

RESOLUTION NO. 191-95 Re: HB 1357 - EDUCATION - COST OF
EDUCATION OF CHILDREN WITH
DISABILITIES

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education strongly oppose HB 1357 - Education - Cost of Education of Children with Disabilities.

RESOLUTION NO. 192-95 Re: HB 1354 - EDUCATION - INTERAGENCY
STATE PLAN FOR TRANSITIONING
STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education support HB 1354 - Education -Interagency State Plan for Transitioning Students with Disabilities.

RESOLUTION NO. 194-95 Re: HB 1371 - BUDGET RECONCILIATION ACT

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education strongly oppose HB 1371 - Budget Reconciliation Act.

RESOLUTION NO. 195-95 Re: POLICY ANALYSIS - GIFTED AND
TALENTED POLICY

On motion of Mr. Felton seconded by Mrs. King, the following resolution was adopted unanimously by members present:

Resolved, That staff bring back a revised policy on gifted and talented students and the corresponding regulations and at the same time provide an analysis of the Gifted and Talented Association's recommended policy on both where staff agrees and disagrees and the rationale.

Re: PUBLIC COMMENTS

The following individuals appeared before the Board:

1. John Hoven, Gifted and Talented Association
2. Karen Mikkelsen
3. John Lafferty
4. Luella Mast, MCCPTA
5. Elizabeth Green
6. Rosanne Ferris
7. Nancy Koran
8. Sionne Rosenfeld

RESOLUTION NO. 196-95 Re: PROCUREMENT CONTRACTS MORE THAN
\$25,000

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

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 are awarded to the low bidders meeting specifications as shown for the bids as follows:

COG 09457	Gasoline - Extension	
	<u>Awardee</u>	
	Steuart Petroleum Company	\$ 300,000
COG LB06894	Tire Retread Service - Extension	
	<u>Awardee</u>	
	Montgomery Tire Service, Inc.	\$ 271,999
26-95	Office Papers	
	<u>Awardees</u>	
	Corporate Express	\$ 16,392
	Nationwide Papers	343,548
	Ris Paper Company, Inc.	195,475
	Stanford Paper	23,689
	Toucan Business Forms	8,116 *
	Unisource	1,049,929
	R. S. Willard Packaging Co., Inc.	5,900
	Zellerback (A Mead Company)	16,956
	TOTAL	\$1,660,005
28-95	Playground Equipment	
	<u>Awardees</u>	
	Freestate General Contractors, Inc.	\$ 127,613
	Gametime, Inc. c/o West Recreation, Inc.	78,597
	Iron Mountain Forge	50,415
	REC-creative, Inc.	45,602 *
	Taylor Associates	15,556
	TOTAL	\$ 317,783

122-95	Diesel Fuel Additive <u>Awardee</u> Givets Enterprises, Inc.	\$ 60,620
122-95	Audio and Video Equipment Parts <u>Awardees</u> Allegheny Electronics, Inc. Capitol Cable and Technology, Inc. Fairway Electronics Kunz, Inc. Lee Hartman and Sons, Inc. Wolsten Multi-Media Corporation The Zamoiski Company TOTAL	\$ 35,700 2,700 7,500 3,650 5,050 11,400 500 \$ 66,500
124-95	Industrial and Technology Education Lumber <u>Awardees</u> Allied International Allied Plywood Corporation Lisa Lumber Company, Inc. Mann and Parker Lumber Company J. Gibson Mcllvain Company Northeastern Lumber Company Pikesville Lumber Company Spotts Academic Supplies TOTAL	\$ 38,202 7,386 1,440 * 48,942 18,145 1,171 29,022 12,060 \$ 156,368
228-95	Art and School Papers <u>Awardees</u> Chaselle J. L. Hammett Company Integrity School Supplies TOTAL	\$ 377,573 1,375 7,090 * \$ 386,038
235-95	Computers for Global Access, Media Hubs, Instructional Classroom and Administrative Use <u>Awardees</u> CompUSA, Inc. Daly Computers, Inc. Data Networks/Intelligent Express Gateway 2000 PC Technology, Inc./Entre Computer Center TOTAL	(Refer to note below) \$1,800,000
	MORE THAN \$25,000	\$5,019,313

*Denotes MFD vendors

Note: Contract amounts will be based on computer selections.

RESOLUTION NO. 197-95 Re: CHANGE ORDERS OVER \$25,000

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

WHEREAS, The Department of Facilities Management has received change order proposals from various contractors that exceed \$25,000; and

WHEREAS, Staff and the project architects have reviewed these change orders and found them to be cost effective; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Board of Education approve the following change orders for the amounts indicated:

Activity 1

Project: Damascus High School

Description: The Damascus High School addition project is being completed in two phases. The first phase has been completed and the second phase is currently underway. Phase II included revisions to the site stormwater management system that were added by the Montgomery County Department of Environmental Protection after the contract award. Funds have been programmed in the FY 1996 capital budget to complete this work.

Contractor: Kimmel & Kimmel, Inc.

Amount: \$150,366

Activity 2

Project: Brookhaven Elementary School

Description: Subsequent to the contract award for the modernization of Brookhaven Elementary School, WSSC determined that the water service had to be upgraded to provide sufficient pressure for the new fire protection (sprinkler) system. This change order is for the site and plumbing work necessary to comply with the WSSC requirements.

Contractor: McAlister-Schwartz Co.

Amount: \$37,530

RESOLUTION NO. 198-95 Re: REDUCTION OF RETAINAGE - JULIUS
WEST MIDDLE SCHOOL

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

WHEREAS, Dustin Construction, Inc., general contractor for Julius West Middle School, has completed 80 percent of all specified requirements, and has requested that the 10 percent retainage, which is based on the completed work to date, be reduced to 5 percent; and

WHEREAS, The project bonding company, Insurance Company of North America, has consented to this reduction; and

WHEREAS, The project architect, Smolen + Associates Architects, Inc., recommends approval of the reduction now therefore be it

Resolved, That the 10 percent retainage withheld from periodic payments to Dustin Construction, Inc., general contractor for Julius West Middle School, be reduced to 5 percent, with the remaining 5 percent to become due and payable after completion of all remaining contract requirements and formal acceptance of the completed project.

RESOLUTION NO. 199-95 Re: AWARD OF CONTRACTS - DAMASCUS
MIDDLE SCHOOL #2

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

WHEREAS, On January 24, 1994, the Board of Education authorized MCPS staff to act as general contractor for the Damascus Middle School #2 project to assure timely completion of this project; and

WHEREAS, Proposals for various contracts for Damascus Middle School #2 were received in accordance with MCPS procurement practices, with work to begin June 1, 1995, and to be completed by August 1, 1995; and

WHEREAS, Details of the bid activity are available in the Department of Facilities Management; and

WHEREAS, The low bidders have completed similar projects successfully for Montgomery County Public Schools; and

WHEREAS, The low bids are below the staff estimates; now therefore be it

Resolved, That contracts be awarded to the following low bidders meeting specifications for the bids and amounts listed below:

<u>Contracts</u>	<u>Amount</u>
Caulking/Sealants LOW BIDDER: Caulking Applicators, Inc.	\$26,670

Outdoor Equipment (backstops, BB standards, trash receptacles, etc.)
 LOW BIDDER: Triple "J" Const., Inc. 30,425

TOTAL \$57,095

RESOLUTION NO. 200-95 Re: UTILIZATION OF FY 1995 FUTURE SUPPORTED PROJECT FUNDS FOR MARYLAND SCHOOL PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT PROGRAM (MSPAP) MATERIALS

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

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 \$19,533 from the Maryland State Department of Education, under the Hawkins-Stafford Elementary and Secondary School Improvement Amendments of 1988, for the Chapter 2 State's Discretionary Funds, for Maryland School Performance Assessment Program materials used by students during testing, in the following category:

<u>Category</u>	<u>Amount</u>
3 Other Instructional Costs	\$19,533

and be it further

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

RESOLUTION NO. 201-95 Re: UTILIZATION OF FY 1995 FUTURE SUPPORTED PROJECT FUNDS FOR A SUMMER BIOTECHNOLOGY PROGRAM AT THE EDISON CAREER CENTER

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

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 \$20,000 from the Howard Hughes Medical Institute, through the Montgomery County Public Schools Educational Foundation, Inc., for a summer biotechnology program at the Edison Career Center in the following categories:

<u>Category</u>	<u>Amount</u>
2 Instructional Salaries	\$15,452
3 Other Instructional Costs	3,235
10 Fixed Charges	<u>1,313</u>

TOTAL \$20,000

and be it further

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

RESOLUTION NO. 202-95 Re: UTILIZATION OF FY 1995 FUTURE
SUPPORTED PROJECT FUNDS FOR THE
LOCAL INTERAGENCY EARLY CHILDHOOD
COMMITTEE

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

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 \$4,100 from the Governor's Office for Children, youth and Families, for the Local Interagency Early Childhood Committee, in the following category:

<u>Category</u>	<u>Amount</u>
3 Other Instructional Costs	\$4,100

and be it further

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

RESOLUTION NO. 203-95 Re: UTILIZATION OF FY 1995 FUTURE
SUPPORTED PROJECT FUNDS FOR THE
SCIENCE, MATHEMATICS, AND COMPUTER
SCIENCE PROGRAM AT MONTGOMERY
BLAIR HIGH SCHOOL

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

Resolved, That the superintendent of schools be authorized to receive and expend within the FY 1995 Provision for Future Supported Projects a federal grant award of \$4,043, from the Space Telescope Science Institute, on behalf of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, for the science, mathematics, and computer science program at Montgomery Blair High School, in the following categories:

<u>Category</u>	<u>Amount</u>
2 Instructional Salaries	\$1,840
3 Other Instructional Costs	2,055
10 Fixed Charges	<u>148</u>
 TOTAL	 \$4,043

and be it further

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

RESOLUTION NO. 204-95 Re: UTILIZATION OF THE FY 1995 FUTURE
SUPPORTED PROJECT FUNDS FOR
SCHOOL-BASED/SCHOOL LINKED
SERVICES FOR STUDENTS AND FAMILIES
OF THE MARK TWAIN SCHOOL

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

Resolved, That the superintendent of schools be authorized to receive and expend within the Provision for Future Supported Projects a grant award of \$19,250 from the Governor's Office for Children, Youth, and Families to develop a community response for meeting the service needs of the students and families at the Mark Twain School, in the following categories:

<u>Category</u>	<u>Amount</u>
4 Special Education	\$17,961
10 Fixed Charges	<u>1,289</u>
TOTAL	\$19,250

and be it further

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

RESOLUTION NO. 205-95 Re: RECOMMENDATION TO SUBMIT AN FY 1995 GRANT PROPOSAL TO THE MARYLAND STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION SCHOOLS FOR SUCCESS/GOALS 2000 PROJECT FOR THE BLAIR, EINSTEIN, KENNEDY, SPRINGBROOK CONSORTIUM

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

Resolved, That the superintendent of schools be authorized to submit an FY 1995 grant proposal for \$101,206 to the Maryland State Department of Education's Schools for Success/Goals 200 Project, to provide interschool video connectivity and interdisciplinary curriculum development for the Blair, Einstein, Kennedy, Springbrook Consortium; and be it further

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

RESOLUTION NO. 206-95 Re: MONTHLY PERSONNEL REPORT

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

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. 207-95 Re: EXTENSION OF SICK LEAVE

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

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 express their sorrow at the death of Mrs. Karin A. Lauriat and extend deepest sympathy to her family; and be it further

Resolved, That this resolution be made part of the minutes of this meeting and a copy be forwarded to Mrs. Lauriat's family.

RESOLUTION NO. 210-95 Re: DEATH OF MR. EDWARD J. HARRIS,
BUILDING SERVICE WORKER LEADER 1 AT
ROCK TERRACE HIGH SCHOOL

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

WHEREAS, The death on February 27, 1995, of Mr. Edward J. Harris, a building service work leader 1 at Rock Terrace High School, has deeply saddened the staff and members of the Board of Education; and

WHEREAS, Mr. Harris had been a loyal employee of Montgomery County Public Schools for 28 years; and

WHEREAS, Mr. Harris' pride in his work and his dedication to duty were recognized by staff and associates alike; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the members of the Board of Education express their sorrow at the death of Mr. Edward J. Harris 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. Harris' family.

RESOLUTION NO. 211-95 Re: DEATH OF RAYMOND S. COSTANTINO,
SECONDARY COUNSELOR AT SHERWOOD
HIGH SCHOOL

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

WHEREAS, The death on March 3, 1995, of Mr. Raymond S. Costantino, a secondary counselor at Sherwood High School, has deeply saddened the staff and members of the Board of Education; and

WHEREAS, Mr. Costantino was a dedicated counselor with Montgomery County Public Schools for more than 28 years; and

WHEREAS, Mr. Costantino was committed to students and sensitive to the needs of all people, making him an asset to the school system and community; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the members of the Board of Education express their sorrow at the death of Mr. Raymond S. Costantino 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. Costantino's family.

Re: MONTHLY FINANCIAL REPORT

Dr. Vance recalled that when he had initially proposed the freeze Mr. Ewing had requested a Board discussion of the impact of the freeze.

Mr. Bowers stated that this report reflected financial condition as of the end of January. On January 3, they had put into place measures to control expenditures. The report before the Board reflected a number of savings. For example, in Category 2 they had savings because there were filling teacher vacancies with long-term substitutes. They had also identified savings in the areas of materials of instruction, office supplies, furniture, and equipment. However, Attachment 2 showed that the deficits in some areas had gotten worse, particularly in Special Education and in Category 1. Therefore, the level of the deficit had not gone down as much as they had anticipated. Overall they had reduced the deficit from \$2.2 to \$1.7 million and would continue to look at measures to bring that amount down to zero by the end of the year. He pointed out that in Special Education they had picked up some additional revenue from the state because the state was paying for 80 percent of the costs for pupils whose costs exceed 300 percent of the regular student cost. They had also received some additional federal money that had not been anticipated in terms of impact aid. There would be \$1.2 million of additional revenues to be collected this year.

Mr. Ewing noted that the first page of the report stated that the projected savings from the expenditure reduction measures were \$1.375 million. He asked whether this was for the rest of this fiscal year. Mr. Bowers replied that in many cases it was, but they had not projected any additional vacancies. It seemed to Mr. Ewing that they were assuming that additional vacancies would occur and the additional savings would permit them to meet the shortfall. Mr. Bowers explained that they were also looking at utilities and the employee benefit program for additional savings.

Mr. Ewing asked if they ever take an opportunity to transmit to the Council what they were doing to save money. For example, if they looked at instructional salaries, the deficit was the result of the Council's action to reduce the starting salary for teachers from B.A. 5 to B.A. 4. In other cases, legal fees were underbudgeted, and transportation was underbudgeted. It seemed to him it was worth calling this to the attention of the Council so that they knew the consequence of this kind of budgeting was that the instructional program suffered because MCPS ended up not filling those positions.

Mr. Bowers reported that in next year's budget request they had included funding for a number of areas mentioned by Mr. Ewing. They had highlighted the need to put extra money in the categories as a result of this year's experience. However, he thought it would be good to stress this as the Council began their budget review. Mr. Ewing assumed that they would get monthly updates and discuss this before the end of the year.

RESOLUTION NO. 212-95

Re: PRESENTATION OF PRELIMINARY PLANS -
POOLESVILLE CLUSTER MIDDLE SCHOOL

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Dr. Cheung seconded by Mr. Ewing, the following resolution was adopted with Dr. Cheung, Ms. Converse, Mr. Ewing, Mr. Felton, Mrs. Gordon, and Mrs. King voting in the affirmative; Mr. Abrams being temporarily absent:

WHEREAS, The architect for the new Poolesville Cluster Middle School has prepared a schematic design in accordance with the educational specifications; and

WHEREAS, The Poolesville Cluster Middle School Facilities Advisory Committee has approved the proposed schematic design; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Board of Education approve the preliminary plans report for the new Poolesville Cluster Middle School developed by Grimm & Parker Architects.

RESOLUTION NO. 213-95 Re: PRESENTATION OF PRELIMINARY PLANS -
WEST FARM VEHICLE MAINTENANCE
FACILITY

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

WHEREAS, The architect for the new West Farm Vehicle Maintenance Facility has prepared a schematic design in accordance with specifications; and

WHEREAS, The West Farm Vehicle Maintenance Facility Advisory Committee has approved the proposed schematic design; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Board of Education approve the preliminary plans report for the new West Farm Vehicle Maintenance Facility developed by CHK Architects.

Re: ORAL UPDATE ON PLAN FOR RESOURCES
AND SUPPORTS TO MEET EXTENDED
SCHOOL YEAR DEADLINES

Dr. Vance reported that he had asked staff to update the Board on the resources and supports to meet the extended school year deadlines. This was in response to inquiries made by the Board as to the sufficiency of their plan and adequacy of the resource level. He was pleased with the way staff had responded to the need to be in compliance with the U.S. District Court's directive. Staff had developed and revised documents for parents, staff, and implemented, and they had implemented extensive training on special education laws and procedures. He had been impressed with the extent to which schools had received information on utilizing flexible resources to meet all the required deadlines. He believed that the plan did provide them with the necessary resources based on individual school needs.

Mrs. Gemberling explained that part of the judgment from the court case was that MCPS had to give an update to the judge on March 31. This would include all the steps they had taken and the revised forms for ESY. They would provide the Board members with copies of that report as soon as it was finalized. The next A&S meeting would include a review of new forms and checklists and systems management training. Within a week, they would have a complete package of this new information for Board members.

Mrs. Gemberling reported that the staff hotline was in place. They would also be doing a verification check with every principal in terms of the allocation of resources that they received. They had been told to use the additional funds in whatever way each school team determined. They would make sure that every school had what they needed. Dr. Stan Sorotkin would be serving in an acting capacity in the compliance office to get the hotline, training, and verification underway. Staff had done the analysis and got the resources together to prepare for the summer allocations. This spring in terms of handling appeals they would use a mediation process to see how effective this could be. Dr. Cornell Lewis, Dr. Hank Shetterly, and Dr. Tom O'Toole had agreed to serve as mediators this spring. Therefore, they were looking at both the compliance and the customer service issue simultaneously.

Dr. Vance recalled that during their last discussion Board members had raised some rather significant points. He asked about the adequacy of the resources that they were allocating for this initiative and whether what they were doing would meet the terms of the resolution. He also asked about the acceptance of staff members as to the procedures. Mrs. Gemberling replied that these were judgment calls. She had received thank-you calls from principals who liked the timeliness of this and their capacity to make their own choices and decisions. She believed they had had several calls from schools requesting additional funds, and these had been accommodated case by case. She thought that incentive to do a job well was always there with the staff. If anything had reaffirmed that to her, it had been the last two to three weeks of watching how people were responding. No one was acting as if they were under some threat. Staff members were assuming responsibility for getting the job done. She had even included a specific form for principals to comment on how they were using the resources and any other issues staff may have forgotten that could be accommodated. She believed that people felt they had a plan that could work. She supposed there might be something that they had missed or a case that they did not anticipate, and for that reason they had kept some reserves and a place to call. She believed they would meet the requirements of the court.

Dr. Hiawatha Fountain, associate superintendent, commented on how impressed he had been with his colleagues at every level. The staff had really rallied in this situation. Principals and other staff members had said that they needed training, and in past years that training had been sporadic. However, they had already done 32 training sessions relating to ESY for staff at every level as well as parents and the OSAE advisory committee. There was additional training they would have using Mr. Dick Ekstrand, and he would work for seven days with a variety of A&S staff.

Dr. Raymond Bryant, director of the Department of Special Education Programs and Services, reported that they were looking constantly at resources in terms of requests for support. They were looking at assessments that needed to be done and a reallocation of staff to get this done as well as looking at per diem and outside people to do this. He felt that the additional resources were morale boosters, and teachers felt that they had been heard. They especially appreciated the support in the areas of Intensities 1, 2, and 3 and speech.

Dr. Bryant stated that they would have the report for the court which would be comprehensive. They were hoping to show the judge that MCPS had listened and would do better. Dr. Bryant noted the creative ways in which principals were utilizing resources. They were using substitute time, clerical time, and per diem.

Dr. Cheung was pleased to hear that empowerment worked in terms of delegation and site-based decision making. It showed that MCPS staff had a lot of talents and were willing to accept responsibility. He inquired about the consolidation of forms and the use of technology in monitoring cases. Dr. Bryant replied that they were currently in the process of going through all forms as part of the state monitoring of their implementation of special education. MCPS had requested some feedback in terms of what other school systems were doing and what could be done to consolidate forms. The technology work group was meeting and already had preliminary screens up and running. It appeared that they would be able to use the initial tracking phase in May. They were putting together a longer-range group to look at the integration of all special education databases.

Mr. Felton said he was concerned about the data on tracking and looking for substantial improvements. He asked if they were setting up a system so that they would be to tell the impact of these changes on new cases versus old. He asked if they had a way of capturing timeliness as it related to new cases. Dr. Bryant replied that there was a checklist for new cases to manage the process step by step. In terms of the technology piece, the screens allowed a school to call up what actions must be completed by the end of each month. This would be available to schools within the next two months. Central Office staff would be able to remind schools of what had to be done and ask schools whether they needed assistance or had a problem. Dr. Sirotkin would be working on these issues.

Mr. Felton asked whether they would be able to show the results of innovation and empowerment by comparing processing times for this year and last year. Dr. Fountain replied that they would be able to manage that process better. As far as the human involvement in the process, he was not sure they were going to be way ahead on that. However, they did have a timeline now and the restructuring would speed up the process. The field office had been moved out of the process, and most of the decisions would be made at the local school level. They were beginning to send people to the school house, and students were being moved to Intensity 4 and 5 programs in one decision. The technology would enable them to keep up with this process and permit them to notify people before they were out of compliance.

Mr. Abrams commented that the driver behind these efforts was the court decision on assessments for ESY. They were making the assessments on who needed ESY, and Dr. Bryant explained that the first phase would be an April 15 deadline for annual reviews. Mr. Abrams said the universe was not all special education students, but only those who needed to maintain progress. Dr. Bryant replied that the universe was all students. All students must be considered. Mr. Abrams stated that the number of students requiring ESY would be something less than that. He asked if they had reached the level of what ESY needed to be provided. Dr. Bryant explained that they had prepared for principals an options guideline. This included the vehicles under which ESY could be delivered. These ranged from special education summer school programs to regular enrichment programs.

Mr. Abrams asked whether the range of options also included the idea of going to a contract provider. Dr. Bryant replied that if the student were currently in nonpublic placement, in the past they had provided that extended school year in that placement. Mr. Abrams asked about students currently receiving their services in the public schools. Dr. Bryant replied that the court had looked at this because of least restrictive environment. MCPS would need to ensure that whatever they did for that student during the summer met the same provision of LRE they had during the school year. Dr.

Bryant assured Mr. Abrams that if the student were in a process MCPS could access and which met the LRE, they would consider it. Mr. Abrams commented that during a 10-month school year, it was the least restrictive regular school environment. If they were providing this when school was not normally in session, this might be a good opportunity to look at some different approaches. Dr. Bryant said they had met with Parks and Recreation, and they had talked with the libraries. They would have to be very careful about the services because they were IEP driven. Mr. Abrams said he was thinking about some of the contract providers and the learning centers. Dr. Fountain replied that they were talking to these people, and if they could use them they would.

Mr. Ewing stated that the Board's action was to focus on the deadlines by which reviews were to be done. They had the April 15 and May 20 deadlines. The expectation was that those deadlines would be met and that this would be done in such a way that the time teachers had with students was not substantially reduced. He asked for a categorical assurance that the deadlines would be met and for information about teacher time.

Dr. Bryant replied that he was committed to do everything in his power in working with schools to meet the deadlines of Ruesch. Categorically he would do everything in his power to see that they met these deadlines. Given the feedback from schools, he had no indication that they would not make it. One school had submitted a report about hiring clerical people to do this which meant that staff were working with students because someone else was managing the paper. Many schools were using part-time funds to do the testing.

Mr. Ewing asked about the process by which they would learn the lessons that needed to be learned about resources to be made available to complete these jobs in a timely way. He assumed that these deadlines would not change in the future, and they would have to go through a similar process in the future. This would cost money in order to do that. He asked what they were doing to ensure that the benefits of these lessons would not be lost. Dr. Fountain replied that they were benchmarking. They would be managing and monitoring the process to make sure that all of the benchmarks were met. This would give them a clearer picture of the shortfall. For example, they would need over 1,000 psychologicals to be completed by September 1. They had determined that they needed to look at the psychologists who were not in field offices to see if they could assist in this process. In addition, they would have to use per diem. He believed they would have a clear picture to assess true shortfalls. Speech, OT, and PT were doing similar things.

Dr. Vance stated that the response was really one for the superintendent. He considered it a function of leadership to make certain that this did not occur again. He would take care of the resources and accommodations needed in a timely fashion this spring. Mrs. Gordon thanked staff for their presentation and comments.

Re: BOARD OF EDUCATION ACTION AREA -
CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT - SCHOOL
IMPROVEMENT PLANS

Mrs. Gordon reported that this was a discussion of school improvement plans. It was an attempt by the Board to review school improvement plans to see how they fit into the overall plan of the Board of Education for continuous improvement and to comply with both the state requirement and their own interest in keeping schools involved and

having as many decisions made at the local level as possible. It was not an attempt on the part of the Board to evaluate on a school-by-school basis, every single management plan to say whether they were good or bad. Board members had had the opportunity to review all plans, and she had done so for purposes of discussion.

Dr. Vance thanked Mrs. Gordon for her comments because there was a growing concern about the purpose of today's meeting. He had asked Dr. Phinnize Fisher, associate superintendent, to come to the table. School improvement plans had been used for a variety of purposes over the past 15 or 16 years. OSA staff worked closely with principals to analyze data and refine the planning process. Recent refinements included parent participation in planning. He would be interested in the perceptions of the principals as to the extent to which parents and public school advocates were involved in the planning, monitoring, and evaluation process. Other refinements included a new planning guide, staff development plans, inclusion of a pupil services goal, and refocusing of priorities. Next year the gifted and talented plan would be included in each school's plan. In his mind's eye, the current local school management improvement was the driving force that breathed life into the Success for Every Student plan for MCPS.

Dr. Fisher expressed her appreciation to the principals in the audience who had come to hear this discussion. She introduced Dr. Dick Towers, principal of Einstein HS; Ms. Carolyne Starek, principal of Forest Knolls ES; Mrs. Diane Ippolito, director of school administration; Dr. Steve Seleznow, director of school administration; and Ms. Jane Butler, principal of Bannockburn ES.

Mrs. Ippolito explained that the school improvement management plan was really the planning document which ensured quality control, direction, and coordination at the local school level and across the school system. It served as a strategic plan for ensuring they were meeting the goals of Success for Every Student and were in compliance with the Maryland School Performance Program. It was based on priorities for improvements, and it was not intended to be a checklist or a laundry list of everything that was happening in a school. They considered the school improvement management plan to be a very serious process which focused on priorities. It reflected the individual needs of the school.

The directors worked with the principals on an ongoing basis throughout the school year on the development and implementation of the plan. Mrs. Ippolito indicated that she met with individual principals and looked at the data with them. She looked at cluster data, K-12, to see how students were achieving. For example, in the Einstein cluster, principals would know how their students were doing in their building and also in comparison to the other elementary schools in the cluster. They also saw how well their students did when they moved to the middle school and then to the high school. She and other directors looked at achievement patterns on the criterion-referenced tests in reading/language arts and mathematics. They did the same thing with the Maryland School Performance Program in Grades 3, 5, and 8. They looked at correlations between CRT achievement and report card grades, class level assessment, and class groupings. They looked at participation and achievement in the gifted and talented classes. They wanted to know if elementary schools proportionately represented in those G/T classes when they moved on to the middle school and high school.

Mrs. Ippolito reported that they looked at successful practices in the schools and what things were not working. For example, peer mediation and conflict resolution were

wonderful programs, but they were asking some tough questions on whether these programs reduced referrals or had an impact on behavior so that suspensions were coming down. They looked at individual student data and class data, and they disaggregated this data by racial and ethnic group and by gender. In the spring, each director reviewed with principals the expectations for the development of the plan for the following year. Each plan should include specific performance objectives based on that data analysis with activities, timelines, and the persons responsible. They wanted to see benchmarks by which they could measure progress in meeting each objective. They wanted a staff training program tied to meeting those objectives. Each plan was reviewed for its content. She agreed that school plans were at different points on the quality continuum. They were moving from plans that focused on program implementation to plans that focused on student achievement with measurable outcomes. She explained that the plan was a working document, and it was adjusted and refined during the school year.

Ms. Butler reported that she had gone to Bannockburn in September, 1990. She had met with the PTA president to start a team, and she asked parents to volunteer to serve on the team. Members were chosen and served for a minimum of two years. Meetings were held in the mornings to allow parents and staff to participate. Originally they met weekly to set goals and objectives, and now they met monthly and publicized their meeting dates in advance. They rotated the chair, and one month a teacher served and the next month a parent. This made everyone feel they were equal partners. Community and staff members unable to attend the meeting could inform another person about their agenda item or write a letter.

Ms. Butler explained that her role was to facilitate conversation, clarify ideas, and provide any explanations. She also managed the time and tried to ensure that there was an opportunity for members to express their thoughts and feelings. They had discussed school issues and concerns, planned school programs and activities, determined school priorities, and solved problems. They had mission goals and objectives, and the management plan was the book from which they operated. They had developed interim reports for the students, homework assignment books, Wednesday information envelopes to parents, informational tote bags, awards and incentive programs, and parent peer groups. She thought that the team worked because they concentrated on solutions and enforced the cooperative spirit.

Dr. Seleznow stated that this plan was fine for Bannockburn, but it might not be fine for Brookhaven or Weller Road or McAuliffe. They did not want the same plan for every school. His job entitled working with the principal to see that the plan was implemented. It was their plan, and it was reviewed externally and internally. The principals and their school improvement teams did a midyear review and an end-of-the-year review. They submitted their plans in August, and their director reviewed the plans. The director might approve the plan or send it back for revision or total rewrite. Part of the process was moving the schools from where they were to where they needed to be. Mrs. Ippolito had spoken about peer mediation, and part of the change they were trying to move in the schools was moving away from the school improvement management plan as a program implementation document into a document that identified particular outcomes. A few years ago a plan would have said that the school would implement peer mediation as an objective. Now the plan would say that the objective was to reduce by 20 percent the number of students who were suspended for fighting. Peer mediation became an activity to meet that objective.

Mrs. Gordon thanked the principals who had taken the time out of their busy day to attend the Board meeting. It was a very important issue for the principals as well as the Board.

Mr. Felton asked about the extent to which they were involving students and other parts of the community, the 75 percent who did not have students in the public schools. Dr. Towers replied that some goals were more appropriate for some clientele than others. He did work with his PTA and student government representatives very closely around school problems and school issues. Einstein HS had dealt with the development of an academic focus, the Institute for International Studies and Technology. They had made it a point to go out and put a lot of effort into involving parents from feeder schools because this was a long-term project that should re-attract students from within their attendance area. An enticement for parents to keep their students in the Einstein cluster was to be a part of process of developing the Institute. Dr. Towers felt they had received a wonderful response and involvement. He also reported that when it came to the modernization of the high school, they had an opportunity to work closely with the neighbors who did not necessarily have children in school. However, they were concerned about the construction site, the ballpark, and the access roads. He had brought the neighbors into the process and found they had great ideas and insights.

Mrs. Ippolito commented that B-CC was a good example in terms of some of the things they had done not only with the Concerned Citizens for B-CC but the businesses at large and the student government. They had analyzed their relationships and public relations and the steps to improve those. On particular issues, they should identify populations they were going to be dealing with, and at the high school and middle school it was important to have students as a part of that plan.

Dr. Cheung knew that teachers and principals were educational experts, and increasingly, were being asked to be educational leaders. A good leader was usually a good manager, but a good manager might not be a good leader. The quality of the school plan was one indicated that reflected the quality of management in that school. They were looking at data in terms of the school, and he always wanted to look at individual children. In terms of planning they needed to build from a foundation based on the individual classrooms and students. Mrs. Ippolito replied that individual principals were sitting down with the individual classroom teachers and reviewing student by student data to look at how the student did on the CRT in reading/language arts, for example.

Ms. Starek reported that their plan allowed them to use substitute time so that teachers met with the school leadership team to review the math data in particular. During that time the magnet coordinator pulled from the SIMS system the CRT data in the case of sixth graders from the last two years as fourth and fifth graders. They also looked at ISM and recent report card grade and level. Teachers examine that data closely and as a result of interpreting the data, they were able to make very clear implications for instructional practices for individual students and for groups. They attempted to do this at the end of each quarter.

Dr. Cheung commented that Ms. Starek's remarks reinforced his views about the need for individual student profiles. Without the profile it was difficult to look at the whole child. He had a first simple plan. They had input and goals and objectives. They looked at these and set their priority, and then they turned to the question of resources including personnel, money, facilities, and workload. With all those investments and

goals, they looked at activities and programs. The next block was outcomes. Some of these were very easily measured and some were not. They had to examine if they met their goals. Then they had to compare all of these with standards in terms of the functional tests, guidelines, etc. If they needed to have improvement, they would look at their goals, objectives, process, etc. In order to do this, they needed a good management information system to use technology to give them signals about individual students. He remarked that as a professional one of the most difficult things for him was to learn about management. Now the school system had to prepare its leadership team to become managers, and they had to have a good accountability system to determine whether or not they achieved their objectives.

Mrs. King asked about the importance of continuity for that school improvement management team. For example, one year they might have great community people and a supportive staff, and the next year community members move and some teachers were not as supportive. She asked if they had to come up with a totally different plan. Mr. John Nori, principal of Julius West MS, replied that the plan itself should not be contingent upon any one person including the principal. The plan should be based on the data and based on community needs. As they moved into a modernized building, their technology capability should increase ten-fold. Their main goal this year was to focus on staff training around the issue of technology and bringing that technology into the classroom. Parents had been involved in the review and management plan last summer and had dropped off because of other commitments, but other parents had joined.

It seemed to Mrs. King that it would take a massive committee for a parent to be on a committee. She wondered whether they had difficulty in recruiting parents. Mr. Nori replied that he was constantly looking for more ways to recruit people. Mrs. Butler commented that she did have this problem and, in fact, they were now rotating members every two years so that more parents could participate.

Dr. Seleznow said that as there was a change in principal or in a significant number of members of the team, there would be changes in the management plan.

Mr. Ewing stated that the school system was driven by multiple and conflicting impulses. One was a desire to have local school plans that reflected local school conditions. At the same time there was a desire on the part of some to ensure that the system as a whole met the goals of the system such as Success for Every Student and the Maryland plan. It seemed to him there would be tension between those two, and he was unclear about how that got resolved in these management plans. In the directions it stated that schools should choose one or more Success for Every Student goal and at least one area from the Maryland pupil services plan. He asked how the school system reached a conclusion about whether or not a school's plan was going to be effective in achieving school system wide goals and objectives if they focused on only one program.

Dr. Fisher explained that this was part of the monitoring process in talking with the principal about their management plan and how they were planning to meet the goals and also to narrow it down into a focus. They had to know what they could actually accomplish this year. In terms of the pupil services plan, they did not have a discrepancy between what was in that plan and what they would have under Goal 1 in terms of working with students with disabilities. The school plan was based on what they could do, had they taken on too much and, after a second look, would they be able

to come up with outcomes based on everything. If they could not, schools had to go back, refocus, and reprioritize.

Dr. Towers reported that built into the instructional guide and the process was provision for the local teams to get feedback from the director of school administration. This was a quality control and a monitoring process. After they worked with the team, staff, community, and students, they submitted to the Office of School Administration. OSA took a second look using the data and the Success for Every Student plan. This did not mean that OSA dictated to schools what their plans ought to be. He said that a lot of comments principals received were technical, and other comments were data driven from information from the whole cluster. While the plans were individual, schools did receive suggestions and feedback on their plans. Dr. Seleznow added that at time they did dictate a particular area that schools must place in their plans because it was critically important for meeting the goals of the school system.

Mrs. Gordon remarked that she was not a judge of whether a school had a good school improvement management plan or a poor one. In looking at all of them, she did see a variety which was part of the design and part of what they wanted for each local school community to assess the needs of that particular school as it related to that community and to the larger picture.

In regard to parent and community involvement, Mrs. Gordon said that as she read the instructions on completing the plan, she also found there was a broad range from continuous involvement of the community to a lack of indication on the part of schools that they had involved the community. Some schools had parents, teachers, supporting services, and secondary students on their team. Other schools did not. She thought they needed to be a little clearer about what their expectation was in the development of the plan. The instructions stated that community was to be involved in the development of the plan, but in some instances no parents were involved or there was just a presentation at PTA. They needed to do more to be inclusive. It was clear that when staff members, parents, and students were included, they would be much more willing to participate. She found that with the exception of six schools, every school was making some attempt to include parents. The great majority of schools did involve parents, supporting services, and students on the team as full participating members. Four schools had at least as many parents participating as they had staff members participating.

Mrs. Gordon would like to see the area of inclusion be strengthened. If this were taking place more broadly than it appeared, principals needed to say what they were doing so there was not this kind of misunderstanding. Board members were receiving comments that parents were not included and were not involved. She knew this was not the case. She cited the outstanding parental involvement in the plans from Rosa Parks, Woodlin, Page, and Burtonsville.

Re: STUDENT RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES

Dr. Vance introduced Mr. Jack Schoendorfer, acting director of the Department of Student, Community and Staff Support; Dr. Pam Splaine, director of the Division of Administrative Analysis and Audits; and Mr. Mike Michaelson. The purpose in preparing an analysis of the Board's policy on student rights and responsibilities was to consider the need for changes to the format of the existing document. Staff also examined the placement of the statement on discipline as an appendix of the policy.

The analysis process included input from students, staff, principals, and parents. The item was before the Board today for discussion; however, if the Board accepted the option in the policy analysis they would return with a draft resolution for tentative action on a draft policy to allow for public comment.

Dr. Villani acknowledged the presence of several secondary principals and assistant principals in the audience. For the last few years at the suggestion of students, they had been working to come up with a more user friendly version of this policy. This year they had developed a handbook, and raised some issues about the current format for the student rights policy. Staff had done a policy analysis and had some suggestions on sorting out the policy from the implementation guidelines.

Mr. Schoendorfer pointed out that Board members had copies of Student Rights and Responsibilities and staff implementation guidelines which had been published as Section M of the Policies and Regulations Handbook. When laws changed, the superintendent published Administrative Regulation JFA-RA which was an implementation document. The third document was a student's guide to rights and responsibilities in MCPS. This document was developed in collaboration with a group of students to provide students with a user-friendly document to interpret the Board's policy. Their next step was to look at old Section M and suggest reformatting to conform to the Board policy on policymaking.

Dr. Splaine commented that most of their suggestions at this time had to do with the format. Discipline became a format issue for a couple of reasons. On several occasions the Board had suggested a discussion of the discipline policy as if it were a separate policy. It was not. Discipline was part of the student rights and responsibilities handbook. The statement on discipline had been appended to the policy which raised the issue of where they would put this if they were going to reformat this policy. The statement on discipline had been included in student rights because it was in the context of a total educational environment as opposed to looking at discipline punitively.

Dr. Splaine stated that they were offering three options for dealing with the policy. The first option was not to reformat at all and leave the policy as a booklet which it had been for the last 20 years. The disadvantage of that would be that it did not conform to the new policy format and could de-emphasize the statement on discipline by having it as an appendage. The second option would be to reformat the policy on student rights and separate the discipline part into a new policy on discipline. The disadvantage was that for many years discipline had been wedded to rights and responsibilities. The third option would be to reformat the policy on student rights and incorporate the statement on discipline into the body of the policy. This would conform with the policy on policymaking and kept discipline as an integral part of student rights and responsibilities. They were recommending the third option, and they further recommended updating the student guide on a regular basis. They had provided a redrafted policy for the Board's review.

Mr. Felton thought it might be time to involve students to see if they had other areas in terms of making changes. He also asked whether it would be possible to have a simple layman's language approach. Mr. Michaelson replied that students were involved in the regular review. The policy required a review every three years, and the committees included students, staff, and parents. The expectation would be that the Board would tentatively adopt a policy and hold it open for a month or more for comment. It seemed

to him that the policy that teachers and administrators used needed to be consistent with other policies in format, language, and structure. The student guide was a second attempt to create a simplified version for students and contained footnotes for all policies and regulations students would need to refer to. He personally saw the need for two documents.

It seemed to Mr. Abrams that there should be some cross referencing to other policies. Dr. Splaine replied that at the top of the policy was a list of other policies for cross reference, and in the student guide they actually had a section at the end where they listed other policies and regulations. Mr. Abrams felt that this was also a guide for parents and should be a good vehicle for bringing to parents some of the contemporary issues such as beepers.

Mrs. Gordon inquired about the way in which this information was disseminated to students and parents. Mr. Michaelson replied that the student guide was published every year and distributed to all secondary students. Elementary schools received 100 copies for use in classrooms. At the school level this information was disseminated in PTA newsletters. Dr. Villani noted that this was required by the policy and regulations. Parents had to be informed yearly of the existence of the discipline committee, and many principals published this document for parents; however, this was a local decision and not a requirement.

Mr. Felton asked for a staff recommendation for distribution of the policy to parents. Mrs. Gordon asked whether every secondary student had a copy of the booklet, and Dr. Villani replied that every student received a copy. Mrs. Gordon said she did not expect that the booklet be mailed home to every parent, but she agreed that principals should let parents know that their child had a copy.

Dr. Cheung noted that the student guide did not contain the name of the superintendent or the names of the Board members. There was no reference in the document to the function of the Board of Education or the superintendent. Dr. Villani replied that when the document had been published at the end of the summer, there was a Board election going on. Therefore, they hesitated to include the names of Board members.

Ms. Converse thought it was important to maintain discipline as a part of rights and responsibilities. If they decided to go with this new format, they could publish the revised documents for student distribution and for implementation. She felt that the current document was about as user-friendly as they could get. In her school, students got the document through their history class. Students knew about the document, and parents would also call and ask for information. She thought that it was accessible and visible, and she said they needed to keep it comprehensive by keeping it modern. A couple of years ago it had been suggested that the policy be put on disk in every media center. She thought this was an excellent idea, and now that they were moving into technology they should consider putting rights and responsibilities on line. She would like to see more individualization at the local school so that students would have the county policy and individual school rules. It would save a lot of paper if these documents were on line, and the documents could be updated easily. She requested information on whether or not this could be done.

Mr. Ewing stated that he preferred the second option with a separate discipline policy. The disadvantage of this would be that discipline would no longer be regarded as a responsibility. It seemed to him that a discipline policy could be written as a

responsibility and published together with rights and responsibilities. The argument was that discipline as part of rights and responsibilities was not seen as punitive, but he suspected that students saw discipline as punitive regardless of where it was located. He thought they should have one place for all the various administrative regulations and policy issues which would give these greater visibility. It would communicate to the larger community that the Board was concerned about a comprehensive statement on discipline.

Mr. Felton proposed a fourth option which was the third option with a separate publication on discipline. However, he would still incorporate discipline in rights and responsibilities. He had just attended a conference where there was a focus on a more conservative approach in student behavior. While they were looking at a format change, this provided an opportunity for the community at large to see if some shifts needed to be made in rights and responsibilities. This could really generate into a major community effort.

Mr. Ewing explained that he was suggesting the second option with a variation. The discipline policy itself would be published together with the student rights and responsibilities statement; however, they would have a separate discipline policy. Mr. Felton agreed.

Mr. Abrams stated that he was in agreement with Ms. Converse and Mr. Ewing. He agreed with the second option with the modification. In addition, he wanted to follow through on using technology as a way of disseminating this information. It seemed to him that they could use video tapes and run it on their MCPS cable station. This could be used for orientation in middle schools and high schools. He also agreed with the on line approach and thought the discipline issue had to be unified with other policies in the information given to students.

Mrs. Gordon said the Board wanted to do a variation on the second option which would be a policy on student rights and responsibilities and a policy on discipline. These would be incorporated in the guide for rights and responsibilities. Dr. Villani said they were hoping to present two distinct documents. One would be the student guide to rights and responsibilities which was a handbook given to all students. It included the student rights references as well as other information on such things as beepers. It seemed to him the Board was asking for a policy on rights and responsibilities and a policy on discipline. Mrs. Gordon explained that these would be two separate policies, but they would be included in the one format. Dr. Splaine stated that they would return to the Board with the student rights and responsibilities and separately with the discipline policy.

Re: BOARD/SUPERINTENDENT COMMENTS

1. Dr. Vance stated that he was energized by the discussions today about gifted and talented, school improvement plans, and student rights and responsibilities. The Montgomery County public school system was a great place to be. There was an article in the newspaper today talking about the growth in the county and the impact on the public schools. The latest information showed there were over 800,000 residents in the county, and Montgomery County was one of the ten fastest growing areas in the nation. He said that the implications of that could not be lost as they went into the budget process for their capital and operating needs.

2. Dr. Vance reminded the Board that a few minutes ago students from Paint Branch HS, Briggs Chaney MS, and Cloverly ES were talking by radio to astronauts aboard the Endeavor shuttle. He knew the excitement must have been acute for the two students whose father was on the shuttle.
3. Dr. Vance reported that Vice President Gore had visited Forest Knolls ES. He and other invited guests came away from that school sincerely impressed by the achievement of the school staff and students. Dr. Vance noted that Mr. Gore had an amazing rapport with the youngsters when he spoke with them. The vice president was also impressed by the computer experience shown by the students.
4. Dr. Vance stated that Samit Dasgupta, a senior at Montgomery Blair HS, placed fourth out of forty finalists in the Westinghouse Science Talent Search competition. He received a \$15,000 scholarship.
5. Dr. Vance reported that Damascus ES had won the 1995 Exemplary Reading Program from the State of Maryland International Reading Association Council. The school was one of just 23 winners nationally.
6. Dr. Vance explained that the President of the United States had been set to visit Cresthaven ES; however, school was closed because of the weather which cancelled the president's visit.

RESOLUTION NO. 214-95

Re: CLOSED SESSION - MARCH 27, 1995

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Mr. Abrams seconded by Dr. Cheung, the following resolution was adopted with Mr. Abrams, Dr. Cheung, Ms. Converse, Mr. Ewing, Mr. Felton, and Mrs. Gordon voting in the affirmative; Mrs. King being temporarily absent:

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 Monday, March 27, 1995, at 7:30 p.m. 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. 215-95 Re: MINUTES OF JANUARY 10, 1995

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

Resolved, That the minutes of January 10, 1995, be approved.

RESOLUTION NO. 216-95 Re: MINUTES OF JANUARY 23, 1995

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

Resolved, That the minutes of January 23, 1995, be approved.

RESOLUTION NO. 217-95 Re: MINUTES OF JANUARY 26, 1995

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

Resolved, That the minutes of January 26, 1995, be approved.

RESOLUTION NO. 218-95 Re: MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 1, 1995

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

Resolved, That the minutes of February 1, 1995, be approved.

RESOLUTION NO. 219-95 Re: MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 2, 1995

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

Resolved, That the minutes of February 2, 1995, be approved.

RESOLUTION NO. 220-95 Re: MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 8, 1995

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

Resolved, That the minutes of February 8, 1995, be approved.

Re: REPORT ON CLOSED SESSION -
FEBRUARY 27, 1995

On February 15, 1995, by the unanimous vote of members present, the Board of Education voted to conduct a closed session on Monday, February 27, 1995, 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, February 27, 1995, from 7 p.m. to 8 p.m. The meeting took place in Room 120, Carver Educational Services Center, Rockville, Maryland.

Board members met to discuss contract negotiations with MCCSSE and MCAASP and agreed to go forward with public actions to amend the FY 1996 Operating Budget. Board members also granted a request for an extension in BOE Appeal No. 1995-2 and reviewed decision and orders in BOE Appeal Nos. 1994-13, 1994-32, 1994-34, 1994-35, and 1995-1.

In attendance at the closed session were Steve Abrams, Larry Bowers, Carole Burger, Alan Cheung, Blair Ewing, Reggie Felton, Tom Fess, David Fischer, Kathy Gemberling, Ana Sol Gutierrez, Bea Gordon, Nancy King, Brian Porter, Tom Reinert, Paul Vance, Mary Lou Wood, and Melissa Woods.

RESOLUTION NO. 221-95 Re: STAFF RESPONSE TO REPORT OF THE
ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR MINORITY
STUDENT EDUCATION

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education schedule a discussion of the staff response to the Report of the Advisory Committee for Minority Student Education.

RESOLUTION NO. 222-95 Re: BOE APPEAL NO. 1994-13

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education adopt its Decision and Order in BOE Appeal No. 1994-13, a student disciplinary matter.

RESOLUTION NO. 223-95 Re: BOE APPEAL NO. 1994-35

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education adopt its Decision and Order in BOE Appeal No. 1994-35, a tuition matter.

Re: NEW BUSINESS

Mr. Ewing moved and Mr. Abrams seconded the following:

Resolved, That the Board of Education review the issue of the footbridge for the new Blair High School and take a position on this issue.

Re: ITEMS OF INFORMATION

Board members received the following items of information:

1. Items in Process
2. Staff Response to Mental Health Report
3. Construction Progress Report

RESOLUTION NO. 224-95 Re: ADJOURNMENT

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education adjourn its meeting at 5:30 p.m.

PRESIDENT

SECRETARY

PLV:mlw