

BALTIMORE CITY PUBLIC SCHOOLS
BALTIMORE, MARYLAND 21218
Office of

The Superintendent of Public Instruction

Circular No. 24
Series 1983-84

August 17, 1983

ADMINISTRATION:

Principal's Evaluation

TO: Regional Superintendents, Principals and Heads of Central Office Units

FROM: Alice G. Pinderhughes, Superintendent of Public Instruction
Thomas R. Foster, Deputy Superintendent

Attached you will find procedures for the evaluation of principals adopted by the Board of School Commissioners on Thursday, July 28, 1983. The new procedures will be used jointly with current procedures. The regional superintendent will determine the final evaluation of each principal at the conclusion of the school year. A comparison study will be made during 1983-84. Results of the study will be reported during the summer of 1984.

During the development of the new procedures, briefing sessions were held for all principals. Since that time, modifications were made in the procedure. Principals are, therefore, urged to study the attachment. Informational sessions will be scheduled for principals in the near future.

TRF:cw

Attachment

BALTIMORE CITY PUBLIC SCHOOLS
PROCEDURES FOR EVALUATION OF PRINCIPALS
EFFECTIVE SEPTEMBER 1, 1983
TO BE USED JOINTLY WITH CURRENT PROCEDURES

Introduction

The evaluation of the executive officers of any unit within our organization should focus upon the primary mission of that unit. The primary mission of the Baltimore City Public Schools is to educate the children and the adults enrolled. It follows that the evaluation of its principals should be placed upon the extent to which the students learn, the extent to which they are present for learning, the extent to which the educational staff is present to provide instruction and managerial skills necessary to carry out the process consistent with the goals and objectives of the Baltimore City Public Schools. Such measures are central to the mission of public schools.

The components of the principal's evaluation have been established as follows:

	Percent	Points
I. School Objectives, Initiatives, Activities	27.3%	30
II. Standardized Tests	36.3%	40
III. Proficiency Tests	9.1%	10
IV. Student Attendance	9.1%	10
V. Teacher Attendance	9.1%	10
VI. Growth Index	9.1%	10
	<u>100.0%</u>	<u>110</u>

Methods and Procedures

Data for Component I will be evaluated by the regional superintendent. Data for components II - VI will be produced by the Bureau of Planning, Research and Evaluation. To establish a standard against which improvements will be measured, data for the base years 1981-82 will be used. The standard will form a base against which future performance will be measured. Scaling will be carried out separately for elementary, middle/junior high and senior high levels. The latter are further distinguished by citywide, comprehensive and vocational/technical schools. The scale avoids bias which may arise from schools at either performance extreme by grouping them by level, economic characteristics, and in the case of high schools, by program. The classification categories are broad enough to encompass better than and less than satisfactory performance.

I. School Objectives, Initiatives and Activities

This section is to be developed jointly, in the Fall, by the regional superintendent and principal. They may address as many items as are mutually agreeable and assign point values to each, the total not to exceed thirty (30). Results should be observable. Points are to be awarded in the Spring by the regional superintendent.

PRINCIPAL EVALUATION FORM

Principal's Name _____ School No. ____ School Year _____

AREA OF EVALUATION	WEIGHTS	POINTS EARNED	RATING
I School Objectives, Initiatives, Activities	30		
II Standardized Tests	40		
III Proficiency Tests	10		
IV Student Attendance	10		
V Teacher Attendance	10		
VI Growth Index	10		
Totals		110	*

*Obtain from chart below.

RATING SCALE

PERFORMANCE RATINGS	PERFORMANCE RATING DEFINITIONS	SCORE
Outstanding Performance	Consistently exceeds expected performance in accomplishing stated objectives and position requirements and manifests a discernable degree of initiative and innovation.	85 and above
Good	Exceeds expectations and demonstrates high level performance in accomplishing objectives and position requirements.	75-80
Satisfactory	Meets stated objectives and satisfies position requirements in a manner resulting in expected performance.	60-74
Needs Improvement	Performs most position requirements in an acceptable manner, but needs improvement in designated areas.	40-59
Unsatisfactory	Does not perform at an acceptable level.	39 or less

RECOMMENDED ACTIONS:

Outstanding: Consider for principalship of larger, more complex school.
Invite to serve on system-wide policy development committees.
Certificate of Recognition placed in official personnel file.

Good: Continue in position. Certificate of Recognition placed in official
personnel file.

Satisfactory: Support for continued improvement.

Needs Improvement: Retain in position with support or transfer with support.
If second consecutive "Needs Improvement" rating, take
action as "Unsatisfactory."

Unsatisfactory: Reassign as an assistant principal and place name on
eligibility list for principal.

RECOMMENDED PERFORMANCE RATING: _____

Regional Superintendent _____ Date _____

Principal's Signature _____ Date _____

If the recommended performance rating does not match the rating designated by the
point values in the RATING SCALE, the regional superintendent must indicate below
the specific reasons for the difference.

REVIEWING OFFICER _____
signature, date



Newsletter



10 WEST TWENTY-FIFTH STREET, BALTIMORE, MD. 21218

PHONE: 243-4310

May, 1984

#11

PSASA NEGOTIATIONS

We are still at the table! On Friday, May 11, 1984 we presented our proposed salary package to the City and the Board negotiation team. They will respond to us on Friday, May 18, 1984. Upon completion of negotiations, which we hope will be very soon, we will call a special general membership meeting for ratification. Watch for the bulletin announcing date, time, and place for the ratification meeting!!!

PSASA PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL

Dr. Delores Baden, President, presented the Performance Appraisal System for school-based administrators to the Board of School Commissioners at the May 17th meeting. This effort is the work of Dr. Earnest James, Industrial Psychologist for the State of Maryland. It is PSASA's response to the Board's challenge for an effective evaluation instrument.

The instrument represents nine months of work by members of PSASA and selected staff of the Baltimore City Public Schools. Remember, this is a proposal. What has been submitted to the Board will be reviewed and possibly changed. However, we hope that an honest effort will meet with a system response that has integrity. Superintendent Pinderhughes, and others, have been cooperative in this endeavor.

What follows is the Performance Appraisal System for school-based

INTRODUCTION

This performance appraisal system has been developed on the basis of a careful job analysis which is in Appendix B (or attached at the end of this document if this is a copy of only this instrument). The knowledge, skills and abilities (KSAs) that are required to perform the tasks are listed in the job analysis. This appraisal system is based upon those KSAs because a KSA-based instrument allows for better performance diagnoses for employee development purposes. Those KSAs are as follows:

1. Knowledge of Educational Procedures, Documents and Policies (31%)
2. Management and Leadership Skills (24%)
3. Data Gathering, Data Organization and Problem Solving Skills (21%)
4. Presentation Skills (12%)
5. Public Relations and Interpersonal Skills (12%)

The above five KSAs, with weights shown in parentheses, constitute the heart of this performance appraisal system and are the components upon which the appraisal ratings are generated.

PURPOSE

There are two primary overall purposes for a performance appraisal system:

- A. Employee Development
- B. Administrative Decisions

These two purposes are antagonistic to each other and must be managed very carefully.

PUBLIC SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS AND SUPERVISORS ASSOCIATION OF BALTIMORE CITY

Employee Development. It is not enough to select the best candidate for the job and then train her/him to maintain the best possible workforce. Employees work behavior and attitudes are in continuous change and modification. If this change is carefully managed, it will result in a great benefit to the organization in terms of production and commitment. To carefully manage this change, management has to be able to diagnose and measure strengths and weaknesses of the skills and abilities of the employees and guide the changing experiences of the employee in a direction that will improve their weaknesses and capitalize on their strengths. This appraisal system allows for diagnoses and recommends at least three conferences which are designed to aid both the manager and subordinate in communicating to get a clear understanding of the employee's strengths and weaknesses. With a clear understanding of the employee's skills, the manager can make recommendations, for example, for assistance, training, a job change or a redesigned job to provide for continued improvement. Please be aware that the employee must be allowed to participate fully in these decisions and may choose not to seek further development. The objective of employee development is to maintain and improve your human resources.

Administrative Decisions. These decisions are, for example, whether to promote, place, transfer, demote or terminate an employee. As you can see, the administrative function is antagonistic to the employee development function. It is to the employee's advantage to disclose his/her weaknesses in the developmental cycle of the system, but not so in the administrative cycle.

It does not take very long to make administrative decisions, especially if appropriate documentation has been maintained and standard procedures have been followed. Therefore approximately 90 percent of the appraisal cycle involves employee development with the remainder involving formulating and making administrative decisions.

Another point to consider about administrative decisions is that if the performance appraisal system is to be used to make administrative decisions, the instrument must be reliable and valid. The use of a performance appraisal system to make promotional decisions brings the appraisal system "within the purview of Title VII of the 1964 Civil Rights Act and the subsequent acts of

government guidelines on employee selection" (Kleiman and Durham, 1981, p. 103). Regardless of the reasons for using a performance appraisal system, a reliable and valid instrument is more effective and tends to have more support from those who are affected by it.

PERPARATION

Before this instrument is used by anyone, that person should attend a formal in-house training program that is designed specifically to teach the manager how to use this instrument. Training is critical!! The user must be thoroughly familiar with the instrument and its limitation. The user must know the appropriate documentation, data collection procedures and when to use the instrument. The user must have a clear understanding of the position for which this instrument was designed. The user must have a very clear understanding the specific purpose of this instrument. Top management may decide to use this instrument for employee development only or for only one administrative decision such as the percent of merit increase an employee should receive. Without a clear understanding of the specific purpose of this instrument, unnecessary work may result.

RELIABILITY AND VALIDITY

This instrument should not be used unless there is evidence to support the reliability and validity of the ratings collected with this instrument. Such evidence should be obtained professionally by someone trained in procedures for validating performance appraisal systems, such as an Industrial-Organizational Psychologist. Such evidence should be presented in a technical report. An example of such a study is Project 3, Reliability Study, that is presented in the original (present) report in which this document is presented.

QUALITY CONTROL

Once the reliability and the validity of this appraisal system is established, it must be maintained. A quality control program must also be established as a part of this performance appraisal system. A quality control program is nothing more than a follow-up validation study that is conducted yearly (e.g., Project 3 of this report). However, quality control also involves a review of the job to determine if there are significant changes. When such changes occur, it may be necessary to make major changes and rewrite the appraisal form.

METHOD, ADMINISTRATOR APPRAISAL PROCEDURE

Appraisee's Goals And Objectives. Each administrator or principal will submit a set of goals and objectives for solving key problems from the previous school year between August 15 and September 30. In the case of newly appointed administrators these goals and objectives will be submitted on a date mutually agreed upon by the administrator and the immediate supervisor, but in no case later than sixty (60) days after the administrator assumes the position to which s/he is appointed. These goals will be agreed upon by the administrator and the immediate supervisor. The immediate supervisor will give the final approval of the goals, of course, and is responsible for seeing that all required performance appraisal conferences take place.

First Conference Report. Objectives and goals are subject to modification upon mutual agreement in writing or in a conference between the administrator and the immediate supervisor no later than September 30. By this date, the First Conference Report form will be completed and copies retained by the appraisee (administrator) and appraiser (immediate supervisor). At minimum, the appraisee is to be provided with expected final ratings based upon progress on objectives to date to prevent any surprises and to allow for mid-course corrections to take place. However, the immediate supervisor should also have a written plan, which included full participation by the administrator, to correct any problems the administrator is experiencing.

Second Conference Report. The Second appraisal session between the administrator and the immediate supervisor will be held no later than January 15. Again, at minimum, the appraisee is to be provided with expected final ratings based upon progress on objectives to date to prevent any surprises and to allow for mid-course corrections to take place. At this time, the Second Conference Report form will be completed.

Continuing communication between the administrator and the supervisor is necessary. Further formal conferences until the end-of-year conference may be held at the discretion of the administrator and/or the immediate supervisor. The results of such conferences will be documented and signed by both parties.

End-of-Year Conference Report. The final evaluation session will involve the same procedures as the previous appraisal sessions, except the ratings are final. This conference is to be conducted between May 1 and June 30. Should the administrator take exception to the performance appraisal results, the administrator may seek redress available via the appropriate administrative procedures at any time during the appraisal year; the sooner it is done, the better.

THE RATING SCALES

How To Use The Scales

Before you begin the appraisal process, it is essential that you read, in its entirety, the description of the rating scale you will be using. The rating scale is a five-point scale with anchors as described below:

- (5) ● Superior and Exceptional Effectiveness
This is the highest level of job effectiveness and should reflect your complete confidence in an individual who is fully competent in every facet of the job activity.
- (4) ● Outstanding or Above Average Effectiveness
This is the second highest job effectiveness level and should include only those individuals who consistently exceed the normal and expected work standards.

- (3) ● Expected and Reasonable Effectiveness
This category should include those administrators who meet the average and expected job effectiveness standards established for the position.
- (2) ● Below Standards but Above Minimum Effectiveness
This is the second lowest level of effectiveness and should include those persons who generally fail to meet the expected standards of work, but are working at a minimally allowable level.
- (1) ● Below Minimum/Acceptable Effectiveness
This is the lowest level of effectiveness and should include only those administrators whose work is completely unsatisfactory.

Each of the five KSAs will be presented separately on the following pages with the above five-point rating scale on which the supervisor is to provide the appraisal ratings. Each KSA is defined by a set of indicators or questions which the supervisor is to ask her/himself and provide documented answers before rating the administrator. The documented answers are to be presented in a manner such that an independent rater can provide a "reasonable" set of rating for the administrator in conjunction with a quality control program discussed earlier in this instrument. Before the rating scales with KSAs are presented, a discussion of rating errors to avoid will follow.

Errors to Avoid:

- The Leniency Error
In an attempt to be either lenient or severe, a rater can fall into the trap of consistently evaluating everyone excessively easy, or the reverse, excessively hard. Since these assessments are so important to the organization, an effort should be made to accurately depict the ratee as he/she actually performs without regard to personal feelings, mitigating circumstances, a desire to be liked, or the desire to be strict.

● The Central Tendency Error

Some raters don't like to make extreme judgments, and tend to fail to use the extreme scale scores (i.e. Superior and/or Below Minimum). By failing to use the extreme scale scores, you may restrict the range of the scale.

● The Halo Error

This error relates to a rater's tendency to let an assessment on one dimension overly influence other assessments on unrelated dimensions. An administrator may be outstanding in "Management and Leadership Skills," but below standard in "Data Gathering, Data Organization and Problem Solving Skills".

● The Recency Error

The recency error occurs when the rater considers only the administrator's last few days or weeks of work. Care should be taken to resist being overly swayed in your assessment by one or two recent events in an administrator's total work experience.

With an understanding of the type of rating errors to avoid, you may begin the completion of the ratings on each of the five KSAs and an overall rating on the following pages.

Knowledge of Educational Procedures, Documents and Policies

This scale measures the extent and how well the administrator applies his/her knowledge of educational procedures, documents and policies in completing job assignments.

As an aid in assessing the administrator's performance in applying this KSA, document and review the answers to questions similar to the following:

- To what extent does this administrator have a typed, well organized and accurate set of documents or report with the appropriate statistics describing his/her assessment and conclusions of the school's performance for the previous school year and key problem areas?
- To what extent does the administrator have a written and appropriate set of objectives, with a time table, for the coming school year that is challenging, seems obtainable and addresses the most serious problems facing the school?
- To what extent is there sufficient evidence to indicate the administrator allowed full participation of his/her staff in setting the school objectives and addressing the major problem areas?
- To what extent does the administrator process the administrative paperwork in an appropriate and efficient manner? Are there delays and errors in the processing and maintenance of documents and school records?

Based on these and other similar questions to which you have documented answers, identify the level of performance of the administrator on this KSA scale only by checking the appropriate circle below.

- 5 SUPERIOR
- 4 OUTSTANDING
- 3 EXPECTED
- 2 BELOW STANDARD
- 1 BELOW MINIMUM

Management And Leadership Skills

This scale measures how well the administrator applies her/his management and leadership skills in completing assignments and solving job related problems.

As an aid in assessing the administrator's performance in applying this KSA, document and review the answers to questions similar to the following:

- How well does the administrator make use of the strengths and weaknesses of his/her human resources in making student and staff assignments, including adjustments to classes?
- How well is the faculty handbook maintained and how well is the administrator's staff informed of the legal and formal organizational procedures for conducting school business?
- To what extent does the administrator make use of the latest available technology and procedures in education to assist in the education of students?
- To what extent does the administrator allow for staff, staff specialists, student, and parent participation in solving school related problems?
- To what extent does the administrator have a set of long-term objectives for solving anticipated and major problems?

Based on these and other similar questions to which you have documented answers, identify the level of performance of the administrator on this KSA scale only by checking the appropriate circle below.

- | | | |
|-----------------------|---|----------------|
| <input type="radio"/> | 5 | SUPERIOR |
| <input type="radio"/> | 4 | OUTSTANDING |
| <input type="radio"/> | 3 | EXPECTED |
| <input type="radio"/> | 2 | BELOW STANDARD |
| <input type="radio"/> | 1 | BELOW MINIMUM |

Data Gathering, Data Organization And Problem Solving Skills

This scale measures how well the administrator applies her/his data analysis skills in solving job related problems.

As an aid in assessing the administrator's performance in applying this KSA, document and review the answers to questions similar to the following:

- To what extent is the administrator constantly aware of his/her progress on action plans and objectives, and any necessary midcourse corrections?
- To what extent has the administrator documented the key student problem areas and trends?
- To what extent has the administrator documented the strengths and weaknesses of staff members (conducted performance appraisals correctly) and plans for improving staff performance and developing human resources?

- To what extent is the principal aware of emerging or potential problem areas and possible cause and effect relations (for long-range planning purposes)?

Based on these and other similar questions to which you have documented answers, identify the level of performance of the administrator on this KSA scale only by checking the appropriate circle below.

- 5 SUPERIOR
- 4 OUTSTANDING
- 3 EXPECTED
- 2 BELOW STANDARD
- 1 BELOW MINIMUM

Presentation Skills

This scale measures how well the administrator applies her/his presentation skills in completing assignments and solving job related problems.

As an aid in assessing the administrator's performance in applying this KSA, document and review the answers to questions similar to the following:

- Are the subordinates fully aware of the goals and objectives and key problem areas facing the school?
Are staff meetings conducted regularly?
- How many presentations has the administrator made to parents, staff, students or community organizations for fund raising activities?

- How many presentation or meetings has the administrator conducted to get parents and other professional individuals in the community to participate in solving school related problems? How successful were these presentation efforts in improving or maintaining community participation?
- How many presentations has the administrator made or participated in at various professional meetings?

Based on these and other similar questions to which you have documented answers, identify the level of performance of the administrator on this KSA scale only by checking the appropriate circle below.

- 5 SUPERIOR
- 4 OUTSTANDING
- 3 EXPECTED
- 2 BELOW STANDARD
- 1 BELOW MINIMUM

Public Relations And Interpersonal Skills

This scale measures how well the administrator applies her/his interpersonal skills in solving job related problems.

As an aid in assessing the administrator's performance in applying this KSA, document and review the answers to questions similar to the following:

- How effective is the administrator in getting the support of parents, community groups and professionals in solving school related problems by visiting the parents and/or meeting with community groups and professionals?
- How well informed are parents and students about school activities?
- To what extent is there participation of staff members in school programs and activities?
- To what extent are staff members willing to support the plans, programs, technology and procedures offered by the administrator to educate students and solve problems?

Based on these and other similar questions to which you have documented answers, identify the level of performance of the administrator on this KSA scale only by checking the appropriate circle below.

- | | | |
|-----------------------|---|----------------|
| <input type="radio"/> | 5 | SUPERIOR |
| <input type="radio"/> | 4 | OUTSTANDING |
| <input type="radio"/> | 3 | EXPECTED |
| <input type="radio"/> | 2 | BELOW STANDARD |
| <input type="radio"/> | 1 | BELOW MINIMUM |

Overall Employee Effectiveness

This final scale measures the overall effectiveness of the administrator in accomplishing his/her job assignments.

As an aid in assessing the administrator's performance in applying this KSA, document and review the answers to the following question:

- All things considered, including unexpected constraints, to what extent has the administrator completed his/her planned objectives?

Based on this question to which you have documented answers, identify the level of performance of the administrator on this overall job performance scale by checking the appropriate circle below.

- 5 SUPERIOR
- 4 OUTSTANDING
- 3 EXPECTED
- 2 BELOW STANDARD
- 1 BELOW MINIMUM

NOTE: The overall rating is NOT to be used as the final rating or included in the calculation of the final rating. This rating is for research purposes only and should not be set equal to the final rating when the results turn out to be different.

CALCULATION OF FINAL RATING

Place the rating given on each KSA scale in the designated box, multiply by the weight, add the weighted ratings, divide the total by 20 and round the results to an integer.

KSA	Rating	Weight	Product
1. Knowledge of educational procedures, documents and policies	<input type="text"/>	X 6	= _____
2. Management and Leadership Skills	<input type="text"/>	X 5	= _____
3. Data Gathering, Data Organization and Problem Solving Skills	<input type="text"/>	X 4	= _____
4. Presentation Skills	<input type="text"/>	X 2.5	= _____
5. Public Relations and Interpersonal Skills	<input type="text"/>	X 2.5	= _____
		Total =	_____
Total divided 20 equals the final rating:		Final =	_____

The interpretation of the Final rating is:

- 5 = SUPERIOR
- 4 = OUTSTANDING
- 3 = EXPECTED
- 2 = BELOW STANDARD
- 1 = BELOW MINIMUM

Signatures:

Appraiser _____ Appraisee _____

END OF REPORT

PSASA GENERAL MEMBERSHIP MEETINGS

PSASA has had a number of meetings dealing with issues of importance to the membership and all of Unit II. We have had discussions about site budgeting, pension, promotional policy, principals' evaluation and salary negotiations. Attendance has been low. Please make an effort to attend forthcoming meetings. We need your INPUT.

COMMUNICATIONS FROM PSASA

We will soon have labels for NEWSLETTERS and other items. In the interim, if you do not receive a NEWSLETTER, call PSASA 243-4310 and ask for one. Don't fume - phone!

CONCERNS ABOUT POLYTECHNIC

Below is a copy of letter dated May 11, 1984 from Jim Addy to Thomas LoFaro, Assistant Superintendent, Department of Human Resources and Labor Relations:

When the one hundred year old Polytechnic Institute was made an independent school within the Baltimore City School System, we were told that the school would be subject to the rules and regulations of the Board of School Commissioners. PSASA sees a minor departure from this governance.

Why was the position of Principal/Director advertised in the public press prior to being distributed among the staff in the usual circular manner? It is our position that this is an unfair practice and serves to further demoralize the staff. Please be advised that PSASA will monitor the interview and selection process for the position of Principal/Director very carefully.

Some of our other concerns about Polytechnic and its Board of Overseers will be brought to the attention of the Superintendent at our meeting on May 14, 1984.

SUPERINTENDENT PINDERHUGHES MEETING - May 14, 1984

1. PSASA presented concerns about the Board of Overseers to Superintendent Pinderhughes and asked about the selection process for Principal/Director. The Principal/Director will select the Deans. All administrative staff must reapply for the new job designations.
2. Supervisory model is not finalized.
3. Elementary specialist model will not be changed.
4. There will be no R.I.F. if attrition occurs as expected (retirements & resignations.)
5. Asbestos will be removed from the schools during the summer.
6. Baltimore City spends more money on DEC children than any other subdivision. Services provided may be to some children who really do not belong in DEC categories.

PSASA JUNE NIGHT

PSASA will hold JUNE NIGHT on Sunday, June 3, 1984 at the World Trade Center, Constellation Room - 21st Floor. There will be hot and cold hors d'oeuvres, assorted vegetables and dips, cheese and fruit table, steamship roast beef, dessert, OPEN BAR, and live music. Limited reservations. Price: \$12.50 per person. Send your check today to PSASA. Come join us for a fun filled evening.

LAST BUT NOT LEAST - JOIN PSASA

DUES DEDUCTION AUTHORIZATION

Public School Administrators and Supervisors Association of
Baltimore City,

Dr. _____
Mr. _____ School No. _____
Mrs. _____
Miss _____ S.S. No. _____

To: Central Payroll Division - City of Baltimore Dept. 162.

I hereby authorize the Central Payroll Division to deduct from my earnings in 21 equal amounts the sum necessary for payment of dues now in effect (or such revised amount as may hereafter be approved in accordance with its constitution) for the Public School Administrators and Supervisors Association of Baltimore City, and remit same to the organization. I reserve the right to revoke this authorization for continuing membership by written notice to the PSASA Treasurer by August 30 of any school year.

(Bi-weekly amount \$5.95)

Signed _____ Date _____
Address _____ Zip _____

- To what extent is the principal aware of emerging or potential problem areas and possible cause and effect relations (for long-range planning purposes)?

Based on these and other similar questions to which you have documented answers, identify the level of performance of the administrator on this KSA scale only by checking the appropriate circle below.

- 5 SUPERIOR
- 4 OUTSTANDING
- 3 EXPECTED
- 2 BELOW STANDARD
- 1 BELOW MINIMUM

Presentation Skills

This scale measures how well the administrator applies her/his presentation skills in completing assignments and solving job related problems.

As an aid in assessing the administrator's performance in applying this KSA, document and review the answers to questions similar to the following:

- Are the subordinates fully aware of the goals and objectives and key problem areas facing the school?
Are staff meetings conducted regularly?
- How many presentations has the administrator made to parents, staff, students or community organizations for fund raising activities?



Newsletter



10 WEST TWENTY-FIFTH STREET, BALTIMORE, MD. 21218

PHONE: 243-4310

1984 - 1985

September - #1

THANKS TO THE MEMBERSHIP

The Executive Committee of PSASA thanks the membership for its patient support during a period of difficult and oftentimes grueling negotiations. We have been successful in reaching an agreement on a salary package that will provide a minimum increase of 4% to a maximum of 12%, depending upon placement on the salary grid. For the second year, there will be a salary increase of 6% minimum to a maximum of 12%. The pay scale is retroactive to the first pay period in July, 1984.

The assessment document for principals and assistant principals will be the performance appraisal instrument developed under the sponsorship of PSASA by Dr. Earnest James, Industrial Psychologist for the State of Maryland. The Board of School Commissioners approved the instrument on August 23, 1984. All other members of Unit II will be evaluated under existing evaluation procedures.

The October NEWSLETTER will contain specific information about salaries and benefits. Please attend the meeting at POLY on September 25, 1984 at 5:00 pm for purposes of ratifying the agreement.

The delay in settling with the City was the result of three problems. (1) Evaluation Procedures for the Contract years. (2) Unit placement of ten month elementary Educational Specialists. (3) Reduction in Force.

TEN MONTH ELEMENTARY EDUCATIONAL SPECIALISTS

As you know, the ten month elementary Educational Specialists were removed from Unit II (PSASA) and placed in Unit I (BTU) by the Superintendent. The removal was approved by the Board of School Commissioners.

Following is a letter from Dr. Baden, President of PSASA, to each of the ten month specialists, dated September 11, 1984:

Dear Colleague:

Several weeks ago you were notified by the Superintendent of Public Instruction of your transfer from Unit II, Elementary Specialist, ten months to Unit I, Support Teacher. As you may recall, PSASA addressed the Board of School Commissioners and the Superintendent about this issue. Next, we asked that you indicate by ballot your preference for BTU or PSASA to act as your representative. The results of the ballot indicated the majority of specialists wanted to be represented by BTU.

As a result, PSASA will take no administrative or legal steps to return ten-month specialists to Unit II.

Many thanks to those of you who were members of PSASA for your past support. Best wishes for a most successful school year.

Sincerely,



Delores F. Baden,
President

PUBLIC SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS AND SUPERVISORS ASSOCIATION OF BALTIMORE CITY

RIF

PSASA is pursuing the individual grievances submitted by those people whose job classifications were affected by the so-called reduction in force. Hearings for individual grievances are now being scheduled. We will keep the membership posted.

OCTOBER EVENT

PSASA has scheduled its Annual Fall Conference on October 25th to be held at Walbrook Senior High School. Jonathan Edges will again cater the affair. However, the School Board may change the dates of the Baltimore City Staff Conferences to coincide with the dates of the MSTA conference, which are October 18 and 19th. If that occurs, PSASA will hold its Fall Conference on October 18th. We will keep you posted via a special communication.

LEVEL II AND UNIT II

Unit II members are not Level II. We are Levels IV, V, VI. Level II are Assistant Superintendents.

GRIEVANCES

PSASA has won a grievance. The Directorship at Polytechnic was re-advertised with the salary stated to be the PSASA negotiated salary as compensation for the position.

Please remember that if you have a complaint against the Baltimore City School System's administration of its policies and procedures, PSASA will assist you. Often, individuals do nothing. To do nothing is not an answer for your problems.

You pay for legal counsel. Use it! Call us at 243-4310.

MONTHLY MEETING WITH MRS. PINDERHUGHES

PSASA's Executive Board meets monthly with the Superintendent. Please let Jim Addy know of any problem or issue you want discussed for resolution.

COMING EVENTS

1. October Annual Fall Conference
2. Representative Assembly Meetings
3. General Membership Meetings in NOVEMBER, JANUARY, MARCH, MAY

FINAL REPORT

COMMITTEE TO STUDY THE SECONDARY SUPERVISORY
INSTRUCTIONAL MODEL

FEBRUARY, 1984

COMMITTEE TO STUDY THE SECONDARY SUPERVISORY
INSTRUCTIONAL MODEL

Co-Chairs

Gloria A. Pegram, Principal
Fallstaff Middle School

Ernest Thayil, Principal
Eastern High School

Vondalee Clark
Members

Charles L. Allen
Coordinator of English
Division of Secondary Education

Robert Anderson
Head of Science Department
Hamilton Junior High

Samuel R. Billups
Principal
Walbrook High School

Jane Birckhead
Coordinator of Instructional
Services
Division of Exceptional
Children

Alice H. Black
Principal
Pimlico Junior High

Reba Bullock
Educational Specialist
Office of Health

Faith Dean
Coordinator of Home Economics
Vocational Education Division

Thomas DeLaine
Coordinator of Music
Division of Secondary Education

Ann L. France
Principal
Mt. Royal Elementary/Middle School

Calvin Glover
Educational Specialist
Office of Foreign Languages

Paul Gorman
Acting Personnel Manager
Division of Human Resources

Jacqueline Gundy
Head of Science Department
Northern Parkway Junior High

Edgar Horsey
Representative
Baltimore Teachers' Union

Wilmer L. Jones (Retired)
Coordinator of Mathematics
Division of Secondary Education

John Mohamed
Principal
Southeast Middle School

Sabine Oishi
Parent
Fallstaff Middle School

Gordon Schmidt
Head of Industrial Arts
Department
Chinquapin Middle School

Eva Scott
Head of Physical Education
Department
Western High School

Freeda Thompson
Coordinator of Business Education
Vocational Education Division

Sandra L. Wighton
Principal
Western High School

Sedonia Williamson
Teacher of Social Studies
Douglass High School

Anne Wilson
Head of Home Economics Department
Walbrook High School

I. THE CHARGE

As stated in the May 16, 1983 memo from Dr. Virginia Roeder, Deputy Superintendent of Instruction, to the members of the Committee to Study the Secondary Supervisory Model, the charges of the committee were to:

1. review and evaluate the present model for the supervision of instruction in the middle/junior high and senior high schools.
2. explore alternative models for the delivery of supervisory services for these levels.
3. recommend within present available resources a secondary supervisory instructional model for all subjects in all schools for the 1984-85 school year. If the present model is to be changed, recommendations for implementation of the changes, including a time line, should accompany the model.

In addressing the charge, the committee included the following components of a secondary supervisory instructional model as well as other topics which were an outgrowth of investigation and discussion:

- . Curriculum development
- . Curriculum implementation
- . Improvement of teaching strategies
- . Program monitoring
- . In-service staff development
- . Program evaluation
- . Teacher supervision
- . Teacher evaluation
- . Resource assistance to teachers
- . Coordination of subject-related projects, at school, regional and citywide levels

In addition to topics which the committee addressed as a committee-of-the-whole, three subcommittees made recommendations in response to specific charges to:

- provide criteria to determine the level of supervision a school would get based on need
- redefine the present model by levels of supervisory responsibility in order to get maximum service out of existing positions
- define ways in which teachers' abilities and skills can be utilized, their responsibility for their own professional development, and the support services that should be available to teachers.

The following sections of the report describe the steps the

committee took in addressing the charge, the conclusions drawn from their investigation, and the recommendations of the total committee. Each recommendation is supported by an accompanying rationale.

II. STEPS IN ADDRESSING THE CHARGE

In order to address the first two charges, the committee embarked on an investigation, study, and analysis of the current secondary supervisory models in the Division of Secondary Education, the Division for Exceptional Children, and the Vocational Education Division. The committee also studied models in use in other school districts.

The actions involved in the study included:

- compilation of a school-by-school discipline-by-discipline allotment of department heads and teachers
- review of the selection process of department heads
- study of the duties of department heads
- investigation of the duties actually performed by department heads
- discussion of the inequities in teaching loads of department heads
- consideration of the quasi-administrative functions of department heads
- study of the ratio of teachers to educational specialists
- discussion of the amount and quality of supervision in schools and disciplines without department heads
- consideration of the needs of schools which periodically necessitate additional support because of numbers of new and/or weak teachers, student performance on standardized and proficiency tests, and programmatic changes
- discussion of the effects of weak department heads on student achievement, program integrity, and teacher performance
- discussion of the inflexibility of the current supervisory structure
- study of supervisory models in other school systems
- application of other systems' supervisory models to the Baltimore City Public Schools

- determination of the level of supervision schools should receive based on need

Following the collection of data and analysis of the information, the committee drew several conclusions regarding the extent and quality of supervision currently in practice.

III. CONCLUSIONS FROM STUDY AND INVESTIGATION

As a result of the study of the present model of supervision in the secondary schools, the committee identified the following conclusions about the scope, quality, and availability of supervisory services to the schools:

- Effective supervision begins and ultimately rests with the building principal.
- Although the experience level of the staff has increased, the need for supervision remains great.
- The system needs to provide supervision at both the school and central office levels.
- Effective supervision involves more than just the observation process.
- The current model of supervisory service is inconsistent from discipline to discipline.
- The present supervisory model is inflexible in that there is no way to respond to unanticipated needs as they occur.
- Many schools and/or departments (e.g., small schools, elective departments) receive no on-site supervisory service. This situation is likely to increase because of declining enrollment and rise of middle schools.
- There are many inequities in the ratio of teachers to educational specialists.
- Many inequities exist in the teaching loads and administrative responsibilities assigned to department heads.
- Insufficient supervision results in negative effects on student achievement, department morale, course integrity, and the professional growth of staff.
- Department heads are often torn between administrative and supervisory responsibilities.
- Some department heads are being paid a differential although the size of their departments does not justify it.

IV. RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The position of department head should remain in the secondary supervisory model. (See Appendix A for job description.)
2. The primary functions of department head should be the provision of the following supervisory services:
 - . Supervising/assisting teachers
 - . Referring teachers to appropriate resources
 - . Monitoring the curriculum
 - . Teaching demonstration lessons
 - . Providing knowledgeable guidance in the ordering of instructional materials and equipment
 - . Serving as the primary link between the school and the secondary instructional divisions

Rationale:

It is vital that every school have the appropriate supervisory support and guidance to insure curricular continuity, course integrity, and effective methodology. The subject area department head is the on-site staff member who can best provide these services.

Although department heads also perform certain administrative functions assigned by the principals, the preeminent task of the department head is supervision. That is their primary reason for existence. They are not to be relegated to disciplinary duties, book dispensers, and quasi-administrators at the expense of the provision of supervisory assistance and direction.

3. Departments meriting a department head should contain five or more staff members in a given subject area.

Exception: Physical education department heads who are also athletic directors should be allowed to adhere to the current model of four department members.

Rationale:

Following examination of the current practice of assigning a department head to a department of four, the committee determined that such a practice was an insufficient use of human resources to justify a released schedule. Additionally, having a department head with only one period a day in which to provide the necessary supervisory services is inadequate.

4. All other groups of subject area teachers (departments with four or fewer members) should be served by an itinerant department head. Itinerant department heads should serve 15-20 teachers in the same subject area in several schools.

Such heads should be classified as Unit I staff and be paid on the actual step with a stipend for department head responsibility. Mileage reimbursement for necessary travel between schools should be kept to a minimum by scheduling full-day service to each school as often as possible.

Rationale:

Every school needs the support of an on-site supervisory staff member whose primary responsibility is the improvement of instruction. Because it is not practical to assign a full-time department head to small schools and departments, an itinerant should be identified to service several schools. Depending on the size of each department in the supervisory load, the department head should spend a full day at each site on a regular, rotating basis so that each school benefits from the services.

Such itinerant department heads should conduct department meetings, attend meetings of citywide department heads, observe teachers, teach demonstration lessons, and perform the same duties assigned to school-based department heads.

5. School-based department heads should teach no fewer than one class per day and no more than three. If the majority of the department is probationary/provisional and/or rated less than GOOD on the most recent evaluation, the head should teach only one class per day.

Rationale:

Since the primary function of the department heads is to provide supervisory services to teachers, they must have the time to do so. In situations where several members of the department are new or less than GOOD, department heads need additional time to work with such teachers.

6. a. The principal should be the evaluator of school-based department heads with input from the coordinators.
- b. The payroll principal should be the evaluator of itinerant department heads with input from other involved principals and the coordinators.
- c. Coordinators should indicate through a checklist or similar instrument their assessment of the performance of department heads.
- d. The Superintendent should appoint a committee to create the instrument through which coordinators may indicate their assessment of the performance of the department heads.

Rationale:

Because department heads are the primary link between the secondary instructional divisions and the schools, coordinators should have some means of making recommendations to the principals regarding their perceptions of the heads' performance of the supervisory functions. While the principal should continue to be the staff member to evaluate the department heads, coordinators should indicate through a checklist or similar instrument their assessment of the performance of the department heads. This instrument should be filed along with the formal evaluation, and regional superintendents should review both documents.

7. Regional superintendents should enforce the correct utilization of department heads.

Rationale:

Regional superintendents have the responsibility to insure the correct teaching load of department heads, to monitor the proper assignment of administrative and supervisory duties, and to analyze an evaluation which reflects the perceptions of both the principal and the coordinator.

8. The position of educational specialist should be maintained, and such staff members should be available in schools for four days per week. One day should be set aside for central or regional meetings, and any other meetings should be scheduled after school hours. (See Appendix B for job description.)
9. The primary functions of the educational specialist should be the provision of the following services:
 - . Producing appropriate curriculum materials
 - . Monitoring implementation of curriculum on a systemwide basis
 - . Providing staff development for teachers and department heads
 - . Providing instructional and supervisory support for department heads and teachers
 - . Reviewing, evaluating, and selecting appropriate print and non-print materials

Rationale:

In order to provide the necessary services, educational specialists need to be in the schools. Their meetings should be kept to a minimum and should be held largely after instructional hours, with the exception of the one-day-a-week meeting for staff development, curriculum update, and program planning.

10. Educational specialists should be assigned to the subject area offices in proportion to the number of teachers and department heads at a ratio of approximately 75 to 1. Because of the amount of standardized and school-system testing in the areas of English, mathematics, and reading, an additional specialist should be assigned to each. Other subject areas may appeal for an additional specialist on the basis of perceived need because of special programs or assignments.

<u># of Teachers/Heads</u>	<u># of Specialists</u>
1 - 75	1
90 - 150	2
165 - 225	3
240 - 300	4
315 - 375	5
390 - 450	6
465 - 525	7

Rationale:

The current inequities in the number of educational specialists assigned to each discipline can be corrected only by establishing a standard baseline for all subject areas. The above model, when seen in relation to the assignment of school-based and itinerant department heads, provides an excellent supervisory model in relation to the numbers of teachers and schools to be serviced.

In addition to the baseline assignment, providing for additional staff in special relation to additional assignment, such as the testing program, will allow flexibility and support based on need.

11. The position of coordinator should be maintained, and such staff members should spend one full day each week in schools. One day should be set aside for central or regional meetings, and any other meetings should be scheduled after school hours. (See Appendix C for job description.)
12. The primary functions of the coordinator should be the provision of the following services:
 - . Providing supervisory support for principals, educational specialists, and department heads
 - . Monitoring programs through on-going assessment
 - . Assisting in identification and deployment of staff
 - . Coordinating all aspects of instruction relative to state and local testing programs
 - . Keeping teachers, department heads, and educational specialists abreast of current research and trends
 - . Maintaining liaison with other school systems, Maryland State Department of Education, and institutions of higher learning

Rationale:

Coordinators must be continually aware of the needs and strengths of teachers, department heads, and educational specialists. They need also to be available to principals for review of programs and schools needs. Only through consistent, on-going presence in the schools can these needs be met.

Simultaneously, coordinators must be completely aware of what is going on in the discipline at the local, state, and national levels. They must be entirely familiar with the programs in institutions of higher learning, the findings in current and past research, and availability of curricular and commercial instructional material.

13. Prior to the beginning of each school year, schools with special needs should be identified to receive additional supervisory help. Any school meeting one or more of the following criteria should receive concentrated supervision in the form of assigned department heads and on-site assistance from the secondary instructional divisions:
 - a. 50% or more of its students scoring lower than 60% on proficiency and/or required state tests
 - b. junior high schools in the transition process of becoming middle schools
 - c. schools charged with implementing a new program, i.e., in need of staff development or monitoring

Rationale:

Periodically, schools develop special needs for a variety of reasons. The current supervisory structure is incapable of providing for those needs because of its rigidity. However, in the supervisory model proposed here, it will be possible to compensate for the concentration of services in a given school through the assignment of educational specialists and itinerant department heads by the regional superintendents with the assistance of the coordinators.

A related, though different, need is the effect of vacancies and/or extended teacher absence on the department head and the students in such classes. Because department heads must assume a major responsibility for the integrity of the instructional program of students in these classes, the model should address these needs as they occur.

14. Department heads, educational specialists, and coordinators should involve classroom teachers and make use of their talents and experience in planning and implementing programs, demonstrations, staff development, and curriculum development.

Rationale:

Recognizing that staff members at all levels have talents, abilities, knowledge, and skills which can be shared with others and that many staff members are eager to share those ideas, the committee urges that those responsible for the staff development and supervision of teachers make use of such staff members.

Teachers should be encouraged to assist in the on-going staff development of all professionals by:

- participating in inter/intra school visitations to demonstrate skill competencies
- serving as system consultants on a voluntary basis
- providing presentations, demonstrations, and appraisals of materials
- participating in the development of proposals for Maryland State Department-approved inservice courses
- developing prototype team teaching models
- assisting teachers when the department head is out of the building for extended periods
- participating in activities initiated by institutions of higher learning
- serving as paid curriculum writers

15. Teachers should be required to take advantage of a variety of support services and should be kept informed of the availability of such services.

Rationale:

Too often teachers are unaware of the myriad sources of support available to them. Principals, coordinators, and educational specialists should insure that teachers and department heads have access to information about opportunities such as the following:

- the Staff Newsletter, particularly the issue listing inservice courses, which should be reinstated as a flyer for all teachers rather than a circular which many never see

- services offered to teachers through national organizations such as the National Institutes of Health, National Diffusion Network, National Council for the Social Studies, and other subject area organizations
- staff development training available for teachers selected to work with student teachers
- current information relevant to teacher growth and development through catalogues, circulars, newsletters, flyers, etc.
- courses, programs, and opportunities available through local and state institutions of higher learning

16. The Office of Staff Development in cooperation with the secondary instructional divisions should provide annually a staff development opportunity in leadership training for all staff members interested in becoming department heads, educational specialists, and coordinators.

Such training should be included in consideration of those applying for promotion to such positions.

17. Current department heads, educational specialists, and coordinators should receive similar annual training in effective management and leadership skills.

Rationale:

It is the responsibility of the school system to insure that the opportunity exists to get continuous training in the skills and experiences needed for successful performance.

It is the responsibility of individual staff members to take advantage of these opportunities. The pursuit of such training should be considered in the recommendation of staff members to positions of wider supervisory responsibility.

18. The Superintendent should appoint a special committee to investigate the current procedures for planning, production, printing, dissemination, and monitoring of curriculum guides and make recommendations as they relate to the proposed secondary supervisory model.

Rationale:

A structured on-going plan for the development and implementation of curriculum is vital to the provision of a consistent, articulated instructional program across the years and from school to school. Because of the everpresent need for updating, strengthening, and revising curriculum guides, the topic should be addressed by a group specifically charged to make recommendations for the production of curriculum.

Such a committee should consider the funding of both the creation, printing, and dissemination of the curriculum and include, but not be limited to, staff members from the secondary instructional divisions, Office of Public Information and Communication, Planning Office, and Business Office.

V. SUMMARY STATEMENT

Improving student achievement quantitatively and qualitatively is the goal of all staff in the Baltimore City Public School system. The members of the committee view regular and consistent supervision of instruction a vital key to improved student achievement. Each recommendation made in this report was based upon research, discussion and careful deliberation. The committee members are well aware of the financial and organizational impact of the recommendations made. However, the committee members are also unanimously agreed that effective monitoring and supervision of instruction are so crucial to improved student achievement that attention to this area warrants the highest priority.

VI. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

(See pages 14 and 15)

PRELIMINARY COSTING OF SECONDARY SUPERVISORY INSTRUCTIONAL MODEL

	<u>Column A *</u>	<u>Column B *</u>	<u>Column C *</u>	<u>Column D *</u>	<u>Total Add. Dept. Heads</u>	<u>Cost At \$25,000</u>	<u>Less Diff. @ \$1,500</u>	<u>Net Cost</u>
English	6	42	2	1	3	\$ 75,000	\$ 9,000	\$ 66,000
Social Studies	1	39	2	1	3	75,000	1,500	73,500
Science	3	43	2	-	2	50,000	4,500	45,500
Mathematics	4	49	3	-	3	75,000	6,000	69,000
Foreign Language	5	89	4	1	5	125,000	7,500	117,500
Art	2	76	4	-	4	100,000	3,000	97,000
Music	10	62	3	-	3	75,000	15,000	60,000
Physical Education	-	61	3	-	3	75,000	-	75,000
Business Education	2	50	3	-	3	75,000	3,000	72,000
Industrial Arts	10	66	3	-	3	75,000	15,000	60,000
Trades	5	16	1	-	1	25,000	7,500	17,500
Home Economics	6	82	4	1	5	125,000	9,000	116,000
Guidance	13	111	5	-	5	125,000	19,500	105,500
TOTALS	<u>67</u>	<u>786</u>	<u>39</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>43</u>	<u>\$1,075,000</u>	<u>\$100,500</u>	<u>\$974,500</u>

(13 positions)

- * Column A - Number of current Department Heads to return to teaching because the number of staff including Department Heads is four or less.
- * Column B - Number of teachers in school with no assigned Department Head or with Department Head of Column A removed (not including Column A count).
- * Column C - Number of Department Heads needed at 1/20 ratio using Column B count.
- * Column D - Number of Department Heads needed to be assigned to schools where count is 5 or more.

TO: []
FROM: []
SUBJECT: []

John Yagielski, Chief Financial Officer

Budget and Financial Management

Elementary Supervisory Model

CITY OF
BALTIMORE

MEMO



DATE: January 11, 1984

Mrs. Vondalee Clark
Assistant Superintendent
Secondary Education

I recently met with Mrs. Louisa Villaret to get an understanding of the Elementary Supervisory Model for the purpose of being able to measure the cost of this model. Below is a summary which reflects this costing. As you can see, in addition to the general model there are some dollars spent in the form of special support to carry both senior teachers and teacher coordinators.

I trust this information will be useful to you and your group.

cc: Mrs. Louisa Villaret

ELEMENTARY SUPERVISORY MODEL¹

General Model

General Fund	\$1.8 million
Special Fund ²	<u>.5</u>
	\$2.3 million

Special Support

General Fund	\$.6 million
Special Fund ³	<u>1.2</u>
	\$1.8 million

- ¹ Includes salaries only - based upon average of actual Educational Specialist assigned to elementary level
- ² Chapter I - Educational Specialists
- ³ Chapter I, EEEP - Senior Teachers and Teacher Coordinators

CC: Mrs. Pegram
Mr. Thayil



JOB DESCRIPTION - DEPARTMENT HEAD

Under the direction and supervision of the building principal(s), the department head will provide leadership in the organization, administration and supervision of the assigned program in one (1) or more schools.

Duties

1. Works effectively with the principal, program coordinator, educational specialist, other department heads, parents, and students to develop schoolwide instructional activities.
2. Works cooperatively with staff and supervisory personnel in the development and use of instructional trends, techniques, and curriculum materials.
3. Conducts needs assessment surveys to determine staff development needs and to develop a staff development calendar of planned activities for the school year.
4. Assists with and participates in the provision of school-based staff development activities (i.e., Project BASIC Test Awareness Program, Mastery Learning and Career Education).
5. Assists teachers in lesson and unit planning and in monitoring the effectiveness of such planning.
6. Works directly with students and staff through the provision of demonstration lessons, and in the development and implementation of tutorial programs and coach classes.
7. Provides direct classroom instruction to students as determined by the level of the Department Head's position.
8. Visits classrooms, works with teachers and brings to their attention special resources, possible field trips, appropriate audio-visual aids, teaching techniques and changing trends in the programmatic area.
9. Acts as a resource person to teachers in his/her department as a source of assistance to individual students.
10. Manages and keeps appropriate records for department affairs such as inventorying materials, ordering and distributing materials, equipment, and supplies.
11. Orients and assists substitute teachers in daily operational procedures.

APPENDIX A (continued)

12. Ensures that all reports, records and files required for documenting assistance provided to students and staff are kept in good order.
13. Assists in the administration of the citywide testing program and the state competency-based testing program.
14. Maintains effective liaison with the Instructional Divisions' administrative and supervisory staff members in order to appropriately facilitate the implementation of new curricula materials, to apprise teachers of professional development activities, to demonstrate current instructional trends in the discipline areas, and to disseminate local, state and federal guidelines affecting program areas.
15. Attends scheduled citywide meetings for department heads and other appropriate professional development activities.

JOB DESCRIPTION - EDUCATIONAL SPECIALIST

Under the direction of the Assistant Superintendent, Instructional Divisions, and through the appropriate coordinator, the Educational Specialist is responsible for improving the effectiveness of instruction by providing instructional supervisory services and appropriate curriculum resources.

Duties

A. Instructional Supervision

1. Provides instructional support services to principals, department heads, and classroom teachers.
2. Observes informally and participates in the evaluation of all instructional staff members within the discipline.
3. Conducts formal observations ~~of selected staff upon request of the principal.~~
4. Provides assistance to the principal and department heads in the development of Instructional Assistance Plans.
5. Provides opportunities for demonstration lessons.
6. Plans and conducts professional activities systemwide (schools, regions) related to the discipline.
7. Suggests strategies for helping department heads and teachers to grow professionally.
8. Assists in providing staff development for department heads in leadership training and supervising techniques.
9. Monitors the activities of the itinerant department heads and reports such activities to the coordinator.
10. Advises department heads in the selection and ordering of instructional materials and equipment.

B. Curriculum Development, Implementation and Monitoring

1. Assists the coordinator in the development and evaluation of curriculum within the discipline.
2. Initiates, develops, implements, and monitors effective curriculum practices.

APPENDIX B (continued)

3. Reviews, evaluates, and selects appropriate print and non-print instructional materials.
4. Assists the coordinator in program monitoring in assigned schools.
5. Assists the coordinator in preparing proposals for new programs.
6. Assists the coordinator in preparing proposals for professional development.
7. Serves as a member of appropriate educational and professional forums and committees and seeks ways to continue professional growth and development.
8. Serves as resource liaison for special projects and programs.
9. Informs parents and community of the various instructional and curriculum trends and changes.

JOB DESCRIPTION - COORDINATOR


Under the direction of the Assistant Superintendent of the appropriate Instructional Divisions, the Coordinator provides system-wide leadership in the development of content area curriculum, and in the administration, supervision and monitoring of the instructional program appropriate to the content area.

Duties

1. Interprets policies and procedures for the content area program.
2. Provides leadership in program development, implementation, monitoring and evaluation.
3. Advises principals and staffs in matters relating to the content area.
4. Works cooperatively with Baltimore City Public Schools staff in all divisions and other community agencies to develop, implement, monitor and evaluate interdisciplinary projects.
5. Provides leadership and maintains liaison with local, state, and national content area offices, programs and organizations.
6. Prepares lists of recommended textbooks, references, and instructional materials for submission to the Board of School Commissioners.
7. Provides on-going staff development experiences for specialists, department heads and teachers in the content area.
8. Assists in writing proposals and applications for special programs in the content area.
9. Provides in-service programs of intensive orientation and staff development for new staff members.
10. Assists in the recruitment and interviewing of applicants for positions in the content area.
11. Makes recommendations to the assigning officer for placement in educational positions.
12. Conducts program assessments under the direction of the appropriate Assistant Superintendent.
13. Conducts formal observations of staff upon request of principals.
14. Monitors informal observation of staff.

APPENDIX C (continued)

15. Maintains contact with book company representatives and vendors of supplies and equipment.
16. Interacts with the appropriate office of the Maryland State Department of Education to participate in the formulation of statewide philosophy and policy procedures applicable to local education agencies.
17. Attends appropriate meetings at national, state, and local levels, relative to the content area.
18. Develops, implements and monitors appropriate budget in specific content areas.
19. Assists in facility planning with other divisions and/or agencies.
20. Provides leadership and/or participates in systemwide committees and task forces.
21. Provides leadership and/or serves as liaison for advisory councils.
22. Evaluates the educational specialists assigned to the content area.
23. Provides leadership for the development, modification, and appropriate utilization of curriculum.

NAME & TITLE	Alice G. Pinderhughes, Superintendent	CITY of BALTIMORE MEMO	
AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS	Public Instruction, BCPS		
SUBJECT	SUPERVISORY MODEL		

DATE:

BOARD OF SCHOOL COMMISSIONERS

December 18, 1985

The current operations of our school system which involve the direct instructional support services provided by support teachers, department heads, supervisors, and specialists (educational and divisional) have been reviewed. The following set of objectives was then identified to guide the development of recommendations for implementation July 1, 1986.

- . Focus resources on direct instructional support (decrease administrative overhead).
- . Retain Elementary Division and Secondary Division distinction.
- . Increase accountability for support teachers, department heads, supervisors and specialists.
- . Integrate elementary, secondary, and special education instructional support services.
- . Improve the quality of teacher assistance services.
- . Increase principal's accessibility to direct instructional support.
- . Limit cost and number of positions to current levels.

Planning discussions have included proposals from Dr. Marchand, Dr. Hancock, Mr. Friedlander, and others. In addition, the Operational Cabinet has discussed the issues with me in several meetings. My goal is to identify, prior to the March 1st budget preparation deadline, the supervisory model we will use next year. We have narrowed our consideration to 3 models. An overview of each is attached for your information. My staff will continue their deliberations and I will make a recommendation to you by February 1st.

APG/ja
Attachment

MODEL A

This model is the one currently being used. There would be no changes in position titles, job descriptions, or resource allocations. The quality of the direct instructional support services to schools would be improved through greater productivity. Revised assignments of the current staff by the Associate Superintendents and Assistant Superintendent of Special Education would be implemented.

Elementary Division

Regular Education

- I. SUBJECT AREA ORIENTATION
 - A. Supervisory Staff
 - 1. Supervisors
 - 2. Specialists
 - 3. Support Teachers

Special Education

- I. HANDICAPPED ORIENTATION
 - A. Supervisory Staff
 - 1. Supervisors
 - 2. Specialists

Secondary Division

- I. SUBJECT AREA ORIENTATION
 - A. Supervisory Staff
 - 1. Supervisors
 - 2. Specialists
 - B. Principal's Staff
 - 1. Department Heads

- I. HANDICAPPED ORIENTATION
 - A. Supervisory Staff
 - 1. Supervisors
 - 2. Specialists
 - B. Principal's Staff
 - 1. Department Heads

MODEL B

This model requires a generalist orientation of the personnel assigned. It increases the number of support staff reporting directly to the principals. The quality of the direct instructional support services would be improved by making more resources school-based. Position titles and job descriptions would not be changed. Teacher assistance programs would be school specific and curriculum management functions would remain centrally administered.

Elementary Division

- | <u>Regular Education</u> | <u>Special Education</u> |
|---------------------------|----------------------------|
| I. GENERALIST ORIENTATION | I. HANDICAPPED ORIENTATION |
| A. Supervisory Staff | A. Supervisory Staff |
| 1. Supervisors | 1. Supervisors |
| 2. Specialists | 2. Specialists |
| B. Principal's Staff | |
| 1. Support Teachers | |

Secondary Division

- | | |
|---------------------------|----------------------------|
| I. GENERALIST ORIENTATION | I. HANDICAPPED ORIENTATION |
| A. Supervisory Staff | A. Supervisory Staff |
| 1. Supervisors | 1. Supervisors |
| 2. Specialists | 2. Specialists |
| B. Principal's Staff | B. Principal's Staff |
| 1. Department Heads | 1. Department Heads |

MODEL C

This model redefines the positions of support teacher and department head. It increases the number of support staff reporting directly to the principals. By maintaining an instructional requirement in the job description of support teachers and department heads, a subject area orientation can be supported without additions to the staff. The allocation guidelines for schools would be modified to provide principals a staff resource specifically assigned to implement teacher assistance programs.

Elementary Division

Regular Education

I. SUBJECT AREA ORIENTATION

A. Supervisory Staff

1. Supervisors
2. Specialists

B. Principal's Staff

1. Support Teachers

Special Education

I. HANDICAPPED ORIENTATION

A. Supervisory Staff

1. Supervisors
2. Specialists

B. Principal's Staff

1. Designee

Secondary Division

Intermediate Schools

I. SUBJECT AREA ORIENTATION

A. Supervisory Staff

1. Supervisors
2. Specialists

B. Principal's Staff

1. Support Teachers

I. HANDICAPPED ORIENTATION

A. Supervisory Staff

1. Supervisors
2. Specialists

B. Principal's Staff

1. Support Teachers

Senior High Schools

I. SUBJECT AREA ORIENTATION

A. Supervisory Staff

1. Supervisors
2. Specialists

B. Principal's Staff

1. Department Heads

I. HANDICAPPED ORIENTATION

A. Supervisory Staff

1. Supervisors
2. Specialists

B. Principal's Staff

1. Department Heads