker seated at the speaker's table, and the next speaker seated a few feet from the table. Stakeholder groups will be given five (5) minutes for their presentations, and members of the general public will given three (3) minutes. All speakers were asked to be respectful of the time limit so as not to infringe on other speakers' time.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Ms. Amethyst Danesie, President of the Baltimore County Student Councils (BCSC), thanked Dr. Hairston and Mr. Kennedy for attending the Camp Airy Leadership Workshop. She stated the keynote speaker was so well received by the students, BCSC is working to bring him back for a week-long speakers' showcase. At Camp Airy, the General Assembly took positions on two bills involving the grading system and the phrase "under God" in the Pledge of Allegiance. Ms. Danesie noted the October dates for the executive board meeting and the General Assembly meeting.

Ms. JoLynn Chadwick, Chair of the Advisory Committee for Gifted/Talented Education, distributed to Board members a schedule of the committee's meetings for this school year. She referenced the next two meeting dates and the topics for those meetings. She asked Board members to contact the committee with any suggestions for meeting topics.

Ms. Kelli Nelson, Chair of the Citizens Advisory Committee for Special Education, reported on last night's meeting activities. The group discussed its list of priorities and goals for this school year. Ms. Nelson stated the group plans to look closely at the new Maryland School Assessments. Ms. Nelson also stated the committee will submit a formal request to the Superintendent and Board for a full day of mandatory professional development, for all staff, focused on special education. Finally, Ms. Nelson said the advisory group supports the recommendation from the Office of Special Education to delete Policies 6164.6 and 6164.7.

Ms. Maggie Kennedy, Coordinator of the Area Educational Advisory Councils, reminded everyone that the Education Coalition of Baltimore County will sponsor a County Executive's Candidate Forum on October 2 at 7:00 p.m. at Loch Raven High School. Candidates Doug Riley and Jim Smith will address issues facing our public schools. In mentioning the upcoming pre-budget meetings, Ms. Kennedy noted two critical issues—teachers' salaries and funding for additional technology. She urged Board members to accept the leadership challenge to speak frankly and candidly with elected officials about funding needed to support student achievement for all students.

Mr. Boyd Crouse, Chair of the Southeast Area Educational Advisory Council, spoke about his group's first meeting last week and the council's two objectives. He reiterated the time and date for the Southeast Area's pre-budget meeting and urged community members to attend and express their views. Mr. Crouse stated a status quo budget is not good enough when it comes to children's education. He expressed that we all must work together to be creative to do whatever it takes to continue to improve children's education.

Ms. Meg O'Hare, Chair of the Northeast Area Educational Advisory Council, commented on the Middle School Task Force. She also spoke about the importance of increasing teacher and administrator salaries and the importance of completing the technology infrastructure. She urged the Board to ask for what is needed. Ms. O'Hare shared her request for an assessment of the Baltimore County's alternative education system.

PUBLIC COMMENT (Cont.)

Ms. Elaine Berry, President-Elect of the Council of Administrative and Supervisory Employees (CASE), informed Board members that President Karen Barnes stepped down from her position and that Paula Simon would continue in the position of President this year. During this year, CASE hopes to communicate to the Board its priorities, needs, concerns, and plans.

Mr. Michael Franklin, President of the PTA Council of Baltimore County, encouraged full funding of the operating budget, noting challenges with overcrowded classes, minority student achievement gap, and attracting and retaining quality teachers and administrators. With regard to Featherbed Lane Elementary School, Mr. Franklin stated the staff and children are suffering and the situation needs to be corrected.

Ms. Maria Watson, parent of a Kenwood High School junior, stated her daughter was taken out of her Honors Anatomy and Physiology class and placed in a basic science class because of her refusal to dissect a cat. Ms. Watson presented the Board with a petition with 1,000 names in support of alternatives to dissection. She asked the Board to draft a student choice amendment that would provide students with an alternative assignment if they hold ethical and moral views against dissection.

Mr. Frank Branchini, Executive Director of the Humane Society of Baltimore County, expressed his disappointment that Ms. Watson was penalized for refusing to perform the dissection assignment and not offered an alternative. He described the practice of dissection as "archaic" and noted that there are many alternatives available. Mr. Branchini also stated several prominent medical schools do not use animal dissection.

Mr. Herb Morrison, Treasurer of the Maryland Animal Rights Advocates, provided an overview of students' rights with regard to dissection. He asked the school system to implement a program so that every student who participates in Honors Biology does not have to dissect an animal when they believe there is a reverence for life issue.

Ms. Jennifer Watson, a junior at Kenwood High School, stated that on the first day of her Honors Anatomy and Physiology class, the class was informed that it would have to dissect a cat. She shared her moral and ethical belief against dissection and stated students should have the right to choose whether or not to dissect an animal.

Dr. Andrew Knight, a veterinarian, outlined humane alternatives to dissection, such as computer simulation, videos, and models. Dr. Knight also shared his concern about the sourcing of animals from Carolina Biological Supply that has numerous violations of the Animal Welfare Act. Dr. Knight stated studies have shown that students using humane alternatives perform as well, if not better, than those students who dissect. Finally, Dr. Knight noted the legal issue of rights of students, stating that there have been numerous cases where lawsuits have been filed against schools.

PUBLIC COMMENT (Cont.)

Dr. Lesley King, a representative of the Humane Society of the United States (HSUS), distributed information about alternatives to dissection from the HSUS. She stated that by forcing students to dissect animals, students might become turned off to science or become blind to the issue of dealing with animals. A student choice policy reflects the concern for the students' rights to respect their own ethical principles. The policy ensures teachers a wide range of options. Dr. King offered to loan the school system the latest teaching tools without cost. The HSUS would also provide free training to teachers and students.

At 8:47 p.m., Mr. Walker moved to adjourn the open session. The motion was seconded by Mr. Sasiadek and approved by the Board.

Respectfully submitted,

_____
Joe A. Hairston
Secretary-Treasurer

dz

REPORT OF THE PUBLIC HEARING ON THE PROPOSED FISCAL YEAR 2004 CAPITAL BUDGET RECOMMENDATIONS

Thursday, September 26, 2002
Greenwood

President Donald L. Arnold called the hearing to order at 6:40 p.m. In addition to President Arnold, the following Board members were in attendance: Ms. Sarah D. Bormel, Mr. Thomas G. Grzymski, Mr. John A. Hayden, III, Mr. Michael P. Kennedy, and Mr. James R. Sasiadek. Also present were Dr. Joe A. Hairston, Superintendent of Schools; staff members; as well as the media.

The following speakers addressed the Board:

1. Richard Badmington, a representative of the Ridgely Middle School PTA – Spoke in support of an auditorium for Ridgely Middle School. He noted that the school's original plans called for an auditorium and, to date, plans for an auditorium have been prepared and estimates generated. As Ridgely is due for renovation in the next year, he requested that the work between the two projects be coordinated. Mr. Badmington asked the Board to show good faith and authorize a commitment of funds; the Ridgely community will make a commitment to private fundraising.

2. Mary Pat Kahle, a representative of the PTA Council of Baltimore County – Concurred with the statements made by the previous speaker. Ms. Kahle advocated for air conditioning in every public school. In the future, the Board will be provided information to support this request. She stated that air conditioning schools would promote consistency of air quality during testing times, as well as promote health and good student achievement.

3. Roxanne Lucas, a New Town Elementary School parent - Proposed eliminating the expenditure of money for an addition to New Town and consider redistricting instead. Ms. Lucas serves on a subcommittee looking at the overcrowding issue at New Town. She informed the Board that parents are against the expansion of the school. Ms. Lucas also indicated the group is aggressively working on a plan to relieve overcrowding that will be brought to the Board.

Mr. Walker entered the room at 6:52 p.m.

4. Kimberley West, a representative of the Powhatan Elementary School PTA – Requested an addition to Powhatan noting that more space is needed for classes, meeting space, library, and computer lab. She also noted the need for parking lot improvements. Some of the school's current problems include:

   - No air conditioning in the office or gymnasium,
   - Leaking pipes in the equipment closet, and
   - Cracked floor tiles in the gymnasium.

Ms. Murray entered the room at 6:56 p.m.

5. Mr. Todd Mitchell, a Featherbed Elementary School parent – Asked the Board to consider an additional entrance/exit for the school property noting, at present, there is only one way in and out. He also requested an addition be built on the school. Currently, there are eight (8) relocatables, and students and staff have to travel outside between buildings. Finally, he asked for additional parking.

6. Ms. Stephanie Wilson, President of the Featherbed Lane Elementary School PTA- Reiterated some of the previous speaker's concerns about the school. She also requested lighting for the parking lot. Some of the other problems at Featherbed include gym classes in hallways and no running water in the portables.

7. Ms. Pam Phillips, a Featherbed Lane Elementary School parent – Noted students must walk outside in order to get from the portables to go to the nurse and the cafeteria. Other areas of concern were the need for a larger cafeteria, a gymnasium, and a parking lot with proper flow. Ms. Phillips stated Featherbed is unattractive and is not a place of which she and her child can be proud.

8. Ms. Karen Brown, a Featherbed Lane Elementary School parent – Stated that students travel between as many as eight (8) different buildings, losing instructional time. There are also safety issues involved with traveling between buildings. Ms. Brown noted the need for a larger parking lot, new library, cafeteria, bathrooms, and roadways.

9. Mr. Charles Johnson, Vice President of the Featherbed Lane Elementary School PTA – Stated the school has been neglected and described the conditions at Featherbed as "sinful." He demanded an immediate response of action, not words. He reiterated the conditions mentioned by previous speakers—insufficient space, safety issues, and teachers pushing carts from class-to-class. Mr. Johnson stated Featherbed needs one school with one vision and one purpose.

10. Ms. Paula Jones, President of the Milford Mill Academy PTA – Thanked the Board for Milford's new lockers. She asked for consideration of a cafeteria expansion at Milford and also noted the limited space throughout the building. Ms. Jones stated that the number of children in the cafeteria each lunch period exceeds the maximum capacity of 250. She also asked for consideration of renovating the fitness labs.

11. Ms. Joan White McCann, a New Town Elementary School parent – Reiterated the position of a previous speaker that redistricting is the answer to New Town Elementary School's overcrowding problem, not an addition. She noted there are more new homes being constructed in the area. Ms. McCann stated that along with the consultant's report, she hoped the Board would listen to parents' concerns.

The hearing was concluded at 7:14 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

_____

Joe A. Hairston
Secretary-Treasurer

dz

REPORT OF THE WORK SESSION OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION OF BALTIMORE COUNTY, MARYLAND, ON THE PROPOSED CAPITAL BUDGET REQUEST

Monday, September 30, 2002 - Greenwood

The work session was called to order at 6:40 p.m. by Vice President James R. Sasiadek. In addition to Vice President Sasiadek, the following Board members were present: Ms. Sarah D. Bormel, Ms. Phyllis E. Ettinger, Mr. Thomas G. Grzymski, Mr. Michael P. Kennedy, Ms. Janese Murray, and Mr. James E. Walker. Also in attendance were Dr. Joe A. Hairston, Superintendent of Schools, and staff members.

Ms. Barbara Burnopp, Executive Director of Fiscal Services, reviewed the capital budget recommendations as presented to the Board on September 24, 2002.

Mr. Hayden entered the room at 6:42 p.m.

Ms. Rita Fromm, Executive Director of Planning and Support Operations, provided information on issues raised at the last meeting about Featherbed Lane Elementary School and the Northwest Area Addition. The latest enrollment figures indicate Featherbed Lane is under capacity. Ms. Fromm noted the September 30th enrollment data was not in yet and, therefore, could not comment on the specifics of the school's enrollment. Also, additional services have been placed at the school that require additional staff. She noted that capital funds for additions are tied to enrollment.

Mr. Kennedy asked Ms. Fromm if Featherbed's enrollment figures this time last year were similar. She replied that after the September 30th enrollment data has been compiled, it would be reviewed to determine any patterns.

Ms. Ettinger stated with respect to the state-rated capacity, we need to look at how the buildings are used to meet students' needs. Ms. Fromm said that the state-rated capacity is a number that fluctuates, depending on how the rooms are being used.

Noting that many of last week's speakers commented on the condition of the building, Ms. Murray inquired if staff had taken a comprehensive look at the physical needs of the building. Dr. Krempel shared that Facilities had completed 140 work orders at the school this year. He recognized safety issues (students walking outside between buildings) at the school. The principals expressed a desire to remove the modulars and relocatables and construct an addition. Dr. Krempel indicated that given the existing structure, an addition does not appear to be a possibility. He also noted that once a new structure is attached to the main building, there are code issues involved, and it becomes cost prohibitive. A remedy to one of the problems is providing an ingress/egress road in the back of the building. It was noted that the estimated cost of this improvement would be about $225,000.

Mr. Kennedy expressed a desire to look at ways to reduce the number of students at Featherbed, whether it be redistricting or denying applications for Special Permission transfers.

Ms. Fromm indicated that staff needs to keep open some of the options mentioned by Mr. Kennedy, as well as looking at the capacities in schools in the Featherbed area.

Dr. Krempel reiterated that Featherbed is a difficult site, and there are few modifications that can be made to the site.

Mr. Sasiadek inquired about the school's mobility rate. The intermediate school principal stated the rate is down, but noted the main concern is new housing that will open up in the area. She noted the typical influx of students occurs between November and January.

Mr. Kennedy requested information on numbers in surrounding schools. He also requested, prior to the October 10th vote, some preliminary ideas from staff as to what can be done to alleviate some of the situations facing Featherbed.

Dr. Kennedy reminded Board members that given the current capital budget, the site configuration, and tonight's discussion, state funding would not be available if an attached addition was considered.

Ms. Ettinger shared Mr. Kennedy's concern about the need to make a reasoned and informed decision on this issue. She also noted this is a long-term issue. Ms. Ettinger asked for population projections for Featherbed and the surrounding schools, going out five years or more. Ms. Ettinger also stated the need to look at the issue of the use of space within the existing space. Program needs for students should also be examined. Finally, Ms. Ettinger asked for the projected student yield from the new homes being constructed.

Ms. Fromm stated the yield is expected to be between 26-36 students. Ms. Ettinger cautioned Ms. Fromm that in the past, staff and the Board have been surprised by the student yield from new homes.

Ms. Ettinger stated the Board has two responsibilities in this matter:

1) To make the current situation better for the students, and
2) To look into the future and try to determine what the needs will be and what should appropriately be done.

Dr. Hairston asked Dr. Krempel about the time frame involved for the projects discussed this evening. He also noted the funding process alone takes time. Dr. Krempel responded that projects would take between 3-3 ½ years to come to fruition.

Ms. Fromm distributed a handout regarding September 30, 2001, enrollment data for the Northwest Area, and a handout showing developments in the New Town area. She noted it has not yet been determined who will receive the 100-seat addition.

Ms. Ettinger stated when New Town was discussed, there was a desire that the school be flexible in the way it was used. Now, she continued, the issue isn't just about building facilities

for children, but about looking forward to meet our needs, as well as an opportunity to think about what schools should look like. She said sometimes action is taken too quickly to house students, when the philosophical issues should be discussed, so the move is not regretted at a later date.

Ms. Bormel shared her view that large elementary schools are not desirable and inquired which elementary school might have space to relieve New Town's overcrowding. Ms. Fromm responded that the September 30th enrollment data needs to be reviewed, but looking at the pattern of development, Cedarmere might be a possibility.

Mr. Hayden suggested that New Town may already be too big and consideration should be given to redistricting as soon as possible.

Mr. Walker voiced his opposition to an addition for New Town.

Mr. Hayden commented on the issues raised by speakers regarding conditions at Powhatan Elementary School. He encouraged Facilities staff to address the situation, and asked his colleagues to visit the school.

Mr. Kennedy agreed with Mr. Hayden and stated there may be other "Powhatans out there." He also addressed two other issues raised during the public hearing—air conditioning schools and an auditorium for Ridgely Middle School. With respect to air conditioning, Mr. Kennedy noted we have disabled youngsters who are mainstreamed and that there is a need to look at that possibility over time and formulate a plan. With respect to an auditorium for Ridgely, he stated middle schools are at a disadvantage without that kind of space. He suggested that the Board start looking at schools that do not have an auditorium.

Mr. Grzymski noted the various types of projects in the exhibit and suggested, perhaps, starting another list for Powhatan and Featherbed Lane to be funded by money left over in other projects after completion. Ms. Burnopp stated the current outstanding list totals $109 million.

At 8:37 p.m., Mr. Walker moved to adjourn the work session. The motion was seconded by Mr. Kennedy and approved by the Board.

Respectfully submitted,

_____

Joe A. Hairston
Secretary-Treasurer

dz

BALTIMORE COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS

B

October 22, 2002

TO: **BOARD OF EDUCATION**

FROM: Dr. Joe A. Hairston, Superintendent

TITLE: **ENROLLMENT**

ORIGINATOR: J. Robert Haines, Deputy Superintendent of Business Services

RESOURCE PERSON(S): Greg Barlow, Executive Director of Information and Technology
Jim Harper, Supervisor Student Data

INFORMATION

Appendix 1 and II contain information related to the enrollment in the System over five years with details for the 2002 – 2003 school year.

Appendix I – Executive Summary – Enrollment 2002 – 2003
Appendix II – Enrollment (Projected versus Actual 1998 – 2002)

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY
Enrollment as of September 30, 2002

The System's enrollment is projected in December. It is based on current enrollment, a three-year enrollment trend for each school, birth information, and school-to-school feeder patterns. After the projected enrollment is established in December, schools continually update the Student Information System which provides new registrations and withdrawals. On September 30th, this information is "frozen" to enable the System to provide the State with its official numbers. The System's revenues from the State are based on the September 30th enrollment count.

Appendix I is a five year history of projected enrollments, actual enrollments as of September 30th , and the increases/decreases that have occurred in the System, areas, and levels.

For the 2002 – 2003 school year, the September 30th enrollment is 108,604, a 1.19% increase over last year's enrollment of 107,322.

The 2002-2003 enrollment count is an increase of 1,164 students over the projection of 107,440 students made last December.

This increase, in the number of students over projections, is due to the following:

• Additional transfers from other public school systems	142
• Additional transfers from private schools	192
• Decrease in the number of students moving out of BCPS	334
• Additional preschool students	204
• Additional students new to the County	292
TOTAL	1,164

BALTIMORE COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS

ENROLLMENT

DESC.	1998				1999				2000				2001				2002			
	Projected Dec. 97	Actual Sept.30	+/-	Percent	Projected Dec. 98	Actual Sept.30	+/-	Percent	Projected Dec. 99	Actual Sept.30	+/-	Percent	Projected Dec. 00	Actual Sept.30	+/-	Percent	Projected Dec. 01	Actual Sept.30	+/-	Percent
AREA																				
Southwest	20037	20543	506	2.46%	20723	20668	-55	-0.27%	20935	20996	61	0.29%	21092	20911	-181	-0.87%	20957	21110	153	0.72%
Northwest	22010	21397	-613	-2.86%	21734	22019	285	1.29%	22505	22341	-164	-0.73%	22707	22934	227	0.99%	23385	23440	55	0.23%
Central	19699	20849	1150	5.52%	20832	20778	-54	-0.26%	20603	20689	86	0.42%	20610	20624	14	0.07%	20555	20832	277	1.33%
Northeast	22723	22025	-698	-3.17%	22061	24451	2390	9.77%	24469	24548	79	0.32%	24506	24577	71	0.29%	24610	24881	271	1.09%
Southeast	21472	21173	-299	-1.41%	20887	18605	-2282	-12.27%	18586	18405	-181	-0.98%	18344	18162	-182	-1.00%	17819	18131	312	1.72%
Misc. Prog.	444	313	-131	-41.85%	313	202	-111	-54.95%	202	154	-48	-31.17%	101	114	13	11.40%	114	210	96	45.71%
SYSTEM TOTAL	106385	106300	-85	-0.08%	106550	106723	173	0.16%	107300	107133	-167	-0.16%	107360	107322	-38	-0.04%	107440	108604	1164	1.07%
LEVEL																				
Pre K	3082	3179	97	3.05%	3179	3250	71	2.18%	3350	3182	-168	-5.28%	3182	3176	-6	-0.19%	3200	3404	204	5.99%
Kindergarten	7116	6919	-197	-2.85%	6640	6781	141	2.08%	7309	6722	-587	-8.73%	6808	6665	-143	-2.15%	6669	6654	-15	-0.23%
Grade 1 - 5	42691	41668	-1023	-2.46%	41055	41163	108	0.26%	40259	40420	161	0.40%	39523	39587	64	0.16%	38589	39088	499	1.28%
Grade 6 - 8	24604	24478	-126	-0.51%	24960	24994	34	0.14%	25190	25564	374	1.46%	25855	25738	-117	-0.45%	26102	26281	179	0.68%
Grade 9 - 12	28337	29495	1158	3.93%	30155	29946	-209	-0.70%	30603	30701	98	0.32%	31448	31631	183	0.58%	32355	32674	319	0.98%
Non-Graded	555	561	6	1.07%	561	589	28	4.75%	589	544	-45	-8.27%	544	525	-19	-3.62%	525	503	-22	-4.37%
SYSTEM TOTAL	106385	106300	-85	-0.08%	106550	106723	173	0.16%	107300	107133	-167	-0.16%	107360	107322	-38	-0.04%	107440	108604	1164	1.07%

C

BALTIMORE COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS

DATE: October 22, 2002

TO: BOARD OF EDUCATION

FROM: Dr. J. Hairston, Superintendent

SUBJECT: Independent Evaluation Of The New Elementary Reading Series

ORIGINATOR: Christine Johns, Deputy Superintendent of Curriculum and Instruction

RESOURCE PERSON(S): Kathleen McMahon, Executive Director of Elementary Programs

INFORMATION

This report should be used, along with information gathered by the Department of Elementary Programs personnel, to evaluate the first year of implementation of the reading materials and to plan for the second year of implementation.

Attachment I – Independent Evaluation Of The New Reading Series Selected By Baltimore County Public Schools

KM/jm

AN EVALUATION OF THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE NEW READING SERIES SELECTED BY THE BALTIMORE COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS

2001-2002

For the

Office of the Superintendent
Baltimore County Public Schools

By

Gilbert R. Austin, Ph.D.

Assisted by
John Hutchinson
Herbert Garber, Ph.D.

August, 2002

Table of Contents

Executive Summary iii

Background 1

Introduction 3

Report on the Survey 3

Summary and Conclusion 10

Report on School Interviews - Introduction 10

Methodology 11

Organization of Interviews 11

The Interview Findings 12

Concluding Thoughts 26

Report on Professional Development and Training Sessions - Introduction 27

Grades 1 - 3 28

Grades 4 - 5 30

Reading Specialists' Meeting Entitled Home/School Connection 32

Summary and Conclusion 33

Reactions from Special Groups 34

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics 5

Table 2. Means for Total Group and Priority Level Groups for the Five Sets of Questions 6

Table 3. Means and Standard Deviations of Special Groups 35

Executive Summary

In September 2000, personnel from the Department of Elementary Programs (DEP), Baltimore County Public Schools, had the opportunity to write a proposal for a one-time only elementary reading textbook purchase to benefit the students and teachers of Baltimore County Public Schools. The decision to identify consistent reading materials was based upon a survey of all elementary administrators during fall 2000. Both teachers and administrators had requested a comprehensive structured format to plan a rigorous high-quality reading instructional program. A comprehensive review process was conducted to adopt a reading series to match the components of the Baltimore County Public Schools Framework for Literacy Instruction. Three reading series were pilot tested beginning in December 2000 at selected grade levels in 28 elementary schools. The series that were selected were the Open Court *Phonemic Awareness* and *Phonics Kit* for kindergarten through grade three, and the Houghton Mifflin *A Legacy for Literacy* for grades one through five. In the fall of 2001, the superintendent of the Baltimore County schools asked Dr. Gilbert Austin, Ph. D. to conduct an independent evaluation of the implementation of the first year of the new reading series.

After many meetings and discussions on how the implementation evaluation was to be carried out, it was agreed that three main activities would be performed to complete the evaluation. First was to design a survey, send it out to principals, and analyze the results. Second, school-wide interviews would be conducted at ten elementary schools, chosen as representative of the five BCPS geographic areas. Third, the evaluator would review and write comments summarizing the evaluation forms completed by those attending about 20 professional development workshops held during the 2001-2002 school year.

The elementary school principals of Baltimore County are in agreement about the new reading series purchased and implemented in the schools. Few are dissatisfied with this program. They find that teachers and students both enjoy working with the Open Court and Houghton Mifflin materials, and the students are learning to read at a pace and level rarely experienced before.

The results of the evaluation indicate with confidence that the Baltimore County Public Schools have chosen a remarkably good set of materials for the teaching of reading both as a basic skill and as a tool to expand academic achievement in general.

To help evaluate the process of professional development and implementation of the new reading program, personnel from ten elementary schools participated in interviews. These schools were considered representative of the five geographic regions of Baltimore County. Schools were asked to select members from their reading leadership team to participate in a group interview.

For the Open Court materials, the overall reaction was positive. Comments on the strengths of the program often came with suggestions for improvement. A kindergarten teacher shared, "I like the Open Court books. The guide is teacher friendly. My kids can blend and know sound manipulations." For the Houghton Mifflin materials, again there was much praise about the strengths of the program. A fifth grade teacher told what the program meant to him, "The new program has been helpful. You have reading, spelling, language, and writing, together all in the guide."

The overall reaction from faculty, parents, and students has been generally positive. There was some concern at the beginning of the year from faculty, but that appears to be easing somewhat now that people are getting used to the materials. One principal noted that, "Initially people were in shock. It was a major undertaking to get comfortable with two series. That was one of the biggest stressors – to learn all the materials."

Teachers and administrators participated in a variety of professional development activities to improve their understanding of the Open Court *Phonics Kit* reading materials. In general, those professional development activities offered by the county received more favorable comments than those offered by the Open Court publishing company.

Schools used a variety of strategies to introduce and implement the new reading program by Open Court. A first grade teacher shared, "One of our teachers taught Open Court in the City last year and we went to observe her." An assistant principal added, "The reading specialists have been very helpful to the new teachers here."

Teachers, administrators, reading specialists, and mentors participated in a variety of professional development activities to improve their understanding of the use of the Houghton Mifflin *A Legacy of Literacy* reading materials. Houghton Mifflin, BCPS personnel, and individual school's faculty members, provided training. Many schools used a combination of the three sources for information. Again, the professional development activities offered by the county received more favorable comments than did those offered by the Houghton Mifflin publishing company – particularly in the beginning of the school year.

Selected teachers from the first through fifth grades participated in professional development sessions to learn to use the new reading program published by Houghton Mifflin and Open Court. Participants filled out evaluation sheets at the end of each workshop and responded to four prompt statements and one graphic rating scale.

Teachers who took part in the Open Court and Houghton Mifflin Baltimore County Schools' professional development apparently enjoyed the experience and felt they had gained valuable understanding. Many found the sample lesson plans to be highly prized and the lesson planner/guide tools of great potential. Often teachers mentioned the value of having the program presented by experienced classroom teachers similar to themselves.

Baltimore County undertook an ambitious overhaul of the reading program in their elementary schools this year. At this point, the overall reaction is positive, although initially educators were feeling overwhelmed by the task. Parents and students had positive reactions to the new reading materials.

The new reading program was implemented in Baltimore County as fully as was possible during this first year. Educators are already looking ahead to next year when they will have more experience with the materials, know the stories better, and can deepen the implementation of the new reading program. Baltimore County accomplished a lot in this initial year of implementation.

AN EVALUATION OF THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE NEW READING SERIES SELECTED BY THE BALTIMORE COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS 2001-2002

Background

In September 2000, personnel from the Department of Elementary Programs (DEP), Baltimore County Public Schools, had the opportunity to write a proposal for a one-time only elementary reading textbook purchase to benefit the students and teachers of Baltimore County Public Schools. As a result of much hard work and many meetings, the new proposal for the reading series was accepted by the Baltimore County Council and was funded for $2,700,000.

The decision to identify consistent reading materials was based upon a survey of all elementary administrators during fall 2000. It revealed that the planning of reading instruction at that time was complex. Both teachers and administrators requested a comprehensive structured format to plan a rigorous, high-quality reading instructional program. A challenging standardized reading curriculum in the elementary schools would afford consistency and equity for all students to become successful, literate individuals as delineated in the *Blueprint for Progress: Realizing the Vision.*

A comprehensive review process was conducted to adopt a reading series to match the components of the Baltimore County Public Schools Framework for Literacy Instruction. The reading selection and review process began with members of the Department of Elementary Programs reviewing six reading series. A thorough program criteria checklist containing elements of an effective literacy program and multicultural considerations was used to identify the reading series' strengths and weaknesses.

Three reading series were pilot tested beginning in December 2000 at selected grade levels in 28 elementary schools. Teachers piloting the series completed the program criteria checklist. Materials for each of the series were available in the five area offices for review and evaluation by teachers and members of the community. A reading selection committee was also formed comprised of classroom teachers, mentors, reading specialists, special educators, administrators, parents, and personnel from the Department of Elementary Programs. A 45-member committee

heard formal presentations by the publishers of all three reading series at separate meetings and completed a program criteria checklist for all three series. A series was identified and the recommendation was made to Dr. Joe A. Hairston, Superintendent. This recommendation was presented to the Board of Education on May 30, 2001. The series that were selected were the Open Court *Phonemic Awareness* and *Phonics Kit* for kindergarten through grade three, and the Houghton Mifflin *A Legacy for Literacy* for grades one through five. The Open Court *Phonemic Awareness* and *Phonics Kits* support the instruction of phonemic awareness, phonics, and fluency. Houghton Mifflin *A Legacy of Literacy* supports the instruction of fluency, vocabulary, and text comprehension.

The objectives identified for the selection of this new reading series were: (1) to provide a clearer focus for all teachers and administrators about components of an effective reading program; (2) to provide consistent reading materials for BCPS students and teachers and to decrease the need for teachers to locate their own materials from which to plan lessons; (3) to increase the alignment of instruction with assessment expectations of the state of Maryland; (4) to provide more structure/information to less experienced teachers about reading instruction; (5) to increase the rigor of the K-3 instructional programs through the use of structured phonics-based reading materials and increase the rigor of the grades 1-5 instructional program; and (6) to provide reading materials that include multiple texts to more easily facilitate differentiation of instruction.

One reason for the identification of these objectives was the increasing diversity in the population of Baltimore County Public Schools. The current program has underserved certain groups of students, such as minority students, students participating in the free and reduced meals program, and students attending multiple schools within their school career.

There has been an increased employment of teachers with five or fewer years of experience. The reading leadership team in schools (principal, assistant principals, reading specialists, mentors, and classroom teachers) needed more information about the components of an effective reading program. The Open Court *Phonemic Awareness* and *Phonics Kit,* and Houghton Mifflin's *A Legacy of Literacy* best met the identified objectives.

Introduction

In the fall of 2001, the superintendent of the Baltimore County schools asked Dr. Gilbert Austin to conduct an independent evaluation of the implementation of the first year of the new reading series. The remainder of this report is based on that evaluation. A number of people in the Baltimore County Public Schools provided a great deal of assistance in this evaluation. This was particularly true of the Department of Elementary Programs, and the Department of Assessment and Student Data.

The evaluation implementation focused on three main activities. First was to design a survey, send it out to principals, and analyze the results. Second, school-wide interviews would be conducted at ten elementary schools, chosen as representative of the five BCPS geographic areas. Third, the evaluator would review and write comments summarizing the evaluation forms completed by those attending about 20 professional development workshops held during the 2001-2002 school year.

Report on the Survey

The final survey contained 45 items and was created based on input from all BCPS personnel concerned with the implementation. The survey was judged to have face and content validity. Its reliability was established by computing a Cronbach Alpha for the total and for each of the five subscales. The Cronbach Alpha is a measure of inter-item reliability and is the most commonly used index of reliability in education. The Cronbach Alphas were: total, .99; Houghton Mifflin, .95; Open Court, .97; new reading series, .94; professional development, .97; and implementing training, .94. All were statistically significant at the .001 level.

There were 103 surveys distributed and 91 were returned. That is an 88% response rate, which in any survey would be judged to be an exceptional return rate. The survey was broken down into five different sets of questions, under the headings of Houghton Mifflin, Open Court, new reading series, professional development, and implementation training.

Table 1 presents the number of responses and the mean and standard deviation for each of the 45 survey items. Each item had a Likert-type response that ranged from 1 (strongly disagree) to

4 (strongly agree). The theoretical mean for each item would be 2.50. Thirty-four of the 45 responses had means above 2.9. Clearly the majority of principals agreed or strongly agreed that the implementation of the reading series had gone well. Two items, 21 and 22, had the highest means, 3.23 and 3.26. Both were concerned with Open Court. Items 38 and 39 had the lowest means, 2.42 and 2.53. Both items were concerned with summer 2001 professional development sessions.

The Houghton Mifflin questions numbered eight. Because each respondent could rate an item from one to four, the possible range was from 8 points to 32 points. Therefore, there was a theoretical midpoint of 20. The mean for the total group was 23.85.

For Open Court, there were 11 items with a possible range from 11 to 44. The theoretical midpoint is 27.5. The total group mean was 34.30.

There were six items relating to the new reading series as a whole, with a possible range from 6 to 24. The theoretical midpoint was 15 and the total group mean was 17.83.

For professional development, there were 14 items with a range from 14 to 56. The midpoint was 35 and the mean for the total group was 39.24.

For implementation training there were six items, and the possible range was 6 to 24 with a midpoint of 15. The total group mean was 17.71.

Table 1

Descriptive Statistics

		N	Mean	Standard Deviation
1.	HM implemented at primary	91	3.02	1.011
2.	HM implemented at intermediate	90	3.09	1.002
3.	OC implemented at kindergarten	90	3.16	1.027
4.	OC implemented at grade 1	90	3.22	1.058
5.	OC implemented at grade 2	90	3.12	1.047
6.	OC implemented at grade 3	90	3.03	.999
7.	OC supports Word-ID	91	3.08	1.035
8.	OC supports differentiation	90	2.88	.910
9.	OC improving pupils' Word-ID	91	3.19	1.010
10.	HM supports reading comprehension	91	2.98	.882
11.	HM supports differentiation	91	2.98	.931
12.	HM improving reading comprehension	90	2.96	.806
13.	New program good for minorities	84	2.92	.839
14.	New program good for FARMS	84	2.94	.841
15.	New program good for mobility	81	3.11	.866
16.	New program easier for newer teachers	90	2.96	.993
17.	New program better for experienced teachers	91	2.79	.937
18.	New program better than previous program	90	3.17	1.030
19.	Tenured teachers implement HM	91	2.98	.989
20.	Tenured teachers implement OC	91	3.07	1.020
21.	OC has good phonics lessons	91	3.23	1.055
22.	OC has consistency for grades, schools	91	3.26	1.042
23.	HM supports MLOs and IRs	90	2.92	.838
24.	Untenured teachers implement HM	90	2.88	.791
25.	Untenured teachers implement OC	89	2.97	.935
26.	Sample lessons for primary	90	2.69	.843
27.	Sample lessons for intermediate	89	2.71	.842
28.	Training for use with highly able readers	91	2.82	.811
29.	Training for use with on-grade readers	91	3.03	.836
30.	Training for use with below-grade readers	91	2.81	.815
31.	Training for use with special-ed readers	91	2.63	.825
32.	Materials available on time	91	2.91	.962
33.	Adequate training for principal	91	3.09	.962
34.	Adequate training for assistant principal	90	2.91	.944
35.	Adequate training for reading specialist	89	3.09	.996
36.	Adequate training for mentors	69	2.91	1.025
37.	Adequate training for classroom teachers	87	2.77	.949
38.	Summer 2001 sessions helpful	90	2.43	.849
39.	August 2001 professional development helpful	90	2.53	.974
40.	School visits by Elementary Ed. helpful	83	3.18	1.026
41.	Nov, Feb teacher sessions helpful	90	2.94	.904
42.	Reading specialists/mentor sessions helpful	89	3.00	.989
43.	FAQ document helpful	90	3.13	.939
44.	Overall implementation has gone well	89	2.98	.892
45.	Overall professional development has gone well	88	2.90	.947

The elementary schools in Baltimore County are each assigned a priority level. These levels are defined as follows. Priority one schools are supported by the academic intervention team schools. They are the ten lowest performing elementary schools based on CTBS and MSPAP data. Priority two schools are the continuation of the priority one list for the next 12 elementary schools. Priority three schools are those that were identified by the area executive directors of schools upon which they would like the elementary office to focus. Reasons for the identification of priority three schools were new principals, achievement lower than other schools with similar demographic profiles, etc. Priority four schools included the rest of the elementary schools, about 60. The mean for each priority level and the total group mean were computed and are presented in Table 2. These data indicate that the priority levels 1 and 2 schools tended to have lower ratings. Priority level 3, however, had the lowest scores of all priority levels. Not surprising, priority level 4 schools had the highest means. To see if these differences were statistically significant, the evaluator did an analysis of variance across the four priority groups for each of the five sets of questions. There were no statistically significant differences among any of the four priority groups.

Table 2

Means for Total Group and Priority Level Groups for the Five Sets of Questions

Question Sets	Total Group	Priority 1	Priority 2	Priority 3	Priority 4
Houghton Mifflin	23.85	22.33	22.67	21.36	24.98
Open Court	34.30	33.11	33.46	31.27	35.32
New reading series	17.83	16.83	16.91	16.70	18.55
Professional development	39.24	37.66	40.27	35.80	41.30
Implementation training	17.71	16.67	18.17	15.80	18.26

Please note that approximately 60 of the 91 schools are classified as priority 4.

The following items were used in the Houghton Mifflin group: 1, 2, 10, 11, 12, 19, 23, & 24

Open Court: 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 20, 21, 22, 25

New reading series: 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18

Professional development: 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 42, & 45

Implementation training: 32, 39, 40, 41, 43, 44

After responding on a four-point rating scale to 45 statements about the implementation of the new reading series, the principals were asked to respond to five open-ended questions on the effects and needed adjustment of the program. The first four questions asked specifically for the principals' judgments on the following topics (paraphrased):

1. ... implementation of the new reading materials in your school?
2. ... professional development provided for your school reading leadership team?
3. ... effect of the new reading materials on your students?
4. ... effect of the new reading materials on your teachers?
5. ... any additional comments or concerns?

Responses were thorough and thoughtful. Most principals' responses indicated the new series and the implementation had a positive effect on their students and teachers. Also, a number made constructive, critical comments and suggestions. Only in one or two cases did a principal claim that the "old way" was good enough and saw no need for the new materials.

Praise for the Department of Elementary Programs of BCPS was seen quite often. Individual members were named from time to time in laudatory terms.

This section presents a summary of the comments and suggestions provided under the five topics listed above. It is followed by a Summary and Conclusion section.

Question 1. "... about the implementation of the new reading materials in your school?"

The most common reply to this was that it had gone well and they believed that teachers truly liked the new materials. Also, the consistency of the program among County schools was a worthwhile accomplishment and will definitely benefit students (and their teachers) when students must change schools.

New teachers, in particular, are mentioned often as major beneficiaries of these new materials and the training that they received. Many principals pointed out that the sheer bulk of materials was "overwhelming" at first but, with excellent support by Department of Elementary Program staff, implementation and successful mastery of the program by teachers has happened and/or is continuing to the present time. In contrast, the publishers' educational consultants were

perceived to be less satisfactory. Several pointed out that they were impressed by the improved lesson planning and unmistakable pupil progress they have observed.

A few schools are finding difficulty integrating Open Court with Houghton Mifflin. Some also seek more help with MLOs and claim indicator alignment is needed.

Question 2. "... professional development provided for your school reading leadership team?"

In the eyes of these principals, professional development was quite effective and that provided by DEP was far superior to that from the publishers. Several did request more professional development assistance because the load of new materials is so taxing. Teachers, even with their best effort, are finding it difficult to absorb and apply so much new, although valued, material.

A scattering of respondents, only two or three in each case, felt as follows: more help was needed with MLOs and training for leader-to-teacher people; principals should be trained first and assistant principals and reading specialists should be trained earlier; teacher training came too late; or too early; all should train simultaneously; and training was inappropriate for special education teachers.

As one can see, perceptions varied across schools. About half of the complaints came from people in priority four schools, which numbered approximately one-half of the 84 principals responding (44).

Question 3. ". . . effect of the new reading materials on your students?"

Time after time, principals remarked on the positive results they had seen: "They are reading purposefully; enjoying reading; they can read; they are strong in phonics; we see increased word identification skills; more skilled readers," and so on. Several pointed to the advantage of the combination of Open Court and Houghton Mifflin: the first providing excellent training in phonics, presumably, word attack skills, and the latter leading to superior ability to comprehend and understand content, hence an appreciation for the power attained with this developed cognitive skill. Many commented on the interesting content in the stories and how the program provides a systematic approach to teaching and learning that is proving most effective.

A few, however, wished to reserve judgment, claiming it is too early to tell. A few others claimed test results show notable improvement in reading scores. All in all, positive comments outnumbered others by a wide margin, of four or five to one.

Question 4 "... effect of the new reading materials on your teachers?"

The most frequent comments (about 20%) from all respondents about the effects on teachers were that they seem to be "happy," find planning easier, and perceived positive support for teaching the MLOs. Teachers were overwhelmed by the sheer bulk and seeming complexity of the program at first, and sometimes found it quite stressful and time-consuming. However, with good DEP support and the passage of time, they are becoming better teachers, and are grateful for the help given them. They are finding planning easier and more effective, and the novels (from Houghton Mifflin) most effective and motivating, especially with more able learners.

Small numbers, four or five, are finding problems with Open Court and Houghton Mifflin alignment with MLOs, continue to need more materials to teach the MLOs, have positive regard for the Open Court materials but less for Houghton Mifflin. Two lauded Houghton Mifflin; and countywide coordination was appreciated.

Question 5. "... any additional comments or concerns?"

Over half (47) of the respondents left this question blank. Of the responses offered, 17 expressed positive thoughts, such as consistency of program, appreciation for excellent training provided by DEP personnel, and gratitude for the fine progress observed by staff among students. Eleven others thought more training was needed in formulating stance questions, narrowing of focus, how to integrate Houghton Mifflin novels, MLO alignment, and worksheets for Open Court lessons.

A scattering, one or two, commented on the need for dialogue among teachers in different schools, help with selection of stories in the Houghton Mifflin materials, information on how to teach two groups of students in kindergarten and first grade simultaneously ("perhaps a video demonstration would help us here"), and information on how to match the teaching of writing with these materials.

Summary and Conclusion

It is clear that the elementary school principals of Baltimore County are in agreement about the new reading series purchased and implemented in the schools. Very few are dissatisfied with this program. They find that teachers and students both enjoy working with the Open Court and Houghton Mifflin materials and the students are learning to read at a pace and level rarely experienced before.

Constructive, critical comments asked for more support from the DEP and more time to adjust to the large volume of materials. A few requested more model lessons, a video or other means for demonstrating some complex classroom strategies, e.g., teaching two groups simultaneously, and arranging for conferences with teachers from different schools.

In conclusion, the survey reveals with confidence that the Department of Elementary Programs has chosen a remarkably good set of materials for the teaching of reading, both as a basic skill, and as a tool, to greater academic achievement in general.

Report on School Interviews

Introduction

Baltimore County purchased and began implementation of a new elementary school reading program in September 2001, which included Open Court's *Phonemics Awareness* and *Phonics Kit* for kindergarten through grade three, and Houghton Mifflin's *A Legacy of Literacy* for grades one through five. To help evaluate the process of professional development and implementation of the new reading program, ten elementary schools identified staff to participate in interviews. These schools represented the five different geographic regions of the county. Of that ten, nine schools participated in the interview process: SW - Hebbville; NW - Owings Mills; C - Pleasant Plains; NE - Orems; SE - Colgate; SE - Sussex; NE - Fullerton; NW - New Town; Spec. Ed. Center - White Oak. The schools ranged from priority one to priority four. The interviews took place between April 16 and April 26, 2002.

Methodology

Schools were asked to select members representative of their reading leadership team to participate in a group interview. Schools selected teams that included principals, assistant principals, reading specialists, mentors, special educators, primary classroom teachers, and intermediate classroom teachers. The interviews took place in the schools and lasted from one and one-half hours to two hours. A retired Baltimore County principal conducted the interviews using a set of predetermined questions. Seven questions were selected and forwarded to the schools to review prior to the interviews. Following are the questions used in the interviews:

1. What is your overall reaction to the new reading materials? What do you see as its strengths? Its weaknesses? How does it compare with its predecessor? Why do you think BCPS purchased the new reading materials?

2. What reactions have you had from your faculty about the new reading materials? Parents? Students?

3. Describe the professional development activities for the Open Court *Phonics Kit* that you participated in during the 2001-2002 school year.

4. Describe what was done in your school, grades K - 3, to implement the use of the Open Court *Phonics Kit*.

5. Describe the professional development activities for the Houghton Mifflin *A Legacy of Literacy* reading materials that you participated in during the 2001-2002 school year.

6. Describe what was done in your school, grades 1 - 5, to implement the use of the Houghton Mifflin *A Legacy of Literacy* reading materials.

7. To what degree has your faculty been able to fully implement the new reading materials? What has helped them? What are your future needs?

Organization of Interviews

This section focuses on the voices of teachers and administrators as they worked this year to learn and implement a new reading program in the elementary schools of Baltimore County. Their voices tell a poignant story of what they have worked so hard to accomplish, their views on training, and the help that was provided. They describe what is really working for children and what is not, their struggles as teachers, and their future needs. The report is organized around the

seven questions of the interview and faithfully tries to capture the essence of what teachers and administrators wanted to say.

The Interview Findings

1. What is your overall reaction to the new reading materials? What do you see as its strengths? Its weaknesses? How does it compare with its predecessor? Why do you think BCPS purchased the new reading materials?

It was interesting to note that this question elicited more responses than any of the other six questions on the interview. It seemed the interviewees were ready to talk and express their views. Following are some of their thoughts on the new reading materials -- overall reactions, strengths, weaknesses, comparisons, and why the county made the purchase.

For the Open Court materials, the overall reaction has been positive. Comments on the strengths of the program often came with suggestions for improvement. A kindergarten teacher shared, "I like the Open Court books. The guide is teacher friendly. My kids can blend and know sound manipulations. Sometimes it is a little too fast paced – doing a lesson a day." One of her colleagues interjected, "True at first grade, too. They need to be more kid-friendly with the pacing in Open Court." A principal offered his opinion, "I'm happy the county made the switch. Even the weakest kids are able to sound out words. Something's working." An assistant principal shared her thoughts, "It's daily, it's sequential, it boosts their skills. It's a basis for all teachers to start with phonics. Open Court provided a good basis for phonics (that new teachers didn't receive in college). It's work, though, to match it with the MLOs." A reading teacher shared her impression of the Open Court materials and how they are working, "I work with kindergarten children. It's easier to work with them. They are excited to work on sounds and letters. It is really working in kindergarten." A teacher in a special education school shared what she saw as the Open Court strengths, "a strong, prescribed program with picture cards, materials visually appealing, and audio support. It is good because all kids use the same materials throughout the county. This is important because we constantly receive new students."

For the Houghton Mifflin materials, again there was much praise about the strengths of the program. A fifth grade teacher told what the program has meant to him, "The new program has been helpful. You have reading, spelling, language, and writing, together all in the guide. We never have had a set program. It's all in Houghton Mifflin and it is a resource to go to. It's so much easier to plan. It's half the time. In grade five, the themes connect to our curriculum. You have easy, average, and hard books in the theme." Teachers like the variety, and the diversity as well in the Houghton Mifflin series. Grade six reading materials were included in the purchase to provide an easy to use resource for differentiation. A special education teacher said, "I like the variety of stories. They're multicultural. They have activities that are optional. They have extra books. Many skills are introduced. I like the CTBS and MSPAP formats for testing the themes. I like the daily language practice and the transparencies." A special education teacher shared her opinion, "The books have fiction and nonfiction. There was a fictional story about a sled dog in the Iditarod Race; then a real magazine article followed that selection." A fourth grade teacher found that Houghton Mifflin has "a lot of multicultural stories." Many educators praised the assessment program that came with the Houghton Mifflin series. A reading teacher commented, "They gave us a reading assessment kit to help us place kids in the series we are using" to which a first grade teacher responded, "It's a good assessment, too, of what kids can and can't do with sight vocabulary and comprehension -- with benchmarks to determine where a child is." Another teacher offered, "Second grade is using the Houghton Mifflin assessments to keep a running record on the students." A reading teacher shared her opinion on the assessment program, "Houghton Mifflin assessments make it easy to place kids."

As to the weaknesses, they were often mentioned along with the strengths during the interview. A third grade teacher shared an example. "There are lots of materials for Houghton Mifflin, which is very helpful. The main stories are great but usually difficult reading. With Open Court there are not enough materials. The sound cards are great. We have to create a lot of our own materials for Open Court and that takes a lot of time." One of the biggest concerns mentioned was matching up the two series – a problem in the primary grades where Houghton Mifflin and

Open Court are both used. The following interview conversation between a first and third grade teacher and principal serves to illustrate this.

Grade one teacher: "I'm a second year teacher. The materials are wonderful. The teacher's edition didn't line up with the MLOs – the county tried to work it out. The strengths are the high interest; kids enjoy the stories. Last year we had Macmillan and kids weren't as motivated. Another strength is that it is easy to pull out of the series to get into outside resources. There are not many stories where you have to 'read to perform a task' so you have to pull out of the series to get into that type of reading. The weaknesses are that Open Court and Houghton Mifflin don't match up, particularly when you have kids in the classroom on different levels. Houghton Mifflin may have a story with the 'ow' sound and Open Court hasn't introduced that sound yet. The Houghton Mifflin story may call for students to work on blending, but Open Court hasn't presented that skill yet."

Principal: "Teachers had a lot of work to do to marry the two series."

Grade three teacher: "The scope and sequence of the two series didn't match up."

Grade one teacher: "It was a bit of a struggle to match up the two series."

Principal: "Particularly when both series are new... The biggest problem – making the two work together."

For the Open Court program a reading teacher pointed out what she saw as a weakness, "Open Court is a nice program, however, for students needing remediation it is not multisensory enough – not enough for the students who are struggling. The black line readers are very nice and the books get advanced very quickly. Open Court needs more of a remedial program." Her principal added, "Experienced teachers are using Project Read while they use Open Court -- it's the Orton-Gillingham approach. They add the multisensory piece that is missing." For the Houghton Mifflin program, a concern expressed was that more work needs to be done to match up to the MLOs. One principal mentioned, "A weakness is matching the stories to the MLOs." Another principal shared her thoughts, "On the stance questions, Houghton Mifflin says they're in the book but they're not really. Teachers still need to write stance questions tied to the MLOs."

As to how the new program compares to its predecessor, one comment seems to speak volumes, "Compared to our predecessor, which was Spotlight on Literacy, it's like you've died and gone to heaven. The new program has the grammar piece built in. We like this much better." A reading teacher shared her thoughts, "It's a big improvement over what we had – to have something in place countywide." A fourth grade teacher offered his opinion, " It's so nice to have an up-to-

date, interesting series. Our basals were antiquated. Students want to read these stories." A reading teacher shared her excitement over the progress students were making in the new materials, "Compared to last year, our students are a year ahead of where they were in the past." The principal shared the same excitement, "In first grade, children are spelling at an unbelievable degree of accuracy."

As to why Baltimore County purchased the new materials, teachers shared some common beliefs. A reading teacher said, "It was purchased to have continuity around the county ... a strong phonics and comprehension program." A first grade teacher in the northwest area of the county shared, "They wanted to have the same reading program in the county to facilitate transfers." A reading teacher offered, "They wanted a more structured program for new teachers." And another teacher felt the new program was purchased to "provide consistency between new and old teachers in building skills in students."

Overall, Baltimore County educators welcomed the purchase and implementation of a new reading program that might bring some consistency to the county, provide support to students who are transferring, and help many new teachers in learning the art of teaching reading -- teaching students phonics, and comprehension to learn to read, and read to learn. Teachers felt the implementation of the new reading series was overwhelming at first, particularly the primary teachers who needed to implement two new programs. Teachers seemed to be growing more comfortable as they learned the materials. One principal said she was glad that she wasn't interviewed in the beginning of the year – when everyone felt stressed out and overwhelmed.

2. What reactions have you had from your faculty about the new reading materials? Parents? Students?

The overall reaction from faculty, parents, and students has been generally positive. There was some concern at the beginning of the year from faculty, but that appears to be easing somewhat now that people are getting used to the materials. One principal noted, "Initially people were in shock. It was a major undertaking to get comfortable with two series. That was one of the biggest stressors – to learn all the materials." Another principal said that now, "All faculty members pretty

much like it. It's a good program, a balanced program. I've heard it's a lot to do, however." A reading teacher shared, "Most teachers like the new materials. They are user-friendly – after having months to acclimate yourself."

A mentor talked about the teachers she works with, "It has been very well received because teachers have a guide – something to hold on to. They're not trying to create their own curriculum. It has become easier." A kindergarten teacher shared her excitement, " How quickly children are reading. It's all positive." A first grade teacher noted, "The take-home books are excellent. The students can read them. One concern is copying the decodable books." Teachers expressed some other concerns as well. A first grade teacher offered, "Back-mapping didn't work -- to find stories that matched the back-mapped objectives." A primary special education teacher thought, "We'd like to have one series or the other. If we could, we'd choose Houghton Mifflin. It's too hard to coordinate the two series. Staying with one series would smooth things out. It would reduce stress on teachers." A principal expressed an often-shared thought, "We need better matching between Houghton Mifflin and the indicators."

Parents appear to like the new reading program. A first grade teacher said, "Parents write notes like, 'I can't believe they're reading this.'" A principal shared, "Parents like phonics. They want that." Another principal related, "Parents aren't coming in complaining." Then another principal found, "For parents of low achieving students, they really like the phonics program." An assistant principal saw, "Parents just love it – particularly first grade parents who like the take-home books. They compare older siblings with what their children are learning now." And, a kindergarten teacher talked about the value of take-home books, "It helps the home-school connection and reinforces reading at home."

For students, the comments were mostly positive. A third grade teacher said, "My students love the books, the stories, and can't wait to get back into them. They've enjoyed the literature selections." A second grade teacher found that her children "are familiar with the stories. They like to go to the library to get the same books out – like Tomie dePaola books." One first grade teacher said her students wanted longer stories, but a third grade colleague said her students found

the stories too long. A fifth grade teacher said his students, "like the stories. They are current with people they can relate to – like Michele Kwan." A second grade teacher agreed, "Students like it – the tapes, the pictures. It's very engaging. In Open Court there are little games. They get excited about that." A kindergarten teacher shared her excitement, "Students want to come in and see the letter of the day, even before they go to their lockers. Students like the puppets, the rhymes, songs, and charts." Probably the best testimonial came from a fourth grade teacher about one of her students, "I have a child who never read anything except catalogs. Now he's outside at recess reading." Picking up on this theme, the principal noted, "I see more boys reading." The reading teacher agreed with this assessment, "There are more materials for boys. It's more engaging for them."

3. Describe the professional development activities for the Open Court *Phonics Kit* that you participated in during the 2001-2002 school year.

Teachers and administrators participated in a variety of professional development activities this past school year to improve their understanding of the Open Court *Phonics Kit* reading materials. In general, those professional development activities offered by the county received more favorable comments than did those offered by the Open Court publishing company.

Following are some comments about the Open Court publishing company presentations. A third grade teacher stated, "We had a presentation from Open Court by a teacher who did an excellent job – in August." In contrast another teacher found, "The person who presented to the second grade was not so good – she had never been a teacher before." A principal offered his opinion on why the different grade level trainings varied so much, "Drawback to that was that too many presenters were needed. That caused mixed messages. The Open Court presenter I heard was very skilled. Other people had presenters who were not skilled." Another principal termed the publisher presentations as, "Awful." A second grade teacher described the Open Court meeting she went to, "We asked how to do it. We got the reaction, 'Honey, I'm just here to sell it.'" Another teacher described her meeting as, "It was almost like a lynching of the Open Court people." However, not all was negative for Open Court. A reading teacher talked about a mid-year meeting

with Open Court, "that was wonderful." A mentor described a demonstration lesson from Open Court that was helpful to her. In another school, a first grade teacher said the model lessons "were helpful." A kindergarten teacher described what she liked, "We had a workshop and saw it live. That was helpful. One of the Open Court people came in and worked with my class. That was good."

Schools also had the benefit of training and help from Baltimore County personnel. A principal described what was helpful, "The Department of Elementary Programs made great efforts to support teachers and schools. They tried to give guidelines to match Open Court and Houghton Mifflin with the MLOs." Another principal described the professional development he received from Baltimore County. "They did professional development for principals for the first three principals' meetings. They did some nice things. Principals got more professional development than usual. The office is excellent (Department of Elementary Programs). You call and you get a response promptly. They are proactive, clear, and helpful." A kindergarten teacher talked about the help she had received from Baltimore County, "Sharon Hoffman (Early Childhood resource teacher) was in to help us. That really helped us on how to design lessons. That was a lifesaver. Anybody can follow it. It was like an Open Court planner."

4. Describe what was done in your school, grades K - 3, to implement the use of the Open Court *Phonics Kit*.

Schools used a variety of strategies to introduce and implement the new reading program by Open Court. One principal shared, "In kindergarten four out of seven teachers are new. We used Sharon Hoffman (Early Childhood resource teacher). She worked with them and gave feedback on their Open Court lessons. We have an affiliation with Goucher College as a PDS school. They gave feedback to new teachers as well." A first grade teacher shared, "One of our teachers taught Open Court in the City last year and we went to observe her." An assistant principal told what was helpful at her school, "The reading specialists have been very helpful to the new teachers here. They are our mentors." A principal shared, "We've had teachers teach teachers." Another principal

offered, "We've been doing structured phonics for five years in the Reading Roots program. This was not new for us."

A reading specialist told what they did schoolwide, "We assessed the entire school with a reading inventory and used the data, in collaboration with teachers, to group students by decoding skills homogeneously. After grouping them, we identified materials they could use. Then we implemented the program in conjunction with the Correlation Guide, which tells what to do for students above, on, and below grade level. We also ordered supplementary materials." A special education teacher related what had happened in her school, "Second grade teachers were instructed to begin at first grade level, so we needed additional materials. The first grade program is the backbone of the Open Court program. We really need to get the kids using the sounds and the cards. Our third grade teachers took our below level kids back to grade one materials." A mentor shared the learning process in her school, "We are learning as we are doing with constant and daily support. Next year it will be much easier." Another mentor believed, " It will take three years to get this under our belt." And a fifth grade teacher summed it up with, "We need to see the beginning, middle, and end of the program to understand it. We are beginning to see that – the long term view." Finally, a reading teacher shared what was helpful at her school, "Our administration has been very helpful and relaxed and kept the anxiety level down so you could get a comfort level to implement it correctly. Teachers needed this exploration time, just like children, with something new."

5. Describe the professional development activities for the Houghton Mifflin *A Legacy of Literacy* reading materials that you participated in during the 2001-2002 school year.

Teachers, administrators, reading specialists, and mentors participated in a variety of professional development activities this past school year to improve their understanding of the Houghton Mifflin *A Legacy of Literacy* reading materials – training provided by Houghton Mifflin, that provided by the county, and that provided in-house, or a combination of the three. Again, the professional development activities offered by the county received more favorable comments than

did those offered by the Houghton Mifflin Publishing Company – particularly in the beginning of the school year.

First, let's look at the Houghton Mifflin professional development activities. In the beginning of the year a first grade teacher found, "Houghton Mifflin was like Open Court with a lot of the consultants unsure of what to tell us. They couldn't answer a lot of our questions." A mentor added, "It was more of a sales job than instruction to teachers." A fourth grade teacher offered, "A lot of us were confused after the August meeting at Martin Boulevard. She confused us. Baltimore County then said something different. They didn't know how to make the materials fit the state. People sitting in smaller groups talking really helped." A first grade teacher shared, "With Houghton Mifflin we had a hard time. Houghton Mifflin expected one thing and Baltimore County expected another that wasn't developmentally appropriate." However, things changed and the Houghton Mifflin professional development became more appropriate for the schools. A principal said, "They also presented in November. We forged a special relationship with two of their consultants. It's a win-win for both sides. It's of value to their company. We are helping develop their program for the exceptional learner." A reading teacher shared, "We've had monthly meetings (January through April) with the Houghton Mifflin representatives for each grade level. The representatives used to be teachers and they have current experience." A special education teacher offered, "Houghton Mifflin came and presented the written language part of it on February 8th."

Baltimore County also did their part in providing professional training for teachers and administrators. One principal shared, "We are a priority four school. Sylvia Lemons (Language Arts resource teacher) came and did an hour and one-half session with each grade level revisiting the planning frame provided by the county. We also had November professional development."

Another principal shared what was helpful in her school, "There were other after-school meetings teachers could attend. Alison Donlon (Language Arts Coordinator) came and worked with us. Patty Nestor and Robin Rupprecht (Language Arts resource teachers) came and helped us with back-mapping and planning lessons tied to the MLOs. A reading teacher shared, "The Frequently Asked Questions was really good. That clarified what we needed." However, a

principal claimed that for him the Frequently Asked Questions was, "Poor." Another principal talked about outside resources, "Nancy Landers and Tony Annello (language arts personnel) were helpful." A mentor claimed that her school was "lucky to have the relationship we do with the language arts office. They give us the latest word." That mentor also offered that it was helpful when "Teachers went to Step Ahead (a DEP grant-funded program to support new teachers with Language Arts instruction) meetings to work with master teachers." A reading teacher offered what was a helpful step to her, "In mid-year I went to training and heard from other teachers. We shared and planned a lesson together. We talked about what was working and not working. That was wonderful."

Teachers also talked about the in-house training that was helpful to them. An assistant principal shared what they did at her school, " We've done a lot of Houghton Mifflin in-house training after principal and assistant principal meetings. We bring back what we learn and share with the staff." A special education teacher told how it was helpful to her to have monthly grade level meetings. In another school a mentor offered, "We did individual planning with teachers, demonstration lessons, Saturday lessons, and teachers planned with other teachers." A fifth grade teacher shared his impressions, "Most of our professional development was engineered by the local school. Sometimes we wonder if we are teaching the right information. It is good to hear from the county. I would like more guidelines from the reading office about this." In another school it was mentioned, "Claire Kruft came from the Maryland Consortium, and looked over our milestones to develop a plan to give feedback on our strengths and needs."

6. Describe what was done in your school, grades 1 - 5, to implement the use of the Houghton Mifflin *A Legacy of Literacy* reading materials.

For a number of the schools interviewed, answers to this question were often expressed in the earlier question, "Describe what was done in your school, grades K - 3, to implement the use of the Open Court *Phonics Kit* reading materials." Schools obviously used some of the same implementation strategies to implement both series. Following are additional comments made by the schools.

Again, schools used a variety of strategies to introduce and implement the new reading program materials by Houghton Mifflin. An assistant principal told what worked at her school, "We focused our training on balanced literature with strategies to develop lessons. We had people get up (in meetings) and share lessons. We use the TMPA plan – Teach, Model, Practice, and Apply." The assistant principal went on to say, "We've done a lot of grade level work. We're all learning this system and stories. It'll be easier next year." In one school it was noted that the reading specialist did a lot of work on Houghton Mifflin. The fifth grade teacher added, "They did back-mapping lessons for us." A fourth grade teacher told what worked at her school, "We plan together... We look at the stories and determine which one skill to work on (there are too many skills). We teach and model that skill. We model with teacher read-aloud. We teach the same skill no matter the level of the student. We adjust it to them." A principal talked about the "Special planning between teachers and resource help. Teachers use their common planning time to collaborate." A fifth grade teacher in another school shared how the program was implemented there in Nike like fashion, "We just did it – implemented the program. Had very little problem with it."

Teachers and administrators also had other thoughts on the Houghton Mifflin program. An assistant principal offered, "The Practice Books, some people like them and some people don't like them." A first grade teacher said she didn't like the Practice Books because they were, "just 'skill and drill' and not meaningful." Then a teacher in another school said, "We love the consumable Practice Books." A fifth grade teacher told how helpful Houghton Mifflin materials were to him, "The stories at the beginning of the year matched the curriculum, like Moving West in social studies, and also a health unit in fifth grade. Students remember the stories like Earthquake Tremor. Students are also more cooperative because they know that everyone else in grade five is reading the same story. They don't feel like they're in the lower reading group." A third grade teacher shared that the materials are used more, "as a resource. I use the MLOs and select stories to go with them." A first grade teacher told how she modifies the implementation of the reading materials, "Houghton Mifflin doesn't develop skills in depth. We dig deeper. At grade one

Houghton Mifflin gives one day per story and does three stories a week. We've stepped off their pacing schedule to really develop the stories." A third grade teacher told how she implements the Houghton Mifflin materials, "I have students on second and third grade reading levels in my class and I find a common MLO to guide my selection of stories and materials." She went on to say, "For reading to perform a task, we create our own materials. It's hard to find materials to use." One principal offered, "We are using it (Houghton Mifflin) as a resource. We use *Images*, *National Geographic, Time for Kids, Science Weekly*, and *Scholastic News* to help our students read for information." It appears that teachers are implementing the Houghton Mifflin materials and modifying them, where necessary, to meet the needs of the students.

7. To what degree has your faculty been able to fully implement the new reading materials? What has helped them? What are your future needs?

It appears that Baltimore County Public Schools accepted and met the challenge of implementing a new reading program. Comments bear this out. A second grade teacher said, "We've fully implemented the program." A principal offered, "We've implemented the program to a high degree. We did the 'before, during, and after' strategies for balanced literacy." And, a reading teacher shared not only what has been, but also a vision for what is to come, "The core materials have been fully implemented. We need time to get used to the materials – the CD's, posters, etc. We need time to get familiar with all the materials. Next year when teachers know their stories, they'll know how to enhance them." Another reading teacher had a similar thought, "We are developing a rhythm. Next year it will be easier; kids, too, will know that rhythm."

Much has already been shared, in the earlier sections of this report, on what helped schools fully implement the new reading materials. Following are some additional comments by administrators and teachers. A principal shared an often-repeated thought, "We have really appreciated the assistance of the Department of Elementary Programs. Tony Annello (Language Arts resource personnel) worked with the individual grades and presented a whole day of professional development that was excellent. Nancy Landers (Language Arts resource teacher) worked with individual grades to develop lessons connected to indicators. Carla Zamerelli-Clifford

(Department of Assessment and Student Data resource teacher) worked with us on writing assignments." Another principal offered similar thoughts, "The Department of Elementary Programs has been very helpful. I call them and they come. Kathy McMahon (Department of Elementary Programs Executive Director) has been positive, helpful, and insightful. Jane Lichter (Language Arts supervisor) has been 'the best' – knows it inside and out." A first grade teacher wanted to offer thanks, "They need to commend the people for picking the series. They did a wonderful job. It is working." Also, a principal gave recognition to the payoff from all the professional development, "It's been the training throughout the year – the large group, the small group arena, and the monthly meetings."

When asked about future needs, teachers and administrators had many ideas to refine, add to, and improve the implementation of the new reading materials in Baltimore County. To do justice to their comments and suggestions, we thought it might be instructive to listen to their voices as they talk about needs. Their comments are listed by level of assignment:

- K In kindergarten we have 100 lessons and 180 days. We need new lessons – especially for the all-day kindergarten children.
- K They need to have kindergarten activity sheets that are more age appropriate. A lot of teachers don't use them – they're too easy. It's a waste of paper.
- 1 The County could create a site (web) for grade one teachers to look for ideas for stories (in Houghton Mifflin).
- 1 We'd like professional development on how to use all the components of the program together, how to plan for a week. The weekly planner with Houghton Mifflin is not helpful. We want training on pacing for different abilities. We want to assess in the beginning of the year, and know where to begin for kids who are already reading.
- 1 I spend a lot of time coming up with my own worksheets. It's time consuming. The county needs to provide things so each teacher is not recreating the wheel.
- 1 We need more resources for differentiation so teachers don't have to create all their own materials.
- 1 The county needs to clarify student expectations for back-mapped skills – how much mastery should they have; for example, should the response be oral, written, etc?
- 1 I work till seven or eight every night and on Saturdays. It needs to be easier. It's hard. None of the materials are in the practice books. It's all so time consuming. A lot of the back-mapped skills have no materials. We have to create a lot on our own. I basically can't use the Houghton Mifflin teacher's edition because it

doesn't match the Baltimore County back-mapped skills. If we just taught Houghton Mifflin it would make life so much easier; or just give us a lesson plan for the skills that are not covered by Houghton Mifflin.

- 2 There needs to be more information on how to use Houghton Mifflin for below level students.
- 2/3 If would be helpful if the stickers matched the MLOs to the objectives.
- 3 The curriculum office could help if they took each story in Houghton Mifflin and wrote a guide with the MLOs that fit best – write up a lesson plan on how to teach the MLOs that exist in that story.
- 3 I like seeing other people teach it (Open Court/Houghton Mifflin lessons).
- 4 Vocabulary development – we need that for next year. We need a highly structured vocabulary development program!
- 4 The GT office needs to get involved and not be a separate entity.
- 5 For future needs, tie it more with the county and indicators. They did samples of back-mapping with a couple of the stories. I'd like to have more of that.
- 5 We need to meet with other schools; we need to meet with people to get ideas.
- 5 They need to streamline other curricular areas since there is so much from Houghton Mifflin. We have to spend reading time doing social studies and science to do content materials. There is a lot to do. All the units are new in health. The Author Studies are longer. They need to streamline.
- 5 We need to clarify the language of the MLOs. We all think an MLO is many different things. They need to be clear.
- 5 We need to use these materials as a resource.
- 5 It is so concrete to watch lessons. I watched J. at grade three and that was great.
- 5 The county needs to provide more lessons – move through theme one, then do theme two, and go on. In the back-mapped document, they haven't referenced all the stories. I want a revision of the *Suggested Resources*. Ours is very general. Need to be more specific. They need to talk to the math office and learn from them – integrate the GT and use the structure that math is using.
- 5 We need a document from the reading office – GT students hit this and this! We need a list that says in addition to Houghton Mifflin, teach this and this – or just use Houghton Mifflin.
- SE Wouldn't it be better if the County listed the MLOs and then listed the theme stories that went with them?
- SE We need more professional development on teaching comprehension skills.
- SE A lot of intermediate teachers are not sure how to teach phonics.
- M We need a countywide database of Houghton Mifflin materials that are teacher-made so we aren't all recreating materials. We need to share all of these. We could develop student exemplars that could be shared to make life easier.
- M We need lessons developed as exemplars with the MLOs developed.
- M First year teachers were attached to the new anthologies to get into the MLOs. They would be helped by more professional development and the opportunity to talk in their grade level teams.
- M With Open Court, we needed to make Baggies with decodable books for the home-school connection.

- Rdg What should the county do? Pick one series. We could meet all needs with Houghton Mifflin.
- Rdg In the Phonics Library there are no activity sheets to go along with the readers -- to reinforce the skills in the textbooks.
- Rdg They haven't been specific on what to take away and what should really be in here. We were told to teach this set of novels and then they said teach the new reading program. They need to say, here are the novels you use along with Houghton Mifflin. Teachers need to know what to include and what to take out.
- Rdg We got the new revised literature units this year in grades four and five and along with that the Houghton Mifflin program. They need to tell us exactly what to teach.
- AP We need to look at the time element in Open Court; for example, if they need more time on a skill we might allow teachers to do that.
- AP We're at stage two and need to go talk to others.
- P This staff was so professional. They attended after-school planning sessions from 4 to 6 pm just to learn – on their own time. We wish we had more professional development on teaching comprehension skills.
- P We need training for all grade levels on how to use Open Court with below level students.
- P The county has given us exemplar lessons. We need some exemplar lessons that go with specific Houghton Mifflin books. We'd like a lesson on butterflies.
- P Teachers come up with great ideas. We need to share these.
- P One of the breakdowns of the professional development was the intermediate teachers had more professional development on back-mapping and connections to the MLOs. The primary teachers didn't get that. I see a great need to do correlations so teachers don't spend so much time planning. Baltimore County teachers spend more time planning than do teachers from other states. (I do interviews for personnel and I see that.) We need a county in-service course on planning for Houghton Mifflin. We need more planning time at grade levels and maybe a time a month to plan together. We need more support for level four schools without mentors.
- P The county needs to take a closer look at special education and gifted and talented and give better direction on how to use the materials.
- P They need to integrate the GT into the regular reading/language arts program. The GT office needs to take a look at this. They have been oblivious to this.
- P We need to think about how we can encourage teachers to continue good instruction now that MSPAP is ending. I appreciate teachers seeing the implementation of the new program as a process and not an event. The administrators have had the same instruction as teachers. We have really felt the pain of learning a new process of implementation.
- P This was a big year with all the changes. Will it be easier? (Does not answer own question.) We want to thank Baltimore County for all their support and professional development they provided without overwhelming teachers. They need to continue to provide professional development.

Concluding Thoughts

Baltimore County undertook an ambitious overhaul of the reading program in the elementary schools this year. Now that the school year is almost over, one can look back and realize the effort was worth it. At this point, the overall reaction is positive although initially educators were feeling overwhelmed by the task. Parents and students have positive reactions to the new reading materials. Educators do as well, however, they offer the critical eye that always wants to improve the reading instructional program. Initially, the professional development at the beginning of the year brought mixed reviews. In a number of instances, the publisher presentations were not well received. However, the presentations and support by the Department of Elementary Programs repaired any early damage, and helped to make the implementation of the new reading materials a success. Educators worked hard to implement the new reading program by continuing to use the publisher representatives for professional development, using the support personnel from the Department of Elementary Programs, and by providing in-house professional development. The new reading program has been implemented in Baltimore County as fully as possible its first year. Educators are already looking ahead to next year when they will have more experience with the materials, know the stories better, and can deepen the implementation of the new reading program. Baltimore County has accomplished a lot in this initial year of implementation.

Report on Professional Development and Training Sessions

Introduction

Selected teachers from the first through fifth grades in elementary schools in Baltimore County participated in learning to use a new reading program published by Houghton Mifflin, Inc. and Open Court. Approximately 22 workshops were conducted in November 2001, February 2002, and April 2002 at various locations. Participants filled out evaluation sheets at the end of each workshop on which they responded to four prompt statements and one graphic rating scale. Evaluation sheets totaling 337 were returned.

Teachers were asked to respond to the following four prompts and one rating scale:

1. My most significant learning was...

2. As a result of this learning, I plan to...

3. I would like to have additional resources, assistance, or information regarding...

4. Other comments I have about today's session are...

Overall, I rated the session (circle one)

1 2 3 4 5

(Low) (High)

Participants responded to nearly every one of the five inquiries. Only about six times out of 100 did a teacher fail to respond to a literal prompt. Most replies were positive in nature and reflected some careful thought involving the material of the session or plans for implementation and other use. The findings are discussed in three sections: grades one and two, grades three through five, and the Home/School Connection group. Each prompt will be discussed in turn followed by a description of the rating scale scores with a suggested interpretation. Finally, the report will present a summary and conclusion of the findings.

Grades 1-3

The first prompt asked teachers to tell their "most significant learning" from the workshop. Overwhelmingly, the response from these 138 people was that they had gained skill in planning. How to use "back-mapping" was next most frequently gained skill. Often it seemed that the teacher had gained a deeper understanding of what previously had been merely an obscure educational term.

Teachers also stated they felt more able now to use all the materials explained in the workshop. They recognized that they could put them to use systematically, appropriately, and in a flexible manner. Among the respondents, it is clear that there is deeper understanding of how primary grade children attain reading skills. They specifically mentioned knowing how to use MLOs with lessons in the Houghton Mifflin, and Open Court series.

To the second prompt, "As a result of this learning, I plan to..." the greatest number of responses indicated that attendees will be using the lesson planning guide, the other lesson planning aids, and their newly acquired skills. They also mentioned an intention to incorporate other stances and to reuse them in the form of a bank for the grade they teach. Also, these teachers intend to share their learning with other teachers, some of whom are team members, at their home schools. They also felt they would be better able to prepare good lesson plans even though, for the next item, many requested more sample plans.

The third prompt asked for responses to the statement "I would like to have additional resources, assistance, or information regarding. . ." A significant number (21) replied that sample lesson plans and/or further instruction in lesson planning would be desirable. Also, many wanted to be able to better align the MLOs and stances to stories. Writing objectives were also mentioned with some frequency, as well as how to budget time, and adjust pacing of instruction were concerns expressed by a few more people. About six participants also expressed a wish for help in using the reading materials to meet the needs of the slower pupils in their classrooms. It is worth noting, however, that nearly half (47%) of respondents doing the evaluations left this item blank.

The final prompt on the evaluation instrument asked for a free response to "Other comments I have about today's session are..." This led to a greater variety of comments since it invited reflection about how the individual interacted within each workshop. Three said they appreciated the adequate time given them, while three others said they felt rushed for time! Other interesting responses were: appreciation for patience of staff; room too noisy; "I'm lost"; workshop should focus on one grade only; valued the step-by-step approach; the value of the "lesson planner"; and a wish for more model lesson plans for the Houghton Mifflin series.

It was found from repeated comments that the participants appreciated the sample lesson plans and the clear approach to instruction. Also, some commented that it was significant learning to understand that they should only focus on two indicators for each story. Evidently, primary reading instruction was perceived as requiring far more extensive indicator attainment than is necessary.

The numerical ratings yielded a significant range of appraisals. The nine people in the Landers and Nestor (language arts resource teachers) group rated their experience the highest of all, 98%. June Bowers (language arts resource teacher) was engaged alone and with collaborators in nearly half the primary grade workshops. Ratings for her groups ranged from the 90s to the 70s. This may suggest that the variety among participants, differing school and life experiences, and professional preparation may be additional factors accounting for differences in evaluations. It seems unlikely that a presenter would vary her performance so radically from day to day. It may also be wise to read the ratings obtained in other workshop groups with a measure of skepticism about their validity.

Grades 4-5

There were 151 forms returned. The first prompt, "My most significant learning was . . ." led most teachers to mention how to use the MLOs and the back-mapping with Houghton Mifflin materials. The next most frequent response indicated that fourth grade teachers valued the close cooperation among colleagues, and the coaching of the presenters. Their fifth grade counterparts mentioned the use of the lesson planner as the second most frequent significant learning. Both fourth and fifth grade teachers mentioned their improved ability to do more thoughtful lesson planning as the third most frequent significant learning.

The second prompt," As a result of this learning, I plan to..." yielded a high degree of intention among grade four teachers to use the "lesson planner." Among grade five teachers, the most frequent remark was about making greater use of all the Houghton Mifflin materials and techniques. Both groups intended to share the learning gained here with colleagues in their schools, use back-mapping effectively, and to continue to plan and teach with increased confidence in the skills they acquired from the workshop experience. The grade two and grade five group intended to make greater use of this format in their teaching, and to use the "lesson planner." The grade two and five group of 20 people made very few entries here.

Responses to prompt number three, " I would like to have additional resources, assistance, or information regarding ..." led nearly half of the respondents to leave this item blank. The most frequent wish among grades four and five teachers was for more model lesson plans. Less frequently mentioned areas of interest included alignment of the MLOs, how to analyze organizational structure, a request for more complete demonstration lessons, and help in writing skills development. Most comments to the fourth and last prompt, "Other comments I have about today's session are..." were expressions of appreciation and praise for the presenters and the program. The opportunity to collaborate, have time for planning, and gratitude for good handouts were a few specific responses. They also mentioned the "lesson planner" with notable frequency. One or two said they were "overwhelmed."

Ratings by these teachers were generally high. Robin Rupprecht (language arts resource teacher) received nearly all highest ratings from her small group of six as did Ms. Wolf (language arts resource teacher) with her six. Wolf and Landers fared worse with their group of 12 resulting in a 78% out of a possible 100% rating. Their people had asked for more sample lessons but also said they felt more relaxed and appreciated the "lesson planner." The explanation that there was no need to attain all outcomes in the guide was seen as a most favorable result.

Teachers in the combined grades two and five sessions frequently objected to the distractions of talk from the other group in the same room. Their ratings were, therefore, among the lowest, 72% out of a possible 100% rating.

The Wolf and Landers participants felt the need for more model lesson plans, planning ideas for the different challenge levels, information about the fables chart, and frames for assisting students in answering stance questions. They thought they might use the "lesson planner" a bit more and use the MLOs with more confidence. This group gave a low general rating of 73% to the workshop. Also, they never stated an intention to use the entire set of Houghton Mifflin materials in their teaching, as had so many other group members.

In the Donlon and Wolf (language arts personnel) sessions, teachers frequently mentioned that the opportunity to work collaboratively with a partner was a definite benefit. Also, the same comments came from teachers in the Donlon and Lemons (language arts personnel) group.

In summary, these primary and intermediate grade teacher participants appreciated the chance to learn how to use MLOs, back-mapping, and other techniques with the Houghton Mifflin materials. Evidently, different skills and knowledge were acquired from group to group. This could be due, in part, to the differences of experience among groups, since the same presenter elicited differing evaluations among groups.

Reading Specialists' Meeting Entitled Home/School Connection

This training was scheduled as a result of the collaboration between DEP personnel, the PTA Council, and the Area Advisory Councils. It provided reading specialists with information to encourage families to become more involved in developing children's reading abilities. As a result of this training, reading specialists would be able to conduct parent meetings at their home school. This group returned 48 evaluation forms. To the first prompt, "My most significant learning was...," the teachers named the "Parent Mobile" overwhelmingly. Twenty-four out of 48 of the participants gave that reply. Next most often, teachers made general, nonspecific words of praise for the workshop, e.g., "great presentation by June and Jessica (language arts resource teachers); generally good information; very informative; etc." A good number mentioned the Houghton-Mifflin web site (19%); the techniques for involving parents (23%); and a scattering of other features of the sessions, such as good materials, new, useful planning ideas, and so on.

To the second prompt, "As a result of this learning, I plan to..." participants intend to share their learning with colleagues (30%) and with parents (56%) through "Parents' Night" and other planned workshop offerings. They also frequently expressed an intention to bring the "Parent Mobile" to their school (17%). Telling others about the web site and planning to use the "Make and Take" activities were other frequent responses.

Prompt three presented the stem sentence, "I would like to have additional resources, assistance, or information regarding..." as a stimulus for responding. Surprisingly, very few people wrote a comment here. Thirty-one members left the space blank. In other words, they came away ready and willing to perform the activities expected. A few scattered requests, such as how to order certain materials, how to set up a summer program, and so on, did appear but only one or two people made these kinds of requests.

To the general, open-ended prompt number four, "Other comments I have about today's session are...," we find confirmation of the general acceptance and even gratitude for the workshop experience. Also, a few criticisms that may be constructive are offered here. Fourteen reading specialists claim that the Open Court presentation was inappropriate or not substantive enough for

this audience; that the physical facilities interfered with easy viewing of graphic materials; or that lunch time was poorly planned. But the positive comments far outnumbered the negative.

Finally, the overall rating, prompt five, was a very positive 89% favorable, with only four people giving a rating below four on a 1-5 scale.

Summary and Conclusion

Teachers who took part in the Open Court and Houghton Mifflin Baltimore County Public Schools' workshops apparently enjoyed the experience and felt they had gained valuable understanding. Many found the sample lesson plans to be highly prized, and the lesson planner/guide tools of great potential. They frequently commented that it was a valuable insight to learn that it was unnecessary to cover every stance, question, or to use all materials for each lesson. They seemed to have learned that a few carefully chosen goals, thoroughly pursued, at a reasonable pace was far more important than trying to cover every topic in the book.

Often teachers mentioned the value of having the program presented by experienced classroom teachers similar to themselves. These presenters provided a sense of camaraderie that made the learning process more meaningful, and conveyed a deeper understanding of the topic. The step-by-step approach and patient, personal guidance served to make learning here exceptionally effective. Another positive factor was the opportunity to work collaboratively with other teachers. It may be advisable to continue this instructional arrangement.

A number of teachers commented that sharing the same room with a different group proved distracting; it might be worthwhile to be certain that adequate instructional space is available. A few participants commented that they were thoroughly familiar with the program since they recalled having experienced it at an earlier time. Also, an occasional comment appeared telling the reader that the materials presented were inappropriate for them since they taught a different grade level. These unusual notes suggest that it might be advisable to exercise care in assigning people to proper workshop settings.

Continuing to provide participants with model lesson plans and other requested materials would be desirable from the number of times this was mentioned. Collaborative work opportunities also should prove worth continuing, as would the use of classroom teachers as facilitators.

Reading specialists who took part in the April 2002 Home/School Connection workshop expressed notable acceptance and appreciation for the experience. They were particularly impressed with the "Parent Mobile" and frequently indicated an intention to make use of it at their own school. They also appreciated the easy access to useful materials and ideas from the Houghton Mifflin web site. In summary, it is evident that this workshop accomplished its purpose.

These elementary language arts teachers and reading specialists now seem ready and willing to do a better teaching job. A positive indicator of their sincerity is the often expressed intention to share these learnings with their colleagues who were unable to participate. All in all, these programs for Baltimore County teachers seem to have been a worthwhile investment in improving learning in the language arts and reading area for County pupils.

Reactions from Special Groups

It seemed important to get some feedback on implementation of the new reading series from some members of the preview committee and selected representatives of special groups, such as teachers of gifted and talented, special education teachers, and mentors. A nine-question survey was sent to this group. Of 41 surveys sent, 23 were returned, a 56% response rate.

The data presented in Table 3 show that eight of the nine means are well above 3.10, indicating agreement to strong agreement with the statements. The highest mean, 3.57, was for statement 4, providing more structure/information to less experienced teachers. The lowest mean, 2.91, was for statement 6, increasing the rigor of the 1 - 5 instructional program through *A Legacy of Literacy*. Some respondents indicated that for items 5 and 6, rigor was the wrong word to use and suggested that effectiveness would have been a better choice.

Table 3

Means and Standard Deviations of Special Groups

		N	Mean	Standard Deviation
1.	Clear focus to all teachers and administrators	23	3.43	1.02
2.	Consistent reading materials for BCPS students	22	3.48	1.04
3.	Increase alignment of instruction	22	3.27	1.05
4.	Provide more structure/information to less experienced teachers	23	3.57	.97
5.	Increase the rigor of the K - 3 program	20	3.10	1.02
6.	Increase the rigor of the 1 - 5 instructional program	23	2.91	.84
7.	Provide reading materials that include multiple texts	23	3.30	1.07
8.	Provide lessons (OC) to teach the skills provided	23	3.38	1.09
9.	Provide lessons (HM) to teach comprehension	23	3.43	1.03

At the end of the survey, there was a request for the respondents to comment on the new reading series. Eighteen of the 23 respondents chose to make comments on the new reading series. The following is a summary of their comments. Most of the respondents felt that Open Court and Houghton Mifflin make a strong reading program. The vast majority also felt that the staff from the Department of Elementary Programs had done an outstanding job of professional development, both in the large and mid-size meetings they led, and in the in-school workshops they provided. The respondents also commented that the new reading series leveled the playing field, particularly for the less able students. They also commented that the adoption of the new series provided consistency of reading instruction countywide. This had been one of the main goals of the group that reviewed the different reading series.

The comments also indicated that the new series required a great investment in time by teachers in the beginning of the year. This burden was particularly hard on new teachers. The writers, however, went on to say that the effort was worthwhile because of the help they received

BALTIMORE COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS
TOWSON, MARYLAND 21204

October 22, 2002

RETIREMENTS

NAME	POSITION	SCHOOL/OFFICE	YRS. OF SERVICE	EFFECTIVE DATE
Marie Astarita	Operator III	Timonium/IMS	17.0	7-1-02
Dorothy G. Della Noce	Instructional Asst.	Sparrows Pt. Middle	16.0	1-1-03
George McClure	Teacher	Owings Mills High	30.0	1-1-03
James G. Norton	Asst. Principal	Towson High	7.7	11-1-02
Irene Sewell	Office Asst. II	Sandy Plains Elem.	10.0	7-1-02

Rescind from Board Agenda April 23, 2002:

Michael G. Bailey, Supervisor/Copy & Printing Services

As of 10/15/02

Exhibit E

BALTIMORE COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS
TOWSON, MARYLAND 21204

October 22, 2002

RESIGNATIONS

ELEMENTARY – 2

Battle Grove Elementary School
Christopher J. Sisk, 10/10/02, 5.2 yrs.

Woodmoor Elementary School
Jaclyn M. Lubozynski, 06/30/02, 3.0 yrs.

SECONDARY - 4

Franklin Middle School
Edward Janusz, 09/29/02, 2 mos.

General John Stricker Middle School
Scott B. Felton, 09/29/02, 2 mos.

Pikesville High School
Doris W. Cline, 11/04/02, 2.3 yrs.

Southwest Academy
Gloria J. Covin, 10/07/02, 3.2 yrs.

Exhibit F

BALTIMORE COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS
TOWSON, MARYLAND 21204

October 22, 2002

LEAVES

CHILD REARING LEAVES

RACHEL SNYDER HILLS – Carney Elementary School
Effective December 20, 2002 through June 30, 2004

EXTENSION MILITARY LEAVES

DAVID F. FRANKENHAUSER – Patapsco High School
Effective September 30, 2002 through April 27, 2003

UNUSUAL OR IMPERATIVE LEAVES

SUSAN LEE BROOKS – Fort Garrison Elementary – (Cafeteria, Person In-Charge)*
Effective August 21, 2002 through August 21, 2003

AMENDED UNUSUAL OR IMPERATIVE LEAVES (Board Agenda July 9, 2002)

JIRI MASER – Ridgely Middle School – (Building Service Worker)*
Effective July 11, 2002 through July 11, 2003 (Date)

*Non-member Maryland State Retirement System & Pension System

Exhibit G

BALTIMORE COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS
TOWSON, MARYLAND 21204

October 22, 2002

DECEASED

The Board gratefully acknowledges the service of the employee listed below:

CRAIG W. DAVIS
Building Service Worker
Westowne Elementary School
September 5, 2002

DOP: 10/23/2002

BALTIMORE COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS
Towson, Maryland 21204

Recommendation for Reappointment to
Ethics Review Panel

Mr. Roland Unger

October 22, 2002

I

BALTIMORE COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS

DATE: October 14, 2002

TO: BOARD OF EDUCATION

FROM: Dr. J. Hairston, Superintendent

SUBJECT: Recommendations for Award of Contracts
Board Exhibit – October 22, 2002

ORIGINATOR: Robert Haines, Deputy Superintendent of Business Services

RESOURCE PERSON(S): Patrick Fannon, Controller; Rick Gay, Purchasing Manager

RECOMMENDATION

That the Board of Education approves the recommendations for award of contracts Board Exhibit for the October 22, 2002, board meeting.

*****

See the attached list of contract recommendations presented for consideration by the Board of Education of Baltimore County.

MA/caj

Appendix I – Recommendations for Award of Contracts – Board Exhibit

Recommendations for Award of Contracts
Board Exhibit – October 22, 2002

The following contract recommendations are presented for consideration by the Board of Education of Baltimore County.

1. **Contracted Services: Evaluation of Magnet School Programs--Additional Services** **Estimated Award Value $20,980**
RFP #4-421-02

On March 26, 2002, the Board of Education approved a Request for Proposal (RFP) for a consultant to evaluate the magnet schools and their programs (curriculum and instruction, admissions criteria, effective use of human and material resources, and student outcomes). The Office of Gifted Education/Magnet Programs has determined that additional services are required to complete this evaluation.

The award bidder, Phale Hale Education Consulting, Inc., will conduct a survey (via mail) of parents and students in Baltimore County Public Schools regarding their opinions and attitudes about our magnet schools. This survey will address the following parent/student populations regarding their satisfaction with the magnet program.

1. Students (grade 12) attending magnet schools
2. Students (grades 5 and 8) who are potential applicants to magnet schools
3. Parents of students (grade 12) attending magnet schools
4. Parents of students (grades 5 and 8) who are potential applicants to magnet schools

Following the compilation of the survey results, a series of focus groups for each of the target populations will be conducted to validate the survey findings. Phale Hale Education Consulting, Inc., will then issue a final report at a future date.

Award of contract is recommended to Phale Hale Education Consulting, Inc., Washington, DC, in the amount of $20,980. Funding for this contract will be provided by the magnet schools program.

2. **Curriculum Software Management Performance Series--EdVISION** **Estimated Award Value $40,000**

On June 12, 2001, the Board of Education approved the purchase of a software package from EdVISION Corporation, San Diego, CA. EdVISION was purchased by Scantron Corporation, 110 West A Street, Suite 100, San Diego, CA 92101. The original request for proposal allowed for a one-year extension of the EdVISION contract. The Board of Education is requested to approve Scrantron as the vendor of record and approve the contract for an additional year. The software package has not changed and compares the alignment of the BCPS' core curriculum with the Maryland State Department of Education performance standards. The Baltimore County Public Schools' Office of Assessments, Research, and Testing, and the Offices of Secondary and Elementary Programs would like to continue this assessment program.

The program specifically will assess student performance relative to the standards established by BCPS and MSDE in the mathematics curriculum and reading comprehension levels for selected students in grades four and seven. Scores are available on an individual-student basis, which allows BCPS to comply with the "No Child Left Behind" federal legislation. The information obtained from these assessments provides guidance for teachers and administrators as to the strengths and weaknesses of students and curriculum. Individual students and curriculum areas that need additional emphasis are then highlighted for specific improvement plans. This purchase allows for the expansion to additional students and teacher training.

Funding will be provided through the budget of the Office of Assessment, Research, and Testing.

Contracted Services: Inspections, Preventative Maintenance, and Time & Material Projects with "Not to Exceed Quotes"

The Division of Physical Facilities, Office of Maintenance has requested the Office of Purchasing to issue the following solicitations. These services will be purchased as needed based upon requirements of the system.

It is the intent of the Office of Maintenance to have pre-qualified contractors with the appropriate insurance, training, and certification to be "on call" to do inspections, repairs, and installations. Based upon the previous needs of the Office of Maintenance for these type services, availability of the contractors when called upon to do work, and the urgency to have the work done within a specified time frame, the award of contract may be made to three or more contractors for each solicitation. All work under this contract will be done either by a "time and material" basis or by a "not to exceed" quote basis.

Inspections and preventative maintenance will be done by the primary award contractor. If, for any reason, the primary award contractor is unable to do the work within the timeframe of the Office of Maintenance, the next ranked contractor will be asked to do the work, and so on throughout the list.

For these three time and material contracts, if a larger project with a definable scope is identified, **all of the award bidders** will be asked to provide a "not to exceed quote." All of the award bidders will be provided with the scope of the project and will be asked to include all materials and labor required to properly complete the project by a specified date. Since all the award bidders are offering a competitive price, the cost is usually substantially less than utilizing the time and material scenario. However, this quote process still guarantees that all work is to be done by pre-qualified contractors.

3. **Contracted Services: Video, Digital, and Audio Networking Services**
Five-Year Bid
Contract # 3-318-03

Estimated Annual Award: $600,000
Estimated Award Value: $3,000,000

A bid for a five-year contract to qualify and select contractor(s) to provide troubleshooting, installation, and repair services for video, digital, and audio networking for Baltimore County Public Schools was issued on July 25, 2002, to 50 vendors. Proposals were received from 13 vendors, including seven no-bids.

The specifications were developed in conjunction with the Office of Maintenance, Office of Information Technology, and the bidders at a prebid conference. Video, digital, and audio networking exists in all schools and is an integral part of the building and curriculum. Existing systems in the schools must be updated, expanded, and repaired, to assure efficient operation.

This is an indefinite-requirements' contract as the services intended for purchase are based upon future needs of the system and are pending allocation of funds. This contract is to be utilized by the Offices of Maintenance, Information Technology, and Construction. It is the intent to have five contractors "on call" to do installation/repair of video and audio networking, and to also have five contractors "on call" to do installation/repair work for digital networking. All work under this contract will be done by either a "time-and-material" basis or by all award bidders being asked to provide a "not-to-exceed" quote to complete the scope of work.

Video & Audio Networking

Award	Company	Hourly Rate
Primary	Caton Communications, Catonsville, MD	$24.19
Secondary	Plexus Installations, Inc., Baltimore, MD	$39.50
Tertiary	Fiber Plus, Inc., Jessup, MD	$45.00

Fourth	**H. P. Electronics, Inc., Baltimore, MD**	**$55.00**
No award	The Foy Group, Inc., Baltimore, MD	$95.00

Digital Networking Award	**Company**	**Hourly Rate**
Primary	**Caton Communications, Catonsville, MD**	**$19.19**
Secondary	**Plexus Installations, Inc., Baltimore, MD**	**$29.50**
Tertiary	**Fiber Plus, Inc., Jessup, MD**	**$36.25**
Fourth	**Bright Networks, Markham, VA**	**$39.72**
Fifth	**H. P. Electronics, Inc., Baltimore, MD**	**$40.00**
No award	The Foy Group, Inc., Baltimore, MD	$45.00

Recommendation of award is to the above contractors in each area as the responsive and responsible bidders offering the most favorable bid prices. Funding will be provided by the operating budget of the Office of Maintenance, aging school funding, capital projects, and individual schools' operating budgets.

4. Supply Contract: Interior and Exterior Paint **Award Value: $80,000**
Contract # 3-317-03

An annual bid to furnish interior and exterior paint and painting accessories for the Office of Maintenance was issued on August 1, 2002, to 22 vendors. Proposals were received from five vendors.

The specifications were developed in conjunction with the Office of Maintenance and the bidders. Paints are all thoroughly evaluated by the Office of Maintenance's paint evaluation committee prior to being placed upon the "approved paint" list. The bidders offer a "per-gallon price" for their products, which includes tinting, mixing, and delivery.

Award was based upon a price-per-gallon by item basis. Recommendation of award is being made to the following vendors:

Vendor	Acrylic Urethane	Primer For Metal	Flat Enamel	Semi-Gloss Enamel
Budekes Paint, Inc., Baltimore, MD	no bid	$10.99	$8.75	no bid
Duron Paint, Beltsville, MD	**$35.00**	**$7.48**	**$7.46**	**$9.18**
McCormick Paint, Rockville, MD	non-responsive	$11.95	$10.75	$14.25
Sherwinn Williams, Cleveland, OH	no bid	$8.35	$7.84	$9.25
Bruning Paint, Baltimore, MD	no bid	$9.54	$8.71	no bid

Vendor	Oil Base Rust Inhibitor	Latex Rust Inhibitor	Metal Paint	Acrylic Semi-Gloss Enamel
Budekes Paint, Inc., Baltimore, MD	$13.49	$13.49	$13.49	no bid
Duron Paint, Beltsville, MD	no bid	no bid	no bid	no bid
McCormick Paint, Rockville, MD	$16.00	$16.00	$16.00	$14.25
Sherwinn Williams, Cleveland, OH	no bid	$12.50	no bid	no bid
Bruning Paint, Baltimore, MD	**$11.95**	**$11.95**	**$11.27**	**$10.99**

Vendor	*Acrylic Urethane	* Semi-gloss Acrylic Enamel	*Odor Free Interior	*Acrylic FlatPrimer
McCormick Paint, Rockville, MD	**$16.00**	**$14.25**	**$10.75**	**$11.95**

*These products are being awarded for testing purposes only and have not been fully evaluated and approved for use by the paint evaluation committee.

Funding will be provided by the operating budget of the Office of Maintenance, aging school funding, capital projects, and individual schools' operating budgets.

5. **Supply Contract:** **Estimated Annual Award: $350,000**
Various Electrical Supplies **Estimated Award Value: $1,050,000**
Three-year Contract
Contract #3-331-03

A three-year bid was issued on August 1, 2002, for electrical supplies to 24 vendors. Proposals were received from nine vendors, including three no-bids. The specifications were developed in conjunction with the Office of Maintenance and the bidders at a prebid meeting. The specifications were to qualify products and to obtain firm-fixed pricing for the purchase and delivery of the electrical supplies to be installed by the Office of Maintenance or electrical contractors.

Pricing shall remain firm through March 31, 2003. After this date, it is the award bidder's responsibility to notify the Office of Purchasing, 90 days in advance, of any change in pricing from the manufacturer. BCPS reserves the right to accept or reject the price increase within 30 days. Pricing can only be adjusted based upon the manufacturer's adjustment in price to the award vendor, not for profit.

Award of contract is recommended to the following responsive and responsible vendors offering the lowest aggregate price per category.

Product	Award Bidders
Ballasts	Graybar Electric Company, Baltimore, MD
Conduit	Tristate Electrical Supply Co. Baltimore, MD
Switches	Shepherd Electric Supply Co. Baltimore, MD

Wire Nuts	Graybar Electric Company, Baltimore, MD
Wiring, Cable	Tristate Electrical Supply Co, Baltimore, MD
Exit Lights	C. N. Robinson Lighting Sup Co, Baltimore, MD
Exit Lights	Capitol Lighting, Baltimore, MD
Exit Lights	C. N. Robinson Lighting Sup Co, Baltimore, MD
Photocells	C. N. Robinson Lighting Sup Co, Baltimore, MD
Exterior Lighting Fixtures	C. N. Robinson Lighting Sup Co, Baltimore, MD
Failsafe Light Fixtures	Shepherd Electric Supply Co, Baltimore, MD
Compact Florescent Lighting Fixtures	Shepherd Electric Supply Co, Baltimore, MD
Various Florescent Lighting Fixtures	C. N. Robinson Lighting Sup Co, Baltimore, MD
Square D Contactors & Starters	Tristate Electrical Supply Co, Baltimore, MD
GE Contactors & Starters	Shepherd Electric Supply Co, Baltimore, MD
Cuttler Hammer Contactors & Starters	Shepherd Electric Supply Co, Baltimore, MD
Wire Molding	Tristate Electrical Supply Co, Baltimore, MD
Emergency Lights	C. N. Robinson Lighting Sup Co, Baltimore, MD
2' x 4' Lights	C. N. Robinson Lighting Sup Co, Baltimore, MD
Fuses	Graybar Electric Company, Baltimore, MD
Metal boxes	Graybar Electric Company, Baltimore, MD
Conduit Connectors	Graybar Electric Company, Baltimore, MD

The estimated award value for this contract is $350,000, annually, based upon historical purchase of these products. Funding will be provided by the operating budget of the Office of Maintenance, aging school funding, capital projects, and individual schools' operating budgets.

BALTIMORE COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS

J

DATE: October 22, 2002

TO: **BOARD OF EDUCATION**

FROM: Dr. J. Hairston, Superintendent

SUBJECT: **Fee Acceptance – Inspection Services for Reroofing Projects at Various Schools**

ORIGINATOR: J. Robert Haines, Deputy Superintendent of Business Services

RESOURCE PERSON(S): Donald F. Krempel, Ph.D., Executive Director, Department of Physical Facilities
Cornell S. Brown, Administrator, Office of Comprehensive Maintenance and Construction
MacArthur Chavis, Project Administrator, Supervisor, Office of Comprehensive Maintenance and Construction

RECOMMENDATION

That the Board of Education approves a fee acceptance.

* * * * *

Fee Acceptance – Inspection Services for Reroofing Projects at Various Schools.

Appendix I – Recommendation for Fee Acceptance

Appendix I

Recommendation for Fee Acceptance
Inspection Services for Reroofing Projects – Various Schools
October 22, 2002

In conjunction with the Reroofing Projects at twelve schools, the Department of Physical Facilities requests approval to contract the services of a roofing inspector. These services include, but are not be limited to, monitoring the roofing contractors and subcontractors for compliance with the contract documents, preparing daily field observation logs, and reporting on deviations and corrections made for contract conformance. To obtain these services, the Department of Physical Facilities will utilize the "on-call" inspection service agreement established by the Baltimore County Department of Public Works. The Department of Physical Facilities requests the approval of the Board of Education to enter into contracts with DFI, Inc. for inspection services in the not-to-exceed amount of $499,700.00 for the followings schools:

Arbutus Middle School	$33,363.00
General John Stricker Middle School	$41,501.25
Golden Ring Middle School	$33,363.00
Hereford Middle School	$33,363.00
Kenwood High School	$49,832.50
Lansdowne Middle School	$49,832.50
Overlea High School	$41,501.25
Owings Mills Elementary School	$25,216.00
Parkville Middle School	$16,883.00
Patapsco High School	$58,579.00
Perry Hall Elementary School	$41,501.25
Perry Hall High School	$74,764.25

Funding for these services is available in Capital Budget Project #671 - Roof Rehabilitation.

APPROVED:

Donald F. Krempel, Ph.D.
Executive Director

BALTIMORE COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS

K

DATE: October 22, 2002

TO: **BOARD OF EDUCATION**

FROM: Dr. J. Hairston, Superintendent

SUBJECT: **Request for Change Order – Fine Grading Package at New Town High School**

ORIGINATOR: J. Robert Haines, Deputy Superintendent of Business Services

RESOURCE PERSON(S): Donald F. Krempel, Ph.D., Executive Director, Department of Physical Facilities
Richard Cassell, Administrator, Office of Engineering and Construction
J. Kurt Buckler, Head of Engineering, Office of Engineering and Construction

RECOMMENDATION

That the Board of Education approves a change order.

*****

Request for Change Order – Fine Grading Package at New Town High School.

Appendix I – Request Approval of Change Order

Appendix I

Request for Approval of Change Order
Fine Grading Package at New Town High School
October 22, 2002

On November 20, 2001, the Board of Education approved an award of contract with T.C. Simons, Inc. to perform the site work associated with New Town High School. In order to complete this project, it has become necessary to provide a grinder pump to allow for a sanitary sewerage line to be connected to the new Grounds Building. The contractor has submitted a proposal in the amount of $17,449.00 to complete this additional work. This price has been reviewed by our consultant and found reasonable. Based upon this review, the Department of Physical Facilities recommends a change order in the amount of $17,499.00 with T.C. Simons, Inc. to furnish and install a grind pump at New Town High School.

Funding for this additional work is available through Capital Budget Project #625 – New Town High School.

APPROVED:

Donald F. Kremmel, Ph.D.
Executive Director

BALTIMORE COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS

L

DATE: October 22, 2002

TO: **BOARD OF EDUCATION**

FROM: Dr. J. Hairston, Superintendent

SUBJECT: **Request for Change Order – Masonry Package at New Town High School**

ORIGINATOR: J. Robert Haines, Deputy Superintendent of Business Services

RESOURCE PERSON(S): Donald F. Krempel, Ph.D., Executive Director, Department of Physical Facilities
Richard Cassell, Administrator, Office of Engineering and Construction
J. Kurt Buckler, Head of Engineering, Office of Engineering and Construction

RECOMMENDATION

That the Board of Education approves a change order.

*****

Request for Change Order – Masonry Package at New Town High School.

Appendix I – Request Approval of Change Order

Appendix I

Request for Approval of Change Order
Masonry Package at New Town High School
October 22, 2002

On August 14, 2001, the Board of Education approved an award of contract with C.F. Masonry, Inc. to perform masonry work associated with New Town High School. In order to provide exterior storage of play equipment for the Child Development program, a new masonry storage building is being proposed. The contractor has submitted a proposal in the amount of $15,885.00 to construct this proposed storage building. This price has been reviewed by our consultant and found reasonable. Based upon this review, the Department of Physical Facilities recommends a change order in amount of $15,885.00 with C.F. Masonry, Inc. to construct a masonry storage building at New Town High School.

Funding for this additional work is available through Capital Budget Project #625 – New Town High School.

APPROVED:

Donald F. Krempel, Ph.D.
Executive Director

BALTIMORE COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS

M

DATE: October 22, 2002

TO: **BOARD OF EDUCATION**

FROM: Dr. J. Hairston, Superintendent

SUBJECT: **Increase Contingency Authorization for Concrete Slab Reinforcement at Patapsco High School**

ORIGINATOR: J. Robert Haines, Deputy Superintendent of Business Services

RESOURCE PERSON(S): Donald F. Krempel, Ph.D., Executive Director, Department of Physical Facilities
Richard Cassell, Administrator, Office of Engineering and Construction
E. Phillip Schied, Program Manager, Office of Engineering and Construction

RECOMMENDATION

That the Board of Education approves an increase to the project contingency authorization.

*****

Increase Contingency Authorization for Concrete Slab Reinforcement at Patapsco High School.

Appendix I – Request Approval to Increase Contingency Authorization

Appendix I

Request Approval to Increase Contingency Authorization for Concrete Slab Reinforcement at Patapsco High School October 22, 2002

On June 11, 2002, the Board of Education approved an award of contract with The Marksmen Company to make repairs to the existing structural concrete beams that support the floor slab at Patapsco High School. At that time, a 10% change order allocation of $7,748.00 was approved to cover any unforeseen conditions and minor changes to the contract. Work on this contract was completed over the summer prior to the return of students for the new school year.

On September 16, 2002, the contractor submitted an invoice for the work completed under this contract. The invoice listed 114 additional feet of concrete beams repaired during the course of this project. The Office of Engineering and Construction has subsequently verified the contractor's claim of additional quantities repaired. The contract between the Board of Education and the contractor established a unit price of $80.00 per linear foot for additional concrete repairs required beyond the repairs listed in the base contract documents. The additional concrete repairs based on this unit price equals $9,120.00.

At this time, the Department of Physical Facilities requests approval to increase the change order allocation by $1,372.00 to cover the additional concrete repairs. Funding for this additional work is available through Capital Budget Project #665 – Major Maintenance.

APPROVED:

Donald F. Kemmel, Ph.D.
Executive Director

O

Baltimore County Board Of Education
Proposed Negotiating Teams – 2002-2003

AFSCME

- Dan Capozzi – Manager, Staff Relations*
- Ed Dieffenbach – Administrator, Payroll
- Dennis Elkins – Administrator, Physical Facilities
- Linda Fitchett – Director, Transportation
- Cynthia Hamlet – Personnel Officer
- Consultants: Randy Grimsley - Executive Director, Human Resources
  Kathleen Harmon - Manager, Employee Benefits

BACE

- Dan Capozzi – Manager, Staff Relations*
- Cornell Brown, Jr. – Administrator, Physical Facilities
- Linda Cassell – Coordinator, Title I and Grant Assistance
- Cynthia Hamlet – Personnel Officer
- Robert Tomback – Principal, Catonsville High School
- Consultants: Randy Grimsley - Executive Director, Human Resources
  Ed Dieffenbach - Administrator, Payroll
  Keith Harmeyer - Principal, Loch Raven High School
  Kathleen Harmon - Manager, Employee Benefits

CASE

- Randy Grimsley – Executive Director, Human Resources*
- Barbara Burnopp – Executive Director, Fiscal Services
- Dan Capozzi – Manager, Staff Relations
- Gwendolyn Grant – Executive Director, Secondary Programs
- Christine Johns – Deputy Superintendent, Curriculum and Instruction
- Dale Rauenzahn – Director, Student Support Services
- Jean Satterfield – Director, Special Education, Instruction

PSNA

- Dan Capozzi – Manager, Staff Relations*
- Michelle Prumo – Coordinator, Health Services
- Yasmin Stokes – Principal, Featherbed Lane Intermediate School
- Consultants: Randy Grimsley - Executive Director, Human Resources
  Ed Dieffenbach - Administrator, Payroll
  David Evans - Position Administrator

TABCO

- Dan Capozzi – Manager, Staff Relations*
- Thomas Evans – Principal, Catonsville Middle School
- Deabra Feaster – Principal, Campfield Early Childhood Center
- John Smeallie – Director, Personnel
- Consultants: Randy Grimsley - Executive Director, Human Resources
  Ed Dieffenbach - Administrator, Payroll
  Kathleen Harmon - Manager, Employee Benefits
  Lyle Patzkowsky - Principal, Dulaney High School

- Lead Negotiator/Board Spokesperson