

APPROVED
24-1996

Rockville, Maryland
May 28, 1996

The Board of Education of Montgomery County met in regular session at the Carver Educational Services Center, Rockville, Maryland, on May 28, 1996, at 8:10 p.m.

ROLL CALL Present: Ms. Ana Sol Gutiérrez, President
in the Chair
Mr. Stephen Abrams
Dr. Alan Cheung
Mr. Blair G. Ewing
Mr. Reginald Felton
Mrs. Beatrice B. Gordon
Mrs. Nancy King
Mr. Charles McCullough
Ms. Rachel Prager, Student Board Member-Elect

Others Present: Dr. Paul L. Vance, Superintendent
Mrs. Katheryn W. Gemberling, Deputy
Mr. Larry A. Bowers, Acting Deputy

indicates student vote does not count. Four votes needed for adoption.

RESOLUTION NO. 353-1996 Re: **BOARD AGENDA**

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education adopt its agenda for May 28, 1996.

Re: **INTERAGES, INC. 10TH ANNIVERSARY**

Due to the illness of Mr. Austin Heymann, this item was postponed until Mr. Heymann could be at the Board table.

Re: **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

The following people testified before the Board:

1. Ms. Phyllis Parks Robinson, President, MCEA
2. Mr. Lawrence Jacobs
3. Mr. Joseph Simon
4. Mr. Michael Calsetta
5. Mr. Dan New-Schneider

- 6. Ms. Claren Holmes
- 7. Ms. Susan Barton
- 8. Ms. Madelyn Cancel
- 9. Mr. Julio Martinez
- 10. Rev. Angel Garcia, Latino Parents Association
- 11. Mr. William Devens
- 12. Ms. Judith Koenick
- 13. Ms. Margaret O'Hare
- 14. Mr. John Willis
- 15. Mr. Fred Evans, Principal of Gaithersburg High School
Ms. Sharon Herzog
Mr. Don McComb

RESOLUTION NO. 354-1996 Re: **AWARD OF CONTRACT - STRATHMORE
ELEMENTARY SCHOOL**

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

WHEREAS, The following bids were received on May 7, 1996, for the Strathmore Elementary School addition, with work to begin June 24, 1996, and be completed by August 1, 1997:

<u>Bidder</u>	<u>Amount</u>
Meridian Construction Co., Inc.	\$ 1,240,400
Henley Construction Co., Inc.	1,243,800
Keller Brothers, Inc.	1,246,622
William F. Klingensmith, Inc.	1,248,200
Pioneer Builders, Inc.	1,248,215
Tuckman-Barbee Construction Co., Inc.	1,310,100
The Perigee Group, Inc.	1,310,541
D&M of Maryland General Contracting, Inc.	1,333,408
Northwood Contractors, Inc.	1,335,000
Porter Construction Management, Inc.	1,369,699
H&H Contractors, Inc.	1,381,600

and

WHEREAS, Meridian Construction Co., Inc., has completed similar projects successfully for Montgomery County Public Schools; and

WHEREAS, The low bid is below the staff estimate of \$1,300,000; now therefore be it

Resolved, That a contract for \$1,240,400 be awarded to Meridian Construction Co., Inc., for the Strathmore Elementary School addition, in accordance with plans and specifications prepared by Wanchul Lee Associates, Architects.

RESOLUTION NO. 355-1996 Re: **AWARD OF CONTRACTS FOR MAINTENANCE PROJECT AT VARIOUS SCHOOLS**

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

WHEREAS, Sealed bids for various maintenance projects were received on April 23 and May 2, 1996, in accordance with MCPS procurement practices, with work at Sherwood High School and Tilden Center to begin on May 15, 1996, and to be completed by September 1, 1996, and work at Wheaton High School to begin on June 24, 1996, and to be completed by August 1, 1996; and

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

WHEREAS, The low bids are below staff estimates, and the low bidders meeting specifications have completed similar work successfully for Montgomery County Public Schools; now therefore be it

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

<u>Project</u>	<u>Amount</u>
<u>Fuel Oil Tank and Related Systems Replacement</u>	
Wheaton High School	
Low Bidder: M & M Welding and Fabricators, Inc.	\$ 56,000
<u>Chiller, Cooling Tower, and Related Systems Replacement</u>	
Sherwood High School	
Low Bidder: EMD Mechanical Specialists, Inc.	204,788

Tilden Center
Low Bidder: EMD Mechanical Specialists, Inc. 190,860

RESOLUTION NO. 356-1996 Re: **BROAD ACRES ELEMENTARY SCHOOL HEALTH CENTER**

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

WHEREAS, On April 22, 1996, contracts were awarded for various subcontracts for the construction of a community health center addition to Broad Acres Elementary School, contingent upon the receipt of additional funds; and

WHEREAS, The Montgomery County Department of Health and Human Services, which is administering the state and federal grant for the health center construction, has asked the Board of Education to rebid the project because additional funds are not available; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the subcontracts awarded on April 22, 1996, for the construction of the Broad Acres community health center contingent upon the receipt of available funds be rescinded at the request of the Montgomery County Department of Health and Human Services, and the project be rebid.

RESOLUTION NO. 357-1996 Re: **UTILIZATION OF FY 1996 FUTURE SUPPORTED PROJECT FUNDS AND CATEGORICAL TRANSFER WITHIN THE CAREER AND TECHNOLOGY EDUCATION PROGRAMS**

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

Resolved, That the superintendent of schools be authorized to receive and expend within the FY 1996 Provision for Future Supported Projects a grant award of \$53,569 from the Maryland State Department of Education, under the Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Applied Technology Education Act, for the vocational and technology education programs, in the following category:

<u>Category</u>	<u>Amount</u>
3 Other Instructional Costs	\$ 53,569

and be it further

Resolved, That the superintendent of schools be authorized to effect an FY 1996 categorical transfer of \$197,798 within this same program, in the following categories:

	<u>Category</u>		<u>From</u>		<u>To</u>
2	Instructional Salaries	\$	100,454		
3	Other Instructional Costs			\$	197,798
4	Special Education		40,587		
10	Fixed Charges		<u>56,757</u>		_____
	Total	<u>\$</u>	<u>197,798</u>	<u>\$</u>	<u>197,798</u>

and be it further

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

RESOLUTION NO. 358-1996 Re: **RECOMMENDATION TO SUBMIT AN FY 1997 PROPOSAL TO THE MARYLAND STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION FOR THE TECHNOLOGY IN MARYLAND SCHOOLS PROJECT**

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

Resolved, That the superintendent of schools be authorized to submit an FY 1997 grant proposal for \$305,600 to the Maryland State Department of Education (MSDE) for the Technology in Maryland Schools project to support the Global Access initiative by providing computer network wiring, hardware, software, and staff training; and be it further

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

RESOLUTION NO. 359-1996 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 effective July 1, 1996:

<u>Appointment</u>	<u>Present Position</u>	<u>As</u>
Daniel Shea	Principal, Westland MS	Principal, Quince Orchard HS

RESOLUTION NO. 360-1996 Re: **PERSONNEL APPOINTMENT**

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

Resolved, That the following personnel appointment be approved effective July 1, 1996:

<u>Appointment</u>	<u>Present Position</u>	<u>As</u>
Dorothy Colding	Assistant Principal, William H. Farquhar MS	Principal, William H. Farquhar MS

RESOLUTION NO. 361-1996 Re: **PERSONNEL APPOINTMENT**

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

Resolved, That the following personnel appointment be approved effective July 1, 1996:

<u>Appointment</u>	<u>Present Position</u>	<u>As</u>
Mary M. Rapp	Acting Assistant Principal, Flower Hill ES	Principal, Chevy Chase ES

RESOLUTION NO. 362-1996 Re: **PERSONNEL APPOINTMENT**

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

Resolved, That the following personnel appointment be approved effective July 1, 1996:

<u>Appointment</u>	<u>Present Position</u>	<u>As</u>
Vera D. Torrence	Coordinator of Elementary Mathematics	Principal, Meadow Hall ES

RESOLUTION NO. 363-1996 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 effective May 29, 1996:

<u>Appointment</u>	<u>Present Position</u>	<u>As</u>
Marlene E. Hartzman	Acting Director, Department of Educational Accountability	Director, Department of Educational Accountability

RESOLUTION NO. 364-1996 Re: **PERSONNEL APPOINTMENT**

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

Resolved, That the following personnel appointment be approved effective May 29, 1996:

<u>Appointment</u>	<u>Present Position</u>	<u>As</u>
Kathy J. McGuire	Acting Director, Department of Comprehensive Pupil Services	Director, Department of Comprehensive Pupil Services

RESOLUTION NO. 365-1996 Re: **PERSONNEL APPOINTMENT**

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

Resolved, That the following personnel appointment be approved effective July 1, 1996:

<u>Appointment</u>	<u>Present Position</u>	<u>As</u>
John Nori	Principal, Julius West MS	Project Director of Middle School Instruction

RESOLUTION NO. 366-1996 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 effective July 1, 1996:

<u>Appointment</u>	<u>Present Position</u>	<u>As</u>
Kathleen Lazor	Acting Director, Division of Food and Nutrition Services	Director, Division of Food and Nutrition Services

RESOLUTION NO. 367-1996 Re: **PERSONNEL APPOINTMENTS**

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

Resolved, That the following personnel transfers be approved effective July 1, 1996:

<u>Appointment</u>	<u>Present Position</u>	<u>As</u>
Michael DeBoy	Assistant Principal, Montgomery Blair HS	Assistant Principal, Damascus HS
Jeanette Dixon	Assistant Principal, Walter Johnson HS	Assistant Principal, Benjamin Banneker MS
Stanley P. Foreman	Assistant Principal, Earle B. Wood MS	Assistant Principal, Poolesville MS/HS

Re: **UPDATE ON TEACHER EVALUATION PROCESS**

Dr. Vance invited the following people to the table: Dr. Robert Shoenberg and Ms. Sharon Friedman, co-chairs of the Teacher Evaluation System Advisory Group; Mr. Armando Gutierrez, director of the Department of Employment Standards and Operations; and Dr. Marlene Hartzman, director of the Department of Education Accountability.

Dr. Vance reported that on February 7, 1996, the Teacher Evaluation System Advisory Group was formed and met that day. The role of the advisory group is to make recommendations on three major phases of the teacher evaluation project within a 18-month timeframe; (1) identify standards for teacher evaluation; (2) analyze the current MCPS system of teacher evaluation as well as the systems in other school districts throughout the country; and (3) formulate possible revisions for the teacher evaluation system. Dr. Vance highlighted his white paper to the Board as well as pointing out that the last major revision of the teacher evaluation was 20 years, and the Board of Education requested a review of the teacher evaluation.

Dr. Shoenberg commended the Department of Educational Accountability for their assistance in working with the advisory group. He updated the Board on the steps taken by the advisory group to this point by: (1) familiarizing themselves with accepted standards of teacher evaluation systems; (2) analyzing teacher evaluation systems; (3) applying standards to the MCPS teacher evaluation; (4) identifying aspects of the current system that needs revision based on accepted standards; (5) collating ideas of the subgroups; and (6) formulating specific recommendations to the Board in the spring of 1997.

Mr. Felton thanked the co-chairs for their efforts to date with this project. He asked if they could share with the Board any discussions regarding basic principles and philosophy. Ms. Friedman responded that the group has spent a fair amount of time familiarizing themselves with the national evaluation standards. The current system has two components: (1) the document, and (2) the manner in which the teacher evaluation system is implemented. The document itself is very comprehensive and covers a variety of different areas for evaluation. The group's discussions have talked about the document but more importantly how those evaluations are carried out; therefore, the recommendations from the group may be a combination of both areas. Dr. Shoenberg added that the consultant has told the group there is no such thing as a perfect system. A system cannot be designed that functions effectively in identifying teachers who should be separated from the school system and, at the same time, enabling good teachers to improve their skills. Obviously, there will be some tradeoffs; therefore, the group is analyzing keeping the present system or shifting the balance.

Mr. Felton asked if there has been discussion regarding shifting for the principal evaluating the teacher to peer and/or student evaluations of teachers? Dr. Shoenberg stated the group has not gotten to that point in their discussion, but the subject is certainly on the table.

Mr. Abrams asked when the final report with recommendations will be available for the Board's review. Dr. Shoenberg responded that they had an 18-month timetable, but will report by next spring or earlier. Mr. Abrams felt this timeframe would fit well with negotiations with MCEA which is in two years.

Mr. Ewing was pleased with the deliberate way in which the group is pursuing its task. After the experience of the Commission on Excellence in Teaching, the school system has learned that a deliberate approach is best when raising complex and potentially very controversial issues. Recommendations are based not so much on total agreement of everyone, but on a system that is of high quality. One issue that will need to be addressed is that of budget implications and the total costs involved if the system is modified or shifted.

Dr. Cheung thanked the group for their initial work and the status report. The Commission on Excellence in Teaching had very good recommendations and established a criterion. Any plans should have goals and objectives and information analysis. He asked if the group has considered having an individual staff profile for performance, evaluation, and development? Dr. Shoenberg responded that there is in the current system a provision that requires each staff member to formulate with the administrator an individual development plan.

Ms. Gutiérrez remarked that the approach the group has taken is very thorough in order to understand what an evaluation system should measure. She asked about the

philosophical framework on which that the group was basing their analysis in order to develop a total quality concept that looks at individuals within an organization as assets as well as the organization's expectations of the employees. There needs to be a philosophical view on which to build performance measures linked to the educational mission of MCPS. Within this scope, the teacher evaluation system might be modified or rewritten, but there needs to be good feedback from the Board as to the assessment philosophy and performance measures associated with outcomes of the educational system.

The Board of Education took a 10-minute break at this point.

**Re: RECOMMENDATIONS ON THE FY 1997
OPERATING BUDGET FOLLOWING COUNTY
COUNCIL ACTION**

Dr. Vance's white paper made recommendations for achieving the \$8.2 million in budget reductions imposed by the County Council in the Board's requested budget for Fiscal Year 1997 for final action by the Board scheduled for June 11. He reported that despite an overall increase of \$32.6 million or 4 percent over the current year, the loss of \$8.2 million cannot be offset without cuts in existing programs and services and/or reductions or elimination of requested improvements. Dr. Vance urged members of the Board to submit questions to him in order for staff to prepare responses prior to the June 11, 1996, meeting.

Mr. Bowers reported that the largest affected budget categories (representing 60 percent of the Council's reduction) include instructional salaries and related fringe benefits and other instructional costs, which primarily affect schools. Nineteen percent of the Council's reduction affect transportation funding, while another 10 percent was cut from the state funding categories for the operation and maintenance of facilities. Of the remaining reductions, 6 percent was taken from administration and approximately 5 percent from employee benefits.

Mr. Abrams asked if the County Council included the authority to charge fees. If, in fact, the Council contended that MCPS charge the fee and come back for a supplemental appropriation after fees have been collected, does that suggest that they are willing to look at that outside the context of spending affordability? Mr. Bowers affirmed that the spending affordability would not apply at that time.

* Ms. Prager left the meeting at this point.

Mr. Ewing appreciated the explanation in the superintendent's white paper and hoped that nobody, however, translates that into what anybody could believe was a logical justification for what the Council did, because he did not believe there is one. These are harmful

reductions, almost every one of them. They involved, in his view, a determined effort on the part of the County Council to attempt to micro-mange in a way that runs counter to the whole range of Board policies and priorities, including early childhood programs, gifted and talented, Head Start, increased security in schools, and the fact of eliminating all increases for inflation. As for the middle school reading teachers, there is presumably some concern on the part of the Council about the issue that has to do with whether or not students graduating from MCPS are in all cases as well equipped as they ought to be to undertake college level reading assignments. Now, the Council is cutting out reading teachers. This makes no sense whatsoever. This is one of the more absurd reductions.

With respect to Head Start, Mr. Ewing thought the superintendent's recommendation was unpalatable but not unreasonable in terms of increasing class size for Head Start. However, in anticipation of both the possibility that the Board may submit a supplemental and, more importantly, with respect to the Council meeting scheduled on June 24, the Board needs to be prepared as does the superintendent and he needs to prepare the Board with as much in the way of analysis of Head Start performance and effectiveness as can be assembled both in terms of local results and national results. There is a national Head Start study put together three or four years ago and many local ones as in other jurisdictions. The school system did not have a thorough study of its own but the system does have Head Start transition evaluations as well as the study done in 1983. As it is evident to anyone who looks at it, that study lacks an important component of a good evaluation because it does not have a control group. But, it is an assessment of an MCPS program's effectiveness after 17 years of operation. That may or may not persuade the majority of the Council, but what it will do is allow the Board to make that kind of presentation and have, at least, on our conscience the satisfaction of knowing that the school system made the very best possible representation of the needs for this kind of program. He hoped that would occur and that the school system would not fail to argue effectively on behalf of this program and not offer, frankly, any concession beyond those that the superintendent has already offered. The Council apparently, if one looks at the questions that Gail Ewing raised in her letter, would like to figure out a way as to make the program cheaper. You make things cheap, you get below quality and that is what the Council's resolution does. MCPS has certified teachers in this program and they do an excellent job. That is not to say that people who are not certified, cannot do well, but the likelihood is that they will not do as well, and that is why we have certified teachers in the program. The Board needs to address all the issues both implicit and explicit of the Council letter and in the Council discussion. For some reason, the Council has decided that after 30 years of successful Head Start, it does not work or ought to be dismantled or ought to be fundamentally changed. That is ridiculous, but it nevertheless needs to be responded to as effectively as the school system knows how.

Of all the issues that are going to be before the Board to decide, Ms. Gutiérrez was quite concerned about the Head Start issue. She was concerned as well when throughout the budget process with the Council, education policy which is the Board's business was being

made through budgetary decisions. The decisions on Head Start are the critical example of the kind of wrong approach that she thought could be taken if the Board continues with letting the funding drive the program. In a way, she regretted that the Board even put the Head Start increase on its list of so-called improvements, which is their word not ours. She sensed that it opened a can of worms if the Council is now going to be looking and making the decisions of what our alternatives and options ought to be. She believed that is for the Board to do, the Board of Education will do that. She urged the superintendent that before June 11 when we make our decision, that the data Mr. Ewing had requested and as much data as possible be provided to the Board. Then the Board will have a chance to review, comment, and can give a sense of what is acceptable from the Board's perspective of what its legitimate options are in which this program can move. The Council is looking to see how the Board can cut costs. There are many, many complexities to this program. There are many ramifications to tamper with the structure and the successful model that MCPS has. Originally, there were two models proposed -- one school-based, which is what we have implemented and, and one non-school based model. They knew back when they started that the school-based model provided the best kind of support and capabilities for a Head Start program. There were obviously alternatives because not every child in the nation has access to a school-based system. However, the clear superiority of the school-based model was recognized at the very beginning of the Head Start program. She hoped the Board could draw those distinctions because it is not something that the Board can rush into. The sense for the memo and from the date is that the Board will quickly come up with a new creative way of redesigning Head Start programs. She would rather that the Board consider keeping the status quo, delivering the services as MCPS is at this moment until the Board has the opportunity to look and evaluate, and see if there are some possible savings, but not put the savings ahead of the quality of the program. MCPS has a top notch, quality program that works.

Mr. Felton believed MCPS has an outstanding model for Head Start, but he does believe that simply because MCPS is successful does not mean necessarily the status quo. He thought that the Council has raised some issues that the Board ought to respond. He too would urge the superintendent to provide the Board with the data necessary to defend the Board's position. However, Mr. Felton believed that there are ways to look at how the school system executes any of its programs, and it must be convincing not only to the Board of Education or Council, but to the community as the Board begins to look at additional and increasing needs from the community. If the Board is unable to deliver as it delivers today because of increasing needs, then he was not certain what alternatives the Board has if it is not willing to look at delivering with some change. The Board has the responsibility to look at issues raised by the community or the Council since it is the taxpayers' money.

Mr. Abrams shared Mr. Felton's views that the status quo on programs with shrinking resources will ultimately lead to a Cadillac program being offered to fewer and fewer students. His view was that right now the average cost per pupil in the Head Start program

is \$6,170 exclusive of overhead, utility, or maintenance costs. For the discussion, the Board ought to be raising the question of getting the most bang for the buck at that level or are there lower per pupil costs alternatives that comply with federal law and allow MCPS to expand the programs in the direction the Board would like to be able to do. Hopefully, when the superintendent comes back to the Board with that data, there will be a significant evaluation of alternative cost models on a per pupil basis utilizing some of the suggestions that have been raised by Board members, by the Council, and the community particularly on an integration of a school-based model and moving toward a school-supervised model that would retain the virtues of school-based model but would provide some additional flexibility on cost savings through some unique partnerships. Mr. Abrams raised the question with regard to the capital component to expansion of programs as to whether MCPS has the capacity currently to expand the program in its current model.

Mrs. Gordon saw a need to focus on the task at hand. It is clear that the Council has suggested ways that they would make reductions. The Board ought not focus on that, the Board ought to focus on what is its authority and that is to determine how it will make those reductions. The Board will agree or disagree or completely ignore the recommendations that the Council made. The Council has given the Board the bottom line number for each category, and that is where the Board goes forward. The superintendent has attempted in his best judgment as the instructional leader and the person with the responsibility of carrying out the education of students and has come forward with recommendations that he believes will at least do the least harm. Mrs. Gordon was concerned not for those students who are being served but more for those students who are not being served which is going to be an increasing number looking at the demographics of our county. The Board needs to be open to how it can provide services to all the children who need them. It may be that the Board will have to make some adjustments and look at models that are out there. She hoped that the Board would get something from the superintendent that would look at national models. Certainly, with any kind of federal program, there is a great deal of monitoring that takes place at the federal level. The school system needs to check with the federal Head Start office to see where there are other programs and models that may be effective that would enable MCPS to provide for its students. Given that fewer than 15% of the Head Start programs in the country are school-based programs and the rest are provided through health and human services, the Board needs to look at how it might change the component and, not necessarily give up the educational component, but strengthen it and perhaps share it. Are there ways that private providers, private nursery schools, private educational facilities could provide services to some of those students who we are not able to provide services for? Whatever changes that come forward, she will look at how MCPS can provide additional services to additional students because she thought that is going to be a growing number. The school system has to look at national models, and she thought a good place to start was the Head Start office to see in their experience of many, many years would provide programs the Board could take a look at.

Mrs. King asked if she was correct in assuming that if the window for the changing of the hours and the school system adjusts the charge for field trips and lengthens the mileage for high school kids walking to school, that will wipe out the bus fee? Mr. Bowers thought that was correct.

Mrs. King stated that the school system has an excellent Head Start program, no question about that. But, there is a question out there, if not from the Council, it is coming from the community at this point. The School system is spending a lot of money on Head Start and is that money spent wisely or is there a better way to still have an excellent program but to serve more kids and to do it more economically. The Board owes it to the community at this point to come up with an answer.

Dr. Cheung stated that since 1990 there has been a continuous pattern of cutting the budget. He has been on the Board for six years and has been unable to make any significant improvements or investments in the education of Montgomery County Public Schools. All Board members have a vision to improve the school system, but because of the economic situation the system must do more with less. At some point, the school system will tip over and never recover. If you look at the natural laws and logical progressions, the Council will continue to cut. At a certain time and at a certain point, the Board will no longer continue to do well. He was concerned about the future. The superintendent and staff have come up with recommendations that do the least damage year after year. He would like to see the Board have a discussion to turn things around and see if the citizens in Montgomery County are willing to invest in quality education, and work with the Board to improve education.

Mr. Abrams had a concern about the rosy scenario that is being included in the assumptions on the cost savings to be achieved by the changes in the school day. He was particularly concerned because the school system is on a six-minute increment building time. The concern is that the school system is reducing the window of turn-around time in the elementary school buses. If the assumption is right, there will be some savings. If the assumption is wrong, there are no savings. To use that as an argument against fees, in his judgment, does not have merit. The transportation fees in any form, reminds him of the Perils of Pauline. The first attack was by legal opinion that questioned the Board's authority on fees generally. Then, there was a circumstance where the legislation died that would have specifically prohibited the Board from collecting fees irrespectfully. The County Council has now included, as an assumption, the charging of fees or recognizing that fees can be charged for special programs only to see them slapped away again in terms of ultimate recommendations by the superintendent as an offset of a questionable nature. He urged his colleagues not to throw away the issue of fees so quickly; particularly, in light of the comment Mr. Bowers made as to what the process is vis a vis fees and spending affordability. It seemed to him that the Board has a rare opportunity to do a couple of things in creating a pool of funds generated from fees, and then go to the Council for a supplemental appropriation and specifically identify where those fees are to

be used. Given the fact there are some areas that the Board might want to act outside the limits of the Council's budget recommendations, he thought looking not only at the transportation fees but some of the other fees included in the budget which are not going to be challenged as much as the transportation fees, and then make a judgment as to a supplement appropriation as where best to use the funds such as program improvements. For example, the funds generated through the transportation fee to reinstate the improvements in the gifted and talented program. He was heartened by the non-categorical designation as the Board is going to come back with a supplemental appropriation. That provides the Board with a great deal more flexibility so that the Board can make policy and identify how to fund it.

Mr. Ewing observed that the Board and the Council react with horror at the notion of class size increases, but there is complacency over the notion of an increase of three students in Head Start. He thought that nursery schools would emasculate Head Start. The Council loves that kind of talk as well as Mr. Abrams' mention of a Cadillac program. The school system does not have a Cadillac program, but a program that involves the employment of certified teachers. The national Head Start office has consistently praised MCPS for having certified teachers as it is effective and it works well. When the numbers of the poor are increasing, the notion that the school system should spend less when their problems are dramatically increasing is unseemly. It appears that as more and more poor appear, the less will be done for them. He thought that was appalling. He hoped that the Board will look at the assessment of the effectiveness of what is done and the opportunity to look at what other people do. To do that because the school system is looking for something cheaper and less good at a time when we need something better, is to give up on young children and early childhood programs for poor children who need them desperately. He hoped that the Board would think twice and three times before it undercuts what has been an extraordinarily effective program.

Mr. Felton clarified the issue of cuts. The budget proposed by the Council is \$32.6 million more. The issue the Board is uncomfortable with is that not enough was given under these circumstances. The Board has talked about the fact that the community is willing to pay more taxes, but the Board has not convinced the Council or County Executive that they are willing to do that. Perhaps, the Board needs to mobilize the community as they truly believe that they want to invest more in education. The Board has a dilemma. The Board must be concerned with ensuring that increased numbers of students are reached with programs that currently exist. If that means some change, the Board must be willing to do that. None of the Board wants to sacrifice the poor or the children. The Board is trying to find a way to sustain, enhance, or expand programs that the Board knows, if we do not pay for now, we will pay dearly for later. He was uncomfortable with fees as some of his colleagues are, but he did not know that the Board can simply say we will not approach the issue if, in fact, we are not sure the Board will get the money. This supplemental appears to be like a carrot. Some of the Board believes the Council will provide for the school

system in the end, but others do not believe that. It is a matter of trust, and he was not convinced at this point that the Board will have the necessary funding.

Mrs. Gordon clarified her previous statement in that her main concern is serving those students that the school system is not able to serve currently. There will be an increasing number, and those students need to be identified. She mentioned nursery schools because most children's pre-school experience is not in Head Start but by private providers such as nursery schools and day care centers. If those facilities are able to provide services to Head Start students, then the school system ought to look at that. She did not mean that was less than of an experience or more of an experience, but it may be another opportunity to provide for those students who are not being provided for now. If the school system cannot do the job, then it should allow someone who might support the school system to provide services.

Mr. Abrams stated that during public comments the Board heard speaker after speaker rail against as interpretation of a policy which, frankly if that is what the policy did, many of the Board would have been against it. But, there was a misinterpretation of the policy. In fact, many of the comments did not reflect on anyone having read the policy. What the Board ended up getting was the fears, demagoging, and other concerns that had absolutely nothing to do with what this Board enacted in the policy. He used that to preface his remarks because it is amazing what language can do. Sometimes language can be used to show an increase in a program that is really a cut in a program. Sometimes people can be labeled as insensitive toward the poor by the comments one makes. He was not so certain, however, that anyone who legitimately suggests ways of looking at program delivery for the benefit of reaching more students and doing it in a more cost-effective manner through innovations or through a lack of some constraints that had been previously attached which may not have program merit. That is what Mrs. Gordon was doing, and that is what he was doing. All of the Board would like to be able to extend Head Start to all students who need it. The question is how the Board will do it. Mr. Felton spoke about trusting the Council regarding a supplemental appropriation. He has heard more Board members talk about mobilizing the community to support a tax increase. He stated that the Board cannot convince the community at large to support a tax increase and public schools until the primary users are willing to stand up and say "me first." That is the logic behind fees. It is a much more compelling argument to go forward to the public at large and say -- "we are the primary users and it is important because we are willing to pay for those services." The Board wants to say to the community that it is important to support public education. In the current climate, that is not going to fly. That is the reason that Mr. Abrams is as much of an advocate of fees as he is. The only way this system becomes creditable in talking about real needs is for the users to demonstrate that they are willing to pay to support this system as an encouragement for the community to be willing to put in more. That would make more of a statement to the County Council than anything else that can be done. The issue on supplementals, whether the Council can be trusted to enact them, what Mr. Abrams heard in response to his questions was that, in

fact, there has been consistency over the past several years for the willingness of the Council to entertain fees. In fact, this year the Council put those assumptions in their budget. The Council is not willing to change the spending affordability interpretations, but they will and, in fact, they have given the precise out on that. This is, if the Board wants to put in the fees and come back to the Council, the Council will appropriate it after spending affordability does not impact it. This is not all that illogical. That is what Mr. Abrams was basing his premise in terms of including the fees when looking at supplementals.

Mr. Ewing stated that he absolutely disagreed with every word Mr. Abrams said. Mr. Ewing felt the community is willing to pay and going forward with fees is a way to ensure that the Board does not get any further support from the community.

Ms. Gutiérrez reacted to the Board members statements and it was clear to her that members had very different opinions. There are extremely different points of view as well as different philosophies and the understanding of the role of government. It is important to understand that the Board members are looking at the budget from different points of view. The Board needs to be as informed as possible to understand all the implications. She urged the superintendent to provide the Board with as much information as possible regarding the implications of reductions, funding options, and Title VI funds. She stated that one program does not need to be destroyed to provide for another one. The Board needs to think in terms of how the Board can divide the resources that are available and recognize what a difference it makes in the lives of children.

**Re: SUPERINTENDENT'S RECOMMENDATIONS FOR
1996-97 SCHOOL CONTINGENCY CALENDAR**

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Mr. Abrams seconded by Mr. McCullough, the following two resolutions were placed on the table:

WHEREAS, The Board of Education approved the 1996-97 school calendar on December 15, 1995, with 185 instructional days and 191 professional days for the 1996-97 school year, ending June 19 for students and associated supporting services staff and on June 20 for teachers and other professional and supporting services staff; and

WHEREAS, The Education Article of the Annotated Code of Maryland requires a school calendar with a minimum of 180 days and 1080 hours for elementary and 1170 hours for secondary schools; and

WHEREAS, On March 13, 1996, the Board of Education requested that the superintendent provide recommendations for a contingency plan to make-up lost days due to inclement weather and to specify when days would be made up; and

WHEREAS, The Board of Education and the superintendent of schools believe that the students of the Montgomery County Public Schools should receive the maximum number of instructional days possible, and

WHEREAS, The Montgomery County parents, community and staff should be informed of the Board adopted school calendar each year and subsequent contingency plan identifying days that will be used to make-up lost instructional time due to emergency closings; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Board of Education amend its 1996-97 school calendar adopted on December 12, 1995, by identifying the contingency plan of specific days to be used in order to meet the state's 180 day and hour requirements; and be it further

Resolved, That the Board of Education and superintendent of schools convey to all students, parents, employees and the general public the importance of providing the instructional program and the need to be in compliance with state law in relationship to the contingency plan as described; and be it further

Resolved, That should the school year be disrupted by more than five emergency closings and schools are closed six days, the student school year will be extended to June 20; are closed seven days, the school year will be extended to June 20 and June 23 (a state waiver will be requested for June 23); are closed eight days, the school year will be extended to June 20 and June 23, and use April 4 of spring break; are closed nine days, the school year will be extended to June 20 and June 23, and use April 3 and 4 of spring break; are closed ten days, the school year will be extended to June 20 and June 23 and use April 2, 3 and 4 of spring break.

Re: **RECOMMENDATIONS TO INCREASE
INSTRUCTIONAL TIME FOR STUDENTS**

WHEREAS, The Maryland General Assembly's 1995 amendment to the Annotated Code of Maryland requires school systems to meet both the minimum requirement of 180 school days and 1,080 hours at the elementary school level or 1,170 hours at the secondary school level; and

WHEREAS, Increasing the length of the student day is necessary to ensure compliance with the state mandated number of instructional hours; and

WHEREAS, Increasing the student day at the high school and middle school levels from 6 hours and 30 minutes to 6 hours and 45 minutes, and at the elementary school level from 6 hours and 5 minutes to 6 hours and 15 minutes will ensure compliance with the new state requirements; and

WHEREAS, Increased instructional time has been shown to improve student achievement; and

WHEREAS, These proposed changes will reduce the cost of transportation by reducing the length of bus runs; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Board of Education approve increasing the student instructional day at the high school and middle school levels to 6 hours and 45 minutes; and be it further

Resolved, That the Board of Education increase the student instructional day at the elementary school level to 6 hours and 15 minutes; and be it further

Resolved, That the Board of Education authorize the superintendent to implement changes in the length of the student day by adjusting the starting and ending times to:

7:25 a.m. to 2:10 p.m. for high schools
7:55 a.m. to 2:40 p.m. for middle schools
8:50 a.m. to 3:05 p.m. tier 1 elementary schools
9:15 a.m. to 3:30 p.m. tier 2 elementary schools

and be it further

Resolved, That these hours shall be effective with the opening of school in September 1996.

RESOLUTION NO. 368-1996 Re: **AMENDMENT TO RECOMMENDATIONS TO INCREASE INSTRUCTIONAL TIME FOR STUDENTS**

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education ask the superintendent to continue to meet with MCAASP and MCEA to consult about and review the parameters of how the additional instructional time should be distributed during the school day, and further that local school administrators should consult their faculties in modifying school schedules; and be it further

Resolved, That the Board of Education direct these changes be implemented in accord with existing negotiated agreements and with respect for the planning time needed for quality instruction.

RESOLUTION NO. 369-1996 Re: **SUPERINTENDENT'S RECOMMENDATIONS FOR
1996-97 SCHOOL CONTINGENCY CALENDAR *and*
RECOMMENDATIONS TO INCREASE
INSTRUCTIONAL TIME FOR STUDENTS**

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Mr. Abrams and seconded by Ms. Gutiérrez, the following two resolutions were adopted with Mr. Abrams, Dr. Cheung, Mr. Ewing, Mr. Felton, Ms. Gutiérrez, and Mrs. King voting in the affirmative; Mrs. Gordon and Mr. McCullough voting in the negative:

SUPERINTENDENT'S RECOMMENDATIONS FOR 1996-97 SCHOOL CONTINGENCY CALENDAR

WHEREAS, The Board of Education approved the 1996-97 school calendar on December 15, 1995, with 185 instructional days and 191 professional days for the 1996-97 school year, ending June 19 for students and associated supporting services staff and on June 20 for teachers and other professional and supporting services staff; and

WHEREAS, The Education Article of the Annotated Code of Maryland requires a school calendar with a minimum of 180 days and 1080 hours for elementary and 1170 hours for secondary schools; and

WHEREAS, On March 13, 1996, the Board of Education requested that the superintendent provide recommendations for a contingency plan to make-up lost days due to inclement weather and to specify when days would be made up; and

WHEREAS, The Board of Education and the superintendent of schools believe that the students of the Montgomery County Public Schools should receive the maximum number of instructional days possible, and

WHEREAS, The Montgomery County parents, community and staff should be informed of the Board adopted school calendar each year and subsequent contingency plan identifying days that will be used to make-up lost instructional time due to emergency closings; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Board of Education amend its 1996-97 school calendar adopted on December 12, 1995, by identifying the contingency plan of specific days to be used in order to meet the state's 180 day and hour requirements; and be it further

Resolved, That the Board of Education and superintendent of schools convey to all students, parents, employees and the general public the importance of providing the instructional program and the need to be in compliance with state law in relationship to the contingency plan as described; and be it further

Resolved, That should the school year be disrupted by more than five emergency closings and schools are closed six days, the student school year will be extended to June 20; are closed seven days, the school year will be extended to June 20 and June 23 (a state waiver will be requested for June 23); are closed eight days, the school year will be extended to June 20 and June 23, and use April 4 of spring break; are closed nine days, the school year will be extended to June 20 and June 23, and use April 3 and 4 of spring break; are closed ten days, the school year will be extended to June 20 and June 23 and use April 2, 3 and 4 of spring break.

RECOMMENDATIONS TO INCREASE INSTRUCTIONAL TIME FOR STUDENTS

WHEREAS, The Maryland General Assembly's 1995 amendment to the Annotated Code of Maryland requires school systems to meet both the minimum requirement of 180 school days and 1,080 hours at the elementary school level or 1,170 hours at the secondary school level; and

WHEREAS, Increasing the length of the student day is necessary to ensure compliance with the state mandated number of instructional hours; and

WHEREAS, Increasing the student day at the high school and middle school levels from 6 hours and 30 minutes to 6 hours and 45 minutes, and at the elementary school level from 6 hours and 5 minutes to 6 hours and 15 minutes will ensure compliance with the new state requirements; and

WHEREAS, Increased instructional time has been shown to improve student achievement; and

WHEREAS, These proposed changes will reduce the cost of transportation by reducing the length of bus runs; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Board of Education approve increasing the student instructional day at the high school and middle school levels to 6 hours and 45 minutes; and be it further

Resolved, That the Board of Education increase the student instructional day at the elementary school level to 6 hours and 15 minutes; and be it further

Resolved, That the Board of Education authorize the superintendent to implement changes in the length of the student day by adjusting the starting and ending times to:

- 7:25 a.m. to 2:10 p.m. for high schools
- 7:55 a.m. to 2:40 p.m. for middle schools
- 8:50 a.m. to 3:05 p.m. tier 1 elementary schools
- 9:15 a.m. to 3:30 p.m. tier 2 elementary schools

and be it further

Resolved, That these hours shall be effective with the opening of school in September 1996; and be it further

Resolved, That the Board of Education ask the superintendent to continue to meet with MCAASP and MCEA to consult about and review the parameters of how the additional instructional time should be distributed during the school day, and further that local school administrators should consult their faculties in modifying school schedules; and be it further

Resolved, That the Board of Education direct these changes be implemented in accord with existing negotiated agreements and with respect for the planning time needed for quality instruction.

Re: **BOARD/SUPERINTENDENT COMMENTS**

Dr. Vance complimented the local press and the media in the past month on their coverage of MCPS students and their accomplishments, particularly academic and interscholastic. There were outstanding examples this past weekend in the state championships when MCPS brought back 15 individual championships.

* Mr. McCullough left the meeting at this point.

Mr. Abrams commended MCPS high school bands in the Rockville Memorial Day Parade.

Mr. Felton commended the staff and the Board for their support at two awards ceremonies at Richard Montgomery and John F. Kennedy high schools.

Ms. Gutiérrez reported to the Board that she met with board presidents from the District of Columbia, Fairfax, Alexandria, and Prince George's County to revive a metro board of education group. It was a worthwhile meeting in mutual advocacy with local and federal governments.

RESOLUTION NO. 370-1996 Re: **CLOSED SESSION RESOLUTION**

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

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 conduct a portion of its emergency meeting on Tuesday, June 11, 1996, at 10:00 a.m. and 12 noon to discuss matters protected from public disclosure by law, specifically pertaining to the acquisition of real property for a public purpose and related matters; 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.

Re: REPORT ON CLOSED SESSIONS

On April 22, 1996, by the unanimous vote of members present, the Board of Education voted to conduct a closed session on May 14, 1996, 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 May 14, 1996, from 9:00 to 10:15 a.m. and 1:25 to 3:10 p.m. The meeting took place in Room 120, Carver Educational Services Center, Rockville, Maryland.

The Board met to discuss personnel issues, legal matters with its attorneys, and matters protected from public disclosure by law, specifically pertaining to the acquisition of real property for a public purpose and related matters. Board members reviewed and adjudicated BOE Appeals 1996-2 and 1996-5.

In attendance at part or all of the closed sessions were: Steve Abrams, Larry Bowers, Judith Bresler, Alan Cheung, Blair Ewing, Reggie Felton, David Fischer, Phinnize Fisher, Hiawatha Fountain, Kathy Gemberling, Bea Gordon, Ana Sol Gutiérrez, Marlene Hartzman, Roland Ikheloa, Nancy King, George Margolies, Brian Porter, Rachel Prager, Elfreda Massie, Charles McCullough, Glenda Rose, Ruby Rubins, Mary Helen Smith, Maree Sneed, Roger Titus, Paul Vance, and Bill Wilder.

RESOLUTION NO. 371-1996 Re: MINUTES - APRIL 10, 1996

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education approve the minutes for April 10, 1996.

RESOLUTION NO. 372-1996 Re: **BOE APPEAL 1996-5**

On motion of Mr. Felton and seconded by Mrs. Gordon, the following resolution was adopted unanimously:*

Resolved, That the Board of Education adopt the Decision and Order in BOE Appeal 1996-5, a student matter.

* Dr. Cheung did not participate in this decision.

RESOLUTION NO. 373-1996 Re: **BOE APPEAL 1996-6**

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education adopt the Order in BOE Appeal 1996-6, a student matter.

** Reflects Mr. McCullough's vote in Closed Session.

RESOLUTION NO. 374-1996 Re: **BOE APPEAL 1996-14**

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education adopt the Order in BOE Appeal 1996-14, a student matter.

** Reflects Mr. McCullough's vote in Closed Session.

RESOLUTION NO. 375-1996 Re: **POLICY ON POLICIES**

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education review and adopt changes to the Policy on Policies.

RESOLUTION NO. 376-1996 Re: **POLICY ON PUBLIC COMMENTS**

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education review the current policy regarding the public comments portion of business meeting.

RESOLUTION NO. 377-1996 Re: **CHARACTER EDUCATION**

On motion of Mrs. Gordon and seconded by Mr. Ewing, the following resolution was adopted unanimously by members present:

WHEREAS, Character education and strong values enhance young peoples' growth and development; and

WHEREAS, Several clusters have adopted initiatives to provide character and value education, and

WHEREAS, NSBA has adopted a resolution that local school boards should establish policies to promote character education programs; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Board of Education develop and adopt a policy designed to promote character and value education.

RESOLUTION NO. 378-1996 Re: **PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT POLICY AND STRATEGIES**

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education schedule time to act on the recommendations of the superintendent regarding the parental involvement policy and strategies.

Re: **A MOTION BY MR. EWING TO SCHOOL A PUBLIC HEARING ON THE 1997 OPERATING BUDGET (FAILED)**

On motion of Mr. Ewing and seconded by Mr. McCullough to schedule a public hearing before the Board takes final action of the Operating Budget for FY 1997 failed with Mr. Ewing and Ms. Gutiérrez voting in the affirmative; Mr. Abrams, Dr. Cheung, Mr. Felton, Mrs. Gordon, and Mrs. King voting in the negative.

Re: **NEW BUSINESS**

Mrs. King moved and Mrs. Gordon seconded the following:

Resolved, That the Board of Education schedule time for a discussion on the Character Counts program.

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education schedule time for discussion of the school system's minority vendor outreach efforts.

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education schedule time on or before the mid-November anniversary of the adoption of the policy on gifted and talented education to discuss the annual report on the progress of implementing this policy; and be it further

Resolved, That the Board of Education ask the superintendent of schools to establish a gifted and talented curriculum review group that would meet and review staff proposals for accelerated and enriched curricula, including members who are representative of staff and members of the general public.

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education schedule time for a discussion on racial and ethnic identification of students keeping in mind the Federal law and regulations, and discussing the issue of how and under what circumstances the Board of Education might wish to make changes in the way in which the Board deals with this issue.

Ms. Gutiérrez moved and Mr. Ewing seconded the following:

WHEREAS, The teacher-to-student ratio in a classroom, i.e. class size, has been shown through extensive research to have a significant impact on student academic performance and instructional effectiveness; and

WHEREAS, Montgomery County Public Schools (MCPS) have experienced continuous increases in average class size over the past five years due in part to the rapid growth of the student population and the concomitant underfunding of MCPS operating budget requests; and

WHEREAS, MCPS current average class size-based staffing allocation formulas do not effectively respond to rapid change and growth, high mobility rates, increased instructional load and diversity factors, thus resulting in increased numbers of classes which are over desired maximums throughout the school system; and

WHEREAS, the Board of Education recognizes the urgency to develop an effective strategy together with school staff, parents, and community stakeholders in order to ensure the long-term support and funding commitments necessary to reverse the current trends; now therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Board of Education commit itself to the development and implementation of a multi-year instructional staffing plan that will effectively reduce MCPS class sizes, as a minimum, to 1990-established levels; and be it further

Resolved, That an ad hoc committee of the Board be established to study the matter over the summer and to present strategies and options to the full Board and the Superintendent for consideration, allowing for possible initial budget action beginning with the FY98 budget cycle; and be it further

Resolved, That the ad hoc committee be constituted immediately and include, in addition to three Board of Education members, representative numbers of school administrators, elementary, middle, and high school faculty, instructional assistants, parents, central administrative staff, and if possible, student representatives.

RESOLUTION NO. 379-1996 Re: **ADJOURNMENT**

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education adjourn its meeting of May 28, 1996, at 11:50 p.m.

PRESIDENT

SECRETARY

PLV:gr

**MONTGOMERY COUNTY BOARD OF EDUCATION
SUMMARY SHEET
May 28, 1996**

BOARD AGENDA	1
INTERAGES, INC. 10TH ANNIVERSARY	1
PUBLIC COMMENTS	1
AWARD OF CONTRACT - STRATHMORE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	2
AWARD OF CONTRACTS FOR MAINTENANCE PROJECT AT VARIOUS SCHOOLS	3
BROAD ACRES ELEMENTARY SCHOOL HEALTH CENTER	4
UTILIZATION OF FY 1996 FUTURE SUPPORTED PROJECT FUNDS AND CATEGORICAL TRANSFER WITHIN THE CAREER AND TECHNOLOGY EDUCATION PROGRAMS	4
RECOMMENDATION TO SUBMIT AN FY 1997 PROPOSAL TO THE MARYLAND STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION FOR THE TECHNOLOGY IN MARYLAND SCHOOLS PROJECT	5
PERSONNEL APPOINTMENTS	5
UPDATE ON TEACHER EVALUATION PROCESS	8
RECOMMENDATIONS ON THE FY 1997 OPERATING BUDGET FOLLOWING COUNTY COUNCIL ACTION	10
SUPERINTENDENT'S RECOMMENDATIONS FOR 1996-97 SCHOOL CONTINGENCY CALENDAR	17
RECOMMENDATIONS TO INCREASE INSTRUCTIONAL TIME FOR STUDENTS	18
BOARD/SUPERINTENDENT COMMENTS	22
CLOSED SESSION RESOLUTION	22
REPORT ON CLOSED SESSIONS	23
MINUTES - APRIL 10, 1996	23
BOE APPEAL 1996-5	24
BOE APPEAL 1996-6	24
BOE APPEAL 1996-14	24
POLICY ON POLICIES	24
POLICY ON PUBLIC COMMENTS	25
CHARACTER EDUCATION	25
PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT POLICY AND STRATEGIES	25
A MOTION BY MR. EWING TO SCHOOL A PUBLIC HEARING ON THE 1997 OPERATING BUDGET (FAILED)	25
NEW BUSINESS	26
ADJOURNMENT	27