

TENTATIVE MINUTES**BOARD OF EDUCATION OF BALTIMORE COUNTY, MARYLAND**

Tuesday, February 23, 2010

The Board of Education of Baltimore County met in closed session at 4:30 p.m. at Greenwood. President JoAnn C. Murphy and the following Board members were present: Mr. James E. Coleman, Mr. Earnest E. Hines, Mr. Rodger C. Janssen, Ms. Ramona N. Johnson, Mr. H. Edward Parker, Lawrence E. Schmidt, Esquire, and Mr. David Uhlfelder. In addition, Dr. Joe A. Hairston, Superintendent of Schools, and staff members were present.

The Board entertained oral argument in Hearing Examiner's Case #10-08. The matter was heard in closed session.

In addition to the above listed Board members, the following persons were present for oral argument: the Appellant; J. Robert Haines, Esquire, Deputy Superintendent, Ms. Rita Fromm, Chief of Staff; Ms. Michele O. Prumo, Executive Director, Planning and Support Operations; Dr. Donald Peccia, Assistant Superintendent, Human Resources; Ms. Linda Fitchett, Director, Transportation; Mr. Daniel J. Capozzi, Staff Relations Manager; Margaret-Ann F. Howie, Esquire, General Counsel; Andrew W. Nussbaum, Esquire, Legal Counsel to the Board of Education; and Ms. Brenda Stiffler, Administrative Assistant to the Board of Education.

The proceedings of the hearing were recorded by a court reporter.

Board members deliberated on the case without staff present.

The deliberation was concluded at 5:32 p.m.

On motion of Mr. Parker, seconded by Mr. Schmidt, the Board adjourned at 5:38 p.m.

OPEN SESSION MINUTES

The Board of Education of Baltimore County met in open session at 5:39 p.m. at Greenwood. President JoAnn C. Murphy and the following Board members were present: Mr. James E. Coleman, Mr. Earnest E. Hines, Mr. Rodger C. Janssen, Ms. Ramona N. Johnson, Mr. H. Edward Parker, Lawrence E. Schmidt, Esquire, and Mr. David Uhlfelder. In addition, Dr. Joe A. Hairston, Superintendent of Schools, and staff members were present.

Ms. Murphy reminded Board members of community functions and Board of Education events scheduled in February and March.

Pursuant to the Annotated Code of Maryland, State Government Article, §§10-508(a)(7) and upon motion of Mr. Schmidt, seconded by Mr. Coleman, the Board commenced its closed session at 5:40 p.m.

CLOSED SESSION MINUTES

The Board of Education of Baltimore County, Maryland, met in closed session at 5:40 p.m. at Greenwood. President JoAnn C. Murphy and the following Board members were present: Mr. James E. Coleman, Mr. Earnest E. Hines, Mr. Rodger C. Janssen, Ms. Ramona N. Johnson, Mr. H. Edward Parker, Lawrence E. Schmidt, Esquire, and Mr. David Uhlfelder. In addition, Dr. Joe A. Hairston, Superintendent of Schools, and the following staff members were present: J. Robert Haines, Esquire, Deputy Superintendent; Ms. Rita Fromm, Chief of Staff; Margaret-Ann Howie, Esquire, General Counsel; J. Stephen Cowles, Associate General Counsel; Andrew W. Nussbaum, Esquire, Knight, Manzi, Nussbaum & LaPlaca, P.A., Counsel to the Board of Education; and Ms. Brenda Stiffler, Administrative Assistant to the Board.

Ms. Howie provided legal advice to Board members regarding the Open Meetings Act.

Mr. Nussbaum provided legal advice on lobbying rules.

On motion of Mr. Schmidt, seconded by Mr. Parker, the Board adjourned its closed session at 6:10 p.m.

ADMINISTRATIVE FUNCTION

At 6:10 p.m., the Board discussed pending legislation that would be added to a future Board agenda.

At 6:23 p.m., the Board adjourned its administrative function for a brief dinner recess.

OPEN SESSION MINUTES

The Board of Education of Baltimore County, Maryland, reconvened in open session at 6:42 p.m. at Greenwood. President JoAnn C. Murphy and the following Board members were present: Mr. James E. Coleman, Mr. Earnest E. Hines, Mr. Rodger C. Janssen, Ms. Ramona N. Johnson, Mr. H. Edward Parker, Lawrence E. Schmidt, Esquire, and Mr. David Uhlfelder. In addition, Dr. Joe A. Hairston, Superintendent of Schools, and staff members were present.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The open session commenced with the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag, which was led by Ms. Patricia Lawton, followed by a period of silent meditation for those who have served education in the Baltimore County Public Schools.

Ms. Murphy informed the audience of the sessions in which Board members had participated earlier in the afternoon.

SCHOOL LEGISLATION

Edward J. Novak, Esquire, Associate General Counsel for Legislation and Policy Matters, reviewed with the Board proposed legislation currently under consideration by the General Assembly.

On motion of Mr. Parker, seconded by Mr. Coleman, the Board voted to oppose HB1016/SB801 – Baltimore County – Public School Employees – Collective Bargaining and Representation Fees (favor-8).

On motion of Mr. Uhlfelder, seconded by Mr. Coleman, the Board voted to take no position on HB948/SB884 – Baltimore County – Bargaining Unit for Public School Employees (favor-8).

On motion of Mr. Uhlfelder, seconded by Mr. Coleman, the Board voted to support HB467/SB275 – Education Maryland Longitudinal Data System (favor-8).

On motion of Mr. Uhlfelder, seconded by Mr. Hines, the Board voted to support SB403 – Education – Maintenance of Effort - Penalty (favor-8).

On motion of Mr. Coleman, seconded by Mr. Hines, the Board voted to oppose HB410 – Education – Statewide Maintenance of Effort Waiver (favor-8).

On motion of Mr. Parker, seconded by Ms. Johnson, the Board voted to take no position on HB632 – Maintenance of Effort – Penalty (favor-8).

On motion of Mr. Parker, seconded by Mr. Coleman, the Board voted to support SB899 – Education Reform Act of 2010 (favor-8).

WORK SESSION REPORTS

The Board received the following reports:

- A. **Race to the Top Grant Program** – Dr. James Foran, Maryland State Department of Education, shared with Board members Maryland’s Race to the Top initiative. Through a PowerPoint™ presentation, Dr. Foran reviewed Maryland’s reform effort. He stated that Maryland’s education reform will occur in three waves:
- First Wave
 - Sondheim Commission Report – Comprehensive system of assessment and accountability
 - Maryland Learner Outcomes/Maryland School Performance Assessment Program
 - High School Assessments (HSA) Development begins
 - System of identification and support for low-achieving schools established

WORK SESSION REPORTS (cont)

- Second Wave
 - Bridge to Excellence Act of 2002
 - No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act
 - Voluntary State Curriculum
 - Maryland School Assessments (MSA)
 - Consolidated early childhood programs
- Third Wave
 - Revise the Maryland State Curriculum PreK-12
 - Build a statewide technology infrastructure that links all data elements
 - Redesign the model for preparation, development, retention, and evaluation of teachers and principals
 - Fully implement the innovative Breakthrough Center approach for transforming low-achieving schools and districts

Next, Dr. Foran reviewed Maryland's four pillars of reform, which make up the third wave. He stated that all 24 school districts will receive a survey to determine what technology software is being used. The goal is to implement a data system that is capable of tracking student information over multiple years in multiple schools. Dr. Foran stated that Baltimore County Public Schools (BCPS) is in a good position with its data system.

Dr. Foran stated that SB899 looks at the tenure and evaluation piece for teachers. Currently, under NCLB, the Act speaks to "highly qualified teachers." It is no longer good enough to be highly qualified; the question is to be highly effective. The definition of "effective" and "highly effective" is still being reviewed at the state level. Dr. Foran noted that the Race to the Top application states that, "An effective teacher is one whose students gain a year's worth of growth for a year's worth of instruction."

Dr. Foran reviewed the criteria for the grant, the four assurances of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA), and the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with participating local education agencies (LEA).

Mr. Uhlfelder asked whether Baltimore County would receive approximately \$15.4 million over a four year period if Maryland would receive \$250 million. Dr. Foran responded in the affirmative.

Mr. Janssen asked if the state would use its portion of the 50% to help an LEA that did not participate in the grant. Dr. Foran responded that the federal

WORK SESSION REPORTS (cont)

government has a distinction between a “participating” LEA and an ‘involved’ LEA on the grant application. Dr. Foran stated that, at this point and time, Maryland is not making that distinction; either the LEA is participating or not participating. If the state chooses to adopt the definition of an “involved” LEA, then that state could give part of its money to that LEA.

Mr. Schmidt asked whether participation was based on the number of students in each LEA or the percentage of jurisdiction statewide. Dr. Foran responded that the application shows the percentage of LEAs that participate in the grant.

Mr. Coleman asked whether “effective” teachers would be developed statewide or countywide. Dr. Foran responded that is would be developed statewide. Dr. Foran noted that conversations have begun with principals about the statewide evaluation process. Dr. Foran also noted that the state would engage teachers in the same manner.

Mr. Parker requested that student input be part of the process when defining “effective” and “highly effective” teachers and principals.

Mr. Janssen asked whether there is a mechanism for an LEA to withdraw. Dr. Foran responded in the affirmative; however, it would likely reduce the award that the state would receive if a number of LEAs withdraw. Mr. Janssen asked whether the state would be audited on the grant funds similar to Title I funds. Dr. Foran responded that the state has not been given any guidance on what level of auditing would occur. The state and all participating LEAs would be held accountable for the plans submitted.

Mr. Schmidt asked if there was a concern at the state level that participation would increase federalism for Maryland schools. Dr. Foran responded that, since the federal government is providing the money, the federal government should be able to have some expectations for the money it gives. Mr. Schmidt asked if any LEAs have expressed concern with the upcoming reform. Dr. Foran responded that, even though the federal government will have certain expectations, there is still a great deal of control built into the reform for local school systems.

B. Consideration of the Race to the Top Resolution – On motion of Mr. Parker, seconded by Ms. Johnson, the Board approved the Race to the Top Resolution:

WHEREAS, The Maryland State Department of Education (MSDE) has decided to submit an application for Race to the Top funds from the United States Department of Education; and

WORK SESSION REPORTS (cont)

WHEREAS, *The State of Maryland is eligible for funding in a range of \$150,000,000 to \$250,000,000, of which amount 50% must go directly to participating local education agencies; and*

WHEREAS, *MSDE has prepared a document entitled “Maryland’s Race to the Top Participating Local Education Agency Memorandum of Understanding,” which, by its terms, is “to establish a framework of collaboration, as well as to articulate specific roles and responsibilities in support of MSDE in its implementation of an approved Race to the Top grant project; and*

WHEREAS, *Any local education agency wishing to participate in the submission of the Race to the Top grant must agree to and sign the Memorandum of Understanding and must certify and agree to certain assurances contained in that Memorandum and in Exhibit 1, thereto; and*

WHEREAS, *The Board of Education of Baltimore County is desirous of participating in the Race to the Top grant; now, therefore be it*

RESOLVED, *This 23rd day of February, 2010, that the Board of Education of Baltimore County expresses its desire to be a “Participating Local Education Agency” in Maryland’s Race to the Top grant and agrees to the terms and conditions contained in MSDE’s Memorandum of Understanding; and be it further*

RESOLVED, *That the Board President is expressly authorized to sign the Memorandum of Understanding committing the Board of Education of Baltimore County to the terms and conditions contained in the MOU and Exhibit 1, thereto; and be it further*

RESOLVED, *That the Superintendent is hereby directed to sign the MOU and Exhibit 1, thereto, and is further directed to take the steps he deems necessary to implement the terms of the MOU and Exhibit 1, thereto.*

- C. **Baltimore County Public Schools’ College Attendance and Maryland Scholars** – Dr. Thomas Rhoades, Executive Director of Research, Accountability, and Assessment, informed Board members that the National Student Clearing House collects information on student achievement in higher education on a national level. The school system procured the clearinghouse to track college attendance rates, first and second year college retention rates, and degree completion rates for BCPS graduates. The report’s highlights included:

WORK SESSION REPORTS (cont)

- The percentage of students who enrolled in college immediately following graduation from high school increased from 54% in 2002 to 61% in 2009.
- The percentage of students who enrolled in college at any time during the first year after high school increased from 60% in 2002 to 63% in 2008.
- College attendance has continued to increase over a five-year period for all racial groups.
- The percentage of students who had received Free and Reduced-price Meals (FARMS) attended college within the first year after graduation increased from 42.7% in 2004 to 52.2% in 2008.
- Of students who have been out of high school since 2002, 31% have earned a college degree.

Mr. Schmidt asked whether BCPS has data available that would give the Board a broad look at where students are going to college. Dr. Rhoades stated that the information had been shared with the area assistant superintendents and various principals on CD. Mr. Schmidt requested that the information be shared with the Board by March 24.

INFORMATION

The Board received the following as information:

- A. 2009 Maryland Report Card – Performance Report
- B. Financial Report for months ending December 31, 2008 and 2009

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Ms. Murphy made the following announcements:

- The Board of Education of Baltimore County will host a dinner meeting with the Baltimore County Executive and Baltimore County Council on Tuesday, March 2, 2010, at approximately 5:30 p.m. The dinner will be held in the Administrative Building on the Greenwood Campus.
- The Southeast Area Education Advisory Council will hold its next meeting on Monday, March 8, 2010, at Chesapeake Terrace Elementary School beginning at 7:00 p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENTS (cont)

- The Board of Education of Baltimore County will hold its next meeting on Tuesday, March 9, 2010, at Greenwood. The meeting will begin with an open session at approximately 5:30 p.m. The Board will then adjourn to meet in closed session. The open session will reconvene at approximately 7:00 p.m. The public is welcome to all open sessions.
- The Board of Education of Baltimore County will hold a public hearing on the proposed boundaries for West Towson Elementary and the proposed boundary changes for Rodgers Forge and Riderwood Elementary Schools on Wednesday, March 10, 2010, at Loch Raven High School beginning at 7:00 p.m. Sign-up for the public to comment begins at 6:00 p.m. on the day of the hearing.

ADJOURNMENT

Since there was no further business, the Board adjourned its meeting at 8:01 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Joe A. Hairston
Secretary-Treasurer

/bls

TENTATIVE REPORT

REPORT OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION OF BALTIMORE COUNTY'S PUBLIC HEARING ON THE PROPOSED BOUNDARY FOR WEST TOWSON ELEMENTARY SCHOOL AND THE PROPOSED BOUNDARY CHANGES FOR RODGERS FORGE AND RIDERWOOD ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS

Wednesday, March 10, 2010
Loch Raven High School

The public hearing was called to order at 7:01 p.m. President JoAnn C. Murphy and the following Board members were present: Mr. Rodger C. Janssen, Mr. Joseph J. Pallozzi, and Mr. H. Edward Parker.

Ms. Murphy announced that the Board of Education of Baltimore County would vote on the proposed boundaries on March 23, 2010. President Murphy urged the audience to contact the Board office, if they had further input and advised that additional comments could be forwarded to Board members.

The following citizens addressed the Board:

1. Ms. Lisa Feigenson, Rodgers Forge Resident – Concerned with the boundary issue and the fact that the current Scenario G as modified, does not include houses on Pinehurst. Eight homes in the Rodgers Forge area are not included in this scenario, and Ms. Feigenson is requesting that these homes be included in Scenario G with modifications.
2. Ms. Ines, Kolen, Rodgers Forge Resident – Asked that the Rodgers Forge neighborhood be kept intact. As a single mom and full-time worker, she would need to get her daughter up earlier so that she can get to work on time. Ms. Kolen stated that she would like her daughter to be able to walk to school with the other children.
3. Ms. Janice Moore, Rodgers Forge Community Association – Requested that, when the Board votes for Scenario G modified, that it includes the eight homes on Pinehurst that Ms. Feigenson spoke about. She emphasized that the community association has supported Rodgers Forge Elementary School for several years.
4. Mr. Gordon Kennard, Rodgers Forge Resident – Supports Scenario G as modified.
5. Ms. Jeannine Fay, Pinehurst Community Resident – Opposes Scenario G. She stated that, as a member of the Pinehurst community, her child would be redistricted to West Towson Elementary School. Ms. Fay expressed her concern about the unannounced December 23, 2009, Boundary Committee meeting and a potential violation of the Open Meetings Act.

6. Ms. Melissa Broome, President, Gaywood Community Association – Opposes Scenario G as proposed. She questioned why the historical boundaries are more important than diversity. Ms. Broome expressed her disappointment with the boundary process.
7. Mr. Dennis King, Co-Chair, Boundary Study Committee – Stated that the Boundary Committee had endorsed Scenario G with modifications. He reviewed the process and the task of districting walkers away from a school with too few seats to accommodate all walkers. Mr. King noted that the committee members worked hard and included an additional scenario that provided a wide variety of choices to be considered by the community.
8. Ms. Danielle Moon, Pinehurst Resident – Opposed Scenario G as proposed. She reiterated the remarks made by Ms. Broome and Ms. Fay. Ms. Moon noted that the voting was skewed due to the early release of information outside of the committee, and asked that the proposed boundary be reconsidered.
9. Ms. Jennifer Helfrich, Rodgers Forge Resident – Supports Scenario G. She stated that she respects the process and believes criticism of the process was addressed at former meetings. Ms. Helfrich noted that both schools were fine choices.
10. An individual, who lives on Yorktowne Drive, stated that she opposes Scenario G as proposed. She expressed concern that one street is being separated. She stated that her street will no longer have a bus stop if the students stay at Rodgers Forge Elementary School.

The hearing was concluded at 7:26 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Joe A. Hairston
Board Secretary-Treasurer

/bls