

APPROVED
21-1998

Rockville, Maryland
May 26, 1998

The Board of Education of Montgomery County met in regular session at the Carver Educational Services Center, Rockville, Maryland, on Tuesday, May 26, 1998, at 8:05 p.m.

ROLL CALL Present: Mrs. Nancy J. King, President
 in the Chair
 Dr. Alan Cheung
 Mr. Blair G. Ewing
 Mr. Reginald M. Felton
 Mrs. Beatrice B. Gordon
 Ms. Ana Sol Gutiérrez
 Ms. Mona M. Signer
 Ms. Debra Wheat
 Mr. Geonard Butler, Student Board Member-elect
 Dr. Paul L. Vance, Secretary/Treasurer

Absent: None

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

Re: **ANNOUNCEMENT**

Mrs. King welcomed Mr. Butler to the table as the student Board member-elect.

RESOLUTION NO. 332-98 Re: **AGENDA**

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 its agenda for May 26, 1998.

Re: **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

The following people testified before the Board of Education:

	<u>Person</u>	<u>Topic</u>
1.	Ginny Gong	School Names
2.	James Bailey	Advisory Committees
3.	Karen Cooper	Autism Program
4.	Tyler Cureton	Student Helping Others Unite Today
5.	Rachel Stewart	Diversity Conference
6.	Rita Manzana	Diversity Conference

- | | | |
|-----|--------------------|----------------------------|
| 7. | John Hoven | Gifted and Talented Policy |
| 8. | George Nolfi | Gifted and Talented Policy |
| 9. | Margaret Hare | Gifted and Talented Policy |
| 10. | Debbie Van Brunt | Autism Program |
| 11. | William Caswell | Gifted and Talented Policy |
| 12. | Ellen Schoenfelder | Reading and Language Arts |
| 13. | Julie Lees | Social Studies Curriculum |
| 14. | Delta Davis | Reading and Language Arts |

RESOLUTION NO. 333-98

Re: **AWARD OF CONTRACT - WALTER JOHNSON MIDDLE SCHOOL #2**

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

WHEREAS, The following sealed bids were received on April 28, 1998, for the reopening of the North Bethesda Junior High School building as Walter Johnson Middle School #2, with work to begin June 18, 1998, and be completed by August 1, 1999:

<u>Bidder</u>	<u>Amount</u>
Henley Construction Company, Inc.	\$ 9,677,000
PEC Construction, Inc.	9,751,000
Porter Construction Management, Inc.	9,978,000
Hess Construction Company	10,002,000
The Leapley Company	10,058,500
Meridian Construction Company, Inc.	10,194,300
Grunley Construction Company, Inc.	10,267,000
Dustin Construction, Inc.	10,472,700

and

WHEREAS, The low bidder, Henley Construction Company, Inc., has completed similar work successfully for Montgomery County Public Schools; and

WHEREAS, The low bid is below the architect's estimate of \$9,750,000; and

WHEREAS, Henley Construction Company, Inc., has submitted \$640,000 of certified Minority Business Enterprise participation to date; however, staff is continuing to work with the contractor to meet the 14 percent goal; now therefore be it

Resolved, That a contract for \$9,677,000 be awarded to Henley Construction Company, Inc., for the reopening of the North Bethesda Junior High School building as Walter Johnson Middle School #2, in accordance with plans and specifications prepared by

Wiencek & Zavos, Architects, contingent upon final County Council action for the FY 1999-2004 Capital Improvements Program request.

RESOLUTION NO. 334-98 Re: **AWARD OF CONTRACT - ASBESTOS REMOVAL AT MONTGOMERY BLAIR MIDDLE SCHOOL #3/ ELEMENTARY SCHOOL #11**

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

WHEREAS, The following sealed bids were received on May 6, 1998, for the asbestos abatement at Montgomery Blair Middle School #3/Elementary School #11, with work to begin June 22, 1998, and be completed by September 14, 1998:

<u>Bidder</u>	<u>Amount</u>
A-L Abatement, Inc.	\$ 218,441
USA Remediation Services, Inc.	262,000
LVI Environmental Services, Inc.	309,000
Barco Enterprises, Inc.	362,840
ARC Construction Services, Inc.	394,000

and

WHEREAS, The low bidder, A-L Abatement, Inc., has completed similar work successfully; and

WHEREAS, The low bid is below the staff estimate of \$240,000; and

WHEREAS, Staff has verified that the contractor has made a good-faith effort to obtain minority participation; now therefore be it

Resolved, That a contract for \$218,441 be awarded to A-L Abatement, Inc., for the asbestos removal at Montgomery Blair Middle School #3/Elementary School #11 in accordance with plans and specifications prepared by the Department of Facilities Management.

RESOLUTION NO. 335-98 Re: **AWARD OF CONTRACT - DIAMOND ELEMENTARY SCHOOL REROOFING**

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

WHEREAS, The following sealed bids were received on April 23, 1998, for the reroofing of Diamond Elementary School, with work to begin June 22, 1998, and to be completed by August 25, 1998:

<u>Bidder</u>	<u>Amount</u>
Orndorff & Spaid, Inc.	\$ 278,383
Cole Roofing Company, Inc.	285,514
Alliance Roofing & Sheet Metal, Inc.	285,900
J. E. Wood & Sons Company, Inc.	289,900
R. D. Bean, Inc.	429,365

and

WHEREAS, The low bidder, Orndorff & Spaid, Inc., has completed similar work successfully for Montgomery County Public Schools; and

WHEREAS, The low bid is below the staff estimate of \$290,000; and

WHEREAS, The State Interagency Committee for Public School Construction will fund 50 percent of the eligible work for the Diamond Elementary School reroofing as part of the state systemic renovation program; and

WHEREAS, Staff has verified that the contractor has made a good-faith effort to obtain minority participation; now therefore be it

Resolved, That a contract for \$278,383 be awarded to Orndorff & Spaid, Inc., for the Diamond Elementary School reroofing in accordance with plans and specifications prepared by the Department of Facilities Management, and subject to final action by the County Council on the FY 1999 Capital Budget; and be it further

Resolved, That the contract be forwarded to the State Interagency Committee for Public School Construction for approval to reimburse Montgomery County Public Schools for the state eligible portion of the Diamond Elementary School reroofing.

RESOLUTION NO. 336-98 Re: **AWARD OF CONTRACT - POTOMAC ELEMENTARY SCHOOL REROOFING**

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

WHEREAS, The following sealed bids were received on May 7, 1998, for the reroofing of Potomac Elementary School, with work to begin June 22, 1998, and to be completed by August 25, 1998:

<u>Bidder</u>	<u>Amount</u>
Orndorff & Spaid, Inc.	\$ 169,460
R. D. Bean, Inc.	187,723
Cole Roofing Company, Inc.	213,133
J. E. Wood & Sons Company, Inc.	221,060
Brothers Construction Company, Inc.	229,900

and

WHEREAS, The low bidder, Orndorff & Spaid, Inc., has completed similar work successfully for Montgomery County Public Schools; and

WHEREAS, The low bid is below the staff estimate of \$190,000; and

WHEREAS, The State Interagency Committee for Public School Construction will fund 50 percent of the eligible work for the Potomac Elementary School reroofing as part of the state systemic renovation program; and

WHEREAS, Staff has verified that the contractor has made a good-faith effort to obtain minority participation; now therefore be it

Resolved, That a contract for \$169,460 be awarded to Orndorff & Spaid, Inc., for the Potomac Elementary School reroofing in accordance with plans and specifications prepared by the Department of Facilities Management, and subject to final action by the County Council on the FY 1999 Capital Budget; and be it further

Resolved, That the contract be forwarded to the State Interagency Committee for Public School Construction for approval to reimburse Montgomery County Public Schools for the state eligible portion of the Potomac Elementary School reroofing.

RESOLUTION NO. 337-98

Re: **AWARD OF CONTRACT - KITCHEN FIRE SUPPRESSION SYSTEM AT VARIOUS SCHOOLS**

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

WHEREAS, The following sealed bid was received on May 12, 1998, to provide kitchen fire suppression systems in various elementary school kitchens that are not sprinklered, with work to begin June 18, 1998, and to be completed by August 15, 1998:

<u>Bidder</u>	<u>Amount</u>
Guardian Fire Protection Service, Inc.	\$ 61,340

and

WHEREAS, Although only one bid was received, and it was within the staff estimate of \$65,000; and

WHEREAS, Guardian Fire Protection Service, Inc., has completed similar work successfully for Montgomery County Public Schools; and

WHEREAS, Staff has verified that the contractor has made a good faith effort to obtain minority participation; now therefore be it

Resolved, That a contract for \$61,340 be awarded to Guardian Fire Protection Service, Inc., to provide kitchen fire suppression systems at various schools, in accordance with plans and specifications prepared by the Department of Facilities Management.

RESOLUTION NO. 338-98 Re: **ARCHITECTURAL FEE INCREASE - WALTER JOHNSON MIDDLE SCHOOL**

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

WHEREAS, The FY 1997-2002 Capital Improvements Program (CIP) contained funds to reopen the old North Bethesda Junior High School facility as the second middle school for the Walter Johnson cluster; and

WHEREAS, The timing and scope of the Walter Johnson Middle School #2 project were modified as part of the Board of Education's FY 1999-2004 CIP request; and

WHEREAS, Funds were included in the FY 1999 capital budget request for additional architectural services to implement the scope modifications; and

WHEREAS, The County Council has taken tentative action to approve the budget request for the Walter Johnson Middle School #2 project; and

WHEREAS, Staff has negotiated an equitable fee increase with the architect for the additional services; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the architectural services contract with Peck & Peck Associates be increased by \$125,000 for additional professional engineering services associated with modifications to the plans for the Walter Johnson Middle School #2 project, contingent upon final County Council action for the FY 1999-2004 CIP request.

RESOLUTION NO. 339-98 Re: **ARCHITECTURAL FEE INCREASE - GYMNASIA AT LUCY V. BARNESLEY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL AND WESTOVER ELEMENTARY SCHOOL**

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

WHEREAS, The County Council has approved a supplemental appropriation to the FY 1998 capital budget for the design and construction of gymnasias additions to Lucy V. Barnesley and Westover elementary schools; and

WHEREAS, Staff has negotiated an equitable fee increase with the two modernization project architects for the necessary design and construction administration professional services; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the architectural services contracts with Duane, Cahill, Mullineaux & Mullineaux, Architects, for Lucy V. Barnesley Elementary School and Wiencek & Zavos, Architects, for Westover Elementary School, each be increased by \$63,400 for additional professional engineering services associated with the design and construction administration for gymnasias additions to Lucy V. Barnesley and Westover elementary schools.

RESOLUTION NO. 340-98 Re: **CHANGE ORDER OVER \$25,000 - FOREST OAK MIDDLE SCHOOL REPLACEMENT**

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

WHEREAS, The site work for the Forest Oak Middle School replacement facility was delayed approximately 60 days by an appeal of the sediment control and grading permit; and

WHEREAS, Maryland law recognizes contractors' rights to collect damages for delays that are beyond their control and that they could not be reasonably expected to include in the bid price; and

WHEREAS, The architect and staff have negotiated a cost with the contractor to settle the damages resulting from the delay; and

WHEREAS, The construction contingency fund will be used to pay the settlement; now therefore be it

Resolved, That a change order in the amount of \$139,000 be approved for the contract with Henley Construction Company, Inc., for the Forest Oak Middle School replacement facility for costs associated with the project's construction delay; and be it further

Resolved, That the completion date be extended from June 1, 1999, to July 1, 1999.

RESOLUTION NO. 341-98 Re: **REDUCTION IN RETAINAGE - WESTOVER
ELEMENTARY SCHOOL**

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

WHEREAS, Henley Construction Company, Inc., general contractor for the Westover Elementary School project, has completed 80 percent of all specified requirements and requested that the 10 percent retainage, which is based on completed work to date, be reduced to 5 percent; and

WHEREAS, The project bonding company, Hartford Accident and Indemnity Company, has consented to this reduction; and

WHEREAS, The project architect, Wiencek & Zavos, Architects, recommends approval of the reduction; now therefore be it

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

RESOLUTION NO. 342-98 Re **AIR-MONITORING FOR ASBESTOS ABATEMENT
PROJECTS**

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

WHEREAS, On April 1, 1998, the following testing laboratories submitted proposals for asbestos-related industrial hygiene, site monitoring, and analytical services at various

facilities, with work to begin on July 1, 1998, and continue through June 30, 1999, as needed:

<u>Respondents</u>	<u>Amount</u>
Yoti N. N. & Associates, Inc.	\$1,289.00
Asbestos Abatement Services, Inc.	1,499.00
National Environmental Corporation	1,706.00
Enviro-Civil Engineering, Ltd.	1,936.00

and

WHEREAS, Because of the variable scope of services that may be required, each respondent submitted unit prices on a hypothetical model; and

WHEREAS, The unit prices are reasonable and in line with industry standards, and the recommended contractor is currently providing air monitoring services for Montgomery County Public Schools; now therefore be it

Resolved, That a level-of-services agreement in accordance with unit costs stipulated in the Request for Proposals be awarded to Yoti N. N. & Associates, Inc., for a cost not to exceed \$100,000; and be it further

Resolved, That the agreement be contingent upon final action by the County Council on the FY 1999 Capital Budget for asbestos abatement.

RESOLUTION NO. 343-98 Re: **BOILER REPLACEMENTS AT TILDEN MIDDLE SCHOOL**

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

WHEREAS, The following sealed bids were received on March 26, 1998, in accordance with MCPS procurement practices, for boiler replacements at Tilden Middle School, with work to begin on May 27, 1998, and be completed by October 15, 1998:

<u>Bidder</u>	<u>Amount</u>
MIC/CO	\$253,156
Hurley Company	255,785
E. J. Snyder, Inc.	256,131
American Mechanical Services	258,460
American Combustion Industries, Inc.	269,090

Calvert Mechanical, Inc.	273,734
M & M Welding Fabrications, Inc.	288,200

and

WHEREAS, The low bidder is below staff estimates, and the low bidder met specifications; and

WHEREAS, This project is partially funded by the state of Maryland, and MIC/CO has submitted evidence of 15.8 percent Minority Business Enterprise participation; now therefore be it

Resolved, That a contract for \$253,156 be awarded to MIC/CO for boiler replacements at Tilden Middle School.

RESOLUTION NO. 344-98 Re: **UTILIZATION OF FY 1998 FUTURE SUPPORTED PROJECTS FUNDS FOR THE MEDICAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAM**

On recommendation of the Superintendent and on motion of Mrs. Gordon seconded by Ms. Signer, 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 additional funds of \$306,506 from the U.S. Department of Education via the Maryland State Department of Education (MSDE) for the Medical Assistance Program in Category 6 Special Education; and be it further

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

RESOLUTION NO. 345-98 Re: **SCHOOL-BASED HEALTH CENTERS**

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

WHEREAS, Funding for a school-based health center to be constructed as part of the Harmony Hills Elementary School modernization project has been tentatively approved by the County Council as part of the FY 1999 Capital Budget request for the Montgomery County Department of Health and Human Services; and

WHEREAS, The school-based health center will be funded jointly by HHS and the state of Maryland; and

WHEREAS, County executive and County Council staffs have recommended that the funds allocated in the HHS budget be added to the MCPS project for School-Based Health Centers once the County Council takes final action on the CIP; and

WHEREAS, This action will facilitate the award of a construction contract for the Harmony Hills modernization project; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the County Council be requested to amend the Board of Education's FY 1999 Capital Budget and FY 1999-2004 CIP request to increase the funds allocated in the School-Based Health Centers project by \$150,000 to facilitate the transfer of funds and the construction of the Harmony Hills Elementary School modernization project; and be it further

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

RESOLUTION NO. 346-98 Re: PERSONNEL APPOINTMENT

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

Resolved, That the following personnel appointment be approved effective July 1, 1998:

<u>Appointment</u>	<u>Present Position</u>	<u>As</u>
Cheryl Ann Clark	Acting Assistant Principal, Stedwick ES	Principal, Lois P. Rockwell ES

RESOLUTION NO. 347-98 Re: PERSONNEL APPOINTMENT

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

Resolved, That the following personnel appointment be approved effective July 1, 1998:

<u>Appointment</u>	<u>Present Position</u>	<u>As</u>
Eileen Kenney Evans	Principal, C. Paul Barnhart ES, Waldorf, Maryland	Principal, Dr. Charles E. Drew ES

Re: PARENT INVOLVEMENT IN QUALITY MANAGEMENT COUNCILS

On recommendation of the Superintendent and on motion of Mr. Felton seconded by Mr. Ewing, the following resolution was placed on the table:

WHEREAS, On March 10, 1998, the Board of Education ratified the contract with MCEA for 1998-2001, that included Quality Management Councils (QMCs); and

WHEREAS, On March 23, 1998, the Board of Education adopted a resolution calling on the Superintendent of schools to develop a plan that will explain how the QMCs will include parent representation in a school's decision-making process and that also will provide guidance as to the extent to which other stakeholders will be included in the workings of the QMCs as specific subjects are addressed, and present the plan to the Board for its action; and

WHEREAS, The Joint Work Group on Local School Governance, that is establishing guidelines for operation of QMCs, includes representatives of MCCPTA, MCCSSE, and MCAASP; and

WHEREAS, Current Board of Education policies mandating parental involvement in certain decisions and activities at the school level apply to operations of QMCs as well as to other school operations; and

WHEREAS, Members of the Board of Education continue to believe that all stakeholders should be involved in the decision-making process; and now therefore be it

Resolved, That as the Board of Education endorses the plan developed by the joint work group with the approval of the Superintendent of schools; and be it further

Resolved, That as local schools determine and begin their involvement in the QMC process, they provide for full participation of representatives of all stakeholder groups from the onset of the process; and be it further

Resolved, That the Superintendent of schools provide a report to the Board of Education at the September Board meeting concerning the extent of involvement of each of the stakeholder groups in the first twenty-five QMCs; and be it further

Resolved, That the Board of Education encourage representatives of all stakeholder groups to participate in the process of determining whether or not their local school will apply to be a part of the initial group of QMC schools.

Re: **DISCUSSION**

Dr. Vance invited the following people to the table: Dr. Steven Seleznow, associate superintendent for the Office of School Administration; Mrs. Sharon Cox, president of MCCPTA; Ms. Bobbi Jasper, principal of Farmland Elementary School; Dr. Beverly McAnulty, MCAASP; and Mr. Don Kopp, director of the Department of Association Relations.

Dr. Seleznow identified the people at the table as those of the writing group. He indicated that Mr. Simon (MCEA) was out of town. First, there were 15,000 applications sent to principals, PTA presidents, and employees organizations within the schools. Second, the involvement of parents and their role in QMCs had been developed.

Mrs. Cox commented that the team had worked very hard toward a future where all stakeholders can participate in decision making for the education of children.

Mr. Felton asked about the participation of volunteers in the first year and any plans for developing a mix of schools that would ensure an appropriate assessment of QMCs. If there were no volunteers from that group, he asked how that representation could be assured. Dr. Seleznow replied that after the application process had been completed, the applications would come back through the Joint Work Group and selections would be made to ensure a broad representation throughout the county.

Mr. Felton requested information on compensation for other participants beyond MCEA members. Dr. Seleznow replied that staff members would be compensated at their normal rate of pay whether they were 12-month or 10-month employees.

Dr. Cheung inquired if 15 hours of training for all QMC participants was adequate. Also, he asked if QMC members did not receive training, would they be allowed to participate. Dr. Seleznow responded that the training was negotiated as part of the MCEA contract since much of the work must be completed in the summer. There was a subcommittee of the Joint Work Group that developed training plans for continuous improvement.

Mrs. Gordon was pleased that there had been collaboration in formulating the QMCs. She asked if training would be provided for everyone on the teams beginning in this summer, and how the representatives on the QMCs would be identified. Dr. Seleznow responded that working within a tight time frame, all members of the QMCs would be identified; however, staff must be flexible to ensure that every member had an opportunity for training and participation. Mrs. Cox explained that it would be difficult for the parent constituency to get together to select representatives. If the students were included at the secondary levels, they should be identified as early as possible.

Mrs. Gordon asked for clarification on what was meant by "unit member" on the application. Mr. Kopp replied that it referred to teachers, not members of MCEA or administrators. Mrs. Gordon wanted to know what provisions had been made for continuing, ending, or enrolling into a QMC for the site-based management schools. Dr. Seleznow stated that if a site-based school chose to become a QMC that would not be prohibited. However, if that school wishes to remain a site-based school, that would be encouraged. Mrs. Gordon encouraged staff to communicate with those schools since there appeared to be confusion.

Ms. Signer sensed dissonance between the proposed resolution and the white paper. The proposed resolution in the second *resolve* speaks to full participation of representatives of all stakeholder groups from the onset of the process (Ms. Signer interpreted that to mean even the decision to become a QMC school). Then, the white paper states that MCEA unit members would vote to determine whether they wanted to apply to become a QMC school, and the staff and administration must want to establish a QMC model for decisionmaking. She asked staff for clarification of that dissonance. Dr. Seleznow replied that in designing the application process it was the intent to make sure that there was widespread community discussion of becoming a QMC school, and that there were considerable opportunities for parents, MCCSSE members, MCEA members, principals and administrators to discuss becoming a QMC school. Where there was dissonance was in the contract language that specified that two thirds of the MCEA unit members must vote in favor of becoming a QMC school. The Joint Work Group tried to resolve the difference through the application process with all key stakeholders involved in the process and by recording votes and using a sign-off procedure.

Ms. Signer pointed out that Dr. Seleznow had referred to the contract language. She found the use of that language to be off-putting and rigid. It seemed more of a fulfillment of a contract rather than a collaborative relationship among the stakeholders. She recommended that language directly from the contract should not be used within the QMC process.

Ms. Signer asked about the further activities of the Joint Work Group and what ongoing tasks, if any, would extend beyond this year. Mrs. Cox replied that it was planned that four subcommittees would work on training issues, application process, on-going evaluations of the QMC, and developing an appeal process.

Ms. Signer thought the composition of the Joint Work Group may need to be addressed over the long term. She counted nine MCPS representatives, eleven from MCEA, three from MCCSSE, five from MCAASP, and four from MCCPTA. It seemed to her that the school system was expecting a lot from the MCCSSE and MCCPTA representatives for them to attend subcommittee and full committee meetings. A more balanced representation may be warranted over the long term. Mr. Kopp stated that the groups were not given a specific number, but rather asked to provide representatives.

Ms. Gutiérrez had an overall concern in that QMCs thrive on flexibility and freedom to address issues at the local level. When she read the application form and the rules, she thought the energy and flexibility was restricted. The QMC solutions would be appropriate to that individual school only. She applauded the seven principles and thought if more than 25 schools apply, all should be included in the QMC process. Dr. McNulty replied that the procedures were merely guidance to empower staff to make decisions for

themselves. The only constraints would be Board policy and the requirements of the MCEA contract.

Ms. Gutiérrez hoped that the Joint Work Group understood the need for the individual schools to work collaboratively. Small groups working for quality improvement always exceed expectations. Also, she thought the wording from the contract was useful for clarification and philosophically uplifting.

Ms. Wheat presumed students were to be equal partners. She asked if any students served on the Joint Work Group, and, if not, how was the decision made regarding the participation of students. Mrs. Cox replied that the Montgomery County Region of Student Councils (MCR) had been contacted for representatives, but there was no response. The parents have encouraged student involvement, but other stakeholders were concerned about mandatory student involvement which could be a hardship for some secondary schools. However, an indicator of success would be the inclusion of students.

Ms. Wheat thought student involvement was imperative. The contract language lists students first along with parents and community. By excluding students from the Joint Work Group, the results would not be as constructive, and that frightened her. Since there were no students on the Joint Work Group, they were not one of the primary stakeholders. Dr. McAnulty explained that students were considered and there were discussions on enlisting student participants and training them. Ms. Wheat knew that the group advocated for students, and she appreciated that, but, student participation was vital because parents and teachers cite how students feel and students should be asked how they feel.

Ms. Gutiérrez temporarily left the meeting at this point.

Mr. Ewing congratulated the Joint Work Group for an excellent product. They took on a difficult task, worked out a set of guidelines that are sensible, and established time lines that are doable. It was important to realize that the school system was venturing into unknown territory. The site-based policy was not identical to QMCs, and site-based management was far from a resounding success. In order to make QMCs work, there was a need for careful planning and procedures. The established process could change if there are flaws in any of the procedures. He thought the Board should adopt the proposal with that understanding and move forward.

RESOLUTION NO. 348-98

Re: **AN AMENDMENT TO THE PARENT INVOLVEMENT IN QUALITY MANAGEMENT COUNCILS**

On motion of Mrs. Gordon and seconded by Ms. Signer, the following amendments were adopted unanimously by members present:

Resolved, That as local schools determine and begin their involvement in the QMC process, they provide for full participation of representatives of all stakeholder groups, **including students**, from the onset of the process; and be it further

Resolved, That the **Joint Work Group on Local School Governance, as it continues its work, should include representation from MCR and MCJC.**

RESOLUTION NO. 349-98

Re: **PARENT INVOLVEMENT IN QUALITY MANAGEMENT COUNCILS**

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

WHEREAS, On March 10, 1998, the Board of Education ratified the contract with MCEA for 1998-2001, that included Quality Management Councils (QMCs); and

WHEREAS, On March 23, 1998, the Board of Education adopted a resolution calling on the Superintendent of schools to develop a plan that will explain how the QMCs will include parent representation in a school's decision-making process and that also will provide guidance as to the extent to which other stakeholders will be included in the workings of the QMCs as specific subjects are addressed, and present the plan to the Board for its action; and

WHEREAS, The Joint Work Group on Local School Governance, that is establishing guidelines for operation of QMCS, includes representatives of MCCPTA, MCCSSE, and MCAASP; and

WHEREAS, Current Board of Education policies mandating parental involvement in certain decisions and activities at the school level apply to operations of QMCs as well as to other school operations; and

WHEREAS, Members of the Board of Education continue to believe that all stakeholders should be involved in the decision-making process; and now therefore be it

Resolved, That as the Board of Education endorses the plan developed by the joint work group with the approval of the Superintendent of schools; and be it further

Resolved, That as local schools determine and begin their involvement in the QMC process, they provide for full participation of representatives of all stakeholder groups, including students, from the onset of the process; and be it further

Resolved, That the Superintendent of schools provide a report to the Board of Education at the September Board meeting concerning the extent of involvement of each of the stakeholder groups in the first twenty-five QMCs; and be it further

Resolved, That the Board of Education encourage representatives of all stakeholder groups to participate in the process of determining whether or not their local school will apply to be a part of the initial group of QMC schools; and be it further

Resolved, That the Joint Work Group on Local School Governance, as it continues its work, should include representation from MCR and MCJC.

**Re: ROLE AND PURPOSE OF BOARD ADVISORY
 COMMITTEES**

Mr. Margolies, Mrs. Rubens, and Dr. Hahn were at the table for the discussion. In addition, all of the chairs and liaisons of the advisory committees had been invited to the discussion, as well as Mr. Ronald Feffer, administrative assistant for student affairs.

Ms. Gutiérrez rejoined the meeting at this time.

Ms. Rubens explained that the advisory committees to the Board of Education were governed by policies BMA, *Board of Education Policy on Committees*; BMB, *Appointing Members of Board of Education Advisory Committees*; and BMG, *Guidelines for Committee Operation*, that are attached for your information. According to these policies, advisory committees must report to the Board annually on issues related to their charge, and they may comment as a group on other topics addressed by the Board. There were currently eight advisory committees and two were mandated by law. Although the Family Life and Human Development and the Career and Technology Education committees are mandated, the regulations do not dictate that the committees be advisory to the Board, only that the school system have these advisory committees.

The same issues continue to arise each year regarding the advisory committees. Increased efforts for recruitment and outreach have not produced the desired level of applicants for vacancies. Additionally, some committees continue to experience poor meeting attendance. A number of committees having student slots receive good response and participation, while others do not generate a high level of student interest. Each

committee has been sent Board agenda-setting packets and liaisons remind the chairs when relevant items are being discussed by the Board. Only a few committees take this opportunity to provide input on items related to their charge. Infrequent reports and reports that offer many of the same recommendations each year could signal that some committees may no longer be necessary or may need to be given more specific assignments.

At the suggestion of several Board members, each advisory committee to the Board was asked to provide suggestions for improving the operation of and purpose for these committees and several suggestions were received and included in the white paper.

Mr. Bailey, co-chair of the Advisory Committee on Minority Student Education (MSE), thought that the advisory committees needed feedback for the Board.

Ms. Gutiérrez stated that her thinking on advisory committees had evolved. The Board had been struggling to encourage people to apply and maintain membership on the committees. If the advisory committees' members do not perceive that their work was relevant, their interest and commitment would wain. At one time, the MSE met with the Board and the Board listened, especially regarding test scores. At one Board meeting, a hearing was scheduled which led to the hiring of Dr. Gordon who reviewed the school system's minority achievement. That advocacy role needs to be rethought – how can the work of the committees be relevant and substantive. If the Board could redefine the functions of the committees to ensure input on substantive issues, the Board would be better served by its advisory committees. She did not know why the Board does not meet with the committees on an annual basis. She remembered when the Board had dialogue with the advisory committees, and the Board members attended advisory committee meetings.

Mrs. Gordon had been troubled by the whole issue of the Board's advisory committees for some time. The issues raised at this meeting have been raised repeatedly by many of the advisory committees. If the Board looked at the average attendance and the number of advisory committees with vacancies, that demonstrated a need to review the process. The Board had moved to have the Superintendent's response and recommendation presented at the same time the committee's report was received by the Board. Also, the Board had acted to accept the reports, but not specific action on individual items. The issue before the Board went more to the issue of advisory committees and whether or not those advisory committees were advising the Board and whether those committees were relevant. Some committees were established in the 60s and 70s, and the Board had not reviewed those committees. It was possible that they may have completed their work and could be reconstituted or discharged. Every Board president had met with the advisory committees and reviewed their charge with the Board's expectations. An annual report was the least affective of receiving information. There have been attempts to send policies

to the advisory committees prior to Board action. Mrs. Gordon thought the Board needed to go beyond tweaking, and it needs to look at each advisory committee to ascertain (1) whether or not it has completed its charge, (2) whether it was useful, or (3) if it is duplicative of other group. The advisory committees want to do a good job, and it is unfortunate that the Board did not use them effectively. She hoped that before the policies come to the Board for action that there would be another discussion and review each advisory committee to ascertain if that committee needs to continue in its current format.

Mrs. King thought that the attendance at some advisory committee meetings reflected the fact that the committees did not have a relevant charter. These committees could be very effective if they were used appropriately.

Mr. Felton observed that if the committees were not useful to the Board, it was the failure of the Board for not giving concise guidelines and charters to those committees. One question would be whether or not the Board wanted advice and what form that should take. There are various ways in which the Board communicates with its advisory committees. The dialogue must be continuous and the Board bears the responsibility to give precise directions on what it wants addressed within a time frame.

Mr. Ewing thought the message from the advisory committees was that fundamentally they need meaningful assignments and responses to what they recommend. Over many years, the Board had received valuable contributions, insights, and recommendations from both ad hoc and continuing advisory committees. The Board should address what kinds of issues justify continuing advisory committees. There are two areas where advisory committees function: (1) advice on specific areas requested by the Board or staff, and (2) reactions to self-generated issues. After the Board asked those questions and heard the committee's views, the response from Board members had been minimal. The Board had an obligation to speak directly to the issue raised by that advisory committee, and why it agrees or disagrees to the recommendations or proposals. If the dialogue was ongoing, there would be no need for formal responses in writing. Guidelines for the Board and advisory committees would be invaluable because it would set expectations and obligations. He suggested that the Board should think about incentives to advisory committees and help them understand their value to the Board.

Dr. Cheung agreed with his colleagues and especially with regard to Board feedback to the advisory committees. The Board seeks community input, but neglects its advisory committees input. The advisory committees have volunteered to do more than the average community member and should be recognized for their contributions. He suggested that the officers of the Board establish a subcommittee to review the Board's advisory committees to ascertain what the Board wanted its committees to achieve.

Ms. Gutiérrez recommended that the Board officers schedule regular Board meetings with the advisory committees. Also, policy input should be put before advisory committees. Furthermore, feedback from the committees on major reports would be appreciated by the Board.

Re: **BREAK**

The Board of education took a break from 10:05 to 10:15 p.m.

Re: **GIFTED AND TALENTED EDUCATION STANDARDS**

Dr. Vance invited the following people to the table: Dr. Mary Helen Smith, associate superintendent for instruction and program development; Dr. Patricia B. Flynn, director of Academic Programs; Ms. Florence Zaudtke, teacher at Lakewood Elementary School; Ms. Virginia A. Tucker, director of Enriched and Innovative Instruction; Dr. Joyce Van Tassel-Baska, Center for Gifted Education, College of William and Mary; and Mrs. Margaret Hare and Mr. Arthur Myrtle, co-chairs of the Superintendent's Advisory Committee for Gifted and Talented Education.

Dr. Van Tassel-Baska reported that as the discussions on national and state standards continue, relatively little attention has been paid to the development of standards for gifted and talented students. Currently, MCPS was one of five known systems nationwide working on development of such standards. There were essentially three approaches that systems are using. The first was to adopt the standards of the national council in that curriculum area as the standards for gifted students. The second was to use those national standards as the "stepping off point" for developing differentiated standards. And the third was to develop gifted and talented standards from scratch focusing on the characteristics of gifted students in each content area, their clear need for both accelerated instruction and lateral enrichment and their learning styles. There are advantages to each approach. MCPS had chosen the second approach as the manner in which to develop its standards. The advantages of this approach are several.

In many regards the national standards are cutting edge and are consonant with international standards. There are significant key elements that cut across all the sets of national standards that serve gifted students well, including the emphasis on:

- authentic assessment
- inquiry based instruction
- hands on learning
- substantive content
- conceptual learning - identifying the significant concepts within a discipline and those that cut across several disciplines

- thinking skills, both discipline specific and those crossing disciplines
- learning through technology application
- viewing the discipline through the eyes of a professional in that discipline
- interdisciplinary connections
- metacognition
- use of multiple resources

However, by clearly differentiating the national standards, MCPS would support the differing needs that gifted students bring to the classroom, particularly on the axis of pace and depth. These differentiated standards clearly define the higher expectations for gifted students, and as such they require a higher level performance assessment. Finally, the differentiated standards provide a clear road map for the implementation of the accelerated and enriched curriculum.

Mrs. Hare had looked at the standards and reported on each. The math standards are concrete and it will accelerate students through the curriculum, but there was a need to focus on assessment tools. Science standards looked extraordinary. The reading/language arts standards need clarification because it is hard to determine what is expected of the student. She felt that existing standards should be used in MCPS in order to start programs for children. There should be more clarification on how the College of William and Mary piece fits into the MCPS curriculum because there are great variances in the implementation throughout the county.

Ms. Tucker and Dr. Flynn reported that curriculum coordinators for elementary mathematics, science, and reading/language arts have set aside time in late May and early June 1998 to review and refine the initial draft standards with their work groups. Information from the field tests going forward this school year, with input from the Board and curriculum advisory groups as well as attention to benchmarking with other differentiated standards projects nationally, will guide these revisions in mathematics and science. These two sets of revised standards will be forwarded as a Board update in July 1998.

Differentiated standards for the reading/language arts program will be completed in initial draft in early July and presented to the curriculum advisory group that same month. Work will continue on mapping the integration of the William and Mary Language Arts Program for High Ability Learners, the ongoing MCPS *Program of Studies* in elementary reading/language arts and the Junior Great Books Program. These three elements are the critical components of a challenging program for gifted and talented students. The differentiated draft standards, and the integrated planning guide will be in schools in time for the 1998-99 school year. Training and support will be provided through regularly scheduled reading specialist meetings and the introductory and advanced levels of training in the William and Mary curriculum framework. During the next school year staff will be

identifying student work samples that demonstrate achievement of the differentiated standards. These exemplars or anchor papers will serve as guides for shaping student performance. During the 1999-2000 school year, a revised package containing the differentiated standards, planning guides, and student work samples will be available for systemwide pilot.

Dr. Cheung appreciated the information received by the Board prior to the discussion. Also, he liked the eleven key elements of concepts and learning of the national standards. He was concerned about the linkage of elementary school gifted and talented programs with those programs in middle and high schools and whether or not it was continuous and seamless. The school system had many good ideas, but it fell short in the implementation and feedback to evaluate change. The school system had not developed a database to expedite those practices. Good information on the individual student would facilitate implementation of the program. The testing system measured the acquisition of course work, not the individual child's learning. Dr. Cheung was impatient and wanted more than a pilot in 23 schools. Dr. Van Tassel-Baska replied that there was a need for the assessment of individual learners in terms of core goals and outcomes. Therefore, teachers should share with parents how each student was learning and improving. The linkage between these elements was the focus for teacher training. Then, follow up by building principals was essential to reinforce implementation of instructional programs.

Ms. Signer expressed her frustration at the slow pace of the implementation of the Gifted and Talented Policy. With respect to the math standards, she noted that the field test of the accelerated and enriched mathematics was not a field test of the standards. Ms. Tucker explained that the accelerated and enriched mathematics program was initially developed and based on the first set of standards. Ms. Signer asked if MCPS field tested the standards -- content and performance. Ms. Tucker confirmed that those standards had not been field tested, but it would be rolled out in September in 23 schools this year. Potentially, staff could support training in 70 schools. Dr. Flynn reported that staff was looking at those initiatives that would be implemented next year. Because there were 54 schools that focused on reading/language arts, staff explained that they would implement math and science standards in the remaining 70 schools. The 54 reading initiative schools would be invited to participate in math and science standards, but if they chose not to participate, reading would be their primary focus.

Ms. Wheat left the meeting at this point.

Ms. Signer asked about elementary science and the expanded field test in 1998-99 and whether or not that would include 70 schools. Dr. Flynn replied that it would be in all elementary schools if there are any of the 54 schools that chose not to participate, then they would not be included.

Regarding reading/language arts, Ms. Signer supported the decision that the 54 schools receiving the reading initiative would not be required to participate. Her concern related to the tweaking of the new standards' project because the standards are not rigorous enough for MCPS' highly-able students. She had seen those standards and they were far more rigorous than anything that the school system was implementing for on-level or gifted students. It was not clear to her on what basis the school system was making those judgments of: (1) tweaking by William and Mary College and (2) that the benchmark papers were not sufficiently rigorous. Ms. Signer was assuming that the 70 plus schools would be implementing the reading/language arts standards. Dr. Flynn stated that the reading/language arts standards timeline was different from development of math and science. The school system would be field testing the reading/language arts standards in a smaller number of schools than it piloted the math and science standards. Therefore, the answer was that the school system would not test reading/language arts in 70 schools; it would be about 23 schools.

Again, Ms. Signer asked why staff believed that the standards were not sufficiently rigorous. Dr. Van Tassel-Baska replied that the new standards project was a very good project as far as general curriculum reform, but it did not respond to those additional differentiated elements for gifted and talented learners. The new reading project, along with the work of the International Reading Association and the National Council of Teachers of English, have a heavy premium on process as the orientation toward what students are held accountable for with an emphasis on developmental reading and understanding literature. Those standards were deficient for able learners in the area of research skills, competency, and understanding grammar.

Ms. Signer asked that if the school system was moving toward a seamless curriculum, would that not presuppose that the school system would implement the new standards project for all students and simply use the more rigorous anchor papers for the highly able learners. Dr. Flynn replied that the school system had chosen intentionally to have gifted and talented standards flow from the standards that were in place for all students.

Ms. Signer inquired about assessments and the fact that CRTs measure on grade level performance. How would the school system assess the progress of highly-able students? Dr. Smith replied that there could be two ways of achieving that by: (1) contracting the consultant for standard assessments being developed and how MCPS can work in partnership for additional measures, and (2) utilizing individual student assessment and portfolios.

Mr. Felton inquired into the implementation and how that was influenced by training and the ability of teachers to understand the transition from the concept to the learning environment. He asked Dr. Van Tassel-Baska to comment on what was the right pace for implementation of the policy. Several Board members were frustrated about the slow pace

of implementation, but what were the variables that influence implementation. Dr. Van Tassel-Baska responded that given the size of the school system, the variables, and the constraints, MCPS was moving forward with deliberate speed. It was important to make mid-course revisions and make sure training was effective. The idea of piloting and using data for revisions was appropriate for curriculum development.

Mr. Ewing thought that the school system had made great progress recently in the development of standards, programs, and approaches to this issue. He confessed a growing frustration with the time that has been used to implement the policy. The school system was not addressing the issue of whether or not there was a shortage of resources or that was the natural pace for implementation that drives the program. He kept hearing from parents who report that there were no gifted and talented programs in their school. Parents ask principals what they should expect in relation to gifted and talented programs for their children. A simple brochure could solve this problem. The Gifted and Talented Policy provides for a program in every school, and the school system was far from full implementation.

He thought that the school system urges staff to do impossible jobs with limited resources; therefore, it was important for the Board to know what resources were necessary to ensure success. It does no good for the Board to be impatient if it has not provided adequate resources for the task at hand. He hoped that the Superintendent would give the Board a better sense of the resources needed for implementation of the policy.

He was convinced that the school system was not reaching a lot of students. The school system had made progress, but it was not there yet. He thought that moving forward as fast as possible with the implementation of the policy was consistent with continuous improvement. He was concerned about the language used in describing which schools would participate. He thought that the school system had a dilemma regarding to what extent the Board mandates what schools participate and still allow discretion. The basic policy was not a document that could be considered as optional. Parents need to know that the school system insists that there are like standards for all children, and that message has not gotten to all principals and parents.

Ms. Gutiérrez disagreed with the issues expressed since the audience could get the impression that the school system was not doing anything. MCPS always had programs for the gifted learner. She was concerned that if the school system rushes forward, it could create a two-track system. She asked what was being done to prevent high expectations for some students and low expectations for others. She was not interested in a public education that enriches only those who are already gifted. She needed to understand whether or not this approach would harm some students. Dr. Van Tassel-Baska commented that curriculum reform raises the standards for all students. The enriched curriculum was for all learners and, then, differentiated at the extreme ends of learning.

Re: BOARD/SUPERINTENDENT COMMENTS

There were no comments from the Board members or the Superintendent.

RESOLUTION NO. 350-98 Re: CLOSED SESSION RESOLUTION

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

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education of Montgomery County conduct a portion of its meeting on Tuesday, June 9, 1998, from 10:00 to 11:00 a.m. and 12:15 to 2:00 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 these meetings be conducted in Room 120 of the Carver Educational Services Center, Rockville, Maryland, as permitted under Section 4-107, *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 April 20, 1998, by the unanimous vote of members present, the Board of Education voted to conduct a closed session on May 12, 1998, as permitted under § 4-107, *Education Article of the Annotated Code of Maryland* and *State Government Article* §10-501.

The Montgomery County Board of Education met in closed session on May 12, 1998, from 8:45 to 9:45 a.m. and 1:30 to 1:55 p.m. The meetings took place in Room 120, Carver Educational Services Center, Rockville, Maryland.

The Board met to discuss personnel issues, Legal Services Update, Student Transfer Process, and legal matters with its attorney. The Board reviewed and adjudicated Appeals 1997-23 and 1998-8.

In attendance at part or all of the above closed sessions were: Elizabeth Arons, Giles Benson, Larry Bowers, Judy Bresler, Ray Bryant, Alan Cheung, Blair Ewing, Reggie Felton, David Fischer, Hiawatha Fountain, Kathy Gemberling, Bea Gordon, Ana Sol Gutiérrez, Pat Hahn, Marlene Hartzman, Roland Ikheloa, Nancy King, Frieda Lacey, George Margolies, Brian Porter, Glenda Rose, Ruby Rubens, Steven Seleznow, Mona Signer, Mary Helen Smith, Marshall Spatz, Roger Titus, Paul Vance, and Debbie Wheat.

RESOLUTION NO. 381-98 Re: **BOARD APPEAL NO. 1997-23**

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education adopts its Decision and Order in Appeal 1997-23, grade matter, reflective of the following vote: Dr. Cheung, Mr. Ewing, Mr. Felton, Mrs. Gordon, Mrs. King, Ms. Signer and Ms. Wheat voting to affirm; Ms. Gutiérrez voting to reverse.

RESOLUTION NO. 352-98 Re: **EDUCATION FOUNDATION**

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education schedule time to hear a report from the Education Foundation about its plans, projects, and progress.

RESOLUTION NO. 353-98 Re: **ON-LEVEL/AVERAGE STUDENTS**

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education schedule a follow-up discussion on the on-level/average students; and be it further

Resolved, That the discussion provide some responses to the issues and questions that were raised on May 12, 1998.

RESOLUTION NO. 354-98 Re: **AUTISM PROGRAM**

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education schedule a discussion and possible action about the autism program and movement and consolidation of classes and the extent to which it is consistent with the Board policy; and be it further

Resolved, That the Board discuss the need for a comprehensive plan for the autism program, their placement in MCPS facilities, and plans for articulation.

RESOLUTION NO. 355-98 Re: **STUDENTS AT MARK TWAIN AND RICA**

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education request information from the Superintendent to review with appropriate staff the unmet needs of students at Mark Twain and RICA, including staffing levels, providing therapy on site, and reducing the cycle time for scheduling parent-requested ARDs and CARDS.

Re: **NEW BUSINESS**

The following new business items were introduced:

1. Mrs. King moved and Mr. Felton seconded the following:

WHEREAS, Students Oppose Smoking (SOS) was formed in 1994 by MCPS students dedicated to curbing the use of student tobacco use; and

WHEREAS, SOS conducted a survey of more than 10,000 MCPS students, using technology provided by the National Centers for Disease Control, to ascertain their habits and desires; and

WHEREAS, Among the findings of the survey were: the mean age for when students started smoking is 13.2 years of age; one-third of middle school students smoke two packs per week; 77% of smokers say their friends smoke; a far greater percentage of tobacco users consume alcohol and use marijuana than those who do not smoke; 29.2% of smokers say they would enroll in a cessation program if readily available; and 58.2% think they would stop if punished; and

WHEREAS, SOS has developed a four-part proposal, including recommendations: to make uniform the strict enforcement of MCPS' no-smoking policy; to widely post the laws and policies regarding the use and purchase of tobacco by minors and their consequences; to establish peer-

led smoking cessation programs at all schools during the school day; and to install pulmonary function machines in all health rooms to assess the damage caused by tobacco use;

WHEREAS, SOS leaders have met with the Superintendent and addressed the Montgomery County Council of PTAs who supported their general efforts; and

WHEREAS, SOS will be holding another one of its Teen Tobacco Forums on June 4 at the Shady Grove campus of Johns Hopkins University; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Board of Education endorse the efforts of the SOS to advocate for measures that would reduce the incidence of student smoking; and be it further

Resolved, That the Superintendent advise the Board as to which recommendations in its proposal are feasible in the short and long term and what measures could be taken to support them.

2. Ms. Gutiérrez moved and Mrs. Gordon seconded the following:

WHEREAS, In February of this year, the Board of Education adopted a resolution directing the Superintendent to undertake the revision and update of Board Policy IOD, Education of Limited English Proficient Students, and Administrative Regulation IOD-RA, Placement of Limited English Proficient Students; and

WHEREAS, The requested revisions are intended to provide a meaningful and practical framework for meeting the needs of limited English proficient (LEP) students based on current research in second language learning and nationally recognized set of ESL Standards for PreK-12 students; and

WHEREAS, At the request of the U.S. Department of Education, the George Washington University's Center for Equity and Excellence in Education has developed a comprehensive educational reform initiative, "Promoting Excellence," for ensuring academic success for LEP students based on six Guiding Principles; now therefore be it

Resolved, That Montgomery County Board of Education adopt the following six principles as the basis for revising its Limited English Proficient policy and programs:

Principle #1. Limited English proficient students are held to the same high expectations of learning established for all students.

Principle #2. Limited English proficient students develop full receptive and productive proficiencies in English in the domains of listening, speaking, reading, and writing, consistent with expectations for all students.

Principle #3. Limited English proficient students are taught challenging content to enable them to meet performance standards in all content areas including reading and language arts, mathematics, social studies, science, the fine arts, health, and physical education, consistent with those for all students.

Principle #4. Limited English proficient students receive instruction that builds on their previous education and cognitive abilities and that reflects their language proficiency levels.

Principle #5. Limited English proficient students are evaluated with appropriate and valid assessments that are aligned with state and local standards and that take into account the language acquisition stages and cultural background of the students.

Principle #6. The academic success of limited English proficient students is a responsibility shared by all educators, the family and community.

and be it further

Resolved, That MCPS staff work closely with the staff of the Center for Equity and Excellence in Education at George Washington University and use the "Promoting Excellence" resources, materials, training guides, and technical assistance to review and revise the educational standards and programs for limited English proficient students in Montgomery County Public Schools to ensure their academic success.

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

WHEREAS, The Board of education has reviewed standards for gifted and talented education, Grades K - 5; and

WHEREAS, There are further actions needed to ensure effective implementation of the gifted and talented policy; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Board of Education directs the Superintendent of Schools to implement the draft math standards for gifted and talented elementary students, as broadly as possible this fall, with the expectation that gifted students will complete on average 1 ½ years of math per year beginning in kindergarten; and be it further

Resolved, That a like effort be made to implement science standards as broadly as possible this fall; and be it further

Resolved, That monitoring and evaluation of implementation of the gifted and talented policy be continued and intensified and that individual schools implementation scores be provided to the Board of Education at least annually; and be it further

Resolved, That the Superintendent identify as specifically as possible the materials, training, curriculum, and other resources needed still to implement the gifted and talented program throughout MCPS, so that the time lines for implementation can be either maintained or accelerated, with the expectation that implementation will begin to occur in every elementary and middle school in math and science in the fall of 1998, but could be accelerated more broadly if resources were available; and be it further

Resolved, That MCPS explore the development and publication of a brief booklet or set of guidelines primarily intended for parents, but also for teachers and administrators, on what parents ought to expect in every elementary and middle school in gifted and talented education.

Re: ITEMS OF INFORMATION

1. Quarterly Change Over Report - Under \$25,000

RESOLUTION NO. 356-98 Re: **ADJOURNMENT**

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education adjourn its meeting of May 26, 1998, at 11:50 p.m.

PRESIDENT

SECRETARY

PLV:gr

**MONTGOMERY COUNTY BOARD OF EDUCATION
SUMMARY SHEET**

May 26, 1998

ANNOUNCEMENT	1
AGENDA	1
PUBLIC COMMENTS	1
AWARD OF CONTRACT - WALTER JOHNSON MIDDLE SCHOOL #2	2
AWARD OF CONTRACT - ASBESTOS REMOVAL AT MONTGOMERY BLAIR MIDDLE SCHOOL #3/ ELEMENTARY SCHOOL #11	3
AWARD OF CONTRACT - DIAMOND ELEMENTARY SCHOOL REROOFING	3
AWARD OF CONTRACT - POTOMAC ELEMENTARY SCHOOL REROOFING	4
AWARD OF CONTRACT - KITCHEN FIRE SUPPRESSION SYSTEM AT VARIOUS SCHOOLS	5
ARCHITECTURAL FEE INCREASE - WALTER JOHNSON MIDDLE SCHOOL	6
ARCHITECTURAL FEE INCREASE - GYMNASIA AT LUCY V. BARNESLEY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL AND WESTOVER ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	7
CHANGE ORDER OVER \$25,000 - FOREST OAK MIDDLE SCHOOL REPLACEMENT	7
REDUCTION IN RETAINAGE - WESTOVER ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	8
AIR-MONITORING FOR ASBESTOS ABATEMENT PROJECTS	8
BOILER REPLACEMENTS AT TILDEN MIDDLE SCHOOL	9
UTILIZATION OF FY 1998 FUTURE SUPPORTED PROJECTS FUNDS FOR THE MEDICAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAM	10
SCHOOL-BASED HEALTH CENTERS	10
PERSONNEL APPOINTMENTS	11
PARENT INVOLVEMENT IN QUALITY MANAGEMENT COUNCILS	11
ROLE AND PURPOSE OF BOARD ADVISORY COMMITTEES	17
GIFTED AND TALENTED EDUCATION STANDARDS	20
BOARD/SUPERINTENDENT COMMENTS	25
CLOSED SESSION RESOLUTION	25
REPORT OF CLOSED SESSION	25
BOARD APPEAL	26

EDUCATION FOUNDATION 26

ON-LEVEL/AVERAGE STUDENTS 26

AUTISM PROGRAM 26

STUDENTS AT MARK TWAIN AND RICA 27

NEW BUSINESS 27

ITEMS OF INFORMATION 30

ADJOURNMENT 31