

NUMBER: 34-1990
STATUS: APPROVED
PLACE: ROCKVILLE, MARYLAND
DATE: AUGUST 27, 1990
TEXT:

WHEREAS, Funds have been budgeted for the purchase of equipment, supplies, and contractual services; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That having been duly advertised, the following contracts be awarded to the low bidders meeting specifications as shown for the bids as follows:

| | | |
|--------|---|--|
| 91-84 | Emergency Restoration for Gasoline Tank Leak AWARDEE Cummins Construction Company | \$ 45,075* |
| 6-90 | Copier Maintenance Service- Extension AWARDEE Waugh Enterprises, Inc. | \$250,020* |
| 168-90 | Elementary Mathematics Supplies AWARDEES Cuisenaire Company of America Delta Education, Inc. Educational Teaching Aids LaPine Scientific Company Nasco Summit Learning, Inc. | \$ 12,914 2,432 11,740 136 3,417 319 ----- |
| | TOTAL | \$ 30,958 |
| 176-90 | Glass and Glazing Materials AWARDEES Almac Plastics, Inc. Commercial Plastics and Supply Corporation Walsh and Koehler Glass Company, Inc. | \$ 2,244 22,200 19,768* ----- |
| | TOTAL | \$ 44,212 |
| 4-91 | Motor Vehicles, Pickup Trucks and Vans AWARDEES Bob Bell Chevrolet/Nissan, Inc. Central GMC, Inc. Koons Ford of Annapolis Lanham Ford | \$ 22,754 98,450 11,639 287,580 ----- |
| | TOTAL | \$420,423 |
| | TOTAL MORE THAN \$25,000 | \$790,688 |

*Denotes MFD vendors

August 27, 1990

RESOLUTION NO. 507-90 Re: BID NO. 171-89, COPY MACHINES

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Mrs. Praisner seconded by Mrs. DiFonzo, the following resolution was adopted unanimously#:

WHEREAS, The Board of Education on July 11, 1989, approved an award for Bid No. 171-89 to Eastman Kodak Credit Corporation for 123 copy machines, with a provision for additional copy machines in the future, on a five-year lease/purchase agreement with preferred municipal financing rates; and

WHEREAS, On September 12, 1989, it was necessary because of the preferred financing rates for the Board of Education to authorize a master lease/purchase agreement for the purchase of additional copy machines in accordance with the terms and conditions of the bid specifications; and

WHEREAS, The Board of Education on July 12, 1990, approved the first year of a three-year potential extension; and

WHEREAS, The Board of Education will from time to time receive additional requests to lease/purchase other copy machines under this arrangement depending upon appropriated funds; and

WHEREAS, It is necessary at this time and in the public interest for the Board to acquire two additional copy machines under a lease/purchase agreement to meet the present needs of the public schools; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education of Montgomery County approve the use of the master lease/purchase agreement with Eastman Kodak Credit Corporation for the acquisition of two additional copy machines at equipment and finance costs totalling \$27,983.95 over five years under the same terms and conditions contained in Bid No. 171-89, Copy Machines, in accordance with Section 5-110 of Maryland's Public School Law; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education president and the superintendent of schools be authorized to execute the documents necessary for these transactions.

RESOLUTION NO. 508-90 Re: RE-AWARD OF BID NO. 65-90, PURCHASE OF SCHOOL BUSES

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Mrs. Praisner seconded by Mrs. DiFonzo, the following resolution was adopted unanimously#:

WHEREAS, The Board of Education of Montgomery County received Quote No. 429-0, Lease/Purchase of a Copier, to be used for the copying needs of the Department of Personnel Services; and

WHEREAS, The Board of Education has determined in accordance with Section 5-110 of Maryland's Public School Law that Lanier World Wide is the lowest responsible bidder conforming to specifications to supply a copier; and

WHEREAS, Lanier World Wide has offered to provide the necessary equipment through a three-year lease/purchase arrangement at preferred financing; and

WHEREAS, The Board of Education has determined that it is in the public interest to obtain the copier through a lease/purchase arrangement with Lanier World Wide subject to cancellation in the event of nonappropriation; and

WHEREAS, Lanier World Wide has agreed to provide the copier equipment in accordance with the lease/purchase terms and nonappropriation condition set forth in the bid specifications; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education of Montgomery County award Quote No. 429-0 for copier equipment and financing to Lanier World Wide, totalling \$5,834.13 for the acquisition and the three-year lease/purchase of a copier, in accordance with the terms and conditions of the bid specifications; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education president and the superintendent of schools be authorized to execute the documents necessary for this transaction.

RESOLUTION NO. 510-90 Re: REDUCTION OF RETAINAGE - WESTBROOK
ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Mrs. Praisner seconded by Dr. Cronin, the following resolution was adopted unanimously#:

WHEREAS, Edmar Construction Company, Inc., general contractor for Westbrook Elementary School, has completed 99 percent of all specified requirements, and has requested that the 10 percent retainage, which is based on the completed work to date, be reduced to 5 percent; and

WHEREAS, The project bonding company, Transamerica Insurance Company, has consented to this reduction; and

August 27, 1990

RESOLUTION NO. 512-90 Re: UTILIZATION OF FY 1991 FUTURE
SUPPORTED PROJECT FUNDS TO PURCHASE
SECONDARY SCIENCE EQUIPMENT

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Mrs. Praisner seconded by Dr. Cronin, the following resolution was adopted unanimously#:

RESOLVED, That the superintendent of schools be authorized to receive and expend within the FY 1991 Provision for Future Supported Projects in Category 3--Other Instructional Costs, a grant award of \$10,000 from the Maryland Equipment Incentive Fund, a component of the Governor's Mathematics/Science Initiatives, for the purchase of selected computing equipment to be placed in Montgomery County public high school science departments; and be it further

RESOLVED, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the county executive and the County Council.

RESOLUTION NO. 513-90 Re: UTILIZATION OF FY 1991 FUTURE
SUPPORTED PROJECT FUNDS FOR PROJECT
ADAPT (COMPUTERIZED ADAPTIVE
TESTING)

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Mrs. Praisner seconded by Dr. Cronin, the following resolution was adopted unanimously#:

RESOLVED, That the superintendent of schools be authorized to receive and expend within the FY 1991 Provision for Future Supported Projects a \$20,000 grant award from MSDE for Project ADAPT in the following categories:

| CATEGORY | AMOUNT |
|------------------|----------|
| 1 Administration | \$18,840 |
| 10 Fixed Charges | 1,160 |
| | ----- |
| TOTAL | \$20,000 |

and be it further

RESOLVED, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the county executive and the County Council.

August 27, 1990

RESOLUTION NO. 514-90 Re: FY 91 CATEGORICAL TRANSFER WITHIN
THE SUBSTANCE ABUSE PREVENTION
PROGRAM

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Mrs. Praisner seconded by Dr. Cronin, the following resolution was adopted unanimously:

RESOLVED, That the superintendent of schools be authorized, subject to County Council approval, to effect the following FY 91 categorical transfer of \$54,901 within the Substance Abuse Prevention Program as funded by the United States Education Department through the Maryland State Department of Education under the Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act of 1986:

| CATEGORY | FROM | TO |
|------------------------------|----------|----------|
| 1 Administration | \$37,892 | |
| 02 Instructional Salaries | 9,209 | |
| 03 Other Instructional Costs | | \$54,901 |
| 10 Fixed Charges | 7,800 | |
| TOTAL | \$54,901 | \$54,901 |

and be it further

RESOLVED, That the county executive be requested to recommend approval of this resolution to the County Council and a copy be transmitted to the county executive and the County Council.

RESOLUTION NO. 515-90 Re: UTILIZATION OF FY 1991 FUTURE
SUPPORTED PROJECT FUNDS FOR STAFF
DEVELOPMENT IN PERFORMANCE
ASSESSMENT

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Mrs. Praisner seconded by Dr. Cronin, the following resolution was adopted unanimously#:

RESOLVED, That the superintendent of schools be authorized to receive and expend within the FY 1991 Provision for Future Supported Projects a grant award of \$8,000 from the Maryland State Department of Education, under the Staff Development Grants for the Maryland School Performance Program in the following categories:

| CATEGORY | AMOUNT |
|--------------------------|---------|
| 2 Instructional Salaries | \$7,407 |
| 10 Fixed Charges | 593 |
| | ----- |
| TOTAL | \$8,000 |

and be it further

RESOLVED, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the county executive and the County Council.

RESOLUTION NO. 516-90 Re: FY 1991 SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION
FOR THE INTENSIVE ENGLISH LANGUAGE
PROGRAM

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Mrs. Praisner seconded by Dr. Cronin, the following resolution was adopted unanimously#:

RESOLVED, That the superintendent of schools be authorized, subject to County Council approval, to receive and expend in the following categories a \$228,719 grant award from the Maryland Department of Human Resources, Community Services Administration, Office of Refugee Affairs, under the Refugee Act of 1980 for the FY 1991 Intensive English Language Program:

| CATEGORY | AMOUNT |
|------------------------------------|------------|
| 1 Administration | \$ 230 |
| 2 Instructional Salaries | 206,294 |
| 3 Other Instructional Costs | 4,190 |
| 8 Operation of Plant and Equipment | 470 |
| 10 Fixed Charges | 17,535 |
| | ----- |
| TOTAL | \$228,719 |

and be it further

RESOLVED, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the county executive and the County Council and that the county executive be requested to recommend approval of this supplemental to the County Council.

Re: CONSTRUCTION PROGRESS REPORT

Dr. Pitt remarked that he had had the opportunity to visit schools under construction and schools having major renovations. He was impressed with the commitment of staff to get the schools ready for opening day. He knew that over Labor Day weekend many

staff members would be working in the schools to assure a smooth opening for students.

Dr. Philip Rohr, associate superintendent for supportive services, reported that the rain over the past week had set them back in terms of site completion and roof repairs. However, they expected to occupy all spaces before the start of the school year. Three gymnasium floors had not been completed because of high humidity problems. Mrs. DiFonzo suggested they consider delaying the gym floors until the cooler weather if they could not be completed before students arrived.

Dr. Cronin asked that Board members receive notice of all open houses scheduled for new and renovated schools. Mrs. Praisner suggested that staff look into possible modifications to the front of Cloverly because design did not make it clear where the entrance to the school was located. Dr. Shoenberg thanked Dr. Rohr for his report.

RESOLUTION NO. 517-90 Re: PERSONNEL APPOINTMENTS AND TRANSFER

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Mrs. Praisner seconded by Dr. Cronin, the following resolution was adopted with Mr. Chang, Dr. Cronin, Mr. Ewing, Mr. Goldensohn, Mrs. Hobbs, Mrs. Praisner, and Dr. Shoenberg voting in the affirmative; Mrs. DiFonzo being temporarily absent:

RESOLVED, That the following personnel appointments and transfer be approved:

| APPOINTMENT | PRESENT POSITION | AS |
|---------------------|---|---|
| Edith M. Kropp | Asst. to the Supt. for Legal Svs. Office of Human Services | Asst. MCPS Attorney Legal Svs. Unit Office of Human Services Effective: 8-28-90 |
| N. James Myerberg | Acting Supervisor of Testing & Evaluation DEA | Supervisor of Evaluation & Testing DEA Effective: 8-28-90 |
| Patricia K. Lesnick | Asst. Principal Stephen Knolls | Director Bridge School Effective: 8-28-90 |
| Donald J. Barron | Admin. Intern Walt Whitman HS | Asst. Principal Walt Whitman HS Effective: 8-28-90 |

August 27, 1990

| | | |
|-------------------|------------------------------------|---|
| Linda W. Fiore | Admin. Intern Gaithersburg HS | Asst. Principal Gaithersburg HS Effective: 8-28-90 |
| Sarah S. Pelham | Admin. Intern Einstein HS | Asst. Principal Einstein HS Effective: 8-28-90 |
| Michael A. Thomas | Admin. Intern Poolesville HS | Asst. Principal Poolesville HS Effective: 8-28-90 |
| TRANSFER | FROM | TO |
| Maxine Jenkins | Asst. Principal Paint Branch HS | Asst. Principal E. Brooke Lee MS Effective: 8-28-90 |

Re: MINORITY ACHIEVEMENT ACCOUNTABILITY
REPORT

Dr. Pitt said there was a question about where they would go with accountability data for all students because the state had eliminated the CAT norm-referenced test. The new testing would be done next spring and would provide them with data to use for the following year. The state criterion-referenced tests were expected to replace the CAT in terms of data; however, there was some question about how good the state tests would be the first year. The question was whether MCPS should use the CTBS which was the new version of the norm-referenced test, but he did not believe they should do this for only the one year unless they planned to continue it for five or six years. Therefore, they had talked about doing some things with the MCPS criterion-referenced tests.

Mrs. Katheryn Gemberling, associate superintendent, reported that her staff had been meeting with DEA, and they planned to prepare CRTs that were directly reflective of the MCPS curriculum. These CRTs would be similar in format to the state CRTs so that comparisons could be drawn when the state tests came out. MCPS would test grades 4, 6, and 7 because the state planned to test grades 3, 5, and 8. Indications were that the state tests would take nine hours for each student to compete; therefore, MCPS did not want to double-test at those grades. The MCPS tests would start with multiple choice and short-answers so that staff could use this for scaling purposes. Eventually they hoped to move to a computer adaptive mode for the content core. Some practice prototypes would be prepared for grades 3, 5, and 8 to prepare them for the state tests. They also hoped to develop some performance assessment particularly for cross-content so that

they could use an interdisciplinary approach to performance assessment.

Dr. Pitt stated that they planned to use the CRTs to measure all achievement including that of minority students. The CRT was a test that measure how well a student did against what the school was trying to teach the student as opposed to a norm-reference test which rated students against students. Mrs. Gemberling said that as they looked toward curriculum revisions they had to assess the curriculum in order to adjust it for what they decided to teach students.

Dr. Shoenberg pointed out that with the CAT they had a standard for students improving relative to the norm. He asked if there was something equivalent for the CRT and, if so, for how long did they have to use the CRT to get some reasonable estimate of what their criteria ought to be. Mrs. Gemberling replied that with the multiple choice items they could do a scaling of what they agreed was the knowledge base for a particular grade level. When they had measured gain and progress, they would be looking toward a rating of satisfactory or excellent.

In regard to the state, Dr. Pitt reported that they would set standards. The state would say that a certain percentage of students had to know a certain percentage of the material. He thought that the same standard should be set for all youngsters and hoped that every youngster in MCPS would meet the minimum standard. Dr. Shoenberg asked if there were any way in which the state could set standards described as satisfactory or excellent and not be arbitrary about it. For example, they could report by number and leave it at that. Mrs. Gemberling agreed. She said that anytime they used a term such as satisfactory they had to have some explanatory criteria. However, just because the state was doing this, it didn't mean MCPS had to do the same thing. Dr. Shoenberg hoped that they would not. He suggested reporting by a percentage of questions answered correctly. The numbers should speak for themselves without their trying to attach some kind of qualitative label to them.

Mrs. Gemberling explained that the primary focus for the MCPS CRTs would be to give principals and staff information on the progress being made by students, and it wasn't necessary to have a particular rating attached to that. Using this information, they could check longitudinal growth, school progress, program weakness, and whether the tests were predictors for the state CRTs. It was an internal monitoring device for schools to enable them to best serve all students.

Dr. Shoenberg asked if the state CRTs were suitable vehicles for measuring what they were trying to measure with the CAT. Dr. Pitt replied that this was the heart of the issue. The state was

going to set arbitrary standards for passing and failing. He believed there should be a goal toward which all school systems could work. He hoped that all students would achieve whatever was set as a baseline for learning, and if the students did not, then the goal had not been achieved and they would work toward that goal. He assumed that they would report this data ethnically as they did now, and if there was a differential between groups of students they would have to work on this area. He asked about the state's plans for releasing information. Dr. Joy Frechtling, director of DEA, replied that the state was still debating this issue; however, she believed that at some point there would be separate data for different groups.

Dr. Cronin remarked that they had used the CAT in Priority 2 in the elementary level to give themselves some benchmarks. Regardless of what was done at the state level, that longitudinal data was now lost to them. This was the last time they could have this type of report. He asked how they would work with the community so that the language they were using at the table translated to the language of parents so that they would understand that their children were learning. Dr. Frechtling replied that the language of the CRTs was much more relevant than the California Achievement Tests had ever been. She thought that the idea of using local tests calibrated to the curriculum would be an effective means of saying to parents that this was what they expected of students and the curriculum and this was how they were doing. Dr. Pitt added that the whole State of Maryland would be starting with the new test and that would establish new baseline data.

Dr. Cronin asked if all of this had been explained to the community. For example, had staff met with MCCPTA and the leaders of the minority community? Mrs. Gemberling replied that community members had been involved on the committee looking at alternative assessments. The minority committee had recommended the Board move away from norm-referenced tests into more criterion-content oriented testing that reflected the curriculum. Because these decisions were not final, she said that staff had not convened any meetings with the community. Dr. Frechtling added that she was chairing a group that was part of the Maryland School Performance Plan. There were PTA members on that committee, and one of their tasks was to decide how best to communicate with parents.

Mr. Ewing pointed out that the item before the Board was billed as a report on minority achievement, and it was not without some significance that they hadn't talked about it at all. They had had Priority 2 for seven years, and he believed they still could not answer the question of how well minority students were doing. The report was obscure, and he thought that the public would not

read it. One could suggest that the obscurity and the volume of the data in the report confused and defeated the possibility of inquiry. He did not think there was a conspiracy, but he did think it was more of a case of simply not knowing how to go about this in a way that would communicate itself simply and intelligibly to the public and to the Board.

It seemed to Mr. Ewing that an accountability report should answer who was accountable to whom, for what, and what were the consequences that followed from that notion of accountability. The report answered none of these questions, and he did not see the answers in previous reports. He was not critical of the people who put the report together because it was what the Board asked for. He was critical of the Board for not demanding a better document that permitted the minority community and the general public to know what students were doing, where they were not succeeding, why they were not succeeding, and what was going to be done about it. The report did not tell them how minority students were doing compared to majority students. He would want the report to say where majority and minority students were doing best in the school system and why and where they were doing the worst and why. He said that it was tragic that after seven years these questions had not been answered. Dr. Pitt suggested that Dr. Paul Scott, the former director of minority education, take a few minutes to explain the report.

Dr. Scott explained that the report had to be viewed in context with respect to the overall plan. In July he had presented the program component of the minority achievement plan, and in the spring the Board had received an update on affirmative action. He reported that as of last week 38 percent of the 213 teachers hired were minority.

Dr. Scott said that the report represented the third year of the accountability program which focused on measuring progress over time. They had set specific goals for each school and had added additional goals each year, and they had established a monitoring component to hold individual schools accountable.

This year the document contained benchmark data for a new goal in algebra 1 and higher level mathematics. There was also an adjusted Project Basic goal for ninth grade to be shared by mid level and senior high schools. Asian student data was included for the first time in the countywide section which was in response to the Board's resolution that Asian students be included in all minority education initiatives. Dr. Scott pointed out that the goals, however, were set specifically for black and Hispanic students.

Dr. Scott reviewed the findings of the report. He pointed out that the accountability goals were included as Exhibit 1.

Exhibit 2 focused on the percentage of students meeting Priority 2 goals for the California Achievement Test. These goals were met with the exception of grades 5 to 8 for Hispanic students. He said data indicated that they must continue efforts to focus on students scoring in the middle range regardless of whether or not they had the CAT. In Exhibit 6, Hispanic students missed the citizenship test goal for Project Basic by two percentage points. The majority of senior high schools met seven of the eight of the Project Basic goals. In regard to the identification and participation for gifted and talented students, the goal was met at the elementary and mid level. This year for the first time they were reporting progress on the average proportion of students in honors classes because last year they had this as benchmark data. Both black and Hispanic students met the goal.

Dr. Scott reported that for the first year they were presenting data on enrollment of students in algebra 1 in the ninth grade. Dr. Pitt stressed that this was a critical area. The general assumption throughout the United States was that students in the top scoring group took algebra 1, and average scoring students did not. The goal was to have average scoring students take and pass algebra 1. Dr. Shoenberg stated that the fact that only 20 percent of the middle group took algebra 1 was shockingly low, and this was a useful statistic. Dr. Pitt explained that this was typical nationally for all youngsters in that group regardless of race.

Mrs. Gemberling said they were trying to focus on college readiness and the need for students to get that college preparatory track started in the ninth grade. Dr. Pitt stated that, regardless of whether or not a student went to college, students ought to take algebra 1 in the ninth grade.

Dr. Scott summarized the report by stating that black and Hispanic students met eight of the twelve goals regarding the CAT. They met the ninth grade Project Basic goals in reading and mathematics, and they met seven of the eight Project Basic goals at the tenth grade level. They met the gifted and talented goals as well as the honors goals at the senior high school. Asian students in general exceeded the goals set for black and Hispanic students.

Dr. Pitt commented that in stanines 4 to 6 they were not doing as well as they wanted to do in terms of moving youngsters alone. They recognized this last year and moved to the special Summer Institute for Achievement program which was a more creative way to teach. Preliminary data indicated that the SIA program was successful. The National Education Association recommended that the program be instituted across the United States. Those same approaches were not being moved into schools on a regular basis

in Montgomery County, and Fairfax County just moved into the program.

In regard to the algebra initiative, Mrs. Gemberling reported that they had a full-day workshop for secondary principals, counselors, and math resource teachers. They shared data on minority youngsters with the group and brought in experts to work with them. They also gave options to the schools rather than a countywide plan because different schools were at different places. Each school developed a plan around the algebra initiative, and most plans involved more cooperation between the feeder school or schools and the high school because decisions about algebra were made at the eighth grade level.

Mrs. Gemberling indicated that they also had a summer program for students who had not registered for algebra but who had been identified as having potential. They put 147 students through the program, and about two thirds of them were black or Hispanic. Only nine of these students failed algebra 1 when they took it in ninth grade. They found that the more successful schools had follow-up programs in the ninth grade for these students, and this information was shared with all schools. They ran the summer school program again this year, and seven schools elected something different. Two of the high schools virtually eliminated the introduction to algebra course and offered a second period for students to give them support in mathematics. These were not double periods of algebra but a regular algebra class plus a second period where students could do some networking with teacher support. The goal was to have a lot of teacher involvement with students at the beginning of the year to work to the point where students would be successful and take geometry in the regular program. They had in-service training for teachers and computer software to support that second period.

Mrs. Gemberling said that they also had the School-based Instructional Monitoring Systems Program (SIMS) which the Board and the minority committee had supported. There were 23 schools involved in that project, and the program was all set for the start of the school year. In this program they would have immediate and constant monitoring of individual student progress.

In regard to the report, Dr. Vance said they had to assess the data in terms of the individual school, the student population, the resources, the initiatives, and the programs. They also had to look at the extent to which the schools were utilizing the programs and projects that Mrs. Gemberling had mentioned. The associate superintendents had analyzed the data and had already met with the principals whose schools did not meet established standards. These schools were required to resubmit plans to correct whatever deficiencies had been determined.

Mrs. Hobbs asked about the seven schools that were in the algebra initiatives. Mrs. Gemberling replied that the schools were B-CC, Seneca Valley, Walter Johnson, Richard Montgomery, Watkins Mill, Einstein, and Blair. The programs ranged from a program at Blair where the instruction for the second period was bilingual to the type of program she had described previously.

Mrs. Hobbs asked whether they could take this report, look at the achievement of black and Hispanic students, look at whether the school was Chapter I, QIE or magnet, and have proof that the reduced class size had a major impact on the success of students. Dr. Frechtling replied that this was a tough question. She could not say they would have proof because schools contained many different programs. Some might involve reduced class size, and some might have special services which did not involve reduced class size. Dr. Scott said that they could identify schools that were Chapter I and the resources in those schools.

Dr. Shoenberg pointed out that what they did not know was how the school would have done without the extra resources. Dr. Pitt said that in the case of Head Start they could show that youngsters at risk receiving Head Start services had significantly improved test results over a period of time.

Mrs. Hobbs commented that she had found out that the program initiated by J. D. Speller at Banneker Middle School would be expanded to 24 schools next year. She thought this was a remarkable effort by a parent volunteer who identified a problem, worked at solving the problem, and now other schools were going to have a black male math honors program.

Mrs. Praisner remarked that part of the frustration was they were dealing with this document in isolation from other documents. They had to look at the relationships between this and other information in the school system and what the system had learned from the analysis of each of these schools. For example, which schools were "successful practices" schools and how had they expanded the successful practices program to other schools. She saw the document as a source document, not an end result. Questions were generated because they did not have the companion pieces of information. They needed all the pieces and needed to talk about results including the differences from one year to the next, what they had done, what they were doing, what they had learned, and where they were going with this information. She suggested that they had to look at how they needed to modify information and report it so that the focus of discussion would be on what they had learned and what they were doing about it.

Mr. Ewing stated that Board member comments illustrated that a major problem was that they did not have an analytic plan that permitted to them explain why what happened, happened. There was

no plan to permit Dr. Frechtling to do that kind of analysis in conjunction with other initiatives. It was difficult to put into place further changes when they could not analyze what they had done.

Dr. Pitt explained that they were in the process of getting basic data, school by school. The information they would be gathering on algebra was very specific and would contain information on what programs worked. They had a much better chance of getting specific analytical data when they used CRTs. When they had this information they could analyze just what happened in schools and whether the programs made a difference. He agreed that the information needed to be combined.

Mr. Goldensohn requested that the next version of the report contained page numbers. While the book had interesting statistics, he found only the summary pages to be helpful. The school-by-school information was awkward to use because the percentages could be skewed if a school had only a few minority children. The summary pages took all of those statistical aberrations and give them an overall picture. He thought the next step was to take this book and show what it meant. The Board had all this statistical information, but they needed to take the next step to show what was working and why some things were happening.

Dr. Cronin did not think that anyone could write the report that Mr. Ewing and Mr. Goldensohn wanted. All the researchers in the country hadn't been able to come up with that kind of plan and report. They had over 100,000 children in schools in Montgomery County had each one of them performed in different ways. He thought that the important thing was to come back to the school with this data so that the school could look at how individual students did on particular segments of particular tests.

Mrs. Hobbs asked when the Board would receive Dr. Gordon's report. Dr. Vance replied that Dr. Gordon would be submitting his preliminary draft report along with a letter of transmittal by the weekend of September 7. Dr. Gordon would be holding a public review of that report on September 21 and 22. After that, it would take five or six weeks to prepare the final report which should be ready during the first week in November.

Dr. Shoenberg thanked staff for the report and presentation.

Re: BUDGET REVIEW PROCESS

Dr. Pitt explained that staff had prepared a document showing how the budget process could be revised. Any changes made by the Board would require a revised timeline and more effort on the part of staff.

Mr. Larry Bowers, director of the Department of Management, Budget and Planning, said the first part would be an annual report which would review the previous year. Staff would be working on this over the summer at the close of the school year. The second part would be a description of some new initiatives, and this would be distributed in the middle or end of September. The third piece would look to the future and include the Board's long-range plans, budget initiatives, and a multi-year look at where the system was going. The operating budget would be tied into all three pieces. They saw this as a much broader look than they had produced before even compared with the "Choices" documents of the 1970's. Since the 1980's they had sent out the management budget to parents in January and another document in March.

Mr. Bowers said the new document would come out much earlier and be in more detail. When they had changed the process in the 1980's, they had also changed the public hearing process. A number of times during the 1970's, they had held public hearings in early November. Part of this would also be making a decision about when the Board would have public hearings. For example, if they held hearings in November, they might want to hold additional hearings in January or written testimony. They would also have to look at what type of document they might produce in March when the Board had completed its budget action.

Dr. Cronin pointed out that if they changed the hearings from January to November, they would change the type of testimony and get a broader view from the community rather than a line item approach. Mr. Bowers agreed.

Mrs. Praisner stated that she was very keen on having an annual report to the community showing where they were, how they had spent their money, where they were going, what their goals were, and soliciting community input through hearings or in writing. She thought they should encourage written comments from the broad community as well as through the hearing process. When she looked at the timetable, she thought the television show might or might not be a component. Early October might be a little too late.

Mrs. Praisner said she would like them to think about imposing this on the system now given the changes they had made in 1981 in the school system itself. Now they had already had public hearings in November related to school facilities. They had to look at whether they had two sets of public hearings in November or some in October. She liked the idea of broad operating goal hearings, and one way to do that might be to do those in October and have the facilities issues in November. If they did not want public hearings in the initial part, in the facilities process the communities commented to the area superintendents in June and

July. The community could be asked to respond to the broad questions without public hearings, and the hearings could be held after the development of the superintendent's budget. In addition, it might be difficult for the Board to be involved in two different hearings in November. Initially she had thought about tying the two types of hearings together, but people would focus on schools. However, the Board needed initial responses about where the school system should be going. There was also some benefit in getting the community organized in January and February right before the Board and Council started to review the budget.

Mr. Goldensohn agreed with Mrs. Praisner because the fall was already crowded. Flipping the hearings and the written comments solved part of the problem. The annual report would be very valuable because it provided people with information early in the fall. Their comments could come in prior to Dr. Pitt's budget submission to the Board. This gave the public an opportunity to participate in the early formulation of the budget rather than just at the end stage. If the public raised something new in January, the Board found it difficult to respond to their request.

Mr. Ewing was concerned that over the years the hearing process had come to focus exclusively on the PTAs, and a lot of others with interest in the schools tended not to become involved. It seemed to him that if they wanted to obtain views on goals and programs they had to have a broader audience. One consequence of their focusing too narrowly was that they did not have as much public understanding as they should. For example, they should encourage Chambers of Commerce and civic groups to focus on the document and to give the Board their views. For that reason, he thought the report as well as the notion of asking people early for their advance were good ideas, but he would not want them to forget the larger community.

Mrs. Praisner recalled that when she had first proposed the annual report and the survey there were lots of elements of using the general public and preparing a document that would be broadly disseminated. They had talked about including the document in newspapers and mailing out. They also discussed having some kind of formal response document as part of this so that everyone knew they were encouraged to respond. Mr. Brian Porter, the director of the Department of Information, explained that the most effective way would be direct mail. It would take about \$17,000 just to mail the publication, and there would be costs involved in producing the publication. They could reach every household in the county, and it would be an effective means of communicating.

It seemed to Dr. Shoenberg they were saying written input prior to the formulation of the budget with oral testimony afterward. They wanted that written input to be solicited broadly. For example, there were groups for the gifted and talented, special education, teacher groups concerned with aspects of the curriculum, etc. He thought that to be able to get that input early and in writing might reduce the felt need to supply oral testimony as well.

Dr. Pitt said there was general agreement that they would move in this direction with the suggestions made by Board members. He was concerned because there were costs involved. He would come back with recommendations and cost figures for the Board in six weeks or so, and Dr. Shoenberg agreed to put this on the agenda when it was ready.

Re: BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS

1. Mr. Ewing reported that he had written a note to Dr. Pitt asking about a letter which stated that the Board had adopted a special program at Poolesville. He questioned the Board's adoption of this, and Dr. Pitt replied that the Board had not. Based on Dr. Pitt's memo, he wanted to know about next steps. It seemed to him they could not implement a program without Board action. Dr. Pitt recalled that during the capital budget the Board had told him to move on planning for a special project at Poolesville as part of the effort to make that school viable in terms of numbers. The Board agreed to having a program, but not the specifics of the program. Area 3 was working with the school, and a survey had been done. There was a lot of interest in an environmental program, and the next step would be the design of that program. He would then come back to the Board with this proposal prior to budget decisions.

Mr. Ewing pointed out that this was the year when they would be developing plans for an up-county special program. Dr. Pitt explained that the program at Poolesville was not related to the special program. He had agreed to look at how Blair and Richard Montgomery were doing and look at what space was available up-county. At the time he had talked about a small program of about 25 youngsters, and he would be giving the Board a statement on this during the fall. Dr. Cronin said he had raised the issue of doing something with life science at Hopkins or at Shady Grove, and he would like the superintendent's reaction to that proposal.

Dr. Pitt said he would review the bidding and provide a timeline as to when he would come in with a recommendation for the special program. However, the Poolesville program was a separate issue and would not necessarily be a program for highly able students.

2. Mrs. Hobbs asked if Giant and Safeway were resuming their computer programs, and Board members indicated that they were. She asked if they could coordinate where schools were helping schools. She suggested they could promote more of this where the more fortunate schools shared their receipts with the smaller schools. Dr. Pitt agreed to think about this. They had allowed local schools to make their own judgments about this.

RESOLUTION NO. 518-90 Re: EXECUTIVE SESSION - SEPTEMBER 12,
1990

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Mr. Goldensohn seconded by Mr. Chang, the following resolution was adopted with Mr. Chang, Dr. Cronin, Mr. Ewing, Mr. Goldensohn, Mrs. Hobbs, and Dr. Shoenberg voting in the affirmative; Mrs. DiFonzo and Mrs. Praisner being temporarily absent:

WHEREAS, The Board of Education of Montgomery County is authorized by Section 10-508, State Government Article of the ANNOTATED CODE OF MARYLAND to conduct certain of its meetings in executive closed session; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education of Montgomery County hereby conduct its meeting in executive closed session beginning on September 12, 1990, at 9 a.m. to discuss, consider, deliberate, and/or otherwise decide the employment, assignment, appointment, promotion, demotion, compensation, discipline, removal, or resignation of employees, appointees, or officials over whom it has jurisdiction, or any other personnel matter affecting one or more particular individuals and to comply with a specific constitutional, statutory or judicially imposed requirement that prevents public disclosures about a particular proceeding or matter as permitted under the State Government Article, Section 10-508; and that such meeting shall continue in executive closed session until the completion of business; and be it further

RESOLVED, That such meeting continue in executive closed session at noon to discuss the matters listed above as permitted under Article 76A, Section 11(a) and that such meeting shall continue in executive closed session until the completion of business.

RESOLUTION NO. 519-90 Re: MINUTES OF JULY 10, JULY 23, AND
AUGUST 7, 1990

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Dr. Cronin seconded by Mr. Goldensohn, the following resolution was adopted with Mr. Chang, Dr. Cronin, Mr. Ewing, Mr. Goldensohn, Mrs. Hobbs, Mrs. Praisner, and Dr. Shoenberg voting in the affirmative; Mrs. DiFonzo being temporarily absent:

RESOLVED, That the minutes of July 10, July 23, and August 7, 1990, be approved.

Re: PROPOSED POLICY ON PLAGIARISM

On July 10, 1990, Mr. Ewing moved and Mr. Goldensohn seconded the following:

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education directs the superintendent to develop for Board consideration a policy on plagiarism that covers both students and employees (teachers, principals, administrators, and so forth); and be it further

RESOLVED, That such policy would define plagiarism, give guidance on how to avoid it, and provide serious penalties for it.

RESOLUTION NO. 520-90 Re: STUDENTS AND PLAGIARISM

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Dr. Cronin seconded by Mrs. DiFonzo, the following resolution was adopted unanimously:

RESOLVED, That the Board agrees with the superintendent's alternate proposal to have a systemwide approach to student plagiarism as follows:

An alternative approach, consistent with the present Student Rights and Responsibilities' policy, would be to identify plagiarism as a major infraction "...requiring consistent countywide actions from and direction for all schools. For these infractions, a specified range of responses must be utilized by all school personnel, with the severity and/or frequency of the infraction determining where in the range the penalty should lie."

RESOLUTION NO. 521-90 Re: SUBSTITUTE MOTION ON STAFF AND PLAGIARISM

On motion of Mr. Ewing seconded by Dr. Cronin, the following resolution was adopted unanimously:

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education directs the superintendent to develop a definition of plagiarism and a specific statement that in Montgomery County this has been and will be included in the definition of misconduct under state law and regulation; and be it further

RESOLVED, That every staff member be provided with a copy of the definition and statement.

RESOLUTION NO. 522-90 Re: BOE APPEAL NO. 1990-28

On motion of Mr. Goldensohn seconded by Mrs. Praisner, the following resolution was adopted unanimously:

RESOLVED, That BOE Appeal No. 1990-28 be dismissed because administrative action has rendered the appeal moot.

RESOLUTION NO. 523-90 Re: BOE APPEAL NO. 1990-39

On motion of Mr. Goldensohn seconded by Mrs. Praisner, the following resolution was adopted with Mr. Chang, Dr. Cronin, Mrs. DiFonzo, Mr. Ewing, Mr. Goldensohn, Mrs. Praisner, and Dr. Shoenberg voting in the affirmative; Mrs. Hobbs abstaining:

RESOLVED, That BOE Appeal No. 1990-39 be dismissed.

RESOLUTION NO. 524-90 Re: BOE APPEALS NO. 1990-31, -36, -41, -43, -44, -48, -50, AND -56

On motion of Mr. Goldensohn seconded by Mrs. Praisner, the following resolution was adopted unanimously:

RESOLVED, That BOE Appeals No. 1990-31, -36, -41, -43, -44, -48, -50, and -56 (student transfers) be dismissed.

RESOLUTION NO. 525-90 Re: DECISION AND ORDER - BOE APPEAL NO. 1990-20

On motion of Mrs. Praisner seconded by Dr. Cronin, the following resolution was adopted with Mr. Chang, Dr. Cronin, Mrs. DiFonzo, Mrs. Hobbs, Mrs. Praisner, and Dr. Shoenberg voting in the affirmative; Mr. Ewing and Mr. Goldensohn voting in the negative:

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education adopt its Decision and Order in BOE Appeal No. 1990-20 (a transfer matter).

RESOLUTION NO. 526-90 Re: DECISION AND ORDER - BOE APPEAL NO. 1990-21

On motion of Mrs. Praisner seconded by Dr. Cronin, the following resolution was adopted with Mr. Chang, Dr. Cronin, Mrs. DiFonzo, Mrs. Hobbs, Mrs. Praisner, and Dr. Shoenberg voting in the affirmative; Mr. Ewing voting in the negative; Mr. Goldensohn abstaining:

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education adopt its Decision and Order in BOE Appeal No. 1990-21 (a transfer matter).

RESOLUTION NO. 527-90 Re: DECISION AND ORDER - BOE APPEAL NO.
1990-23

On motion of Mrs. Praisner seconded by Dr. Cronin, the following resolution was adopted with Mr. Chang, Dr. Cronin, Mrs. DiFonzo, Mr. Ewing, Mrs. Praisner, and Dr. Shoenberg voting in the affirmative; Mrs. Hobbs voting in the negative; Mr. Goldensohn abstaining:

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education adopt its Decision and Order in BOE Appeal No. 1990-23 (a transfer matter).

Re: NEW BUSINESS

1. Mr. Chang moved and Mr. Ewing seconded the following:

RESOLVED, That the Board schedule for action on September 12 the following resolution pertaining to expanded voting rights for the student Board member:

WHEREAS, The Montgomery County Delegation initiated and secured passage of an amendment to Section 3-701 of the Education Article of the Annotated Code of Maryland, which permitted the student member of the Board limited voting rights; and

WHEREAS, Some members of the Board have publicly expressed an interest in expanding those voting rights to full voting privileges with the exception of negative personnel actions affecting certified employees, as provided in Section 3-701(e) (4)-(6)(i-iv), and Section 6-202(a) of this article; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the Montgomery County Board of Education supports granting to the student member a vote on all matters except those involving negative certified personnel actions; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education requests its Legislative Aide to work with the Montgomery County Delegation to introduce and enact an amendment to the Education Article of the Annotated Code of Maryland.

2. Mr. Ewing moved and Mr. Goldensohn seconded the following:

RESOLVED, That the Board schedule discussion and action on the matter of the state Board of Education budget submission in support of its superintendent's revised reform proposals.

3. Mr. Ewing moved and Mr. Chang seconded the following:

RESOLVED, That the Board schedule discussion and action on the matter of a survey of the nature and extent of the numbers and kinds of students with serious emotional disturbances as proposed in the original SED committee report but not undertaken either by the school system or by the county, with the expectation that this survey would be done in conjunction with the county.

Re: ADJOURNMENT

The president adjourned the meeting at 11:30 p.m.

PRESIDENT

SECRETARY

HP:mlw