

Maryland Policy Report

No 2009-3

July 17, 2009

TEACHERS AS ENTREPRENEURS

BY TOM NEUMARK

CURRENTLY, MOST TEACHERS IN THE STATE OF Maryland are employed by a local Board of Education and are direct employees of the school system. However, a better arrangement is possible. What if all Maryland schools districts could hire employees under their existing union-negotiated agreements and could also sign contracts with education companies, individual teachers, and other unions? This paper examines how this approach would work, the policy changes needed to enable teacher entrepreneurship, and the potential benefits, and also answers the common arguments for a single, union-negotiated contract.

WHAT IS AN EDUCATION ENTREPRENEUR?

The Mind Trust, a group dedicated to finding and funding new education ideas, describes education entrepreneurship broadly:

Education entrepreneurs are individuals who develop new approaches to tackle society's greatest challenges in radically new ways. They are driving some of the most compelling improvements in educational outcomes for chronically underserved students. Ventures like Teach For America, College Summit, New Leaders for New Schools, The New Teacher Project, and the Knowledge is Power Program (KIPP) are prime examples. The leaders of these organizations have transformed education for thousands of children and have changed our very ideas about what is possible in public schools.¹

This excellent definition mentions initiatives relating to teacher and principal recruitment, admissions counseling, and school choice. All of these initiatives have looked outside the traditional public schools for sources of new ideas, talent, and school management approaches.

ESTABLISHING EXCLUSIVE REPRESENTATION

Maryland law provides a specific procedure to establish exclusive representation for certificated employees, which is summarized as follows:

- The union requesting exclusive representation must certify that its membership enrollment is at least 30 percent of teachers in the district.
- If another union can certify that it has at least 10 percent of the teachers in the district, an election is held. Teachers vote to determine which organization will have exclusive representation, or if neither one will have exclusive representation.
- By law, the public schools must grant exclusive representation to the union that certifies that it represents at least 30 percent of teachers if no other union can certify that it has at least 10 percent of the teachers, and the union certifying 30 percent of the teachers have not requested an election to determine exclusivity.
- The public schools must also grant exclusive representation if the union can certify that it represents a majority of the teachers in the district.²

Once exclusivity is established, it must last for at least two years, and remains in effect until another election is held.

- An election may be held if 20 percent of the employees in a district sign a petition requesting an election.

In Baltimore City, there may not be more than three bargaining units, and one must represent elementary and special school nurses and one must represent employees whose position requires an administrative and supervisory certificate.³

MARYLAND'S VARYING PROVISIONS

Currently, every school district in Maryland has an exclusive agreement with its teachers' union.⁴ In addition to the different terms and conditions spelled out in each negoti-

ated agreement, some provisions of Maryland's law vary by county, with some counties having different rules about who is represented and what representation fees may be levied. In addition, some provisions only apply to employees hired before or after a certain date.

For instance, in Montgomery County, the union represents substitute teachers.⁵ In Prince George's County, a "public school employee" includes home and hospital teachers and Junior Reserve Officer Training Corps (JROTC) instructors, but in Charles County and Garrett County, a "public school employee" includes Junior Reserve Officer Training Corps (JROTC) instructors, but not home and hospital teachers.

In Baltimore County, the employee organization with exclusive representation must base its representation fee only on expenses related to negotiations, and must submit an annual audit from an external auditor that reflects the operational expenses of the employee organization and explains how the representation fee is calculated. In Charles County, the ability to charge a representation fee only applies to employees who were hired on or after July 1, 2005, and no audit is required. Montgomery County, Prince George's County, Baltimore County, Baltimore City, Anne Arundel County, and Howard County allow employees with religious objections to unions to negotiate with the union over how much the employee must pay to a charity in lieu of the representation fee.⁶ In Garrett County, non-union employees who were employed by the school system prior to a representation fee being charged are exempt from paying the fee.

Also, there are restrictions on collective bargaining. Teachers are not permitted to negotiate maximum class sizes or the school calendar.⁷ All other topics that the union and the public school employer mutually agree to negotiate are permitted.

IS MARYLAND'S APPROACH FAIR TO TEACHERS?

Maryland's law allows the decision of a group of teachers to overrule an individual teacher's rights. A current teacher who would prefer to negotiate individually is not allowed to do so unless he or she first convinces 20 percent of the other teachers to agree to an election. Assuming that unlikely event happens, this teacher would then need to convince a majority of the teachers to vote against exclusive representation. Yet why should any teacher's terms and conditions of employment be subject to anyone else's vote?

The issue is not just about individual rights. Maryland's law allows a group of teachers to overrule another group of teachers. In all districts, if a union represents 10 percent of teachers, an election can be held in which the other (usually larger) union can vote to maintain its exclusive representation of teachers. But why should the incumbent union essentially have veto power over a smaller union? Groups of teachers that can reach an agreement

with the public school employer should have the right to do so, no matter what their size.

In Baltimore City, there may only be three bargaining units, only one of which may represent teachers. Why should teachers be limited to a single bargaining unit? As long as teachers believe they are well-represented by the unit they belong to, what right does the state have to limit the number of unions teachers have available for consideration?

In addition, the countywide variations in Maryland's law appear arbitrary. For example, whether a teacher pays a representation fee depends on when they were hired. Baltimore County's unions are audited, but others are not. Some unions represent JROTC instructors and others do not. The fact such differences exist demonstrates that different teachers may want different terms and conditions, and therefore different unions, or no union representation at all.

WHAT WOULD TEACHER ENTREPRENEURSHIP LOOK LIKE?

Imagine for a moment if all current employees and potential service providers could offer teaching services to the schools. Individual teachers would be free to negotiate with their school board, and they could form companies—both unionized and non-union—that offer teaching services to the schools. Both individuals and companies could choose to focus on a particular subject, type of student (special education, English language learner, accelerated), or situation (such as turning around struggling schools). The terms of the contract could include provisions relating to maximum class sizes or any other topic that was mutually agreeable, including merit pay, differentiated pay, and retirement plans. Let's examine each of these features in terms of the benefits to teachers.

Union Status Generally speaking, competition drives improvement. Under the current model, teachers only have one union attempting to represent them. If multiple unions were competing to convince teachers to choose them as their representative, the resulting competition would likely drive down union dues and increase benefits. In addition, under this model, teachers who prefer to negotiate on their own or would like to form a company will have more opportunity to do so.

Specialization In the private sector, companies can specialize to provide expertise in a particular area. By allowing multiple providers, districts could gain the benefit of specialized services that meet both their needs and their teachers' needs. For example, a unionized company that specializes in closing the achievement gap by working in high-poverty schools may wish to negotiate different terms and conditions for its members in a way that reflects its unique circumstances and ability to deliver improved instruction. Districts would get the expertise and results they want, and teachers would get the salaries and working

conditions appropriate for the level of challenge they are taking on and the results they achieve, as well as a chance to focus on a particular specialty of interest.

Class Size Right now, Maryland law does not allow teachers to negotiate class size, but is possible with the entrepreneurial model. Class size has a direct impact on the budget. The larger the class size, the less it costs the school system to teach the same number of students. Research on class size does suggest that smaller class sizes make a positive difference in kindergarten and first grade, but class size reductions do not appear to have a significant impact after the early grades.⁸ Since teachers may differ in their ability and preference to manage classes of various sizes, why not give them a choice? Teachers might want to have different class sizes depending on grade level, subject(s) taught, and the level of teachers' preference and skill for particular class sizes. Teachers who could successfully teach larger class sizes could be paid more while, at the same time, saving the school system money.

Groups of teachers that can reach an agreement with the public school employer should have the right to do so, no matter what their size.

Merit Pay Paying teachers for performance has been a controversial topic in education, and understandably so, since a number of merit pay approaches have failed due to a lack of funding or poor design. Unfortunately, rather than work toward approaches that are well-funded, fair, and supported by teachers, unions have usually opposed even considering merit pay. Under a model where teachers have more freedom in setting the terms and conditions of their employment, a teacher would not be forced into a merit pay approach that he or she disagreed with, and all teachers would have the opportunity to design their own approach to merit pay and negotiate it with the district. The approach to merit pay could vary based on the subject and grade level taught, and teachers' comfort level with the method of evaluation. By providing freedom to teachers and encouraging a diversity of approaches, school districts and teachers would get a chance to see what works best.

Differentiated Pay Multiple unions could also result in higher salaries, particularly for teachers of subjects that have a shortage of candidates. Unions have generally opposed paying some teachers more than others because of the complaints it generates from teachers. As veteran union researcher Mike Antonucci explains,

The reason teachers' unions love the traditional salary scale, for example, is not some blind devotion to their industrial union roots. It's because that's the only system that keeps member squawking to a minimum and assures the prime internal imperative: That the union be the sole source of teacher advancement, benefit, and protection. If you receive a raise or promotion based on your own performance, why do you need a union? If a math teacher in a low-income school can receive more money than a kindergarten teacher in a wealthy suburban school, the math teacher doesn't need the union (he's making more money based on his performance) and the kindergarten teacher doesn't need the union (he hasn't seen an extra dime). They both need the union only if it is the sole means by which to benefit.

Some may think I'm overstating this attitude; let me further illustrate my point. When statewide K-3 class-size reduction was instituted in California—a reform the union not only supported, but shepherded through the legislature—it actually caused all sorts of problems for union members. The K-3 teachers loved it, naturally. It reduced their workload. But what a competition for the new K-3 jobs that opened up (smaller classes means hiring more teachers)! It has been well-reported that veteran inner-city teachers fled to new K-3 openings in the suburbs, thus leaving inexperienced instructors behind. Less reported was the movement of veteran middle school and intermediate grade teachers into the primary grades. Teachers who previously wouldn't be caught dead teaching kindergarteners suddenly found educating five-year-olds desirable. Then the intermediate-grade teachers started moaning about how they had the same prep time for 34 students as their K-3 counterparts had for 20 students.

Because the California union had *differentiated* among its members, it had to spend a lot of time pacifying them (with contract provisions for additional prep time and teacher aide help). But of course it was motivated to do so because the main result of class-size reduction was more teachers, and therefore more union members. Without similar motivation, the union will avoid differentiation at all costs.⁹

If unions were able to specialize—such as a math teachers union—they would be better able to focus on the particular needs of their members without causing unrest within the unit. A union representing only math teachers, for example, could likely argue for significantly higher compensation since their skills are paid at higher rates in the private sec-

tor. In specialized unions the members' interests are more similar, which not only reduces conflict among members, but also enables the union to make a stronger case for those it represents. Since a specialized union would only represent a portion of teachers, it would be in a stronger position to argue that raising salaries for its members with specialized skills is warranted, and would have a smaller financial impact on district budgets than larger unions representing employees with skills in greater supply.

If unions were able to specialize—such as a math teachers union—they would be better able to focus on the particular needs of their members without causing unrest within the unit.

Retirement Plans Maryland's pension is not portable outside the state of Maryland. Individual teachers, companies, and multiple unions could offer teachers a defined contribution plan—such as a 403(b) or 401(k)—instead of the traditional defined benefit plan available in Maryland. No teacher would be forced to change plans if they prefer the older model, and they would simply have the option of a portable plan that is more in tune with modern workers' propensity to change jobs frequently.

Political Activity Unions participate in political activity that some members may oppose. As one report about unions noted,

Some [union] presidents said that new teachers often objected to the state or national affiliate's political activity on behalf of pro-union candidates or in support of issues (such as abortion or gun control) that are not directly tied to education. Los Angeles' Duffy observed that 30 percent to 35 percent of California's new teachers were Republicans rather than Democrats, the traditional party of unions. When Duffy visited schools, he encountered "a discernible number of most new teachers who say 'I'm tired of the union supporting candidates that I don't support.'" Howard County, Md., Howard County Education Association president Ann DeLacy said that new teachers there were inclined to be "apolitical."¹⁰

Providing teachers with more choices for how they are employed or represented would give them the freedom to participate in political activity if they wish, or keep their employment politics-free.

ANSWERING COMMON OBJECTIONS

An article appearing in the *Baltimore Sun* articulated the union's position on giving teachers options beyond the existing union.

Education is a common community and societal concern, not an enterprise to be run with profit as its first priority... Teachers join unions so that their common concerns and problems can be addressed collectively instead of through a fragmented and individualized process that would allow administrators to marginalize and dismiss these issues...

Those teachers who prefer not to join unions nevertheless benefit when unions negotiate better wages and improved working conditions—improvements that would never have become realities if teachers had to argue for them individually.¹¹

First, although education is a common concern of citizens, the workers addressing that concern will not necessarily be more effective if unionized, and allowing companies who succeed in addressing that concern to make a profit is not somehow inconsistent with the goal of educating students. The primary benefit of allowing entrepreneurship is teacher freedom, not profit-making. Indeed, under the entrepreneurial model, non-profit companies could offer services as well.

Second, under the model this paper proposes, teachers could still join unions. In fact, the approach would open up the possibility of more union choices. If unions are as advantageous to solving problems that they claim to be, the proposed approach would not prohibit districts from choosing to sign contracts with unions, including signing an exclusive contract with one union.

The role of unions in resolving issues is questionable. As one report noted, "Day to day, most tried to resolve problems informally or through standing committees, rather than resorting to the formal grievance process."¹² In several states, non-union teacher professional associations offer similar benefits as unions do, but at a lower cost.¹³ Regardless of the union status of workers, administrators can still ignore pressing problems. What spurs better administrative decision-making in other industries is competition from other companies, but unions have typically opposed school choice initiatives, which would create the kind of competition that would drive improvement.

Third, the argument that unions are primarily responsible for increases in wages is questionable. The market is largely responsible for setting salaries. Unions argue for a premium above market rates. Regarding claims that unions improve working conditions, they have not been altogether successful in that task. A University of Maryland report cites working conditions contribute to the teacher shortage.¹⁴ The Maryland State Teachers Association reported

that 50 percent of teachers leave within the first five years of teaching, and that working conditions are the primary reason teachers leave.¹⁵

The reason unions oppose entrepreneurship likely has little to do with profit-making or addressing school concerns. Unions are businesses. They are in the business of labor representation. Allowing multiple providers exposes them to competition they do not want, which is why they oppose giving teachers that freedom.

STEPS TOWARD TEACHER FREEDOM

Several steps could be taken toward providing teachers with the freedom to be entrepreneurs.

Alternative Certification Opens the Pool The current teacher certification process has little effect on teacher quality, and the time and expense of obtaining certification discourages potential applicants. While this step is not needed to open up entrepreneurship to current teachers, alternative certification is needed to attract non-traditional candidates to the profession, both as traditional district employees and as entrepreneurs.

Recognition of Multiple Unions Must Become Local BOE Choice Maryland's law should not limit how many unions can be recognized by a district, or set arbitrary thresholds for percentages of teachers a union must represent to be recognized. Local districts should be free to sign contracts with as many unions as they can reach agreement with, just as they should also be able to sign contracts with individual teachers or companies.

Exclusivity Must be Mutually Agreed to, Not Regulated by Government Local districts should be free to sign exclusive agreements, but should not be forced to. It is not the proper role of government to encourage or discourage unions. Maryland's law needs to drop provisions mandating exclusivity based on elections and arbitrary percentages of employees represented, and allow districts and teachers to mutually agree without government interference.

Ensure Fair Treatment for Unionized and Non-Unionized Teachers Maryland's law should confer no advantages or disadvantages to workers based on their union status, and should simply ensure that all employers and employees adhere to the contracts terms and conditions.

School Choice Bolsters Freedom In other states, charter schools are given the freedom to hire non-unionized workers. In Maryland, charter schools are permitted to make modifications to the existing agreement, but are not allowed to sign a contract with a different union than the one the local district recognized, or to choose to be non-union. Charter schools in Maryland ought to be afforded the same

flexibility as charters in other states, which in turn gives teachers more options for their work environment.

ALTERNATIVES TO ENTREPRENEURSHIP: FLEXIBLE UNIONS?

The Maryland State Teachers' Association (MSTA) does not support giving teachers entrepreneurial freedom. Indeed, the MSTA has encouraged teachers to support the misleadingly-named Employee Free Choice Act, which forces all employees to be represented by a union if a majority of teachers indicate support. The MSTA is especially influential in Annapolis, so legislation giving teachers true freedom of choice is likely to face an uphill battle. In the absence of legislation, one must ask: Are there alternatives to entrepreneurship? There might be, if unions were willing to be more flexible about some issues. In Sweden, for instance, teachers have the ability to negotiate their own salaries:

National pay agreements guarantee a minimum salary after one year of employment and individuals negotiate pay levels beyond that. The first national agreement stipulated an increase in national expenditure on teacher salaries of 20 per cent during the first five years of the agreement.

Beyond these guidelines, the local municipality (the employer) has the flexibility to

Maryland's law should confer no advantages or disadvantages to workers based on their union status, and should simply ensure that all employers and employees adhere to the contracts terms and conditions.

determine an individual teacher's pay. Subsequent salaries are determined once a year in local negotiations... Strath (2004) states that, 'the ultimate goal of all parties is to grant more autonomy on setting pay levels to the school managers and the expectation is that the use of the dialogue method will ultimately replace traditional negotiations'... Strath reports that a recent study by the largest teacher union found that 60 percent of teachers are now in favor of individualized pay compared to less than one-third in a 1999 study. Newer and younger teachers viewed the new scheme more favorably than more experienced teachers.¹⁶

If a teachers union in a socialistic country can offer teachers that kind of flexibility, surely unions in capitalist America are capable of offering similar freedom, at the very least by being willing to consider differentiated pay for teachers in hard-to-staff subjects. The Maryland State Teachers Association could also withdraw its opposition of alternative certification such as the American Board's Passport to Teaching program as a way to open the teaching profession to more candidates and increase its membership. Unions could consider offering greater support to school choice through charter schools as a way to increase teacher satisfaction by giving them more options for their work environment. Supporting these initiatives should pose no threat to unionization. Indeed, each provides benefits to teachers and to the union itself.

CONCLUSION

Hopefully, the Maryland State Teachers' Union will begin to recognize that supporting important education reforms is needed if the union is to regain relevance, especially for the next generation of teachers. As one report notes:

The local presidents described their efforts to lead two groups of teachers—veterans and novices—who had different and often competing needs, interests, and beliefs about the appropriate role of teachers unions. Veterans, many of whom helped to found teachers unions in the late 1960s and 1970s, rarely questioned the importance of unions. In general, they wanted to preserve traditional approaches to pay and protections and maintain autonomy in their classrooms. The presidents said, however, that newer teachers had no memory of the hardships teachers endured prior to unionization. Most new teachers took the contract for granted and some even questioned the need for a labor organization in schools. Unlike their veteran counterparts, many of these novices expected their unions to give them strong support in the first, often difficult years of teaching, provide ongoing training, pursue innovations in pay, or create opportunities for teachers to take on different roles in school.

Rhonda Johnson of the Columbus (Ohio) Education Association observed, "We're running a couple of parallel organizations."

Gary Brennan, president of the Frederick County Teachers Association, summed it up by observing that new members are not "into the whole union mentality as some of the older members are."¹⁷ Instead of fighting this reality, Maryland's unions should give teachers the freedom to be entrepreneurs. If, in the end, teachers return to unions because they offer teachers more satisfying pay and working conditions, the union's case will be made. But, if Maryland's union continues to prevent teacher freedom by using their legislative influence to enact laws that protect them from competition, they will have avoided the chance to demonstrate their relevance to teachers. If the union is important to teachers as unions claim, setting teachers free is the best way to prove it.

TOM NEUMARK is a Visiting Fellow at the Maryland Public Policy Institute.

1. The Mind Trust, <http://www.themindtrust.org/fellowship/faq.aspx>, accessed May 10, 2009.
2. Maryland General Assembly, Maryland State Statute §6-405, http://mlis.state.md.us/asp/web_statutes.asp?ged&6-405, accessed May 11, 2009.
3. Maryland General Assembly, Maryland State Statute §6-404, http://mlis.state.md.us/asp/web_statutes.asp?ged&6-404, accessed May 11, 2009.
4. See Appendix A for a list of negotiated agreements.
5. Maryland General Assembly, Maryland State Statute §6-407, http://mlis.state.md.us/asp/web_statutes.asp?ged&6-407, accessed May 11, 2009.
6. Note: This corrects an earlier column that incorrectly implied that teachers in all Maryland counties must pay representation fees. This is only true in some counties: Tom Neumark, "Free Maryland teachers from unions," December 9, 2008, *The Baltimore Sun*, http://www.schoolchoiceformaryland.org/research/pubID.225/pub_detail.asp.
7. Maryland General Assembly, Maryland State Statute §6-407, http://mlis.state.md.us/asp/web_statutes.asp?ged&6-407, accessed May 12, 2009.
8. Eric A. Hanushek, "The Evidence on Class Size," W. Allen Wallis Institute of Political Economy, University of Rochester, *Occasional Paper No. 98-1*, February 1998, at <http://www.edexcellence.net/doc/size.pdf>, accessed July 13, 2006; and Susan E. Meyer and Paul E. Peterson, eds., "Earning and Learning: How Schools Working," Brookings Press, 1999, p. 109, at <http://brookings.nap.edu/books/0815755295/html/109.html>, accessed July 13, 2006.
9. Mike Antonucci, "Teachers' union psychology 101," *The Education Gadfly*, February 21, 2008, vol. 8, no. 8, at <http://www.fordhamfoundation.org/gadfly/index.cfm?issue=328#a3860>, accessed May 30, 2009.
10. Susan Moore Johnson, et al., "Leading the Local: Teachers Unions Presidents Speak on Change, Challenges," *Education Sector Reports*, June 2007, at http://www.educationsector.org/usr_doc/Union-Leaders.pdf, accessed June 23, 2009.
11. "Market wrong model for public education", Loretta Johnson, Executive Vice President, American Federation of Teachers, published December 20, 2008, *The Baltimore Sun*, Page A.17
12. Johnson, "Leading the Local."
13. Association of American Educators, State Partners, at <http://www.aaeteachers.org/state-partners.shtml>, accessed June 23, 2009.
14. Megan A. Conlon, "Working Conditions, Salaries Contribute to Teacher Shortage," October 3, 2008, *Southern Maryland Online*, at <http://smd.com/news/headlines/2008/8456.shtml>, accessed June 23, 2009.
15. Maryland State Teachers Association, NEA, "Critical Issues: Putting it All Together—Teacher Induction, Retention and Shortage," at http://www.mstanea.org/teaching_learning/issues/sep05.php, accessed June 23, 2009.
16. Lawrence Ingvarson, et al., "Research on Performance Pay for Teachers," Australian Council for Educational Research, at <http://www.dest.gov.au/NR/rdonlyres/D477C6A5-C8EF-4074-8619-FF43059445F8/25208/ACERPerformancePayPaper.pdf>, accessed June 23, 2009.
17. *Ibid.*

APPENDIX A – NEGOTIATED AGREEMENTS

DISTRICT	EXCLUSIVE REPRESENTATION	CONTRACT
ALLEGANY	YES	WWW.ACPS.ALLCONET.ORG/ASSETS/UPLOADS/FILE/UNIT%20I%20CONTRACT(1).PDF
ANNE ARUNDEL	YES	WWW.AACPS.ORG/HUMANRESOURCES/TAAAC.PDF
BALTIMORE CITY	YES	WWW.MNSMD.ORG/FILES/AGREEMENTS/3/BALTIMORE%20CITY%20BTU%202005-2007.PDF
BALTIMORE COUNTY	YES	WWW.MNSMD.ORG/FILES/AGREEMENTS/4/BALTIMORE%20COUNTY%20TABCO%202007-2012.PDF
CALVERT	YES	WWW.CALVERTNET.K12.MD.US/DEPARTMENTS/HR/CONTRACTS/CEA/DOCUMENTS/CEAAGREEMENT2007-2010.PDF
CAROLINE	YES	WWW.MNSMD.ORG/FILES/AGREEMENTS/6/CAROLINE%20COUNTY%20CCTA%202008-2011.PDF
CARROLL	YES	WWW.MNSMD.ORG/FILES/AGREEMENTS/7/CARROLL%20COUNTY%20CCEA%202008-2009.PDF
CECIL	YES	WWW.MNSMD.ORG/FILES/AGREEMENTS/8/CECIL%20COUNTY%20TEACHERS%202008-2011.PDF
CHARLES	YES	WWW.MNSMD.ORG/FILES/AGREEMENTS/9/CHARLES%20COUNTY%20TEACHERS%202008-2010.PDF
DORCHESTER	YES	WWW.MNSMD.ORG/FILES/AGREEMENTS/10/DORCHESTER%20COUNTY%20TEACHERS%202008-2009.PDF
FREDERICK	YES	FCPS.SCHOOLWIRES.COM/15291011215335303/LIB/15291011215335303/FCTA209.PDF
GARRETT	YES	WWW.MNSMD.ORG/FILES/AGREEMENTS/12/GARRETT%20COUNTY%20TEACHERS%202006-2009.PDF
HARTFORD	YES	WWW.MNSMD.ORG/FILES/AGREEMENTS/13/HARFORD%20COUNTY%20HCEA_AGREEMENT%2007-08.PDF
HOWARD	YES	WWW.MNSMD.ORG/FILES/AGREEMENTS/14/HOWARD%20COUNTY%20HCEA%202007-2010.PDF
KENT	YES	WWW.MNSMD.ORG/FILES/AGREEMENTS/15/KENT%20COUNTY%20KCTA%202008-2010.PDF
MONTGOMERY	YES	WWW.MNSMD.ORG/FILES/AGREEMENTS/16/MONTGOMERY%20COUNTY%20MCEA_CONTRACT%2008-10.PDF
PRINCE GEORGE'S	YES	WWW.MNSMD.ORG/FILES/AGREEMENTS/17/PRINCE%20GEORGE'S%20COUNTY%20PGCEA%202007-2009.PDF
QUEEN ANNE'S	YES	WWW.MNSMD.ORG/FILES/AGREEMENTS/18/QUEEN%20ANNE'S%20COUNTY%20TEACHERS%202007-2009.PDF
ST. MARY'S	YES	WWW.MNSMD.ORG/FILES/AGREEMENTS/20/ST.%20MARY'S%20COUNTY%20EDUCATION%20ASSOCIATION%202006-2009.PDF
SOMERSET	YES	WWW.MNSMD.ORG/FILES/AGREEMENTS/19/SOMERSET%20COUNTY%20TEACHERS%202008-2009.PDF
TALBOT	YES	WWW.MNSMD.ORG/FILES/AGREEMENTS/21/TALBOT%20COUNTY%20TCEA%202003-2008.PDF
WASHINGTON	YES	WWW.MNSMD.ORG/FILES/AGREEMENTS/22/WASHINGTON%20COUNTY%20WCTA%202005-2008.PDF
WICOMICO	YES	WWW.MNSMD.ORG/FILES/AGREEMENTS/23/WICOMICO%20COUNTY%20TEACHERS%202007-2010.PDF
WORCESTER	YES	WWW.MNSMD.ORG/FILES/AGREEMENTS/24/WORCESTER%20COUNTY%20TEACHERS%20ASSOCIATION%202008-2009.PDF

ABOUT THE MARYLAND PUBLIC POLICY INSTITUTE

Founded in 2001, the Maryland Public Policy Institute is a nonpartisan public policy research and education organization that focuses on state policy issues. Our goal is to provide accurate and timely research analysis of Maryland policy issues and market these findings to key primary audiences.

The mission of the Maryland Public Policy Institute is to formulate and promote public policies at all levels of government based on principles of free enterprise, limited government, and civil society.

In order to maintain objectivity and independence, the Institute accepts no government funding and does not perform contract research. The Maryland Public Policy Institute is recognized as a 501 (C) (3) research and education organization under the Internal Revenue Code.