



Resolved, That the Board of Education approve its agenda for December 13, 1994.

Re: STATEMENT BY MRS. GORDON

"First of all, I would like to thank my colleagues for unanimously showing their support for my leadership on the Board. I hope that I will be able to fulfill their expectations and represent the Board fairly. We have a lot of things that we can be proud of. We have many successes, and our students continue to perform far exceeding the expectations for most students in other school systems around the country. We have a number of challenges facing us, and I am committed to help the Board and our students be successful in meeting those challenges. I hope as Board president that I will be able to support the Board in enhancing the partnerships that we have begun to build with other elected officials, with members of the community, businesses, and with our staff members. I think that will be what continues to keep us successful, and I am committed to do that so that the Board will be successful. If the Board is successful, our school system will be successful. I will, to the best of my ability, represent the views of the Board, understanding that we are each individuals but when we have taken an action, as Board president, I will represent the action that the Board has taken as a Board. I look forward to it. I am excited. I think we will be an excellent Board. I think we have a great deal of potential, and I look forward to working with all of you."

Re: STATEMENT BY MS. GUTIERREZ

"I thank my fellow Board members for having selected me as vice president. I am also terribly excited and very pleased to have their support. I think we are going to have another tough year. I think it is very important for us to work very closely together as a team because we will be the front line for education. We are going to be trying to make the goals for quality education, maintaining it at its level and improving it. As I was out in the campaign, it was completely different from the first four year campaign. We are in a different climate. We have customers, stakeholders, who need to be more a part of what the school system is doing. We need to bring them in closer. We need to make them part of our decisions because we are not going to be able to do it alone. That is very clear to me. We have made incredible changes to the school system in the last four years. I think we have set the foundation for addressing issues not on a year-by-year basis but on a real long-term basis. We will see that in today's agenda item on Success for Every Student. This has been a wonderful framework for us to have a plan and a long-term vision of where the school system needs to go. I think that has been enormously helpful for the school system in managing itself but also in saying where we want to go

to the rest of the community. I think now more than ever we need to keep that dialogue and that vision very clear not only among ourselves but among everybody who has a stake in Montgomery County."

Re: THIRD ANNUAL REPORT ON THE  
SYSTEMWIDE OUTCOME MEASURES OF THE  
SUCCESS FOR EVERY STUDENT PLAN

Dr. Vance stated that it would be difficult for him to add much more to the comments made by Ms. Gutierrez. Her comments were an excellent opening to their discussion this morning. It had been more than interesting to him to observe external to Montgomery County the extent to which their Success for Every Student plan had donned seven league boots throughout the state and increasingly throughout the nation. It was amazing how many school systems had "success for every student" as part of their official logo. He had been contacted by other superintendents for contents of the MCPS plan, and superintendents had come to visit.

Dr. Vance was pleased to present their third annual report on the systemwide outcome measures of the plan. In the three years since the adoption of the plan, they had made substantial progress in achieving specific outcome measures. Their students had made steady gains, and there were several examples of exceptional achievement. The achievement levels had gone far above the baseline data for the 1990-91 school year. They had seen marked improvement in nearly all of the 12 outcome measurement categories. In some instances the disparity that existed among racial and ethnic groups had all but disappeared. This progress had been made despite the impact of limited financial resources for instructional improvements and amid the rapid pace of change particularly within their student population.

Dr. Vance commented that they had more ground to cover, and they were not nearly as close as they were going to be. This report signalled to them the fact that they had made an excellent beginning. They needed to cite the facts and the data because the success of their students was unprecedented in the history of the school system. Last year half of all high school students were enrolled in honors or AP courses. This was the highest enrollment ever achieved. A greater number of students took advanced placement tests, and 86 percent scored 3.0 or higher. Among graduating seniors last year, 75 percent took the SAT and continued to achieve the highest results in Maryland and also in the Washington metropolitan area. More than two-thirds of all ninth grade students successfully completed Algebra 1, which was an upgraded and rigorous course. This was the largest percentage ever achieved in the history of MCPS.

Dr. Vance explained that in establishing the 12 outcome measures the Board intended to develop a means to assess progress in meeting the goals of the vision statement approved by the Board in December, 1991. The statement had become the foundation for the actual Success for Every Student Plan adopted in January, 1992. He believed the clear progress reflected in today's report clearly demonstrated that they were steadily moving all of their students towards personal and academic achievement. However, they realized they still had a good ways to go; but the Success for Every Student Plan continued to prove itself an important framework in which students, staff members, administrators, and parents to achieve the kind of success that just a few years ago seemed out of reach to many.

Mrs. Gemberling commented that one of the things the staff was struck by when they prepared today's report was there was probably never going to be an end report. As they prepared it, they tried to consider the fact that it should not be a one-shot picture. At this point they did have enough time and history to set a format to look at trends over time and begin to see the progress that they had made. Most of the data shared in the report did show four-year trends. The exception to that was the last two outcomes which were not in the original plan.

Mrs. Gemberling said that they had a new format for the report because of input from people who had read previous reports. The first part was a narrative, the second part was a summary matrix, the third was a summary of the outcomes, and the last part went outcome by outcome. They had included a statement of a specific outcome, definitions of any terms, and the specific listing of the data, systemwide and school by school.

Today they would give the Board an overview and the total picture. Mrs. Gemberling explained that they were going to try to give the Board a sense of how they had done over time. They were going to look at state and local standards, higher order academic standards (outcomes e through g), issues related to student performance including placement in special education and student suspensions, annual student accountability in terms of the MCPS, and how they used the document in the long-range planning process.

Dr. Phinnize Fisher, associate superintendent, stated that the fundamental state standards formed the basis for the Maryland School Performance Program. They included measures of student attendance, promotion, dropouts, and performance on the four Maryland functional tests required for high school graduation. Outcomes A and B in the plan addressed these state standards. Outcome A looked at county-wide results disaggregated by racial and ethnic group. Outcome B looked at the performance of students in each school, disaggregated by racial and ethnic group. The performance at the local school level was crucial for

their continuous improvement model. Gains in performance at the local level would collectively produce gains at the county level.

Dr. Fisher reported that the local standards contained in Outcomes C and D included students who had been in MCPS schools for two or more years. Their local standards told them how successful their long-term students were in achieving the educational fundamentals defined by the state. In regard to the state functional tests, on the Grade 9 test in mathematics all four ethnic groups met the standard at the satisfactory level. Since the 1990-91 school year the performance of all ethnic groups had improved. Relative to the local standards, the students who had been in MCPS for two years or more showed higher levels of performance. On the state functional reading test, all racial and ethnic groups met the excellent standard. For the students who had been here at least two years, all four groups exceeded the excellence and were indistinguishable on the graph. On the Maryland writing test, all four groups met the satisfactory standard and were difficult to distinguish. On the local test, they saw continuous progress since the baseline year, and all groups were performing at a uniformly high level. On the Maryland test of citizenship skills, three of the racial and ethnic groups were now meeting the standard. While Hispanic students had made extensive progress, they had not yet met the target. On the local standard, all students in MCPS for two or more years met the standard. This demonstrated that students in MCPS for two or more years had a better grasp of these fundamentals.

Dr. Elfreda Massie, associate superintendent, explained that Success for Every Student went beyond fundamental expectations for students. Outcomes E through G formed the basis of the higher order academic standards established for high school students. Significant gains had been made in percentage of students completing Algebra 1, the percent enrolled in honors, and student performance on the SAT and PSAT. The results were because of programs in OIPD and the staff training of thousands of teachers particularly at the elementary level. It was also the result of students who had worked to prepare themselves for the competitive world and the result of the work of school principals, teachers, and their staffs.

Outcome E was the successful completion of Algebra 1 which was critical to student participation and success in higher level science and math courses and in being prepared for the SAT. The percentage of ninth grade students completing Algebra 1 had increased from 60.4 percent to 69.2 percent since the 1990-91 school year. The highest rate of change for completion of Algebra 1 was by African American students.

Outcome F was the continued improvement in the percentage of high school students participating in honors and AP courses systemwide

and among all racial and ethnic groups. As Dr. Vance had mentioned, 51 percent of MCPS high school students were enrolled in at least one honors courses. The highest rate of change was African-American students followed by Hispanic, white, and Asian American students. They also increased in the overall number of advanced placement tests taken. Last year 2,570 took the exams, an increase of 10 percent over the year before. College credit was given for high school course work when a scores of 3, 4, or 5 were achieved. MCPS students received an average of 3.62 on a 5 point scale. Increases were also made among racial and ethnic groups. In spite of increased numbers taking the tests, MCPS not only performed as well as their counterparts but also performed higher than all other racial groups nationally. The lowest scores in Montgomery County were higher than highest scores of all the students nationally.

Dr. Massie reported that the performance of students taking the SAT and PSAT had continued to be high as described in Outcome G. The system-wide SAT score remained at 992 for the second year in a row compared to 983 three years ago. Of great concern to all were the scores by Hispanic students which had fallen in the last three years. Staff had accelerated efforts to address this decline. By comparison, African-American students retained a score of 822 last year and Asian-American students achieved a total score of 1,040, a 10 point gain from the year before. White students achieved the highest system-wide score of 1,041 in 1993-94, an increase of 5 points last year and a gain of 17 points over the last three years. The percentage of students taking the PSAT was also up and their overall scores had increased from the previous year. All MCPS racial and ethnic groups performed well above the national averages for each group on the PSAT. The PSAT tests were important because students earned scholarships based on their scores.

Dr. Hiawatha Fountain, associate superintendent, stated that they were very encouraged by the improvements they had seen in Outcomes H through J. These outcomes focused on issues related to the suspension of students and the identification of students as learning disabled or seriously emotionally disturbed. Outcome H targeted the elimination of disproportionate suspension rates of African-American and Hispanic students system-wide. The suspension rates had decreased for African-American students which had declined to the lowest level in two years. They were concerned about and continued to work on the rate of suspensions for Hispanic students. This year they saw a decline in the rate of increase for students suspended system-wide among all racial and ethnic groups.

Outcome I targeted the elimination of disproportionate suspension rates for African-American and Hispanic students at each school. The suspension rates continued to improve, and this indicated that the interventions and support put in place were producing

positive results. The number one concern in schools where the suspension rate remained high was fighting. OIPD, OSA, and OSAE worked with those schools to implement services and supports such as conflict resolution and mentoring programs.

Dr. Fountain stated that Outcome J targeted the elimination of disproportionate representation of African-American students as learning disabled or as SED. The data indicated that they were on the right track in addressing this outcome. The percent of students identified as LD among all racial and ethnic groups continued to decrease. Currently less than 1 percent of students were identified as SED. This represented a slight increase in overall identification rates, but the percent of African-American students identified was decreasing. This downward trend reflected a good response to system-wide strategic planning and intervention. They were very encouraged by the progress being made in Outcomes H through J. However, the disproportionate representation of African-American students as SED was a complex problem in schools both nationally and locally. MCPS had coordinated major initiatives to eliminate the disproportionate representation, and the Board would receive a detailed update on this information on January 10, 1995.

Dr. Joseph Villani, associate superintendent, commented that the academic assessment program, which Outcomes K and L reported on, was at the core of accountability and school improvement efforts. These were new outcome measures, and this past year's data would serve as a baseline for measuring student success. This would give them a tool to assess individual student progress as well as the effectiveness of the instructional program and individual classrooms. As currently planned, the program would give data on an individual student every year from grades 3 through 8 in both math and reading.

Outcome K focused on a system-wide standard for grade level proficiency in reading and math to be met by all racial groups within five years. The standard was that at least 75 percent of all students at each grade level would meet the individual grade level proficiency standard in both subjects, and this was a very tough standard. For this past year, the percentage of students meeting the math proficiency standard ranged from 86 percent in Grade 3 to 53 percent in Grade 8. Their program and training efforts in early childhood education and in math content connections in the earlier years seemed to be producing results in the lower grades. They expected these improvements to continue into the upper grades as they progressed away from the baseline year. When looked at by race, the levels of proficiency showed similar variations from Grade 3 to Grade 8 and showed differences in achievement levels among the four racial categories. Their goal was to have all four racial categories meet the standards within five years.

Dr. Villani reported that the reading scores were much more constant across grade levels, but no grade level met the system proficiency standard of 75 percent. Disaggregation of reading proficiency levels by race gave a picture similar to that seen in math, congruence with the total group but differences among racial categories. Although these results were baseline data, they were far from the results they wanted to see. These were clear targets for improvement in order to meet the expectations stated in Outcome K.

Outcome L set a similar standard for each school. At least 75 percent of students in each racial category would achieve a proficient level in math and reading. The standard for success in this outcome was 100 percent. They expected every elementary school and every middle school in Montgomery County to have at least 75 percent of its students in each racial category score above the proficiency level in both math and reading. The school-by-school data was in today's report. For this baseline year the percentage of schools meeting the standard in math varied widely by grade level and by race. In reading, the results were relatively consistent across grade levels and varied sharply by racial groups. The graphs in the report reflected the difficult task ahead so that they could meet the expectations of Outcome L, but they had put into place an academic assessment program which would give them data every year on every student between early childhood and high school.

Mr. Larry Bowers, chief financial officer, explained that Success for Every Student had been an integral part of every operating budget document prepared since March, 1992. They had included the Board's vision statement and goals, and they had included the operating budget requests for resources to focus on improved teaching and learning. Although the county's fiscal situation had limited their ability to provide new funding, FY 1995 included some additional funds to address areas of critical need identified by the Board in March of 1993. These included additional funds for staff training, early childhood education, resources to provide equitable educational opportunities throughout the county, support for initiatives at the high school level to implement special programs, and salary increases for employees.

Mr. Bowers stated that more important than the additional resources were the steps they had taken to realign financial resources to address the immediate and long-term requirements of the Success for Every Student plan. For example, there had been a major shift in the focus of staff development from a model based on individual choice to a comprehensive initiative that included all staff. To do this, the staff development resources were redirected from centralized training efforts to individual school allocations and support designed to meet the training needs of school staff in reaching Success for Every Student



outcomes. A second example was the establishment of the Success for Every Student special projects team that was created as part of the Board's plan to restructure the central and area offices. This team provided flexibility for the Office of Instruction and Program Development to address priority areas such as mathematics and reading/language arts. A third example of realignments to address the Success for Every Student plan is the newly structured Division of Early Childhood Services. This division allowed staff to provide for coordination, collaboration, and cooperation of the many on-going early childhood programs and services, both within MCPS and between MCPS and other agencies. The Success for Every Student plan, the Early Childhood Education Policy, and comprehensive planning for staff development were just a few examples of their longer range perspective on policy and strategic planning issues. They represented the more systematic thinking and problem solving techniques of strategies that had been applied to address significant issues facing the school system. This process had allowed the Board to focus more of its time on the strategic evaluation and discussion of issues, recommendations, and choices. Finally, the Success for Every Student plan which was updated by the Board in April incorporated the recommendations of the Corporate Partnership to ensure continuous improvement on school system processes, services, products, and customer satisfaction. These efforts would help units throughout MCPS to address the goal of creating a positive work environment in a self-renewing organization.

Mrs. Gemberling remarked that Success for Every Student was a strategic planning process. Neither the document nor the report told it all. It was really about the commitment they had. She had had a meeting with another school system where the question was raised as to why MCPS would have added these new outcomes when they did not have to. She thought that nothing was as illustrative of the commitment behind this planning process as the addition of the new outcomes.

It was clear to them that they would be able to achieve the fundamental standards. To really achieve the higher academic standards they had to have in place a process by which they could clearly delineate what they expected students to know and be able to do and clearly measure one student at a time year by year and be able to identify where they needed to focus their attention. The data gave them the information they needed to make better decisions for their students. She was not surprised by the data on the first round of the CRTs. They knew what the data would reveal, but they needed that kind of information to correct and improve the results. Mrs. Gemberling thanked that Board for the one thing that amazed other superintendents -- a Board committed to one plan for more than a year.

Mrs. Gordon thanked staff for an excellent presentation. Mr. Felton added his thanks. He thought that it was important to

show trends. He was concerned about a couple of areas and wondered why so few gains had been made for Hispanics and African Americans in some of the outcomes.

Mrs. Gemberling replied that they did have significant gains in some areas and not in others. The areas where they did not show a closing of the gap were particularly in those areas where the assessment did not have a ceiling. If they looked at things where no one was at the top, the outcomes said they would increase the performance of African American and Hispanic students. It did not say they would close the gap. They knew that if they were going to improve the achievement, other students were going to improve their achievement as well when they did not have ceiling-type assessment results. They had to concentrate on initiatives to have an accelerated increase with African American and Hispanic students.

Mrs. Gemberling stated that they had looked at the slow decline in Hispanic scores on the SATs. If it had been a single blip, they would not have been as concerned. However, it was a steady decline. They had gathered specific data to see whether new programs had to be created. They did not need new programs. They had to get more of the African American and Hispanic students participating in existing programs. They had taken specific initiatives around the SAT preparation classes. However, an SAT prep program could only help a student with the testing mechanisms. The real issue was what course work the student had taken. For that reason, they were really pushing for algebra as that gateway course. This coming school year for the first time they would not have an introduction to algebra course. Those students who had passed the Maryland Functional Test in Grade 8 would enroll in algebra in Grade 9. MCPS would provide the option of a second support period. The data revealed that in the past five years students taking double-period algebra in Grade 9 did better than students who took intro to algebra in Grade 9 and algebra in Grade 10. Clearly algebra was the gateway to more advanced work. The same kind of approach was being used in looking at honors programs across the board. Students had to have the content to perform well the more challenging tests.

Mrs. Gemberling pointed out that when they were able to get students into the programs and into the courses, they did not have disparity in performance. When they looked at students taking the same courses and the same exam across the nation and compared racial data, all MCPS students were significantly higher. The programs were there in MCPS, but the issue was getting more students into the programs. Staff had met with the Hispanic leadership and the Hispanic community for suggestions on how to increase communication with parents. They had put some initiatives in place and planned to have some additional efforts.

Dr. Villani added that they had worked with some principals in six high schools, focusing on schools where they detected drops in SAT scores of Hispanic students. They wanted to provide some incentives to get students to enroll in the SAT prep program. Staff was currently tracking the SAT results of students who had enrolled in the prep program to determine how effective the MCPS program was in improving scores. He thought that the real key was in Outcomes K and L because they would give MCPS the opportunity to track students from their earliest years. If students were not proficient in math and reading, staff could target resources and hold teachers and principals accountable for progress or lack of progress.

Dr. Vance recalled that one of the major concerns the community had when they had initially developed Success for Every Student was that it was a strategic plan pinpointing African American and Hispanic youngsters. Staff had made every effort to show that it had much broader implications for every student in MCPS. They would see this as they looked at the individual data on students across the county, but it also exacerbated efforts to closing the gap for Hispanic and African American students. He said that when they looked at the data it was absolutely amazing. If they looked at the SAT scores for the average white youngster, it was amazing. That score was 1041, and he asked what school system could say they had broadened the base, had more youngsters taking the SATs, and their average was 1041. However, they had to be able to do the same thing for Hispanic and African American youngsters.

Mrs. King noted that for Outcome E African Americans increased by 26.9 percent and Hispanics increased by 16.4, and she asked what they were expecting for next year and whether they would keep improving at that rate. Dr. Villani replied that next year their expectation was that all students would pass the Maryland Functional Mathematics test, would be in Algebra 1, and would complete it successfully. He hoped that there would be a very sharp jump in all of those areas.

Mrs. King said that on the seventh grade math CRTs, six schools reported that less than half their students met the criteria and only four schools had more than 70 percent of their students meeting the criteria. She asked whether they had any special plans to change that. Dr. Villani replied that as schools developed their school improvement management plan they had to address their CRT scores. They had already done a round of training with every school. Dr. Fisher added that the directors meet directly with principals and reviewed all of the data related to SATs and programs for Hispanic and African American youngsters. For CRTs, they met individually with principals to show them how to analyze their data, how to prioritize their information, and how to determine what should be a focus in their management plans. The directors were in the schools and were

monitoring the progress and were meeting with Dr. Villani's people to determine what programs were needed. They moved from the individual student, to grade level, and to the entire school to determine the focus.

Dr. Vance commented that one of the issues they were going to have to face in the future was the question of what they were going to mandate for all of their students and the impact that would have on electives. Two years ago, white and Asian youngsters were taking Algebra 1 in Grade 9, and African American youngsters took it in Grades 10, 11, or 12. This had an impact on college selection, SAT scores, PSAT scores, and eligibility for scholarships. This also showed them what electives youngsters were taking.

Mr. Abrams knew that the SAT and PSAT scoring formats was changing, and he asked whether any of this was reflected in the data before the Board. Mrs. Gemberling replied that new format would be in place in the coming year, and the recentering would come the year after that.

Mr. Abrams asked if they were able to disaggregate the data on the suspension rate and show where it was mandatory in terms of policies and how those numbers traced out. Mrs. Gemberling said that last fall they had done a presentation to the Board on the four major categories that accounted for more than two-thirds of the suspensions. These included fighting, disrespect and insubordination, failure to cooperate with school rules, and weapons. They acknowledged that the middle two were soft categories and depended on judgments. The racial rate had improved in those two categories, and there was no difference among the races. In the category of fighting, a large disparity remained. This was also the category in which they had the largest number of suspensions. They had met with principals of schools having large numbers in the "soft" categories and asked them how they would handle these if they were not permitted to suspend and what alternatives they might use. These principals submitted individual plans and suggestions for alternatives, and a couple of plans had been underwritten. Mrs. Gemberling said they would next determine if there were alternatives in addition to conflict resolution training to end fighting. There was no question that the spill over of societal violence was the biggest factor in suspensions in the schools.

Mr. Abrams said he was trying to reconcile this report with what they heard about MCPS graduates attending Montgomery College in terms of their ability to perform at a college level particularly in the area of reading skills. Dr. Villani replied that the College had purchased an assessment program it gave each incoming student who had not scored 1,000 on the SAT. These students were placed in their remedial/diagnostic program. The program was a test which self-adjusted as the student took the test so that the

questions would become easier and easier until the student could answer them. The College had offered to share that program with MCPS, and staff was working with several high schools to pilot test that program so schools could use it as a diagnostic tool. Dr. Villani said they were recommending that principals use this with ninth or tenth graders as a part of the college planning process. This would give students a picture of where they stood with expectations for college. He had personally taken the test, and he thought it was a very difficult test.

Mr. Abrams thought that something along the lines of this diagnostic tool might help enrich the Success for Every Student plan. He kept hearing about the average student and the relevance of this program to the average student. When they had issues such as the Montgomery College one, he would be curious as to the outcomes of those discussions on the diagnostics.

Dr. Cheung thanked the staff for coming up with a good report especially regarding the positive outcomes. He thought that this report as compared with the previous report was a fantastic improvement. He was interested in looking at individual students. They had 10 percent of their students scoring at the top on the SAT and at the lower end 10 percent got poor scores. When they averaged these scores, it came to 1041. This meant that a lot of students were not doing well. Therefore, they needed to look at individual student performance before and after. They needed to measure the improvements for that individual student which would change the delta of the individual student. This would give them a truer reflection of changes in performance.

Dr. Cheung said that better data and better information would help them in terms of planning. This would also give them better management and accountability. Their information was limited by the measures and outcomes they had defined in their goals. There were other measures that the Board and system had not included in the plan in terms of assessing the individual student. For example, they had not assessed the creativity of students and their strategic thinking. In the information society in order to be competitive, students needed strategic thinking. Dr. Villani replied that their latest trends in training teachers were around strategic learning because students had to learn how they learned and not just learn. All of the program development in OIPD was in the mode of strategic-based learning. They had not developed a way to measure this; however, they were developing their own performance assessment to go hand-in-hand with the CRTs. He thought it would be useful for the Board to see a presentation on open-ended testing. Dr. Cheung commented that as more and more people had access to educational software, they were learning how to learn on a strategic basis which would give them an advantage over others without the access to the software.

Ms. Gutierrez thought that the presentation was a fantastic one. She said it was a major step they had taken because although they had had the data and facts before, this time they had gone into the marriage of those facts with policy and planning. It was clear from the document that they were not just looking at data and then reacting to it. It was part of a systematic plan that had goals and policy implications.

Ms. Gutierrez commented that the problem was that the more they knew, the more they wanted to know. She thought that the looking at trends was good, but they were somewhat short. She knew there was data on some of these parameters that went further back. She had in her computer a comparison of 1980 through 1990 SAT scores. She suggested that the document including a supplement showing longer term trends. In the area where she had been focusing, she would say that the trend was either stagnant or negative in the Hispanic and African American scores.

It seemed to Ms. Gutierrez that the real benefit to the Board was that this information would help clarify their priorities and to make sure that the plan got reflected in their decisions in budget, staffing and hiring, and programs. This was the advantage of having a more integrated approach. However, they now had a picture, and the question was what were they doing about it. It seemed to her that it was key for the Board to set some goals and a timeframe to meet them. They had looked at seven schools and could now project how many students they expected to take Algebra 1. If they established this as a target, they could measure against that. This added a level of more precise managing and planning and would aid in making them more accountable. This had been a significant theme with parents and the community. They now had goals, and they had to think about how they did this more at the school and student level because this was the only place where they would make a difference.

Ms. Gutierrez thought they needed to use the management plans more effectively to project where they wanted to go and to inform the community of what they were doing about an issue which was unique to a school. She was struck by the incredible variability in achievement among racial groups in the early grades. The SATs were based on previous courses taken by students. Algebra 1 was an indicator, but even before students got to that course, it was clear to her that some students were not going to pass that functional test and were not going to be in Algebra 1. She would put almost all the energy in those lower grades because that was where she saw them running out of time.

Ms. Gutierrez commented that as she looked at the possibilities to use this data, she noted a chart showing the level of participation school-by-school in the math CRT. Some schools showed 64 percent and others had 100 percent. This was an

immediate indicator for the directors who were monitoring this. If they said to all schools they expected at least an increase to 75 percent of participation, they would be pulling schools to a higher standard. She thought that the use of management plans linked to the indicators was a strong way for them to make progress and to report on that progress.

It seemed to Mr. Ewing that this was a remarkably helpful document which showed that the school system, unlike the perception one would hear from many people, was making remarkable strides for students. This was clearly reflected in the data and in the trends, and this was an answer to those who said that MCPS was deteriorating. It was not. The reverse was true, and they needed to make that message come clearer. He thought that this document would help in that regard.

Mr. Ewing suggested that they continue to emphasize the dual focus of the Success for Every Student plan. There was still a widely held perception that the Success for Every Student plan was aimed at meeting the needs of minority students, particularly those who were not performing very well. The plan did this, but it had much broader purposes as well. The public needed to understand this. The document helped them because it revealed some specific areas of weakness. It pointed them to these as areas requiring attention. These were not new to the Board. He had been on the Board a long time, and he knew that superintendents came and went but so did plans. However, this plan had lasted a number of years. He thought it had great merit, but they had to recognize that the issues were not met. They had simply defined them better and revealed them more fully. They had still not explained to the satisfaction of Hispanic and African American students and their parents why it was that the results were what they were. Nor did they know for certain what it was that they needed to do. Nor did they know for certain whether certain interventions worked and under what conditions and for whom. Those questions remained to be answered.

Mr. Ewing said he had been reading school management improvement plans. These were fascinating documents. Some of them were truly excellent blueprints for the future. Others were oblivious to the problems in the school. He thought those plans were an important vehicle because there was where they ought to have specific interventions described that dealt with specific local circumstances revealed through this report and other data. They could then say to the schools that they wanted to find out in collaboration with them, what it was that schools did that worked and for which students under what conditions. These were not easy questions to answer, but this was essential if they were going to go beyond where they stood. They had increased their knowledge of how students were doing, and now they needed to be much clearer about how they went about assessing the results of

the actions they took based on that knowledge. This was the point that Ms. Gutierrez was making.

In regard to the question of expectations, Mr. Ewing said it was important to be engaged in a constant revision and update of their goals and expectations for students. He thought they could expect students to do better, but the Board needed to know what those expectations were and needed to be a participant in setting the goals incorporating those expectations. He thought they had come a long way, but there was still a great deal to be done.

Mr. Ewing indicated that he had some questions about what the CRT standards really meant at this juncture. For example, at the Grade 3 level the students seemed to be doing well. Did this mean that they had set the standard too low for third grade and too high at other grades? Did it mean that their early childhood education was paying off? Or were there other explanations? He would be interested in knowing the staff's view of this. It was his belief that because of their investment in early childhood education, they were doing better with younger children. Then they had the older students who were not as well prepared as the third graders. This suggested an intervention strategy if this were true. This was the sort of question the Board needed to discuss and be informed about if the Board were going to make good decisions in the future.

Mr. Ewing thought that the Board was on the right track, but they needed to take those next steps and turn the school improvement plans into true efforts to put in place the interventions that were going to be effective and to measure their outcomes. They needed to understand the whole process of measurement more fully, both in terms of the measures used and in terms of what they were measuring and why. He noted that their students did not do as well as they would hope on the Maryland Citizenship Test. One could argue that it was a dumb test. If they concluded this, they should make strenuous efforts with the state to revise that test. If they were not preparing students well enough for this test or if there were other explanations, the Board needed to know about this. He hoped that they could have some further discussion of this particular subject.

Mrs. Gordon thanked staff for an excellent report and expressed her appreciation for the people in the schools doing their jobs every single day. The Board and central office staff were committed to the plan, and employees in the schools were committed to wanting students to be successful. They had a long way to go, but they had made progress.

Re: CLOSED SESSION

Mrs. Gordon announced that the Board had recessed for lunch and a closed session from 12:10 p.m. to 2:25 p.m.



## Re: PUBLIC COMMENTS

The following individuals appeared before the Board:

1. Bernadette Pickett
2. Santiago Sandoval
3. Ellen Green
4. Joan Karasik
5. Kandie Zitelman
6. Dorothy Hearn
7. Claire Funkhouser
8. Richard D. Brown
9. John Hoven
10. Phyllis Parks-Robinson, MCEA

RESOLUTION NO. 818-94      Re: UTILIZATION OF FY 1995 FUTURE  
SUPPORTED PROJECT FUNDS FOR THE  
CHALLENGE GRANT PROGRAM

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Ms. Gutierrez seconded by Dr. Cheung, the following resolution was adopted unanimously:

Resolved, That the superintendent of schools be authorized to receive and expend within the FY 1995 Provision for Future Supported Projects, a grant award of \$2,000,000 from the Maryland State Department of Education (MSDE), under the state Challenge Schools Program for the third year of the Challenge Grant Program in the Wheaton cluster, in the following categories:

	<u>Category</u>	<u>Positions*</u>	<u>Amount</u>
02	Instructional Salaries	3.9	\$ 808,860
03	Other Instructional Costs		<u>1,191,140</u>
	TOTAL	3.9	\$2,000,000

\* 2.9 Teachers, A-D (10-month)  
1.0 Financial Assistant, 13 (12-month)

and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of the resolution be transmitted to the county executive and the County Council.

RESOLUTION NO. 819-94      Re: PROCUREMENT CONTRACTS MORE THAN  
\$25,000

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Ms. Gutierrez seconded by Mr. Abrams, the following resolution was adopted unanimously:

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:

PG CBE 26-95	Trencher with Trailer and Backhoe for the Division of Maintenance <u>Awardee</u> Suit and Wells Equipment Company, Inc.	\$	45,286
37-92	Supply and Deliver of Hardware Items - Extension <u>Awardee</u> MSF County Services Company	\$	74,000
120-94	Computer Supplies for Schools and Offices <u>Awardees</u> Budget Stationery Egghead Software B. T. Ginns Office Products, Inc. GRRASP, Inc. Innovative Technologies, Inc. International Business Supplies Corp. Landon Systems Corporation Matrix Data Corporation MicroWarehouse, Inc. Network Communications Technology, Inc. Potomac Enterprises Virginia Impression Products Wordex Corporation Richard Young Products TOTAL	\$	237 * 559 127 2,884 * 34,489 39,460 8,033 1,120 * 2,020 750 * 3,451 * 622 13,105 5,155 112,012
110-95	Aftermarket Automotive Parts <u>Awardees</u> Arrow Auto Parts Automotive Equipment Company, Inc. County Engine Shop D & L Truck and Bus Parts, Inc. District International Trucks, Inc. Ditch, Bowers and Taylor, Inc. Fitzgerald Auto Mall, Inc. General Fleet Service Company H & H Automotive Parts Warehouse Hi-Gear Tier and Auto Supply, Inc. Jasper Engines and Transmissions K & M Supply, Inc. Northern Virginia Supply, Inc. Ourisman's Rockmont Chevrolet-Geo Patco Distributors, Inc.	\$	20,000 1,429 15,000 14,000 * 167,500 13,100 * 57,000 20,000 47,620 4,858 10,000 116,500 84,833 14,250 30,000 *

	Quality Automotive Warehouse, Inc.	17,146
	R & S Auto and Truck Spring Works, Inc.	13,500
	Rockville Radiator Shop	30,000 *
	Rosedale Auto Electric and Parts, Inc.	14,000
	School Bus Parts Company	13,429
	Vehicle Maintenance Program, Inc.	44,667 *
	Virginia Spring and Alignment, Inc.	<u>2,000</u>
	TOTAL	\$ 750,832
112-95	Cafeteria Disposable Supplies	
	<u>Awardees</u>	
	Acme Paper and Supply Company	\$ 142,317
	C & K Manufacturing and Sales Company	14,113
	Calico Industries, Inc.	4,954
	S. Freedman and Sons, Inc.	41,146
	Joseph Gartland, Inc.	338
	J & K Distributors, Inc.	217 *
	Kahn Paper Company, Inc.	160,519
	Marstan Industries, Inc.	67,062
	Saf-T-Gard International, Inc.	<u>498</u>
	TOTAL	\$ 431,164
114-95	Roofing Supplies	
	<u>Awardees</u>	
	R.E. Michel Company	\$ 17,763
	The Roof Center, Inc.	<u>109,774</u>
	TOTAL	\$ 127,537
116-95	Safety Supplies and Equipment	
	<u>Awardees</u>	
	ABRAMSCO-Herbert Abrams Company, Inc.	\$ 36,466
	Baltimore Washington Insulation, Inc.	23,821
	Carey Machinery and Supply Co., Inc.	4,070
	Commercial Wiping Cloth, Inc.	
	T/A Industrial Product Supply	673 *
	Grainger, Inc.	20,418
	Greenwald Industrial Products	11,700
	Mine Safety Appliances Company	26,627
	Protective Glove Company	500
	Safeware, Inc.	10,900
	Vallen Safety Supply Company	<u>160,606</u>
	TOTAL	\$ 295,781
222-95	Elementary Mathematics Supplies	
	<u>Awardees</u>	
	Delta Education, Inc.	\$ 1,676
	Educational Teaching Aids	14,156
	J. L. Hammett Company	1,449
	Nasco	<u>11,937</u>
	TOTAL	\$ 29,218
	MORE THAN \$25,000	\$1,865,830

\*Denotes MFD Vendors







and be it further

Resolved, That the county executive be requested to recommend approval of these actions to the County Council.

RESOLUTION NO. 824-94 Re: PERSONNEL MONTHLY REPORT

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Mr. Abrams seconded by Mr. Felton, the following resolution was adopted unanimously:

Resolved, That the following appointments, resignations, and leaves of absence for professional and supporting services personnel be approved: (TO BE APPENDED TO THESE MINUTES)

RESOLUTION NO. 825-94 Re: EXTENSION OF SICK LEAVE

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Mr. Abrams seconded by Mr. Felton, the following resolution was adopted unanimously:

WHEREAS, The employee listed below has suffered serious illness; and

WHEREAS, Due to the prolonged illness, the employee's accumulated sick leave has expired; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the members of the Board of Education grant an extension of sick leave with three-fourths pay covering the number of days indicated:

<u>Name</u>	<u>Position and Location</u>	<u>No. of Days</u>
Welch, Karen	Bus Operator Division of Transportation	20

RESOLUTION NO. 826-94 Re: DEATH OF MRS. RENEE W. RICHMAN,  
ENGLISH COMPOSITION ASSISTANT AND  
MEDIA ASSISTANT AT JOHN F. KENNEDY  
HIGH SCHOOL

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Mr. Abrams seconded by Mr. Felton, the following resolution was adopted unanimously:

WHEREAS, The death on November 23, 1994, of Mrs. Renee W. Richman, an English composition assistant and media assistant at John F. Kennedy High School, has deeply saddened the staff and members of the Board of Education; and





Resolved, That the following personnel appointment be approved:

<u>Appointment</u>	<u>Present Position</u>	<u>As</u>
John M. Burley	Principal Captain James E. Daly ES	Principal Gaithersburg MS #2 Effective: 2-1-95

RESOLUTION NO. 829-94 Re: PERSONNEL APPOINTMENT

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Mr. Abrams seconded by Mr. Felton, the following resolution was adopted unanimously:

Resolved, That the following personnel appointment be approved:

<u>Appointment</u>	<u>Present Position</u>	<u>As</u>
Jerome E. Lynch	Principal John T. Baker MS	Principal Damascus MS #2 Effective: 2-1-95

Re: SCHOOL CALENDAR FOR 1995-96

Mr. Ewing moved and Dr. Cheung seconded the following:

WHEREAS, The establishment of school terms by the County Board of Education is required by state law; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the proposed school calendar for 1995-96 be adopted.

RESOLUTION NO. 830-94 Re: DEFERRAL OF SCHOOL CALENDAR FOR 1995-96

On motion of Mr. Abrams seconded by Mr. Felton, the following resolution was adopted with Mr. Abrams, Dr. Cheung, Ms. Converse, Mr. Ewing, Mr. Felton, and Ms. Gutierrez voting in the affirmative; Mrs. Gordon and Mrs. King voting in the negative:

Resolved, That the Board of Education defer consideration of the proposed school calendar for 1995-96 until the next business meeting when staff would provide additional information.

Re: DEMONSTRATION OF SCHOOL-BASED  
INSTRUCTIONAL MONITORING SYSTEM  
(SIMS) 2.0

Dr. Vance explained that they would present a demonstration of the expansion of SIMS. The SIMS project was now fully implemented in schools, and as a result MCPS had a base of users who were now demanding increased capabilities to monitor student

progress. As they provided increased staff access to technology through the global access plan, they were using school-based and central office staff input to develop SIMS 2.0. Today Dr. Villani and staff would demonstrate the prototype which would be implemented in the seven global access schools this year.

Dr. Villani introduced Ms. Deva Garel, acting director of the Division of Instructional Technology; Mr. Allan Kamara, application specialist in the Division of Instructional Technology; and Ms. Lani Seikaly, director of the Department of Educational Media and Technology. SIMS 2.0 marked a transition from the original SIMS which was a valuable tool to a FOXPRO-based application which permitted them to change any portion of the information accessed without changing the whole database.

Mr. Kamara explained that the system was developed with a lot of input from principals, teachers, and staff. FOXPRO allowed a menu-driven system, and he demonstrated some of the menus. Under "student information" they had the student database which allowed them to access information from several different sources from one screen.

Ms. Garel stated that they were developing a way to deliver increased functionality for monitoring student data. The screens that had been created allowed staff to view information on one screen that previously required opening and viewing more than one file. Throughout the screens, the Board members would see data that would help staff monitor individual student progress as well as allowing the schools to monitor their implementation of the Success for Every Student plan. This provided data such as a "completion of Algebra 1" indicator, honors enrollment, and attendance. On the testing screen they had data from functional tests, CRTs, and SATs. The program also contained basic biographical information which allowed the school to continue to monitor data. Schools could search and locate information on any of the categories. On the SAT screen, schools could monitor which students who had not taken the test as well as student scores. In the courses file, staff now had the additional ability to see a course history screen to track progress in courses previously completed. On the math screen, they could look at data which would impact a student's success and progress.

Ms. Garel explained that the data available to staff formed a student profile that could be augmented with individual student work. On the student portfolio screen, student art work and written work could be stored and viewed. In addition, they had a suspension screen where they could display information about a suspension including the incident that caused the suspension as well as the disposition.

Mr. Kamara stated that they wanted to gather information on attendance, period by period. Their main goal was to cut down on

paperwork and the amount of time a teacher had to spend on entering information. Now a teacher could find the period and the class roster, and by double clicking the student could be registered as absent. The teacher also had the ability to check the attendance from prior days. The information then went to the attendance secretary who updated the information for medical and personal reasons.

Ms. Garel remarked that they had a number of analytical reports created in the SIMS 2.0 system. In honors reporting, staff could see on one screen data broken down by gender and race. As the database was updated, that data would be reflected in the statistics on the screen. For attendance data for the school, they had information broken out by groups as well as for the entire school. The suspension data could be analyzed by race. The screen showed numbers in different colors to point out where there might be problems.

Mr. Kamara commented that a teacher had said that if they could cut down on the amount of time it took to enter interim information by the teacher, they could get teachers to use this system. Therefore, they built a screen where a teacher could enter information and then look at fields for tests and quizzes, homework, classwork, or projects. The teacher could enter an interim grade and written information. This would allow for a unified interim letter to the parent, and the computer had the ability to print these letters in several languages depending on the ESOL indicator and country of origin of the student.

Dr. Cheung complimented the staff for the development of the individual student profile because he had been pushing for this. He was pleased to see the beginnings of a very good profile. Last week staff had invited him to review the profile, and he had spent several hours doing just that. The purpose of this was to help students learn and achieve. They had to design a profile system that was user friendly because teachers would not use it unless they were comfortable with it. He thought that SIMS 2.0 was a good system, and he thought that eventually this should be interactive between schools. He thought they needed alerts to let them know how the child fit into a range of scores. When reports went to the parents, it would be nice to know how the child had progressed.

Dr. Cheung felt that this should not be limited just to the seven pilot schools. He thought that other staff and teachers should be encouraged to work with disks for improvement and communication and to make suggestions for better information. He thought that parents should be involved as well to get their suggestions.

Ms. Converse congratulated staff especially in the areas dealing with reducing paperwork. The paper stated that this was a pilot,

and she wondered whether it was currently in use. Staff replied that it was in the seven pilot schools, but the original SIMS would be in every school by the end of the year.

Mr. Abrams asked whether they had any sense of how much data time a instructor would need to use this system. Mr. Kamara replied that it just took a minute to indicate the students who were absent. Mr. Abrams said it looked like this was almost geared up to report card generation. He wondered how wedded to the instrument the teacher would be and how this fit timewise into the context of the classroom and other activities. Dr. Villani replied that one of the strengths of the program was that it utilized current data. Most of the information they saw on the screen was already in their computers somewhere. This took existing databases, put them in relationship to each other, and permitted staff to draw from them when they needed the information. For example, when report card grades were entered into the computer, that portion of the database would change and the individual student profile screen would change. Teachers did not have to enter that data themselves.

In regard to interims, Ms. Seikaly reported that one principal had told her his school was using computerized interims and about the amount of staff time that saved. On the attendance side, they had teachers "bubbling" in sheets that had to be hand carried to the office every morning to do attendance. She could not help but think that this on-line application would have to be a savings in time.

Mr. Abrams said he was raising a question about the discipline required to use this technology. They had marvelous systems, but they had to change the culture of people who had not been using them. He asked about the cultural response to the system. Ms. Seikaly replied that this was so new there had not been a response to it. The data had been entered at Springbrook, and they were in the process of training the administrative team. They did not have this in every classroom, so they did not have a test of this yet. They would keep the Board posted.

Ms. Gutierrez said it was not quite clear to her where they were with this. She asked whether it was being used at the sites. Ms. Seikaly replied that it was in its infancy. It had been downloaded at Springbrook and Clemente, and Eastern had it on a stand-alone computer.

It seemed to Ms. Gutierrez to have a preplanned application approach which she had always objected to. They were predesigning and anticipating that people were going to look at the data in a certain way. The first SIMS was flexible and permitted innovation and comparison of data very easily by any user. The new SIMS was an application for all seasons, and there was a problem with this if they did not clearly modularize it or

focus on what they wanted to achieve. They were mixing student profiles and teacher productivity and on principal management and assessment and performance. They had pieces of all this, but she did not see a real clear overall concept of what they wanted the primary purpose of this to be.

Ms. Gutierrez thought that the operational concept of this was somewhat confusing. It seemed to her they would want to have it in every classroom, but this was primarily a Windows-DOS-based system. There seemed to be a requirement that the operational function would come back to a centralized office for a person to produce the interims. This seemed closer to an administrative use rather than letting everyone have access. If everyone had access, they would have a configuration management nightmare as to what was the latest and correct data. She wondered how often they would be updating from the mainframe and how they would keep track of that. She saw a mélange of operational processes that they put together. She asked how it fit with teacher productivity models. She asked whether they were concentrating on attendance or building a system that truly empowered teachers. She asked about the scope of SIMS 2.0 and where it began and ended.

Ms. Seikaly replied that they wanted to do everything Ms. Gutierrez had said, but they could only tackle one piece at a time. They did not want to lose the ad hoc features of SIMS 1.0, and they had not lost them. However, they were using a relational database which was a more sophisticated application. It did mean that the ad hoc was not as user friendly as before. They were looking to empowering teachers, and they did not think there was an end to SIMS. They wanted to start with some applications that teachers had asked for, and they wanted teachers to help create applications. It seemed to Ms. Gutierrez that SIMS might not be able to do all of this, and they might think about a teacher productivity package.

Dr. Cheung pointed out that Ms. Gutierrez was a systems engineer, but she had always emphasized a customer focus. He thought that SIMS 2.0 was focused on the student, and if they had student data they could build up in terms of communications. If MCPS had a good comprehensive database, they could get all kind of information for planning and accountability. He thought they needed to look at this from a systems approach during its development, and he agreed that this could not be free standing because they needed the interaction. He believed that this would save a lot of manual work and would truly become interactive. Dr. Cheung commented that he now worked in a paperless workplace, and he would share information about this.

Mr. Felton asked about security safeguards to protect the data. Ms. Garel replied that they had a wide-area network committee setting standards for MCPS, and their subcommittee was a security

committee that would be looking at types of data and who should have access to those data. Ms. Seikaly added that staff must have passwords to use the material, and each password had a certain kind of clearance.

Mrs. King thought that this was exciting, and she related that she had had the opportunity to get her own tour of SIMS. She asked whether or not they would be able to look at the math skills of a group of students, determine their deficiencies, and identify who their teacher had been in the prior year. Ms. Seikaly replied that they could do this now with SIMS 1.0. Dr. Villani invited other Board members to call him for a session of hands-on time with the system. Mrs. Gordon thanked staff members for their presentation.

Re: REPORTING ON STUDENT PROGRESS IN  
MATHEMATICS

Mrs. Gordon recalled that this item was presented to the Board as an item of information. Dr. Vance stated that the MCPS elementary mathematics program was still unique in that it includes a built-in assessment system. The instructional system in mathematics (ISM) was designed to provide teachers and administrators with information on student achievement. Recently parents had requested copies of those reports of their children's performance to help identify area for additional support. Unfortunately the ISM reports were designed for teachers and presented some problems with interpretation by some parents. He had asked staff to find a way to provide this information in a concise and clear way.

Dr. Villani introduced Dr. Cindy Sullivan, director of the Department of Academic Programs; Mrs. Vera Torrence, coordinator of elementary mathematics; and Mrs. Vivian Gray, parent of two children at South Lake Elementary School. Dr. Villani explained that this presentation was really the third part of a three-part emphasis on data. This part had to do with developing individual reports to parents on how their children were doing in mathematics. He had asked Dr. Sullivan and her staff to work a way to report information to parents that would be easily understood and be usable.

Dr. Sullivan stated that the profile under discussion was one of the many in which they communicated math information to parents. This was an additional component with two major purposes. The first was to provide a record of the student's progress as reflected by the instructional system in mathematics. The second was to facilitate parent identification of their student's strengths and weaknesses. This report had been under development for a year, and the elementary math unit had been supported by two advisory groups, one staff and another parent.

Mrs. Torrence explained that the profile was developed during the last school year in response to parents who wanted additional information about their child's progress. MCPS had designed a report which was now in a pilot status. The parent advisory group had provided them with concrete suggestions of how to design the program and how to implement the program. The profile was being piloted in South Lake and Burtonsville elementary schools and in Farquhar Middle School. Board members had been provided with copies of the profile. They were now gathering evaluation data from parents, teachers, and principals, and they would use this information to assess the clarity, the usefulness, and the function of the profile.

Mrs. Gray thought that overall the ISM pilot report was excellent. The report strengthened the relationship between the parent and the school. Report cards did not tell what a child had learned, and parents did not get this information unless they went to a parent conference. The report alerted parents to areas where the child needed work or had not mastered concepts. However, she thought that the profile should be reduced to one page with coded objectives to permit the parents to read the report more quickly. Parents were interested in the success of their children, but their time was limited. Therefore, the report should be as concise and easy to read as possible.

Mrs. Torrence walked Board members through a sample profile, and Dr. Cheung asked how long it took a parent to read it. Mrs. Gray replied that it took her about 10 to 15 minutes the first time; therefore, she had suggested that the objectives have codes next to them so that parents would not have to go back and forth between pages.

Ms. Gutierrez asked if they were ready to distribute this profile to all parents in February. Dr. Villani replied that they would have the results of the pilot in early January, and at that point they would determine next steps. Ms. Gutierrez thought that they had great information in the profile, but they had to package it better. She asked what they did when a parent did not read English. Mrs. Torrence explained that the documents accompanying the profile had been translated, but they felt it would be impossible to translate the ISM objectives. Schools were planning to provide translators for parents who needed assistance. They would be looking at the numbers of questions generated by the report and what would be the need for that type of service. Ms. Gutierrez felt that they would be sending out to the world, and for a large number of parents the report would not serve any purpose. She strongly urged them to think about how to make this information useable for all parents in MCPS, particularly the parents of ESOL students.

Mr. Ewing asked if all the suggestions from the parent advisory group were incorporated in the report. Mrs. Torrence replied

that she had joined the staff after the parent group had met, but she had been told all their suggestions were incorporated. Mr. Ewing asked what they would do when they got feedback from the pilots. Mrs. Torrence indicated that they would receive the data, her department would look at it as well as DEA, and then it would be taken to the advisory committee for their suggestions.

Mr. Abrams asked Mrs. Gray what she did when she noticed there were areas that were not filled in for her child. Mrs. Gray replied that she talked with the teacher if she felt there was a problem. Mr. Abrams asked how the parent would be assisted by the school in terms of sending work home. Mrs. Gray commented that she had a close rapport with South Lake. When her children had problems, the teachers would send work home to strengthen those areas. If after a trial period of time the child did not progress, she and the teacher would try something else. It was the communication between the teacher and the parent, and so far it was successful at South Lake because of their staff. Dr. Vance remarked that South Lake had an exceptional principal, Betty Collins.

Mrs. Torrence said that in working with the ESOL office, she had been told that the report could not be translated, but the explanatory documents could be translated. She agreed to check back with ESOL. She said that Mr. Abrams had brought up a good point. It was nice for the school to send home a paper, but the question was how parents became instructional advocates for their children. Schools were doing different things. Some schools had training sessions for parents in the evenings about how to help with math. They had an active family math program, and they had parent volunteers coming into the classroom. She had a group of people who were willing to add a visual component to the objectives, and she would be sharing this with the advisory group.

Mrs. Gordon recalled that many, many years ago they had PIBS which was widely used as supports for parents in enrichment activities. These were matched directly with specific objectives in ISM. She did not know how widely this was being used and whether or not it was being used in the pilot schools. She would suggest it would be an easier way of communicating with all parents because the activities had been translated into many languages. Parents could do these activities in advance of the profiles going home. She suggested that staff check into this and see if this could be coordinated with the pilot schools. She thanked staff for their presentation.

Re: BOARD/SUPERINTENDENT COMMENTS

1. Dr. Vance said that the new Maryland delegates and senators were touring the state and had requested a tour of Broad Acres Elementary School. The tour was originally to last for 25



minutes, but the group got so involved they stayed for almost an hour and a half. After a briefing, they went into the classroom to talk to both students and teachers and were extremely impressed by the ESOL program.

2. Dr. Vance reported that he would have a brief report to the Board informing them about the MCPS interscholastic teams that were successful in local, regional, or state championships. The list was impressive, particularly when they looked at the success of their young women. He believed that this was an indication of the success of gender equity in athletics programs.

3. Dr. Vance noted the passing of Dr. Pat Emma, who had been a legend in Montgomery County. He began his career in 1951 as a science teacher at Wheaton High School. He was the first principal of John F. Kennedy High School and then became principal of Montgomery Blair High School. Before his retirement in 1981, he served three years as the assistant to the deputy superintendent. Dr. Vance knew that Board members would join him in extending sympathy to Dr. Emma's family.

4. Ms. Gutierrez stated that she and Dr. Cheung were involved in interviewing and assessing candidates for the four service academies. In looking at the profiles of many students, MCPS students compared very favorably. She noted that class rank had been eliminated as a criteria. The bad news was that so few MCPS students had applied to the academies. She suggested they might ask counselors to do some outreach for the academies because this was a free opportunity for college. Dr. Vance agreed to follow up with Ms. McGuire; however, they had observed a disinterest in the academies. Dr. Cheung commented that it was an opportunity for students to serve their country. The applicants were well rounded in their scholastic, extracurricular and athletic backgrounds, and they had prepared themselves for this opportunity.

5. Mr. Ewing commended two groups providing assistance to MCPS. The first was the Hands-on Science program under the auspices of MCCPTA. Their new program was Math Start which was a math readiness program developed with Head Start teachers and staff. Phyllis Katz had run the Hands-on Science program for 15 years and the program got better all the time.

6. Mr. Ewing said that the second group was the Montgomery County Historical Society which provided a program for fourth graders in Montgomery County history. They had developed materials which were integrated with and supportive of the specific objectives of the curriculum. This material was not narrowly focused on Montgomery County history, but it talked about Montgomery County in the context of change and the impact of change on the lives of people. About 10 percent of the Society's budget went for this program, and they had invited

Board members to see the program in action. He had several copies of their materials, and if people were interested they could obtain copies from the Board Office.

7. Mrs. Gordon reported that Tobin Coziahr, a junior at Paint Branch High School, had earned a perfect score of 1,600 on the PSATs.

8. Mrs. Gordon expressed her appreciation and commendation for Ms. Pamela Montgomery in her efforts in dealing with fire at the Travilah dump site. She was on site daily almost around the clock.

RESOLUTION NO. 831-94 Re: CLOSED SESSION - JANUARY 10, 1995

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Dr. Cheung seconded by Ms. Gutierrez, the following resolution was adopted unanimously:

WHEREAS, The Board of Education of Montgomery County is authorized by the Education Article of the Annotated Code of Maryland and Title 10 of the State Government Article to conduct certain meetings or portions of its meetings in closed session; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Board of Education of Montgomery County hereby conduct a portion of its meeting on January 10, 1995, at 9 a.m. and at noon in closed session to discuss personnel matters, matters protected from public disclosure by law, and other issues including consultation with counsel to obtain legal advice; and be it further

Resolved, That this meeting be conducted in Room 120 of the Carver Educational Services Center, Rockville, Maryland, as permitted under Section 4-106, Education Article of the Annotated Code of Maryland and State Government Article 10-501; and be it further

Resolved, That such meeting shall continue in closed session until the completion of business.

RESOLUTION NO. 832-94 Re: MINUTES OF OCTOBER 11, 1994

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Ms. Gutierrez seconded by Dr. Cheung, the following resolution was adopted unanimously:

Resolved, That the minutes of October 11, 1994, be approved.

RESOLUTION NO. 833-94 Re: MINUTES OF OCTOBER 17, 1994

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Mr. Ewing seconded by Dr. Cheung, the following resolution was adopted unanimously:

Resolved, That the minutes of October 17, 1994, be approved.

RESOLUTION NO. 834-94 Re: MINUTES OF NOVEMBER 15, 1994

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Mr. Felton seconded by Ms. Gutierrez, the following resolution was adopted unanimously:

Resolved, That the minutes of November 15, 1994, be approved.

RESOLUTION NO. 835-94 Re: MINUTES OF NOVEMBER 16, 1994

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Mrs. King seconded by Ms. Gutierrez, the following resolution was adopted unanimously:

Resolved, That the minutes of November 16, 1994, be approved.

Re: REPORT ON CLOSED SESSIONS -  
NOVEMBER 21 AND 29, 1994

On November 9, 1994, by the unanimous vote of members present, the Board of Education voted to conduct a closed session on Monday, November 21, 1994, as permitted under Section 4-106, Education Article of the Annotated Code of Maryland and State Government Article 10-501.

The Montgomery County Board of Education met in closed session on Monday, November 21, 1994, from 7:30 p.m. to 8:15 p.m. The meeting took place in the Room 120 of the Carver Educational Services Center, Rockville, Maryland.

The Board met to discuss personnel appointments to the positions of coordinator of the Blair magnet and of the Takoma Park magnet. Votes taken in closed session were confirmed in open session. The Board received a report on the fire on Travilah Road and its potential impact on nearby schools. The Board voted unanimously to proceed with condemnation proceedings for the Northeast High School site.

Board members reviewed decision and orders and adjudicated appeals as follows: No. 1994-26, 1994-28, 1994-18, and 1994-27.

In attendance at the closed session were Steve Abrams, Fran Brenneman, Alan Cheung, Wendy Converse, Blair Ewing, Carol



charge as an item of information and requested that this be scheduled for future Board action; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the following statement of the composition, mission, and charge of the Subcommittee on Long-range Planning be adopted:

### **Composition**

The Subcommittee on Long-range Planning shall be comprised of three members of the Board, appointed in December of each year. One member shall be appointed for a one-year term, one for a two-year term, and one for a three-year term, by majority vote of the Board.

The Board shall annually name the chairperson of the Subcommittee. The chairperson shall have the responsibility for establishing meeting dates as appropriate, and for developing agendas for meetings after consultation with other members of the committee.

The Subcommittee shall report to the Board of Education at least twice a year on its proposed recommendations.

The superintendent or his designee shall attend all meetings of the Subcommittee.

The Subcommittee's meetings shall be open to the public and conducted in accord with the laws and regulations governing public meetings.

### **Mission**

The Subcommittee on Long-range Planning shall have as its mission the development of effective approaches to long-range planning for the school system's instructional and support functions. It shall be an advocate for and play a leadership role in long-range planning and shall promote a long-term commitment to keeping all school system stakeholders involved and informed.

### **Charge**

The Subcommittee shall have as its responsibilities:

- ! To provide a forum for considering the direction of the school system as a whole institution and for developing systematic recommendations to the Board directed at achieving long-range, whole system initiatives.
- ! To review and evaluate approaches to long-range planning and related management improvement and organization development practices in both public and



to definitions, process, format, content, and timelines.

Board members agreed to change the last bullet to read:

- ! To recommend a process for informing and educating the public, elected officials, and MCPS staff on long-range planning, including strategic planning, and its goals.

RESOLUTION NO. 838-94      Re:    COMPOSITION, MISSION, AND CHARGE OF  
THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON LONG-RANGE  
PLANNING

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Mr. Ewing seconded by Ms. Gutierrez, the following resolution was adopted unanimously:

WHEREAS, On September 8, 1994, the Board of Education established the Subcommittee on Long-range Planning and formed a temporary subcommittee to develop a draft statement of the charter and mission of the Subcommittee; and

WHEREAS, On November 21, 1994, the temporary subcommittee submitted a draft statement of the composition, mission, and charge as an item of information and requested that this be scheduled for future Board action; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the following statement of the composition, mission, and charge of the Subcommittee on Long-range Planning be adopted:

#### **Composition**

The Subcommittee on Long-range Planning shall be comprised of three members of the Board, appointed in December of each year. One member shall be appointed for a one-year term, one for a two-year term, and one for a three-year term, by majority vote of the Board.

The Board shall annually name the chairperson of the Subcommittee. The chairperson shall have the responsibility for establishing meeting dates as appropriate, and for developing agendas for meetings after consultation with other members of the committee.

The Subcommittee shall report to the Board of Education at least twice a year on its proposed recommendations.

The superintendent or his designee shall attend all meetings of the Subcommittee.

The Subcommittee's meetings shall be open to the public and conducted in accord with the laws and regulations governing public meetings.

### **Mission**

The Subcommittee on Long-range Planning shall have as its mission the development of effective approaches to long-range planning for the school system's instructional and support functions. It shall be an advocate for and play a leadership role in long-range planning and shall promote a long-term commitment to keeping all school system stakeholders involved and informed.

### **Charge**

The Subcommittee shall have as its responsibilities:

- ! To provide a forum for considering the direction of the school system as a whole institution and for developing systematic recommendations to the Board directed at achieving long-range, whole system initiatives.
- ! To review and evaluate approaches to long-range planning and related management improvement and organization development practices in both public and private sector organizations. To recommend ways to implement appropriate planning and management innovations, to include necessary steps to build leadership, management, and staff commitment and skills.
- ! To make recommendations to the Board concerning strategic planning and the development and updating of a strategic plan for MCPS including recommendations as to definitions, process, format, content, and timelines.
- ! To review MCPS policies, existing and proposed, to assess their impact on strategic planning efforts.
- ! To solicit ideas and suggestions for long-range planning initiatives from sources external to Montgomery County as well as sources within the county, including the general public, business and community groups and organizations, parents, PTAs, employee organizations, staff, and elected officials.
- ! To review and analyze, with the help of the superintendent and school system staff, reports and recommendations for long-range planning initiatives from sources both external to and within the county.





WHEREAS, Membership on the committee is for a two-year term; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the following individuals be appointed to serve a two-year term, effective January 1, 1995, and ending December 31, 1996:

Gail Cheek	Jane Lee
Beverly Soodak	Carol Bergen
Rebecca Jane Schwisow	Jane Thayer

RESOLUTION NO. 841-94      Re:    APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO THE TITLE  
IX GENDER EQUITY ADVISORY COMMITTEE

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Ms. Gutierrez seconded by Mr. Abrams, the following resolution was adopted unanimously:

WHEREAS, On July 19, 1977, the Board of Education established the Title IX Gender Equity Advisory Committee; and

WHEREAS, The members of the advisory committee are appointed by the Board of Education; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the following individuals be appointed to serve a two-year term effective January 1, 1995, and ending December 31, 1996:

Ella Iams	Mary Pelz
Linna Barnes	Gail Marcus
Richard Rothenberg	Mary Ann Jobe

RESOLUTION NO. 842-94      Re:    APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO THE  
MEDICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE TO THE  
BOARD OF EDUCATION

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Ms. Gutierrez seconded by Mr. Abrams, the following resolution was adopted unanimously:

WHEREAS, The Medical Advisory Committee to the Montgomery County Board of Education has been active since it was reconstituted by the Board in 1972; and

WHEREAS, Membership on the committee is composed of representatives of organizations and associations named in the "Statement of Purpose" of the committee; and

WHEREAS, Members of the committee are appointed by the Board of Education; now therefore be it





terms of office with the Board are equal to or greater than the terms for which they are appointed to this subcommittee; and

WHEREAS, The Audit Committee consists of three members, appointed by the president of the Board of Education, serving staggered terms of three years each, and the term of office begins on the date of the first all-day Board meeting in December of the year of appointment and ends three years later on November 30; and

WHEREAS, Mrs. Fran Brenneman was appointed to serve until November 30, 1994, and one vacancy now exists on the committee; and

WHEREAS, Mrs. Beatrice Gordon was appointed to serve until November 30, 1995 and no longer wishes to serve, and Mr. Steve Abrams was appointed to serve until November 30, 1996; and

WHEREAS, Mrs. Brenneman's term as chairperson expired on November 30, 1994; now therefore be it

Resolved, That Mr. Reginald Felton be appointed to serve until November 30, 1997; and be it further

Resolved, That Ms. Wendy Converse be appointed to serve until November 30, 1995; and be it further

Resolved, That Mr. Abrams serve as chairperson of the Audit Committee until November 30, 1995.

RESOLUTION NO. 848-94      Re:    APPOINTMENTS TO THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON  
LONG-RANGE PLANNING

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Ms. Gutierrez seconded by Mr. Abrams, the following resolution was adopted unanimously:

WHEREAS, On September 8, 1994, the Board of Education established a Subcommittee on Long-Range Planning; and

WHEREAS, Eligibility for appointment to the Subcommittee on Long-Range Planning is limited to members of the Board of Education whose remaining terms of office with the Board are equal to or greater than the terms of which they are appointed to this subcommittee; and

WHEREAS, The Subcommittee on Long-Range Planning is to consist of three members appointed by the president of the Board of Education, serving staggered terms of three years each, and the term of office begins on the date of the first all-day Board meeting in December of the year of appointment and ends three years later on November 30; and

WHEREAS, Three vacancies now exist on this newly created Subcommittee for Long-Range Planning; now therefore be it

Resolved, That Mrs. Beatrice Gordon be appointed to serve until November 30, 1995; and be it further

Resolved, That Mr. Blair G. Ewing be appointed to serve until November 30, 1996; and be it further

Resolved, That Mrs. Nancy King be appointed to serve until November 30, 1997; and be it further

Resolved, That Mr. Ewing serve as chairperson of the Subcommittee on Long-Range Planning until November 30, 1995.

RESOLUTION NO. 849-94      Re:    APPOINTMENTS TO THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON  
RESEARCH AND EVALUATION

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Ms. Gutierrez seconded by Mr. Abrams, the following resolution was adopted unanimously:

WHEREAS, On January 14, 1986, the Board of Education established a Subcommittee on Research and Evaluation; and

WHEREAS, Eligibility for appointment to the Subcommittee on Research and Evaluation is limited to members appointed by the president of the Board of Education, serving staggered terms of three years each, and the term of office begins on the date of the first all-day Board meeting in December of the year of appointment and ends three years later on November 30; and

WHEREAS, Mr. Blair Ewing's term expired on November 30, 1994, and one vacancy now exists on the committee; and

WHEREAS, Ms. Ana Sol Gutierrez was appointed to serve until November 30, 1995, and Dr. Alan Cheung was appointed to serve until November 30, 1996; and

WHEREAS, Mr. Ewing's term as chairperson expired on November 30, 1994; now therefore be it

Resolved, That Mr. Reginald Felton be appointed to serve until November 30, 1997; and be it further

Resolved, That Ms. Gutierrez serve as chairperson of the Subcommittee on Research and Evaluation until November 30, 1995.

RESOLUTION NO. 851-94      Re:    SITE-BASED MANAGEMENT

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education schedule further discussion on site-based management requesting that the superintendent bring the Board his recommendations with respect to the comments received and contained within his memorandum of November 21,

1994, and any further recommended changes that might be the result of any discussions he may have with MCEA.

RESOLUTION NO. 852-94 Re: GIFTED AND TALENTED POLICY

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education request the superintendent to prepare for March 14, 1995, a policy analysis aimed at revising the policy on gifted and talented using as one reference point the draft policy now circulating.

RESOLUTION NO. 853-94 Re: DEATH OF WILLIAM E. COYLE, FORMER  
PRESIDENT OF THE MONTGOMERY COUNTY  
BOARD OF EDUCATION

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Mr. Ewing seconded by Mr. Abrams, the following resolution was adopted unanimously:

WHEREAS, The recent death of William E. Coyle has deeply saddened the staff and members of the Board of Education; and

WHEREAS, Mr. Coyle served with distinction as a member of the Montgomery County Board of Education from 1962 to 1966; and

WHEREAS, Mr. Coyle was elected by his fellow Board members to serve as vice president of the Board of Education in 1963 and as president in 1964; and

WHEREAS, On December 10, 1963, when Mr. Coyle was elected president, he promised to do his best because he had six children in the Montgomery County Public Schools and his decisions would have a direct bearing upon their education; and

WHEREAS, While serving on the Board, Mr. Coyle contributed his leadership skills and advocated a spirit of understanding and cooperation among his fellow Board members; now therefore be it

Resolved, That on behalf of the staff and students of the Montgomery County Public Schools, the members of the Board of Education express their sorrow at the death of Mr. William E. Coyle and extend deepest sympathy to his family; and be it further

Resolved, That this resolution be made part of the minutes of this meeting and a copy be forwarded to Mr. Coyle's family and to other Board members who served with him.

Re: APPEALS

Mrs. Gordon announced that Mr. Felton and Mrs. King would not vote on the appeals because these matters had been considered before they joined the Board.

RESOLUTION NO. 853-94 Re: BOE APPEAL NO. 1994-18

On motion of Ms. Gutierrez seconded by Ms. Converse, the following resolution was adopted unanimously:

Resolved, That the Board of Education adopt its Decision and Order in BOE Appeal No. 1994-18, a curriculum matter.

RESOLUTION NO. 854-94 Re: BOE APPEAL NO. 1994-21

On motion of Ms. Gutierrez seconded by Mr. Abrams, the following resolution was adopted unanimously:

Resolved, That the Board of Education adopt its Decision and Order in BOE Appeal No. 1994-21, an athletic matter.

RESOLUTION NO. 855-94 Re: BOE APPEAL NO. 1994-27

On motion of Ms. Gutierrez seconded by Ms. Converse, the following resolution was adopted with Dr. Cheung, Ms. Converse, Mr. Ewing, Mrs. Gordon, and Ms. Gutierrez voting in the affirmative; Mr. Abrams voting in the negative:

Resolved, That the Board of Education adopt its Decision and Order in BOE Appeal No. 1994-27, a curriculum matter.

Re: ITEMS OF INFORMATION

Board members received the following items of information:

1. Items in Process
2. Construction Progress Report
3. Monthly Financial Report

RESOLUTION NO. 858-94 Re: ADJOURNMENT

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Mr. Abrams seconded by Dr. Cheung, the following resolution was adopted unanimously:

Resolved, That the Board of Education adjourn its meeting at 5:25 p.m.

---

PRESIDENT

---

SECRETARY