

Mrs. Gordon briefly commented on the process that is being followed for the High School Assessment. She wanted the Board to be aware that the Maryland State Board of Education (MSBOE) is moving forward very rapidly and at their last meeting they gave the authority to issue the RFP this summer for the development of the task specifications for the high school assessment. Depending on how that RFP is written and issued, it may preclude the MSBOE from making changes and any further decisions. This is something that the Board must monitor closely. Ms. Gutiérrez suggested that the Board invite the MSBOE to a regular meeting to discuss concerns about the high school assessment.

Ms. Gutiérrez reported on the celebration of the Takoma Park Unification, and it was amazingly positive and supportive. The amount of support expressed at the hearing from elected officials and community advocates will be a welcomed collaboration.

Mr. Felton mentioned that he attended: (1) the breakfast with Montgomery Education Connection and the Board was very pleased with their continued support; and (2) the Muslim Community Center in recognition of the outstanding graduates from Montgomery County Public Schools.

**Re: FACILITY FOR TAKOMA PARK UNIFICATION
STUDENTS**

Dr. Vance invited the following staff to the table: Dr. Mary Helen Smith, associate superintendent for the Office of Instruction and Program Development; Mr. Joseph Lavorgna, director of the Department of Educational Facilities Planning and Capital Programming; and Ms. Deborah Szyfer, facilities planner. Dr. Vance presented the background and options that resulted in the resolution before the Board.

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Mr. Ewing seconded by Ms. Gutiérrez, the following was placed on the table:#

WHEREAS, The citizens of the City of Takoma Park voted in November 1995 to unify in Montgomery County; and

WHEREAS, Montgomery County Public Schools is expecting approximately 275 elementary school unification students to enter our schools in September 1997, and this number is expected to increase to approximately 330 students by 2002; and

WHEREAS, The Board of Education assigned the unification students to the Montgomery Blair cluster in March 1996; and

WHEREAS, The Board of Education took action to assign the elementary students from the unification area to Takoma Park Elementary School for Grades K-2 and Pine Crest

Elementary School for Grades 3-5 on an interim basis until the elementary school facility plan is available; and

WHEREAS, The superintendent convened a planning advisory committee in February 1995 to consider elementary school facility plans for 300-400 incoming unification students and to address current overcrowding in Montgomery Blair Cluster elementary schools; and

WHEREAS, The committee recommended building a new elementary school or purchasing an existing private school to accommodate elementary students from the unification area, reinstate the French Immersion Program in the Montgomery Blair cluster, and relieve elementary schools in the cluster that are overutilized; and

WHEREAS, The superintendent reviewed the committee's report and recommended to the Board of Education that a new school be opened in the Montgomery Blair cluster subject to identification of a building/site; and

WHEREAS, The Board of Education took action in March 1996 to open a new elementary school in the Montgomery Blair cluster to accommodate Grades K-5 unification students, relieve overutilized schools in the cluster, and reinstate the French Immersion Program subject to identification of a building/site; and

WHEREAS, The Board of Education requested staff to explore site possibilities for a new school for Board of Education action no later than November 1996; and

WHEREAS, The superintendent convened a site selection committee to find a suitable site for the new elementary school; and

WHEREAS, The site selection committee recommended purchasing a private school near the City of Takoma Park, and the superintendent reviewed the site selection committee's recommendation and recommended the purchase of the private school; and

WHEREAS, The Board of Education took action in November 1996 to purchase the private school to open a new elementary school; and

WHEREAS, The Board of Education took action in November 1996 to create a second French Immersion Program at Maryvale Elementary School, and the two French Immersion Programs would serve different geographic areas of the county by splitting the current program along geographic boundaries so that the two programs begin in September 1999 with two classes per grade for Kindergarten and Grade 1, and one class per grade for Grades 2-5; and

WHEREAS, The Board of Education directed staff in March 1997 to enter into negotiations with the owner of the private school to purchase the site; and

WHEREAS, The negotiations for the identified site concluded without an agreement to acquire the property; and

WHEREAS, The superintendent submitted an alternative recommendation to the Board of Education on June 16, 1997; and

WHEREAS, The Board of Education conducted a public hearing on July 2, 1997, on the proposed solution to elementary school enrollment issues; and

WHEREAS, The County Council approved \$400,000 in FY 1998 for planning the new elementary school; and

WHEREAS, As part of the adopted FY 1998 Capital Budget, the County Council requested a review of all the options in July 1997 to discuss and resolve the scope of this project for future construction funding; and

WHEREAS, The approved FY 1997-2002 Capital Improvements Program includes a project for the City of Takoma Park Unification to provide for an elementary school and a separate project under Rehabilitation/Reuse of Closed Schools (RROCS) to provide for minor modifications to the Wayne Avenue facility to accommodate the third middle school for the Montgomery Blair cluster; now therefore be it

Resolved, That a new elementary school be opened at the Wayne Avenue facility along with the third Montgomery Blair cluster middle school to provide the space necessary in the Montgomery Blair cluster to accommodate Grades K-5 unification students, relieve overutilized schools in the cluster, and return the French Immersion Program to the Montgomery Blair cluster; and be it further

Resolved, That the FY 1997-2002 Capital Improvements Program be amended to redefine the scope of the City of Takoma Park Unification project to include a new elementary school at the Wayne Avenue facility and to accommodate the third middle school in the Montgomery Blair cluster for a total project cost of \$13.2 million; and be it further

Resolved, That \$2.041 million currently in the RROCS project be transferred into the combined City of Takoma Park Unification project; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to the county executive and County Council, and the county executive be requested to transmit his recommendation for approval to the County Council.

Re: DISCUSSION

Mrs. Gordon commented on the testimony that the Board heard about a K-8 academy and, if there is not a K-8 academy, the ability for students to avail themselves of educational opportunities throughout the facility. It was her understanding that the program may change the design of the building. There was a perception on the part of some in the community and, in fact, on the part of Council staff that the action taken would preclude a K-8 academy or any kind of commingling of the students and services. Dr. Vance responded that he had been assured by facilities staff that staff needs to make decisions and plan with the community to make a determination on the program, thereby affecting the design of the facility.

With that clarification, Mr. Ewing expressed hope that the Board would support the recommendation unanimously. It is important to do that in order to ensure that the Council understands that the whole Board is eager to have this proposal accomplished. With respect to the K-8 alternative, there is some support for that idea among some in the community, and there also was opposition. Therefore, all options should be examined and the issues addressed. Among those who are opposed, the issue is a concern about putting young students with adolescents. If the formal K-8 academy is not addressed, an issue that needs to be addressed is whether or not students could participate in various aspects of the programs at an advanced level. Given the initial plans, that is possible and in select cases would be highly desirable. The schools will share certain facilities, i.e., auditorium. There is no reason why a 5th grade student who is advanced in a subject could not participate in some advanced work in the middle school. That is not precluded by the present facility plan and design. Dr. Vance responded that if both programs — elementary and middle schools — are in the same facility, there would be marvelous opportunities to be very creative in providing advanced studies for youngsters as well as cross-class offerings, the arts, and extracurricular activities.

Mr. Felton thought the opportunity to look at several options was a good one. He had heard many parents talk about the benefits of a K-8 model. However, the issue before the Board is the facilities, and he hoped the Board would move forward with approval.

Mrs. King stated that she gleaned from the responses of the people at the hearing that there was excitement about the possibilities, whatever the programmatic model.

Ms. Gutiérrez strongly supported looking at educational solutions in this opportunity. She was delighted to hear the range of creative suggestions at the hearing. It would be a missed opportunity not to break the mold and go beyond the K-5 and 6 - 8 model. Unfortunately, the Board did not hear from the adult learners at the hearing. The Board heard some very innovative recommendations about moving forward with an afternoon program that could provide more than in the past and could be built on the ICB pilot. She

urged the Board to request the superintendent to see no bounds as to what might be some very creative educational solutions. Staff should take seriously the idea that the design of the space would affect the educational programs. Her concern at the hearing was that, if the school system says middle and elementary school, the system has standards and models that need to be applied. She would encourage the Board to put a resolve in the motion ensuring the clarification made by Mrs. Gordon. Therefore, the Council would know, the Board would know, and the community would know, that the Board will be looking for as much innovation as possible in this opportunity.

Re: **AN AMENDMENT BY MS. GUTIERREZ ON THE FACILITY FOR TAKOMA PARK UNIFICATION STUDENTS**

On motion of Ms. Gutiérrez and seconded by Mr. Ewing, the following amendment was introduced:

Resolved, That the Board of Education will continue to review the programmatic and educational options to maximize the use of the site to provide a full range of educational opportunities to the community.

Re: **A SUBSTITUTE AMENDMENT BY MRS. GORDON ON THE FACILITY FOR TAKOMA PARK UNIFICATION STUDENTS**

Mrs. Gordon offered the following substitute motion which was agreed to by Ms. Gutiérrez as a friendly amendment:

Resolved, That the facility design will not preclude innovative, creative educational options for members of the Blair community.

Re: **AN AMENDMENT BY MS. SIGNER TO THE SUBSTITUTE MOTION ON THE FACILITY FOR TAKOMA PARK UNIFICATION STUDENTS**

Ms. Signer made the following amendment which was agreed to by Mrs. Gordon as a friendly amendment to her substitute motion:

Resolved, That the facility design will not preclude innovative, creative, educational opportunities for the Montgomery Blair community, **that will be decided at a later date.**

RESOLUTION NO. 410-97

Re: **AN AMENDMENT BY MS. SIGNER TO THE
SUBSTITUTE MOTION ON THE FACILITY FOR
TAKOMA PARK UNIFICATION STUDENTS**

The following substitute motion by Mrs. Gordon as amended by Mrs. Signer was adopted unanimously:

Resolved, That the facility design will not preclude innovative, creative, educational opportunities for the Montgomery Blair community, that will be decided at a later date.

Re: **DISCUSSION**

Ms. Signer sought clarification on how this amendment to the Capital Improvements program (CIP) affects the spending affordability guidelines (SAG). She thought the placeholder was 11 million dollars for the Takoma Park solution. Mr. Lavorgna stated that when the Council considers this action, it can amend the CIP without considering SAG. However, when the 1999 - 04 CIP is submitted, it will have to be included in the SAG for the entire program.

Ms. Signer stated that her concern is that this action not have the unintended effect of bumping some other CIP project that has been included these many years. She needed to know how that will be addressed. What if the Council does not decide to increase SAG? Then, is the school system in the position of potentially bumping another project?

Ms. Signer stated that the CIP approved last fall included \$2.04 million out of the RROCS project for the middle school portion of this proposal. She asked if that 2.04 million was in addition to the 13.2 million total costs? Mr. Lavorgna replied no.

Ms. Signer asked if the school system was making any additional changes to the middle school portion that it would not have made out of the RROCS portion of this. Mr. Lavorgna replied yes.

Ms. Signer asked about what additional modifications would now be done, since the school system is combining two schools on Wayne Avenue, that it would not have done if it was simply reopening a middle school on Wayne Avenue? Mr. Lavorgna replied that, in terms of combining an elementary and middle school in the facility, there are many more modifications that need to occur because there are ADA requirements, asbestos removal, many system upgrades, Global Access, and electrical work.

Ms. Signer understood the elementary portion of that, but her question relates to what changes the school system is making in the middle school portion of the building that it would not otherwise have made were the two schools not co-located. Mr. Lavorgna replied that those systems have to be modified throughout the building if both schools are in the

building instead of just part of it. Mr. Hawes stated that, under the original concept, where the school system was to move in and reopen it as a middle school, the majority of the money was for furniture and equipment, Global Access, and to make some minor modifications in the facility in the areas of administration and the IMC. Under the combined plan, the elementary school side will be almost a full modernization. The middle school side is going to get more than in the original plan because the school system will have to upgrade and replace mechanical equipment, all the life-safety things like new fire alarms, new wiring for Global Access, new sprinkler systems, and a lot of mechanical and electrical work that would not have been done under the plan were the building opened only as a middle school.

Ms. Signer asked if the plans for this were being done in house? Mr. Hawes replied that the combined plan with elementary and middle school is too great a magnitude for in-house architects; therefore, an outside architect will be used like other capital projects.

Ms. Signer turned to the programmatic side of this issue. She asked about the timeline, given the need to move forward on the facility side of this. In order to accommodate the opening times, the modifications to the facility will change depending on the programmatic aspects. She asked Dr. Vance what he envisioned as a realistic timeline working with the community to come to some decision about the programmatic issue? Dr. Vance thought that one of the critical decisions that has to be made is French Immersion and what the geographical boundaries are going to be feeding both French Immersion in the Blair Cluster and at Maryvale. The second critical decision, after the Board takes action, is to proceed and organize the committees in the cluster to begin work on the programmatic implications. Mr. Lavorgna continued that, in terms of coming up with the boundaries for French Immersion, staff could do that and bring some recommendations back to the Board. Staff would have to research the implications and see where the reasonable geographic assignment areas would be. Ms. Szyfer added that there has been a committee that is dormant, but they were looking at program issues on the middle school level in the spring. When the Board makes a facility decision, they can come back together to look at the K-8 academy and continue exploring programmatic issues at Wayne Avenue.

Ms. Signer asked about reaching some agreement to pursue the K-8 academy. How long a timeframe will be needed for that? Ms. Szyfer stated that the summer is hard to get folks together, but there are many members out in the community who are ready to get back together.

Ms. Signer was excited about the prospects for combining these two schools on Wayne Avenue. She was particularly excited about the prospect of exploring a K-8 academy, given the fact that the Board had just adopted an amendment to basically defer any decisions on the programmatic options that will be used on Wayne Avenue.

Mr. Ewing followed up on a question that was raised about the possibility that this project might bump other CIP projects. His understanding was that the school system does, indeed, list modernization projects in rank order. The expectation that he had was that this project will be added to the list of those that the school system has already proposed for the future, and that it will neither bump nor be bumped by subsequent ones. Mr. Ewing asked, "Is that correct?" Mr. Lavorgna replied, "That is correct." Staff was not assuming it would bump any project on the modernization schedule.

Re: **AN AMENDMENT BY MS. SIGNER ON THE FACILITY
FOR TAKOMA PARK UNIFICATION STUDENTS**

On motion of Ms. Signer and seconded by Mrs. Gordon, the following resolution was introduced:

Resolved, That the Board of Education strike the references to the French Immersion Program.

RESOLUTION NO. 411-97

Re: **A SUBSTITUTE MOTION BY MR. EWING ON THE
FACILITY FOR TAKOMA PARK UNIFICATION
STUDENTS**

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

Resolved, That a new elementary school be opened at the Wayne Avenue facility along with the third Montgomery Blair cluster middle school to provide the space necessary in the Montgomery Blair cluster **but not necessarily at the Wayne Avenue site** to accommodate Grades K-5 unification students, relieve overutilized schools in the cluster, and return the French Immersion Program to the Montgomery Blair cluster.

RESOLUTION NO. 412-97

Re: **FACILITY FOR TAKOMA PARK UNIFICATION
STUDENTS**

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

WHEREAS, The citizens of the City of Takoma Park voted in November 1995 to unify in Montgomery County; and

WHEREAS, Montgomery County Public Schools is expecting approximately 275 elementary school unification students to enter our schools in September 1997, and this number is expected to increase to approximately 330 students by 2002; and

WHEREAS, The Board of Education assigned the unification students to the Montgomery Blair cluster in March 1996; and

WHEREAS, The Board of Education took action to assign the elementary students from the unification area to Takoma Park Elementary School for Grades K-2 and Pine Crest Elementary School for Grades 3-5 on an interim basis until the elementary school facility plan is available; and

WHEREAS, The superintendent convened a planning advisory committee in February 1995 to consider elementary school facility plans for 300-400 incoming unification students and to address current overcrowding in Montgomery Blair Cluster elementary schools; and

WHEREAS, The committee recommended building a new elementary school or purchasing an existing private school to accommodate elementary students from the unification area, reinstate the French Immersion Program in the Montgomery Blair cluster, and relieve elementary schools in the cluster that are overutilized; and

WHEREAS, The superintendent reviewed the committee's report and recommended to the Board of Education that a new school be opened in the Montgomery Blair cluster subject to identification of a building/site; and

WHEREAS, The Board of Education took action in March 1996 to open a new elementary school in the Montgomery Blair cluster to accommodate Grades K-5 unification students, relieve overutilized schools in the cluster, and reinstate the French Immersion Program subject to identification of a building/site; and

WHEREAS, The Board of Education requested staff to explore site possibilities for a new school for Board of Education action no later than November 1996; and

WHEREAS, The superintendent convened a site selection committee to find a suitable site for the new elementary school; and

WHEREAS, The site selection committee recommended purchasing a private school near the City of Takoma Park, and the superintendent reviewed the site selection committee's recommendation and recommended the purchase of the private school; and

WHEREAS, The Board of Education took action in November 1996 to purchase the private school to open a new elementary school; and

WHEREAS, The Board of Education took action in November 1996 to create a second French Immersion Program at Maryvale Elementary School, and the two French Immersion Programs would serve different geographic areas of the county by splitting the current program along geographic boundaries so that the two programs begin in September 1999 with two classes per grade for Kindergarten and Grade 1, and one class per grade for Grades 2-5; and

WHEREAS, The Board of Education directed staff in March 1997 to enter into negotiations with the owner of the private school to purchase the site; and

WHEREAS, The negotiations for the identified site concluded without an agreement to acquire the property; and

WHEREAS, The superintendent submitted an alternative recommendation to the Board of Education on June 16, 1997; and

WHEREAS, The Board of Education conducted a public hearing on July 2, 1997, on the proposed solution to elementary school enrollment issues; and

WHEREAS, The County Council approved \$400,000 in FY 1998 for planning the new elementary school; and

WHEREAS, As part of the adopted FY 1998 Capital Budget, the County Council requested a review of all the options in July 1997 to discuss and resolve the scope of this project for future construction funding; and

WHEREAS, The approved FY 1997-2002 Capital Improvements Program includes a project for the City of Takoma Park Unification to provide for an elementary school and a separate project under Rehabilitation/Reuse of Closed Schools (RROCS) to provide for minor modifications to the Wayne Avenue facility to accommodate the third middle school for the Montgomery Blair cluster; now therefore be it

Resolved, That a new elementary school be opened at the Wayne Avenue facility along with the third Montgomery Blair cluster middle school to provide the space necessary in the Montgomery Blair cluster but not necessarily at the Wayne Avenue site to accommodate Grades K-5 unification students, relieve overutilized schools in the cluster, and return the French Immersion Program to the Montgomery Blair cluster; and be it further

Resolved, That the facility design will not preclude innovative, creative, educational opportunities for the Montgomery Blair community, that will be decided at a later date; and be it further

	Total	\$ 39,433
107-96	HVAC/Refrigeration Equipment and Parts - Extension	
	<u>Awardees</u>	
	Aireco Supply, Inc.	\$ 57,666
	Barber Colman Pritchett, Inc.	25,000
	Boland Services Parts Center	24,000
	Capital Compressor, Inc.	10,500
	Capp, Inc.	13,666
	Chesapeake Systems	33,500
	The Cooling Tower Store	5,000
	Industrial Controls	733
	Pameco Corporation	50,602
	Parco	19,000
	Refrigeration Supply Company, Inc.	500
	H.M. Sweeny Company	22,500
	T Stats Supply of Rockville, Inc.	1,140
	United Refrigeration, Inc.	<u>38,500</u>
	Total	\$ 302,307
111-96	Lawn Service Equipment, Mowers and Tractors - Extension	
	<u>Awardees</u>	
	H.B. Duvall	\$ 22,350
	Gaithersburg Ford Tractor Company	37,800
	Gaithersburg Rental Center	24,948
	Kohler Equipment, Inc.	<u>27,720</u>
	Total	\$ 112,818
10-97	Plumbing Supplies - Extension	
	<u>Awardees</u>	
	Best Plumbing Specialties, Inc.	3,816
	Daubers, Inc.	1,525 *
	Industrial Controls	590
	Noland Company	90,024
	Northeastern Supply	15,996
	J.A. Sexauer, Inc.	1,233

Thomas Somerville Company	51,240
Spartan Tool	3,520
Superior Specialty Company	39,970
Wolverine Brass Works	<u>1,785</u> *
Total	\$ 209,699

105-97 Industrial and Technology Education Automotive Supplies

Awardees

Mattos Pro Finishes	\$ 26,809
Myco, Inc.	1,210
School Bus Parts Company	<u>287</u>
Total	\$ 28,306

114-97 Shade and Upholstery Materials

Awardees

Dymalon, Inc.	\$ 386
Frankel Associates, Inc.	15,355
Loktite, Inc.	3,105
Mileham and King, Inc.	38,676
Rocky Mount Cord Company, Inc.	3,685
Stimpson Company, Inc.	996
Sun Control Systems	320
Tedco Industries, Inc.	<u>17,773</u>
Total	\$ 80,296

165-97 Lease/Purchase of Food Services Integrated Software System

Awardee

Snap Systems, Inc.	\$ 954,668
--------------------	------------

169-97 LAN/WAN Communication Equipment for the Office of Global Access Technology

Awardees

Cisco Systems, Inc.	\$ 341,911
Data Connect Enterprises	<u>17,760</u>

	Total	\$ 359,671
172-97	Alcohol/Drug Testing Program Services	
	<u>Awardees</u>	
	Quest Diagnostics, Inc.	\$ 24,703
	Substance Abuse Services, Inc.	<u>4,021</u>
	Total	\$ 28,724
303-97	Fresh Produce	
	<u>Awardee</u>	
	Lexington Produce Company, Inc.	\$ 490,000
314-97	Studio Television Communications Systems	
	<u>Awardees</u>	
	Allegheny Electronics	\$ 540
	CTL Communications Televideo	29,706 *
	Kinetic Artistry, Inc.	7,175
	Kunz, Inc.	2,112
	Peirce-Phelps, Inc.	56,123
	Valiant International Multi-Media Corporation	1,054
	Washington Professional Systems	<u>30,770</u>
	Total	\$ 127,480
321-97	Processed Meats and Refrigerated and Frozen Foods	
	<u>Awardees</u>	
	Carroll County Foods	\$ 115,292
	Chef Garcia Mexican Foods, Inc.	17,642 *
	Continental Foods/Div. of U.S. Foodservice	44,699
	Shane Meat Company	47,928
	Smelkinson Sysco	<u>58,983</u>
	Total	\$ 284,544

322-97 Computer Carts

Awardee

Landon Systems Corporation

\$ 60,496

MORE THAN \$25,000

\$3,303,442

* Denotes MFD vendors

RESOLUTION NO. 414-97

Re: **MONTGOMERY BLAIR HIGH SCHOOL REPLACEMENT SCHOOL PROJECT**

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

WHEREAS, The following sealed bids represent the ninth in a series of subcontracts that were bid as part of a construction management process for the Montgomery Blair High School replacement project:

<u>Low Bids</u>	<u>Amount</u>
<u>Display Boards and Projection Screens</u>	
Sun Control Systems	\$ 196,700
<u>Telescoping Bleachers</u>	
Modern Door and Equipment	189,957

and

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

WHEREAS, The low bids are within the staff estimates and sufficient funds are available to award the contracts; now therefore be it

Resolved, That contracts be awarded for the above-referenced subcontractors meeting specifications for the Montgomery Blair High School replacement project for the bids and amounts listed.

RESOLUTION NO. 415-97

Re: **ELECTRIC SERVICE FOR MODULAR CLASSROOM BUILDINGS - PHASE I**

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

WHEREAS, The following bids were received on June 30, 1997, to provide electrical service to 28 modular classroom buildings at various schools, with work to begin immediately and to be completed by August 22, 1997:

<u>Bidders</u>	<u>Amount</u>
Paul J. Vignola Electric Company, Inc.	\$ 99,146
Porter Construction Management, Inc.	138,700

and

WHEREAS, The low bid is below the staff estimate of \$110,000; and

WHEREAS, Paul J. Vignola Electric Company, Inc., has completed similar work successfully for Montgomery County Public Schools; now therefore be it

Resolved, That a contract for \$99,146 be awarded to Paul J. Vignola Electric Company, Inc., to provide electrical service to 28 modular classroom buildings at various schools, in accordance with plans and specifications prepared by the Department of Facilities Management.

RESOLUTION NO. 416-97

Re: **ELECTRIC SERVICE FOR MODULAR CLASSROOM BUILDINGS - PHASE II**

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

WHEREAS, The following bids were received on July 1, 1997, to provide electrical service to 28 modular classroom buildings at various schools, with work to begin immediately and to be completed by August 22, 1997:

<u>Bidders</u>	<u>Amount</u>
Paul J. Vignola Electric Company, Inc.	\$103,560
Porter Construction Management, Inc.	134,800

and

WHEREAS, The low bid is below the staff estimate of \$120,000; and

WHEREAS, Paul J. Vignola Electric Company, Inc., has completed similar work successfully for Montgomery County Public Schools; now therefore be it

Resolved, That a contract for \$103,560 be awarded to Paul J. Vignola Electric Company, Inc., to provide electrical service to 28 modular classroom buildings at various schools, in accordance with plans and specifications prepared by the Department of Facilities Management.

RESOLUTION NO. 417-97 Re: **ACCESSIBILITY MODIFICATIONS AT VARIOUS
MONTGOMERY COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS - PHASE
II**

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

WHEREAS, The following sealed bids were received on June 25, 1997, to provide accessibility modifications at William H. Farquhar and Benjamin Banneker middle schools, with work to begin immediately and to be completed by August 25, 1997:

<u>Bidder</u>	<u>Amount</u>
Meridian Construction Company, Inc.	\$122,000
Keller Brothers, Inc.	130,900
Porter Construction Management	161,900
William F. Klingensmith, Inc.	175,100
The Gassman Corporation	178,000

and

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

WHEREAS, The bid is below the staff estimate of \$135,000; now therefore be it

Resolved, That a contract for \$122,000 be awarded to Meridian Construction Company, Inc., to provide accessibility modifications at William H. Farquhar and Benjamin Banneker middle schools in accordance with plans and specifications prepared by Murray & Associates, Architects.

RESOLUTION NO. 418-97

Re: **ARCHITECTURAL APPOINTMENT - EARLE B. WOOD
MIDDLE SCHOOL**

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

WHEREAS, It is necessary to appoint an architectural firm to provide professional and technical services during the design and construction phases of the Earle B. Wood Middle School modernization project; and

WHEREAS, Funds for architectural planning were appropriated as part of the FY 1998 Capital Budget; and

WHEREAS, The Architect Selection Committee, in accordance with procedures adopted by the Board of Education on May 13, 1986, identified Smolen-Emr + Associates, Architects, as the most qualified firm to provide the necessary professional architectural and engineering services; and

WHEREAS, Staff has negotiated a fee for necessary architectural services; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Montgomery County Board of Education enter into a contractual agreement with the architectural firm of Smolen-Emr + Associates to provide professional architectural services for the modernization project for a fee of \$807,000, which is 6.2 percent of the construction budget.

RESOLUTION NO. 419-97

Re: **GRANT OF EASEMENT AT THE NEW NORTHEAST
AREA HIGH SCHOOL**

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

WHEREAS, The Washington Gas Light Company proposes to install a natural gas line along the eastern portion of the new Northeast Area High School, located at 300 Norwood Road in Cloverly; and

WHEREAS, The proposed grant of easement of 8,805.44 square feet, configured in a 10-foot wide strip and an adjacent 20-foot wide temporary construction strip, will not adversely affect any land anticipated to be utilized for school purposes and would benefit the school and community by providing gas service; and

WHEREAS, All construction, restoration, and future maintenance will be at no cost to the Board of Education, with the Washington Gas Light Company and its contractors assuming all liability for all damages or injury; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the president and secretary of the Board of Education be authorized to execute a grant of easement of 8,805.44 square feet to the Washington Gas Light Company on land along the frontage of Norwood Road at the new Northeast Area High School.

RESOLUTION NO. 420-97 Re: **NORTHEAST AREA HIGH SCHOOL ENERGY MANAGEMENT SYSTEM INSTALLATION**

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

WHEREAS, The following sealed bids were received on June 19, 1997, for the energy management system installation at the new Northeast Area High School:

<u>Contractor</u>	<u>Amount</u>
Engineering Services, Inc.	\$432,140
Barber-Colman Pritchett, Inc.	449,450
Systems 4, Inc.	496,400
Control Systems Sales, Inc.	505,869

and

WHEREAS, The low bid is below the staff estimate of \$488,000 and the recommended contractor has completed similar work successfully for Montgomery County Public Schools; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Board of Education award a contract for \$432,140 to Engineering Services, Inc., to install an energy management system at the new Northeast Area High School and assign it to the general contractor for implementation and supervision.

RESOLUTION NO. 421-97 Re: **UTILIZATION OF FY 1998 FUTURE SUPPORTED PROJECT FUNDS FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE BOWIE STATE UNIVERSITY BACHELOR'S DEGREE PARTNERSHIP PROGRAM**

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Ms. Signer 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 1998 Provision for Future Supported Projects a grant award of \$20,000 from Bowie State University for the Bachelor's Degree Partnership Program in the following categories:

<u>Category</u>	<u>Amount</u>
4 Supplies and Materials	\$ 3,000
5 Other Instructional Costs	<u>17,000</u>
Total	<u>\$ 20,000</u>

and be it further

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

RESOLUTION NO. 422-97 Re: **UTILIZATION OF FY 1998 FUTURE SUPPORTED PROJECT FUNDS FOR THE ROYALTIES GENERATED BY THE EVENT-BASED SCIENCE PROJECT**

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Ms. Signer 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 1998 Provision for Future Supported Projects royalties of \$14,000 from the sale of books produced by the Event-Based Science Project, in the following categories:

<u>Category</u>	<u>Amount</u>
3 Instructional Salaries	\$ 7,000
5 Other Instructional Costs	6,440
12 Fixed Charges	<u>560</u>
Total	<u>\$14,000</u>

and be it further

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

RESOLUTION NO. 423-97

Re: **UTILIZATION OF FY 1998 FUTURE SUPPORTED PROJECT FUNDS FOR THE PROJECT TEAM**

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Ms. Signer 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 1998 Provision for Future Supported Projects a grant award of \$12,657 from the Montgomery County Workforce Development Corporation, formerly the Private Industry Council (PIC), under the Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA) Title IIB for Project Team in the following categories:

<u>Category</u>	<u>Amount</u>
6 Special Education	\$ 11,806
12 Fixed Charges	<u>851</u>
Total	<u>\$ 12,657</u>

and be it further

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

RESOLUTION NO. 424-97

Re: **RECOMMENDATION TO SUBMIT AN FY 1998 GRANT PROPOSAL TO THE MARYLAND STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION FOR THE COMMUNITY TEAM COLLABORATION PROJECT**

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

Resolved, That the superintendent of schools be authorized to submit a grant proposal in the amount of \$29,028 to the Maryland State Department of Education, Division of Special Education, under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, Part B State Grant Preschool Discretionary Program, for the Community Team Collaboration Project; and be it further

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

RESOLUTION NO. 425-97 Re: **PERSONNEL MONTHLY REPORT**

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education approve the Personnel Monthly Report dated July 8, 1997.

RESOLUTION NO. 426-97 Re: **MRS. EVELYN C. JONES, SPECIAL EDUCATION RESOURCE ROOM TEACHER, ROSA PARKS MIDDLE SCHOOL**

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

WHEREAS, The death on June 15, 1997, of Mrs. Evelyn C. Jones, Special Education Resource Room Teacher at Rosa Parks Middle School, has deeply saddened the staff, students, and members of the Board of Education; and

WHEREAS, Mrs. Jones had been a respected and dedicated employee of Montgomery County Public Schools for three years; and

WHEREAS, Mrs. Jones was a calm, purposeful, and productive teacher who provided quality instruction for students; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the members of the Board of Education express their sorrow at the death of Mrs. Evelyn C. Jones 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. Jones' family.

RESOLUTION NO. 427-97 Re: **PERSONNEL APPOINTMENT**

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

Resolved, That the following personnel appointment be approved effective July 9, 1997:

<u>Appointment</u>	<u>Present Position</u>	<u>As</u>
Durinda Yates	Principal, White Oak MS	Principal, Rockville HS

RESOLUTION NO. 428-97 Re: **PERSONNEL APPOINTMENT**

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

Resolved, That the following personnel appointment be approved effective July 9, 1997:

<u>Appointment</u>	<u>Present Position</u>	<u>As</u>
Oliver Marshall Blackman	Assistant Principal, Whetstone ES	Principal, Candlewood ES

RESOLUTION NO. 429-97 Re: **PERSONNEL APPOINTMENT**

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

Resolved, That the following personnel appointment be approved effective July 9, 1997:

<u>Appointment</u>	<u>Present Position</u>	<u>As</u>
Frances R. Levin	Elementary Principal Trainee, Flower Hill ES	Principal, Jones Lane ES

RESOLUTION NO. 430-97 Re: **PERSONNEL APPOINTMENT**

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

Resolved, That the following personnel appointment be approved effective July 9, 1997:

<u>Appointment</u>	<u>Present Position</u>	<u>As</u>
Louis R. Berlin	Acting Principal, Longview School	Coordinator, Longview and Stephen Knolls Centers

RESOLUTION NO. 431-97 Re: **PERSONNEL APPOINTMENT**

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

Resolved, That the following personnel appointment be approved effective July 9, 1997:

<u>Appointment</u> Karen E. Dwyer	<u>Present Position</u> Deputy Program and Integration Manager, GRCI, Inc.	<u>As</u> Student Systems Project Manager, Applications Development and Implementation Team
--------------------------------------	---	---

Re: **CONSTRUCTION STATUS REPORT**

Dr. Vance invited the following staff to the table: Mr. David G. Fischer, associate superintendent for the Office of Supportive Services; Mr. William M. Wilder, director of the Department of Facilities Management; and Mr. Richard G. Hawes, director of the Division of Construction.

Dr. Vance provided the Board with an update on the major school construction projects that are scheduled for completion. There are two new facilities (Poolesville Cluster and Kingsview middle schools), four modernizations (Wyngate and Ritchie Park elementary schools, Westland Middle School, and Albert Einstein High School), a gymnasium addition to Galway Elementary School, and a modular addition to Board Acres Elementary School for the school-based health and Linkages to Learning programs. The school system is also moving 59 relocatable classrooms during the summer of 1997 to handle overcrowding at various facilities. All projects are expected to be completed on schedule.

The Board members raised the following issues:

1. Ms. Gutiérrez congratulated the staff on completing most projects well within scheduled dates. She asked about the Broad Acres Elementary School's health program with a thirty-five percent completion rate. Mr. Hawes explained that it is a modular building and will be on the site by August 5, 1997.
2. Mrs. Gordon was concerned about the funds for a covered walkway at Broad Acres Elementary School between the school and the health facility. Mr. Hawes assured her that the walkway would be fully enclosed with funds from Health and Human Services.
3. Mr. Ewing asked if the relocation of John F. Kennedy High School to Northwood and Takoma Park Middle School to Tilden were on schedule; Mr. Hawes assured him that they were.
4. Mr. Felton asked about occupancy and moving administrative staff into a building that is not complete. Mr. Hawes stated that the Fire Marshall authorizes partial occupancy.

The Board of Education recessed for lunch and closed session from 11:55 a.m. to 3:15 p.m.

Re: **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

The following people appeared before the Board:

	<u>Person</u>	<u>Topic</u>
1.	Baird Straugham (read by Ms. Dolan)	Bethesda-Chevy Chase Parking
2.	Jean Lutes	Bethesda-Chevy Chase Parking
3.	Bill Schweinsburg	Bethesda-Chevy Chase Parking
4.	Diane Kupelian	Bethesda-Chevy Chase Parking
5.	Mary Ellen Dolan	Bethesda-Chevy Chase Parking
6.	Marilyn Politzer	IB Program at Springbrook High School
7.	Fran Miller	Cancellation of Calculus Class
8.	Robin Hoffland	Bethesda-Chevy Chase Parking
9.	Sharon Cox, MCCPTA	Early Release Days

Mr. Felton asked the superintendent for clarification on the interpretation of the IB program plan for Springbrook High School.

Mr. Felton requested information on the calculus class, and Dr. Vance replied that the information would be supplied in response to an earlier Board member's request.

Ms. Wheat asked for information on whether or not other MCPS schools or Montgomery College offer multi-functional calculus.

Re: **EARLY RELEASE DAYS**

Dr. Vance invited the following staff to the table: Dr. Steven G. Seleznow, associate superintendent for the Office of School Administration; Dr. Mary Helen Smith, associate superintendent for the Office of Instruction and Program Development; Ms. Dorothy Colding, principal of William H. Farquhar Middle School; and Mrs. Pamela Shirley, principal of DuFief Elementary School

Dr. Vance stated that the issue of early release days requires staff to balance the needs of the school system with the inconvenience these days cause some of our parents. As indicated in the paper, the early release days serve some rather distinct purposes, such as:

1. Four early release days are used for report card preparation and planning days. These days, you will recall, are required as part of the negotiated agreement.

2. At the elementary and middle school levels two release days are used for parent conference days. These days ensure that parents have an opportunity to confer with their children's teachers. For an increasing number of parents, this is the only opportunity that teachers have to schedule meetings and to meet with these parents.
3. The other remaining early release days are used for staff training.

Dr. Vance offered some options that he did not think were doable: (1) they are costly, and (2) they would shorten the 185-day school year. Given the vast changes that have taken place in the school system and the incredible turn over in staff at all levels, the need for increased staff training and staff development is an absolute necessity. He believed that what the school system provides is a bare minimum.

Dr. Seleznow stated that the structure of schools makes it difficult to train teachers as an entire staff when there are so many differentiated schedules during the day. It makes it very difficult to bring an entire staff together for training, and the release days provide that opportunity for continuous, ongoing training. It allows staff on a periodical basis to revisit issues and provide practical applications of training in the school day immediately following training. The other option that it provides is cluster-wide training where teachers and staff from across schools and the cluster has an opportunity to meet with each other. Staff has also found that these training days can be used to respond to new issues that come up such as the SAT intervention. It provides flexibility as well as training.

Dr. Smith stated that when schools develop the local Success for Every Student plan, the School Improvement Training Unit trainers look at the goals laid out in those plans and determine whom they need to work with the schools they are assigned to. They are assigned by clusters and directors and that enables them to plan tri-cluster training, cluster training, or school-level training. By taking advantage of the early release days by maximizing the trainers ability to work with the staff to bring in curriculum coordinators or instructional specialists, it allows us to follow up in school with smaller groups of staff during the rest of the school year so that staff can watch as training is implemented in the classroom and provides some coaching and guidance. The benefit to train a whole staff and then look at implementation is a very strong benefit for having some release time during the day.

Ms. Shirley remarked about meaningful experiences that take place during in-services on early dismissal days. These days are vital to the program to meet the objectives of the local school Success for Every Student plan and thereby meets the needs of all the students in following ways:

1. It provides time to analyze and reflect on data to plan appropriate strategies and programs to meet the needs of students.

2. It gives continuity to staff development with the entire staff over a period of time to ensure continuous improvement.
3. It provides collaboration within the whole cluster and sometimes across clusters, as we did with the Gaithersburg Character Counts, to ensure continuity.
4. It provides staff the time to absorb, implement, reenforce, and reflect on new learning to ensure continuous improvement.
5. It provides time to address new issues, data, and concerns that arise during the school year.

The early release days are critical for principals and staff to hold training and meetings to move ahead with the school's objectives. New ideas, issues, concern, and training cannot be thoroughly addressed at the end of the day at staff meetings. She gave several examples of how staff at DuFief Elementary School utilizes these days for training including areas such as Global Access and reading.

Dorothy Colding pointed out that at Farquhar the same kinds of activities take place with staff. Like student learners, adult learners need reinforcement of skills learned and time to practice and utilize information. At Farquhar, staff has totally embraced the continuous improvement philosophy. In order for students to achieve their very best, it is essential that our teachers receive ongoing training in various way to improve the instructional programs. During the 1996-97 school year, the SES days allowed staff to provide continued focus on differentiated instruction and instructional strategies to improve student performance. She also gave examples of school-based training.

Mr. Felton stated that he understood the delivery of training and how school staff finds that very effective because of the split days. The Board also understands the impact of early release days, and there is no additional pay for teachers or substitutes. He thought that when the subject came up most recently, it was an attempt to look at school system delivering training differently and at the same time address the concern of some parents who are concerned with the number of early release days. He asked:

1. Are other school systems, either locally or throughout the nation, addressing this in a different manner?
2. Is there use of computer assisted training?
3. Are there other innovative approaches to delivery of training that allows systems not to make use of early release days as much as MCPS does?
4. Is there anything else to share with us in terms of what other possibilities might be an approach?

The Board values training and staff development, and very much appreciates the innovation that the schools are using in that area.

Mr. Seleznow replied that there are lots of different training models and methods that staff uses beyond early release days, such as with technology and computers, videos, and other kinds of technology. The difference is that the training focused on is school-based training; the training that principals and staff can do together. Staff is looking at a 10-month cycle when staff is in the schools. The school system has used two substitute days for training where groups of teachers would be pulled out of school for training to go somewhere else. That has engendered a lot of concerns from parents when a grade-level teacher is out for a day or two days for training. Using early release days for training is a unique experience when a school staff or cluster can be together.

Ms. Signer commented that there was nothing in this new business item that was meant to suggest that the kind of staff training that is provided on early release days is not necessary, and, in fact, an important and integral part of the program. From that vantage point, she did not need to be convinced that the training needs to be provided and is worthwhile. The issue is whether there is another way to do it and is there a way to combine some of these half days? This is not just a matter of convenience for the parents, but there are educational issues. She knows from first-hand experience as well as what she hears from other parents that not much education goes on in the half day. What she hears from many staffs is that by the time they have worked a half day, they are tired, and they do not get the most benefit they can out of the training that is provided. Certainly, it is better than having to do it after school, but it is not better than having a whole day to do it. She noted that when it comes to the half days for training, there are five for elementary schools and four for middle and high schools. She wanted to know what that extra half day for elementary schools is used for, and why there is an extra half day for elementary schools.

Mrs. Gemberling remarked that it was a request from the elementary principals when there was a significant new curriculum, and there was a reduction of the amount of time that staff could stay after for training. It was felt that elementary school setting did not lend itself to an opportunity for faculty to get together sufficiently to focus on instruction and curricular changes; therefore, an additional half day was given to elementary schools.

Ms. Signer asked if that time was negotiated with the union or not. Mrs. Gemberling replied no. It just got to the point where principals and teachers felt that they needed more time to learn the new programs and work on instruction.

Dr. Vance said that was really the closure of a long process that went back to the 70s when the area offices had money and staff developed teacher training centers and released elementary teachers for training, using money for substitutes. There was a great deal of curriculum revision at that time particularly in the elementary schools. It was found that the elementary schools needed more release time to be with the staff developers in the area offices. The high schools had a different set up with resource teachers, and they

were more readily available to conduct their in-service training on site. The same thing was true with junior high schools and eventually the middle schools. Unanimous requests from elementary school principals stated that they needed more time on staff development because of massive curriculum changes that they were being asked to implement.

Ms. Signer asked staff to follow up on what occurs on that additional, extra release day for elementary schools. Her next question related to the report card preparation which occurs on two half days at the end of the first quarter; a single day in January at the end of the second quarter and two half days at the end of the third quarter. She wanted to know if there is a reason (perhaps contractual) why they are done on half days in the first and third quarter and on a single day at the end of the second quarter. Is that a change that has to be negotiated or one the Board administers?

Mr. Bowers stated that two days at the end of first and third marking periods really came out of the mediator's report in 1993 when there were a number of things on the table. There were some issues and some language changes in the contract that were offered to try to reach a settlement. It would be done this way but there could be some flexibility in looking at that. As we get into the alternatives, the alternatives do fall into how it might be handled if they were not done in the half days as opposed to all day.

Ms. Signer's last question related to the costs of changing the calendar. The salary costs of adding days to the calendar is stated, but not specified is the savings in transportation costs if the school system moved to a full day off for students and used that as a full day of training. She wanted to know what the savings would be in transportation costs for students if the school system is not transporting them to school for two days, but transporting them for only one day. She stated that staff could get back to her with that number.

Mr. Bowers replied that it is about \$50,000 a day from the pure costs of operating the vehicles with fuel and oil. Salaries are a different issue and that is the number that was in the paper. Staff would have to look at how those different days are scheduled.

Ms. Signer presumed that the \$405,000 is the cost for the in-school staff to work on days that might be added to calendar, not for bus operators. What she was getting at was, if bus operators are not working on a full day, what is the savings?

Ms. Signer assumed that there would be roughly an equal offset in savings since the school lunch program is designed not to make a profit, but to basically break even. If there are savings or additional costs, she wanted to know that. Finally, she would appreciate just some quick phone calls to other LEAs in the area to find out how they handle staff training and whether or not it is done on half days, full days. Her presumption was that the model in Fairfax where the students were off on Monday afternoons is planning time for

teachers, not training time. Ms. Signer said she wanted to know what the other LEAs do as well. She said it is entirely possible, when the Board hears from MCCPTA in fall, that there will be some actions introduced that will affect the calendar for 1998-99 school year.

Mrs. Gordon stated that several years ago, as a result of a possible budget action, two of the half days were combined into a full day release. There was never much discussion after that one time about how successful it was, what the results were, and what the costs or savings were. She asked for information about what happened that year, and why it was abandoned without any further discussion about the results of doing that?

Mr. Ewing stated that it has been said that not much goes on in the classroom on half days of instruction and that teachers are too tired in the afternoon after half a day's work to benefit as fully as they might from staff training. He wanted the views of the two principals at the table as to whether that has been their experience and if that has been the experience of others in other schools.

Mrs. Shirley stated that she is in the classrooms every day, even on half days, and the same schedules are followed and students are on task involved in their reading groups, or whatever the instruction that happens in the mornings. Usually, they shorten the lunch time and no recess time to get as much instruction out of the day as possible. Teachers even get their students later to lunch because there is so much to do and they have an urgency to complete and follow through with instruction. From being in the schoolhouse, she did not see that happening.

Ms. Colding said they consider it business as usual from day one to the end of the school year including the half days. That is the message she gives to students and staff. That they will continue with the educational program, and they are serious about it. They have a seven-period day with shortened periods so that students go to each of those seven periods so that continuity is maintained in the classrooms. She felt that was important. Her assistant principal and she do observations even on half days. They want to model that each day is important, like any other day. They may not have the full six hours but there is a half day and the expectations are still there for staff and students as well.

Mr. Ewing continued: with respect to alternatives, the superintendent has laid out a couple which have disadvantages with costs and scheduling. He asked how important is it from the point of view of effective training to offer training on successive days versus offering training on one or two days during the year? Dr. Smith pointed out that what happens when it is spaced out the way the early release days are is that the concept is introduced, practice it, they are observed, and come back a month and half later to discuss what they have been doing. Then, they go back to refine the practice that they have learned about sharing with their colleagues and trainers following that sequence of space, learning and practice. The research says that is the best kind of learning possible.

Mr. Ewing commented that the problem MCPS faces is one of finding an alternative, if there is one, that has the advantages that this process has and none of the disadvantages that this process has. It is true MCPS has more money for training overall than it used to, but it does not have more money training overall per capita than it used to and, even if it did, it has more need for training than it used to. He thought it was important for the Board to recognize that it never, until lately, was able to do very much with training that involves whole sets. The disadvantage of training for a group of people on some new technique is one teacher in a school may be trained to go back and try to innovate it in that school and run into a stone wall. That one teacher cannot convey all the new knowledge to everybody in the school. The principal and other teachers may not have had an opportunity to be exposed to that. It offers a quick and effective way to deal with that need for staff training that cuts across all staff. Whatever is done, this must not be lost. That is a very important part of what MCPS does.

Ms. Gutiérrez stated that her overall feeling on this issue is that she has a problem saying that it is an all or nothing approach. An approach of taking into consideration the different changes in society as they are occurring now, there is enormous need for additional support of single families. She thought that the Board must look at what are possible alternatives that give equivalent, if not better, in terms of the view of the parents and perhaps the view of the teachers. She mentioned one of the view points that was missing from here is the view point of the teachers. The Board needs a more analytic approach to understand that half a day cannot be equivalent to a full day. The Board saw that it got into trouble when it had the short year where there were not only days but the total number of instructional hours. It is not sufficient to say 185 days because they are not full days, so there is less instructional time. Montgomery County has the shortest instructional day in Maryland, or one of the shortest. There is another aspect that has not been addressed, and that is that there are many other training models and MCPS uses them here. If you look at the *Bulletin, FirstClass*, there are many other options of training on subject matter, cross job categories, special topics. She thought that when the Board looks at needs for training, it also needs to look at other ways we are meeting instructional needs. Is there something better that is working better as an all-day subject matter intensive, train the trainer model, or is there an absolute benefit to this many days being at the whole staff level with everybody involved?

Ms. Gutiérrez agreed with Ms. Signer that, for costs, there is information that is lacking in this analysis since there are savings. If MCPS looks at different ways of the delivery model and who participates, maybe what the system needs to do is differentiate by level. When Board members meet with community members, this issue comes up as well as in the length of the school day issue. She did not know if the Board can put it to rest with the discussion and analysis that the Board has here. She thought the Board still needs to look at the issues raised and hear from teachers.

Mr. Felton clarified that there was a survey and the Board recognizes that the results of the survey indicated that the majority of the parents did not have a problem with early release days, but the Board, subsequent to that, was concerned about whether there were any additional measures it might address.

Ms. Wheat spoke about her experience at the high school level. There is a very distinct difference between a half day and full day in a high school. In middle school, on a half day was not as significant a change as it is in high school. In high school, a half day the student goes to all seven classes for 20 minutes. On a personal level, a student is more tired at the end of the day and nothing is accomplished. There is such a short period of time that the student either gets too much homework and nothing accomplished. Ms. Wheat asked about child care during half days or full days. Would it be possible for staff to look into checking with the Department of Recreation to see if there would be an open gym or different programs that go on in the schools.

Mr. Felton thanked staff for the discussion and it was fruitful. As usual, a number of issues have been raised.

**Re: TENTATIVE ACTION ON POLICY ECN,
TELECOMMUNICATIONS TRANSMISSION FACILITIES**

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Ms. Signer seconded by Mrs. King, the following resolution was placed on the table:

WHEREAS, The 1996 Federal Telecommunications Act and related Montgomery County legislation requires that all public land-owning agencies, which would include the Board of Education, consider legitimate requests from the private sector to place telecommunications transmission facilities on school sites; and

WHEREAS, The accompanying draft Policy ECN: Telecommunications Transmission Facilities, has been developed with the input of school administrators and county government staff; and

WHEREAS, This draft policy provides a reasonable process to evaluate prospective proposals to place telecommunications transmission facilities on school sites; and

WHEREAS, This draft policy satisfies the legal requirements of federal and local legislation; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Board of Education take tentative action to adopt draft Policy ECN and direct the superintendent of schools to circulate the draft policy to all interested parties for their input.

RESOLUTION NO. 432-97

Re: **AN AMENDMENT TO THE TENTATIVE ACTION ON
POLICY ECN, TELECOMMUNICATIONS
TRANSMISSION FACILITIES**

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education amend the draft policy at C.2.d)(1) to read as follows:

No site shall be considered unless it meets the acreage needed for standard setback requirements.

RESOLUTION NO. 433-97

Re: **AN AMENDMENT TO THE TENTATIVE ACTION ON
POLICY ECN, TELECOMMUNICATIONS
TRANSMISSION FACILITIES**

On motion of Ms. Gutiérrez and seconded by Mrs. Gordon, the following resolution was adopted with Mr. Ewing, Mr. Felton, Mrs. Gordon, Ms. Gutiérrez, Mrs. King, and Ms. Signer voting in the affirmative; Dr. Cheung abstaining; and Ms. Wheat was not in the room.

Resolved, That the Board of Education amend the draft policy at C.2 to read as follows:

Factors such as site size, compatability with the county's Master Plan, impact on school operations, school and community input (including school personnel and neighborhood citizens' concerns), compensation, and the ability to co-locate telecommunication facilities at the site shall all be considered when evaluating sites for telecommunications facilities on school property.

RESOLUTION NO. 434-97

Re: **AN AMENDMENT TO THE TENTATIVE ACTION ON
POLICY ECN, TELECOMMUNICATIONS
TRANSMISSION FACILITIES**

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education amend the draft policy at C.4 to read as follows:

The superintendent will review and, if necessary, gather additional views of the community as well as principals and/or site managers and evaluate those views prior to making a decision.

RESOLUTION NO. 435-97

Re: **AN AMENDMENT TO THE TENTATIVE ACTION ON
POLICY ECN, TELECOMMUNICATIONS
TRANSMISSION FACILITIES**

On motion of Mrs. Gordon and seconded by Ms. Signer, the following resolution was adopted unanimously:

Resolved, That the Board of Education amend the draft policy at C.4 to read as follows:

Based on the criteria set forth in this policy, the superintendent will decide whether to approve the request and, if so, negotiate the most favorable terms.

RESOLUTION NO. 436-97

Re: **TENTATIVE ACTION ON POLICY ECN,
TELECOMMUNICATIONS TRANSMISSION FACILITIES**

On motion of Ms. Signer and seconded by Mrs. Gordon, the following resolution as amended was adopted unanimously:

WHEREAS, The 1996 Federal Telecommunications Act and related Montgomery County legislation requires that all public land-owning agencies, which would include the Board of Education, consider legitimate requests from the private sector to place telecommunications transmission facilities on school sites; and

WHEREAS, The accompanying draft Policy ECN: Telecommunications Transmission Facilities, has been developed with the input of school administrators and county government staff; and

WHEREAS, This draft policy provides a reasonable process to evaluate prospective proposals to place telecommunications transmission facilities on school sites; and

WHEREAS, This draft policy satisfies the legal requirements of federal and local legislation; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Board of Education take tentative action to adopt draft Policy ECN, as amended, and direct the superintendent of schools to circulate the draft policy to all interested parties for their input.

Telecommunications Transmission Facilities

A. PURPOSE

To establish the criteria by which the Board of Education determines the best way to evaluate proposals to place private telecommunications transmission facilities on school sites

B. ISSUE

There have been requests to place private telecommunications transmission facilities on school sites. Federal and county laws provide for such placements. The Board of Education needs to have criteria with which to approve such requests without compromising the school system's primary mission to provide a safe and supportive environment for the academic success of every student.

C. POSITION

1. The Board of Education supports federal and county legislation relating to the infrastructure of modern telecommunications systems and wishes to implement these laws without contravening the primary mission of the organization which is to provide a safe and supportive environment for the academic success of every student.
2. Factors such as site size, compatibility with the county's Master Plan, impact on school operations, school and community input (including school personnel and neighborhood citizens' concerns), compensation, and the ability to co-locate telecommunication facilities at the site shall all be considered when evaluating sites for telecommunications facilities on school property. Specifically, the following criteria will be considered in the evaluation of proposals:
 - a) Conformance of the proposal with federal and county legislation as demonstrated in the county's Telecommunications Transmission Facility Coordinating Group's (TTF CG) recommendation and the Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission (M-NCPPC) report.
 - b) Telecommunications providers must show evidence of pursuit of co-location with existing transmission facilities.

- c) Telecommunications providers must have a long-range master plan for future telecommunications transmission facilities throughout the county.
 - d) Impact on the school site and operations as determined by school staff, PTSA, community groups, and facilities staff. These considerations should include the following:
 - (1) No site shall be considered unless it meets the acreage needed for standard setback requirements
 - (2) No private structure shall be placed on school buildings
 - (3) Any proposed installation must satisfy all legal, safety, and health concerns
 - (4) Any proposed installation must be architecturally and aesthetically compatible with the school site
 - (5) The applicant making the proposal is responsible for notification of potentially affected communities
 - (6) Installation and location shall not disrupt normal operation of school system activities and/or community activities as determined by the principal or site manager
 - (7) The applicant shall bear all responsibility and related costs for liability and maintenance arising from the installation and its operation. This would include related upkeep, repair, and appearance of the tower, monopole, equipment building, enclosed grounds and fencing, and provision for its removal.
 - e) Demonstrated record of successful experience with such projects.
 - f) Benefit to the Board including provision of revenue to support educational improvements.
3. A standard MCPS lease form shall govern all leases and permits for telecommunications facilities on school property. The lease/permit shall require indemnification of the Board, its employees, and agents by the applicant for any contingent liability arising from the operation of the facility.

Revisions to the standard lease/permit form, except for changes required due to site specific concerns, shall not be accepted.

4. The superintendent will review and, if necessary, gather additional views of the community as well as principals and/or site managers and evaluate those views prior to making a decision.
5. Based on the criteria set forth in this policy, the superintendent will decide whether to approve the request and, if so, negotiate the most favorable terms. The applicant will be responsible for removing the installation completely and returning the site to its previous condition at conclusion of the contract.

D. DESIRED OUTCOME

Fair and consistent criteria with which to evaluate the appropriateness of placing telecommunication transmission infrastructures on school sites so that they do not detract from the primary mission of the school system

E. IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGIES

1. In compliance with county statute, the TTF CG will submit recommendations on proposed installations to the school system.
2. The superintendent will transmit that recommendation to the M-NCPPC for its review under the mandatory referral or special exception process. The review will include expert testimony and citizen input.
3. The superintendent will notify site managers of the proposed installation.
4. The superintendent will receive the M-NCPPC report and any other relevant information and make a decision concerning the application.

F. REVIEW AND REPORTING

1. This policy will be reviewed on an ongoing basis in accordance with the Board of Education's policy review process.
2. Periodic reports on the implementation of this policy, including input from affected schools and communities, will be reviewed by the Board.

RESOLUTION NO. 437-97

Re: **NORTHEAST AREA HIGH SCHOOLS CONSORTIUM
SIGNATURE PROGRAMS**

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education amend its agenda to make this item discussion and action.

Re: **NORTHEAST AREA HIGH SCHOOLS CONSORTIUM
SIGNATURE PROGRAMS**

Dr. Vance invited the following people to the table: Dr. Steven G. Seleznow, associate superintendent for the Office of School Administration; Dr. Mary Helen Smith, associate superintendent for the Office of Instruction and Program Development; and Mrs. Nancy Powell, consultant for the signature programs.

Dr. Vance announced that the presentation would provide an update on the progress of developing the individual signature programs in the Northeast Consortium. The staff has worked on instructional program development, process planning and implementation, management, timeline for implementation, student choice and assignments. There will also be information on transportation, preliminary information on budget, personnel recruitment, placement communications, and policy implications. Staff will continue to keep the Board informed on the progress with regular updates with development and implementation of this important initiative.

The concept of signature programs is not new to MCPS. The concept of campus wide signature programs within the concept of a preferred choice initiative are new. The major purpose of a signature program is to enhance and extend the schools instructional program. It will generate new models and areas of focus for students. Staff believes this is being accomplished in collaboration with communities, businesses, universities, government agencies, and other organizations that are helping the school system identify innovative approaches to teaching and learning. Indeed, the effort underway in the Northeast Consortium takes the development of signature programs to a new level of school involvement by students, staff, parents, and community residents. For the Northeast Consortium, the signature programs also are designed to provide demographic stability to each of the schools to retain the student population, compete with private schools, and give parents and students the opportunity to choose among several high quality programs that best match their interest and their needs.

Dr. Seleznow provided as much detail on the work that has been done by Mrs. Powell and in particular the staff, parents, and community leaders who have been active in developing the programs in each of the schools. This process has created a great deal of enthusiasm

and excitement and a sense of energy at Paint Branch, Springbrook, and the new Northeast high schools.

Mrs. Powell focused her remarks on the instructional program in the schools. The timeline calls for the system to define the signature programs; this summer do detailed planning for grades nine and ten; and this fall and coming school year pieces of the signature will be tried out in order to find new instructional strategies, particular units, or whole courses. The school system is no longer talking about three independent high schools, but three campuses forming one consortium. In the past, most curriculum initiatives have come from the central office. This program has been one that was developed with a great deal of school initiative. While school staff was working very hard on their concepts, central office administered the process to assure that curriculum and signature programs fit into overall comprehensive high school standards. An entrepreneurial spirit to develop programs has triggered the staff's excitement and commitment.

In the process of defining what makes each of the schools in the consortium distinctive, planners have to determine the commonality since each school is a comprehensive high school. The signature programs are as follows:

1. Research in Science, Health, and Media at Paint Branch High Schools, and
2. Information Technology in a Global Society and IB Program at Springbrook High School, and
3. The Arts at Northeast Area High School.

Mr. Felton was pleased with the progress that has been made to date, recognizing that the school system is traveling on new ground which is a new experience for Montgomery County. While there still may be some unanswered questions about various aspects of the programs, a great deal of information has been brought forward and those on the Board and in the community can begin to share what the difference will be in the consortium. It is not just another curriculum; it is about changing the way the school system delivers education as well as the excitement and participation of staff and the community.

Mrs. Gordon stated that the white paper was comprehensive and answered many of the questions that have been posed by the Board, community, and staff. The variety of signature programs will be an enhancement for the schools in the consortium. As a Paint Branch parent, she had the opportunity to provide input about the kind of signature program that was developing, as well as other community members and parents were involved throughout the progress at all of the schools including the Northeast Area High School. Signature programs are divergent and have come from the grassroots without a dictum from the Board of Education. She asked about the skills for success mentioned in the paper and asked if it was related to the skills for success mandated in the state's high

school assessment. Mrs. Powell stated that staff was very aware of the state mandates as well as the national trends, and there are a lot of parallels in the school systems' signature programs.

Mrs. Gordon asked about the new high school and the program for the arts. During forums that were held, the program for the Northeast Area High School was being described as arts and humanities. While the definition of the arts has been expanded from the traditional arts, the humanities' piece has not been developed. She pointed out that that will be important as the signature programs are being developed and stressed that that piece not be lost because it broadens the opportunities for students in the humanities. Mrs. Powell stated there still is a great deal of discussion about the role of the arts in society, multi-cultural approaches, and the arts as a way of knowing. It was her failure to mention that piece.

Mrs. King was excited about the programs. She pointed out that the paper stated that each student in the school will have the opportunity to participate in the signature program. What if a student just wants to attend the school without participating in the signature programs? Staff replied that it was not a problem because the schools will be comprehensive high schools. Students will come into contact with the themes of each school in the ninth grade through other courses such as math and English. If the student elects not to study the theme further, that will be their choice. Mrs. Powell stated there was another way of looking at it. There will be a required arts course for all ninth graders in the new Northeast Area High School. That will meet the arts requirement if the student elects not to follow up with a signature program. Mrs. King pointed out that it is important for the students to know how the signature programs fit into the comprehensive high school.

Due to a prior commitment, Mrs. King left the meeting at this point.

Dr. Cheung stated that the community and school leadership should be thanked for the development of the signature programs. It is exciting to hear that the teachers are involved in the curriculum development. The paper outlines a very outstanding and exciting vision; next comes implementation. The role of the Board is to support the principles, actions, and resources. In the meantime, the Board is making some cuts the existing special and magnet programs. The Board will try to find ways to protect and encourage innovative programs. It is very exciting for the Northeast Consortium, and, hopefully, it can be disseminated to other schools. The Board, school system, and community needs to be realistic about what they are doing, and it will require a lot of hard work and continuous effort.

Dr. Vance commented that at the inception of the magnet programs and the IB program, the Board of Education and superintendents made very strong commitments to those programs. For over a decade, those commitments have been honored. It is not an excuse

for not honoring those commitments currently. It would be his intention in that same context to make the same level of commitment to the signature programs and to make sure subsequent budgets reflected the level of that commitment. He thought that what Dr. Cheung raised is a significant position that the school system has to assure the community that signature programs will be supported once the design and purpose are approved. He stated that other special programs have been supported in light of overwhelming odds. Dramatic cuts have been made in the budget, and staff and the Board has refused to cut those programs.

Mr. Ewing thought it was important for the Board to go on record as acting on the set of proposals. When the Board adopted the Blair Magnet Program as well as other magnet programs and the IB program, it was as a result of intensive review on the part of the Board of those programs. The Board is obligated under the law and to the public to do likewise with respect to these programs. That does not mean that the Board needs to get into the detail of every action that goes on in connection with these programs. But, the Board does have, under the law, legal authority for approving curriculum actions and courses of study. It is one of its most important authorities and is one that the Board needs to exercise and, indeed, it cannot avoid it. One of the most critical elements of this whole enterprise is that these programs will be offered in schools that continue to offer comprehensive academic high school programs with all of the core high school courses.

On November 25, 1996, the Board asked for a clear statement of the signature programs, goals, and objectives for the Board's review and adoption along with proposed practices and procedures for governing the programs, and proposals for needed policy changes. Mr. Ewing hoped that the superintendent would bring them to the Board in a timely way before it is no longer relevant. It is important that the school system is clear that there are expected outcomes and a sense of the assessment of those programs, and the Board needs to know how the results will be evaluated. He was impressed by the amount of effort that has gone into the development of these programs to date, but specifics are still missing: requirements, sequence of courses, elements of the program.

Ms. Gutiérrez echoed her colleagues' comments about being excited with the signature programs. The Board has been looking forward to the programmatic attraction to these programs which is the primary focus of the educational enterprise especially in this consortium. Staff has met the challenge of developing innovative and creative programs. With multiple programs, previous programs will not be abandoned for new programs. There needs to be a reflection and collaboration of what courses are already in the consortium schools.

She was very excited with the programmatic proposals currently being developed. Specifically, the groups should confer within the consortium to enhance linkages. The way that information about the signature programs is shared from now on is very important. If

the school system is planning on being technologically astute, it is a wonderful opportunity to address lessons learned in keeping the community informed about program development and implementation. The traditional way of bringing reports to the Board should be expanded using technology.

The process of planning and implementation management should be more precise in outlining the expectations and outcomes. The issue of the timeline for implementation needs to be further developed. There are things that need to be identified including the milestones of bringing things to the Board at decision points. It needs to include a development of the planning document for implementation that would be similar for all three high schools. She was concerned about some kind of a review as well as an appeal process to the applications within the consortium.

In transportation, she suggested that the plan be developed further because there is an opportunity to develop a new cost containment model, use new algorithms, and use some operations research. The report states clearly that the school system will develop a transportation plan utilizing established policy. If there are more creative ways of doing transportation, it could alleviate some of the Council's criticism about costs. As the school system is moving forward with signature programs, it has an opportunity to look at different configurations or innovative approaches to at least address cost containment.

The Board clearly stated at the beginning that it wanted ESOL students to participate in the signature programs. There is no evidence in the paper presented to the Board that the school system is meeting that established requirement, and this should be addressed as soon as possible. The base area predictions will be affected in balance and diversity. It is essential that the ESOL population be factored into those numbers.

Ms. Signer had nothing to add but said her silence should be construed as enthusiastic support.

Re: **MOTION ON THE NORTHEAST AREA HIGH SCHOOLS
CONSORTIUM SIGNATURE PROGRAMS**

On motion of Mrs. Gordon and seconded by Ms. Signer, the following resolution was placed on the table:

Resolved, That the Board of Education approve the design and purpose of the signature programs for the high schools in the Northeast Consortium as defined in the superintendent's memorandum; and be it further

Resolved, That the superintendent provide the Board with regular updates on the further development of each program.

Re: DISCUSSION

Mr. Ewing stated that he had no objections, but the proposal needs to have from the superintendent goals and objectives as well as outcomes. He did not see this document furthermore as a design for a program, but rather an outline.

Mrs. Gordon thought it was fine that the Board took action in November and said that the superintendent would bring to the Board for approval goals and objectives for the signature programs. She wanted to be clear, though, that goals and objectives are not specific courses, are not specific designs, and that these signature programs for these three schools should be put under no more scrutiny than the Board has put other signature programs that have been implemented over the last four or five years in other schools.

Ms. Gutiérrez wanted language to be used in the motion in approving the approach and general outline of the signature programs. She was just saying as a school system there is a need to raise the level of rigor in planning and in outlining and dealing with the various issues.

Mr. Felton stated that the Board was in agreement that further development is required and that further communication and presentation to the Board are desired. At present, the resolution is simply saying that the Board supports signature programs as presented and it wants the staff to continue to pursue the plan.

Mr. Ewing stated that he would be much more comfortable with Mr. Felton's language which was that the Board approves the signature programs as of this date given what the superintendent has said. If the Board talks about approving the design, he did not think the Board had a design yet. Otherwise, he was prepared to vote for the motion, particularly given that the superintendent said he would come back to the Board not just with updates but with a set of recommendations for the Board to review and approve.

**Re: AN AMENDMENT (Mr. Ewing) MOTION ON THE
NORTHEAST AREA HIGH SCHOOLS CONSORTIUM
SIGNATURE PROGRAMS (FAILED)**

On motion of the Mr. Ewing and seconded by Ms. Gutiérrez, an amendment to add the word "conceptual" before the word "design" failed with Dr. Cheung, Mr. Ewing, and Ms. Gutiérrez voting in the affirmative; Mr. Felton, Mrs. Gordon, and Ms. Signer voting in the negative; Ms. Wheat abstaining.

Re: **AN AMENDMENT (Mr. Ewing) MOTION ON THE
NORTHEAST AREA HIGH SCHOOLS CONSORTIUM
SIGNATURE PROGRAMS (FAILED)**

On motion of the Mr. Ewing and seconded by Dr. Cheung, an amendment to add the words "the approach to the" before "design" failed with Dr. Cheung, Mr. Ewing, and Ms. Gutiérrez voting in the affirmative; Mr. Felton, Mrs. Gordon, and Ms. Signer voting in the negative; Ms. Wheat abstaining.

Ms. Gutiérrez offered a friendly amendment, to which Mrs. Gordon agreed, to change the second resolve to read:

Resolved, That the superintendent provide the Board with regular updates on the further program development with the inclusion of ESOL and special needs populations.

RESOLUTION NO. 438-97

Re: **MOTION ON THE NORTHEAST AREA HIGH
SCHOOLS CONSORTIUM SIGNATURE
PROGRAMS**

On motion of Mrs. Gordon and seconded by Ms. Signer, the following resolution, as amended, was adopted unanimously by members present:

Resolved, That the Board of Education approve the design and purpose of the signature programs for the high schools in the Northeast Consortium as defined in the superintendent's memorandum; and be it further

Resolved, That the superintendent provide the Board with regular updates on the further program development with the inclusion of ESOL and special needs populations.

Mr. Ewing made the following statement for the record. "If what the Board has here is a design, then Mrs. Powell is a math teacher. It is not a design. A design means — look it up in the dictionary — something quite different than what the Board has in front of it."

RESOLUTION NO. 439-97

Re: **CLOSED SESSION RESOLUTION**

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Ms. Gutiérrez seconded by Ms. Wheat, the following resolution was adopted unanimously:

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education of Montgomery County conduct a portion of its meeting on Tuesday, July 29, 1997, at 7:00 to 8:30 p.m. to discuss personnel matters and other matters protected from public disclosure by law, to review and adjudicate appeals, and to address 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 Section 10-508 of the State Government Article; and be it further

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

Re: REPORT OF CLOSED SESSION

On June 11, 1997, by the unanimous vote of members present, the Board of Education voted to conduct a closed session on June 23, 1997, 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 June 11, 1997, from 7:13 to 8:30 p.m. The meeting took place in Room 120, Carver Educational Services Center, Rockville, Maryland.

The Board met to discuss personnel issues and legal matters with its attorney. The Board reviewed and adjudicated Appeal No. 1997-9, Appeal No. 1997-10, Appeal No. 1997-12, and Appeal No. 1997-13.

In attendance at part or all of the closed sessions were: Elizabeth Arons, Larry Bowers, Alan Cheung, Blair Ewing, Reggie Felton, David Fischer, Katheryn Gemberling, Bea Gordon, Ana Sol Gutiérrez, Pat Hahn, Nancy King, George Margolies, Brian Porter, Rachel Prager, Glenda Rose, Ruby Rubins, Steven Seleznow, Mona Signer, Mary Helen Smith, Roger Titus, Paul Vance, and Debbie Wheat.

RESOLUTION NO. 440-97

Re: MINUTES OF MAY 27, 1997

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education approve its minutes of the May 27, 1997, meeting.

RESOLUTION NO. 441-97 Re: **MINUTES OF JUNE 11, 1997**

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education approve its minutes of the June 11, 1997, meeting.

RESOLUTION NO. 442-97 Re: **MINUTES OF JUNE 17, 1997**

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education approve its minutes of the June 17, 1997, meeting.

RESOLUTION NO. 443-97 Re: **BOARD APPEAL NO. 1997-10**

On motion of Mrs. Gordon, the following resolution was adopted by members present:

Resolved, That the Board of Education adopt its Decision and Order in Appeal 1997-10, a student matter, reflective of the following vote: Dr. Cheung, Mr. Felton, Mrs. Gordon, Ms. Gutiérrez, and Ms. Signer voting to remand; Mr. Ewing voting in the reverse.

* Mrs. King did vote took part in the adjudication and voted to remand.

RESOLUTION NO. 444-97 Re: **BOARD APPEAL NO. 1997-12**

On motion of Mrs. Gordon, the following resolution was adopted by members present:

Resolved, That the Board of Education adopt its Decision and Order in Appeal 1997-12, a student matter, reflective of the following vote: Dr. Cheung, Mr. Ewing, Mr. Felton, Mrs. Gordon, Ms. Gutiérrez, and Ms. Signer voting in the affirmative.

* Mrs. King did vote took part in the adjudication and voted to affirm.

RESOLUTION NO. 445-97 Re: **BOARD APPEAL NO. 1997-13**

On motion of Mrs. Gordon the following resolution was adopted by members present:

Resolved, That the Board of Education adopt its Decision and Order in Appeal 1997-13, a student matter, reflective of the following vote: Dr. Cheung, Mr. Ewing, Mr. Felton, Mrs. Gordon, Ms. Gutiérrez, Mrs. King, and Ms. Signer voting to affirmative.

* Mrs. King did vote took part in the adjudication and voted to affirm.

** Student Board Member Debra Wheat did not participate in the above appeals. Former Student Board Member Rachel A. Prager was present and participated, but her term of office expired before adoption of the formal decision and orders.

Re: RESOLUTIONS FOR MABE CONFERENCE

After a short discussion, the Board decided to work with staff and draft resolutions for the MABE Conference. After Board review and approval, the resolutions will be presented to MABE's Resolution Committee or taken directly to the floor at the conference.

RESOLUTION NO. 446-97 Re: CONSOLIDATING GROUPS ADDRESSING SPECIAL EDUCATION

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

Resolved, That the superintendent of schools present to the Board of Education, as soon as feasible, recommendations for consolidating the MCPS groups that address special education; and be further

Resolved, That these recommendations ensure the representation of parents' points of view.

RESOLUTION NO. 447-97 Re: CURRICULUM GUIDES AND COURSES OF STUDY

On motion of Mr. Ewing and seconded by Ms. Gutiérrez, the following resolution with a friendly amendment by Mr. Felton was adopted unanimously by members present:

WHEREAS, Sections 4-111(a) and 4-205(l) of the Education Article of the Annotated Code of Maryland direct that local boards of education are vested with the authority to establish curriculum guides and courses of study for local public schools; and

WHEREAS, These provisions of law imply that programs that are designed to expand on, or to infuse ideas or concepts into, the curriculum are also to be approved by boards of education; and

WHEREAS, Montgomery County Public Schools (MCPS) receives Federal, State and local grants, grants from foundations, businesses and from other sources that affect the MCPS curriculum; and

WHEREAS, A wide variety of organizations introduce in local schools programs that are designed to affect or change the curriculum; and

WHEREAS, Local schools propose initiatives that are designed to affect or change the programs and curriculum of MCPS; and

WHEREAS, The Board of Education of Montgomery County wishes to ensure two objectives: 1) the maintenance and improvement of a coherent, consistent, high quality curriculum and the associated programs of instruction to present that curriculum, and 2) the encouragement of creative, innovative initiatives to test new curriculum and program efforts throughout MCPS; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Board of Education schedule time to discuss the role and responsibilities including legal and policy, of the Board in the review and approval of the curriculum guides and courses of study; and be it further

Resolved, That the superintendent provide to the Board his views for the decisions to be made regarding curriculum.

RESOLUTION NO. 448-97 Re: **ISSUES OF SAFETY AND SECURITY**

On motion of Mr. Ewing seconded by Ms. Gutiérrez, the following resolution with a friendly amendment by Ms. Signer was adopted unanimously by members present:

WHEREAS, There is growing concern over the levels of safety and security in Montgomery County Public Schools; and

WHEREAS, Principals of high schools have published a report proposing action; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Board of Education schedule time in September for an in-depth discussion of the issues of safety and security, including but not limited to those raised by the high school principals; and be it further

Resolved, That the superintendent shall provide the Board with background data detailing the nature, extent, and seriousness of the problems in MCPS and provide options and recommended solutions to the problems confronting MCPS in this area; and be it further

Resolved, That the Board requires public comment on the issues raised by the principals and to be raised by the superintendent, and be it further

Resolved, That the Board shall take action on the superintendent's recommendations as soon as feasible but no later than January 1, 1998.

Re: **NEW BUSINESS**

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

WHEREAS, The Board adopted its FY 1998 Operating Budget on June 11, 1997, after making reductions to its original budget request so as to conform to the final appropriation of the County Council; and

WHEREAS, Among the reductions made was a reduction in Category 3 in the amount of \$128,548 both to reduce released time for teachers in magnet and special programs; and

WHEREAS, Many of the models of the special programs were established with this released time so as to provided time for teachers to develop the specialized curriculum, to train staff in the new curriculum, to work with individual or small groups of students, and to disseminate the program throughout the school and the county (as seen recently with the advent of additional IB programs); and

WHEREAS, This reduction has limited the flexibility of principals to address their priorities and allocate staff; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Board maintain this reduction in the amount of \$128, 548 in Category 3; provided, however, that it not be mandated that the reduction at the individual secondary schools with magnet and special programs must be absorbed by eliminating released time for teachers; and be it further

Resolved, That the Superintendent allocate the exact proportionate amount of the reduction among the affected schools, but that principals of those schools be vested with the flexibility as to how to absorb such reduction within their Category 3 funds; and be it further

Resolved, That this revision to the budget be communicated immediately to the affected secondary schools in time for plans to be made for the opening of school.

2. 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) has experienced continuous increases in average class size over the past six 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 the Board President appoint an ad hoc committee of the Board to work with the superintendent and MCPS staff to study the matter (over the summer) and to propose options to the full Board, allowing for possible initial budget action beginning with the FY99 budget cycle.

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

WHEREAS, The Board of Education took action in the FY 1998 operating budget to add funds to reduce class size; and

WHEREAS, Class size reductions appear likely to be minimal, based on data the superintendent has provided to the Board; and

WHEREAS, The preparation of the budget for FY 1999 needs to include substantial support for further class size reduction; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the superintendent bring to the Board at the earliest possible date a comparison of class sizes at each grade level, by school, for FY 1997 and projected for FY 1998 and FY 1999, based on planned funding increases; and be it further

Resolved, That the Board of Education discuss these data with a view to making a determination as soon as possible about what resources could be made available to reduce class size in kindergarten through grade three in FY 1998, and with a view to making an early determination about what the resource levels for class size reduction should be in FY 1999 and in the succeeding five years.

Re: **ITEMS OF INFORMATION**

1. Items in Process
2. Construction Progress Report

RESOLUTION NO. 449-97

Re: **ADJOURNMENT**

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education adjourn its meeting of July 8, 1997, at 7:35 p.m.

PRESIDENT

SECRETARY

PLV:gr

**MONTGOMERY COUNTY BOARD OF EDUCATION
SUMMARY SHEET**

July 8, 1997

AGENDA 1

BOARD/SUPERINTENDENT COMMENTS 1

FACILITY FOR TAKOMA PARK UNIFICATION STUDENTS 2

CONTRACTS FOR MORE THAN \$25,000 12

MONTGOMERY BLAIR HIGH SCHOOL REPLACEMENT SCHOOL PROJECT 16

ELECTRIC SERVICE FOR MODULAR CLASSROOM BUILDINGS - PHASE I 16

ELECTRIC SERVICE FOR MODULAR CLASSROOM BUILDINGS - PHASE II 17

ACCESSIBILITY MODIFICATIONS AT VARIOUS MONTGOMERY COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS -
PHASE II 18

ARCHITECTURAL APPOINTMENT - EARLE B. WOOD MIDDLE SCHOOL 18

GRANT OF EASEMENT AT THE NEW NORTHEAST AREA HIGH SCHOOL 19

NORTHEAST AREA HIGH SCHOOL ENERGY MANAGEMENT SYSTEM INSTALLATION 19

UTILIZATION OF FY 1998 FUTURE SUPPORTED PROJECT FUNDS FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF
THE BOWIE STATE UNIVERSITY BACHELOR'S DEGREE PARTNERSHIP PROGRAM .. 20

UTILIZATION OF FY 1998 FUTURE SUPPORTED PROJECT FUNDS FOR THE ROYALTIES
GENERATED BY THE EVENT-BASED SCIENCE PROJECT 21

UTILIZATION OF FY 1998 FUTURE SUPPORTED PROJECT FUNDS FOR THE PROJECT TEAM 21

RECOMMENDATION TO SUBMIT AN FY 1998 GRANT PROPOSAL TO THE MARYLAND STATE
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION FOR THE COMMUNITY TEAM COLLABORATION
PROJECT 22

PERSONNEL MONTHLY REPORT 22

MRS. EVELYN C. JONES, SPECIAL EDUCATION RESOURCE ROOM TEACHER, ROSA PARKS
MIDDLE SCHOOL 22

PERSONNEL APPOINTMENT 23

CONSTRUCTION STATUS REPORT 24

PUBLIC COMMENTS 25

EARLY RELEASE DAYS	26
TENTATIVE ACTION ON POLICY ECN, TELECOMMUNICATIONS TRANSMISSION FACILITIES .	33
NORTHEAST AREA HIGH SCHOOLS CONSORTIUM SIGNATURE PROGRAMS	38
CLOSED SESSION RESOLUTION	45
REPORT OF CLOSED SESSION	46
MINUTES	46
BOARD APPEAL	47
RESOLUTIONS FOR MABE CONFERENCE	47
CONSOLIDATING GROUPS ADDRESSING SPECIAL EDUCATION	48
CURRICULUM GUIDES AND COURSES OF STUDY	48
ISSUES OF SAFETY AND SECURITY	49
NEW BUSINESS	49
ITEMS OF INFORMATION	52
ADJOURNMENT	52