

NUMBER: 22-1990  
STATUS: APPROVED  
PLACE: ROCKVILLE, MARYLAND  
DATE: APRIL 17, 1990  
TEXT:



WHEREAS, If a dollar value were attached to the hours of service volunteers provided, the sum would be more than \$15.6 million; and

WHEREAS, As volunteers share their time, energy, and experience in schools, they inspire the school and the community to remember and renew our commitment to excellence in education; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the week of April 16-22, 1990, be proclaimed Volunteer Week in Montgomery County Public Schools; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the Montgomery County Board of Education express its appreciation to all volunteers for their assistance and encourage all school personnel, parents, and students to recognize and support the contributions of these volunteers.

For the record, Dr. Shoenberg pointed out that two persons, Mrs. Sally Marchessault and Dr. Michael Vaccaro, had received awards from the National Association of Partners in Education. These were very prestigious awards, and he asked that letters of congratulations be sent to these individuals.

RESOLUTION NO. 235-90      Re:    STUDENT LEADERSHIP WEEK, APRIL 22-28, 1990

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

WHEREAS, This year in Montgomery County, the week of April 22-28 will be recognized as Student Leadership Week; and

WHEREAS, The Montgomery County Board of Education has a continuing commitment to support active student participation in school and community activities; and

WHEREAS, The dialogue among the Board of Education, county government, and student leaders representing individual schools and student organizations is productive and useful; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the members of the Board of Education hereby proclaim the week of April 22-28, 1990, as Student Leadership Week; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education commend student leaders for their efforts and achievements on behalf of Montgomery County Public Schools.

Re:    LONG-RANGE PLANNING AND BOARD  
RETREAT

Dr. Shoenberg reported that the Board had been planning a retreat this summer to address long-range issues for the school system. Dr. Cronin had provided the Board with a memo, and Dr. Shoenberg suggested they take a few minutes at the end of the discussion to consider Dr. Cronin's memo.

Dr. Shoenberg indicated that he had sent the Board a memo, and the Board had received a ranking of priorities for these topics from senior staff. Dr. Kenneth Muir, director of long-range planning, had also provided a memo suggesting a way of organizing issues for discussion. He said he had asked Board members to develop specific questions for each topic and list the kind of information they would like to have before entering into a discussion on the topic.

Dr. Shoenberg said that the first topic had a high ranking from the Board and senior staff. It was a definition and assessment of outcomes, and the Board had already had some discussion on this topic. The thing that was of most concern to Dr. Shoenberg was not whether they ought not do a better job of defining outcomes, but it was the definitional problem itself of arriving at some means of defining those outcomes that represented a set of terms on which they could agree and was specific enough to have some meaning so that assessment could follow.

Dr. Cronin noted that the Board would be considering different methods of evaluation. As they talked about outcomes, they could either make it a specific shopping list of items students should know which were testable or look at whether students were succeeding at the next stage of their education or vocation. For example, did the students of an elementary school succeed in middle schools or did high school graduates succeed in college or in jobs? Therefore, they had to define what they were looking for in education. Did they want basic information or a set of skills that would enable people to succeed? They could develop any measures they wanted for the basic information, but he was not sure they knew how well students succeeded in college or business.

Dr. Shoenberg wondered if whether success at the next level was not based on success in terms of outcomes they had no more confidence in at the higher level than they did at the lower level. Dr. Cronin recalled that when they discussed dropouts they found that no one had a good definition of dropouts. He had asked Melissa Bahr, staff assistant, to write to Baltimore and get their report card for the schools. He said that when they looked at comparisons, not many of them worked between school systems except for CAT scores and SATs. They had to be sure what they were doing was reasonably good and then go from there to

look at whether they were preparing students to be adults.

Dr. Shoenberg commented that one definition that Dr. Cronin was offering was "success." There were efforts of those studying higher education to relate success in the adult world to grades in college which seldom correlated with each other. Then there were all those questions about how one measured success. The measures of success on those studies were highly questionable.

Mrs. Katheryn W. Gemberling, associate superintendent, stated that the point had been made that if they were going to look at success at the next level they had to decide whether the criteria were acceptable. If they asked for the same type of knowledge base at the various levels, there would be a correlation. However, this didn't mean this was what they were going to be looking for in a long-range outcome.

Mr. Ewing thought it was important for them to focus on this, and he agreed that it ought to be a high priority. It seemed to him they needed to spend some time talking about what they meant about what it meant to be successful and what they thought the purposes of public education were in Montgomery County. He thought it was interesting that the Board and staff ranked involvement with business and industry very low. He had ranked it low, too. It was not because they were not doing some of that or because it was unimportant, but he was concerned that they did not fall into the trap of believing that the purpose of public education was to prepare students for jobs. This was "a" purpose, but it was not "the" purpose. If they went back to the reason for public education in America, it was to make citizens literate and to make young people into citizens. That had benefits in terms of performing on the job, but that ought not to be thought of as the primary purpose.

Mr. Ewing did not know how they could define outcomes if they had not defined what it was they wanted students to be when they graduated from public schools. He did not mean this in the sense of what jobs they held. He meant this in terms of what they knew and what skills they had. He liked Dr. Muir's formulation of the larger question, "what should all students know by the time they graduate and how can we know what they know." It was his view that the knowledge they ought to be concerned about was not just skill knowledge. It included substantive knowledge, the literary, historical, and political tradition of the country. While he was in agreement that that was difficult to define, he thought that if they failed to give it some definition they would have failed to transmit the great body of historical and ethical and moral and literary traditions that defined what America was all about.

Mr. Ewing commented that there was, of course, the purely personal success they wanted students to have. They wanted them not merely to be successful at jobs or as the bearers of historical tradition, but also to have some personal satisfaction in continuing to learn and to understand both the past and the present. He would like them to seek not necessarily agreement but at least some understanding of whether there was disagreement on those notions. If they had disagreement, there would be disagreement on how they assessed outcomes.

It seemed to Dr. Pitt that they were talking about what they expected students to learn from the curriculum. He did not know how they could talk about this topic without thinking about what the state was doing right now. The state was going to set standards through criterion-referenced tests which measured certain things in the curriculum. The state was making judgments about what they expected students to learn, and MCPS would have little leeway but to make sure that students learned what the state said they had to learn. He believed this was the beginning of a more centralized state-wide structure.

Dr. Shoenberg stated that this was why this issue was important.

This would enable them to respond to what the state was trying to do. He agreed that this question got very close to the curriculum question. Dr. Cronin hoped that the state criteria would be minimal because he was concerned that they might end up teaching to the test. Dr. Pitt replied that the state was not talking about minimal in any sense of the word. He guessed that MCPS students would do well, but it would take focus and effort.

For example, they were going to have to change their goals for minority students based on the fact that the CAT would not be there, and they would have to use a different reference point.

Dr. Carl Smith, associate superintendent, stated that another piece they might look at would be the Board's GOALS OF EDUCATION.

If they were going to talk about outcomes, they were going to have to talk about the qualitative and the quantitative aspects of outcomes. They would have to determine whether those goals were still relevant. If they were relevant, they would have to look at outcomes derived from those goals.

Dr. Shoenberg thought they needed to look at some different kinds of assessments. The State of Vermont was looking at this, and the New York State Regents were experimenting with a science test. He thought there was a midwestern state which was revising its assessment processes. He said it would be helpful to know about some of those as they went on with the discussion.

Mrs. Praisner agreed that they had to look at the GOALS OF EDUCATION. She thought they did need to look at what other

states were doing to the extent they had developed relevant mechanisms to transfer. She said they had to be careful because they were not aware of the curricula in these states that would be driving the development of those mechanisms and the funding of the development of those mechanisms. At the same time there was a caution that relevances might develop in Maryland as the state began to get more and more involved in the issues of criterion-referenced tests. She suggested they had to continue to reinforce as much as possible their own Montgomery County priorities and the extent to which they could continue and maintain their individuality.

Dr. Shoenberg recognized that assessment processes were the end point and not the beginning except that it was sometimes very useful to see what other people were doing and reason back from the end point to see what it was that they were testing. They very often had trouble imagining what they might be able to do by setting certain sorts of goals. Looking at those assessment processes might suggest to them something that it might be important to look at that they would not think of looking at because they were used to thinking of what they did rather than what they might do.

Dr. Hiawatha Fountain, associate superintendent, stated that he was concerned about values, ethics, and service. He wondered as educators if they had anything to do with any of those things, or whether they would continue to allow a variety of these notions to be taught because they said nothing about them in any way. He wondered if they wanted to go in a particular direction or continue as they had done for the last 25 or 30 years. They had allowed every person to do his own thing. He was concerned about the environment and students who did certain things in school and had not have any remorse. He noted that by the time students were 16 years old they had seen 30,000 violent acts on television and 16,000 murders. He wondered if they had anything to do with any of that as educators when students were in their care for 13 years.

Dr. Shoenberg thought this might be a very good segway into talking about the fourth item on the list which was the extent of the curriculum. He pointed out that it was difficult to tell exactly how they arrived at the Board's ranking. He indicated that in the ranking of the executive staff they had first, second, and three thirds. The difference between the first and the three thirds was only two points. It would be fairer to lump those five topics together as being at the top of the staff's list. Curricular questions followed from a discussion of outcomes. This was not specifically the extent of the curriculum but the specific things that got included in it. In looking at the revision of the career and vocational education curriculum,

he was struck by how many different courses were offered in MCPS. He wondered if they weren't trying to do too many things and if they shouldn't try to pull in their wings a little bit and tighten up the curriculum. He would guess that they had added a lot of these electives in the late 1960's.

Mrs. Praisner recalled that in the late 1970's they had dropped courses and changed them. They had also gone to semester courses rather than year long courses. Before they jumped to conclusions, she thought they needed to look at the context in which those courses were listed. In the first place they had semester courses, and in the second place they had some Board edicts which stated that certain courses must be offered no matter how many students were enrolled. In 1976 she had been involved in the development of a list of courses because they didn't have a handle on what was being offered. Some of this might have been modified when the Senior High Study came out. She said that it would be useful to hear from the Council on Instruction as to how many courses they were looking at, either from a revision or a piloting process. Before they made judgments about numbers, it would be useful to know how many courses were on the books and not being offered. She thought it was a case of assessment with better information before they made some judgments about having too many courses.

Dr. Pitt thought it was important to go back and look at the Senior High Study which was an in depth effort over a two-year period to look at their program in terms of courses. Mrs. Praisner commented that most of what was of some significance in the Senior High Study was rejected by the Board at that time. Dr. Shoenberg explained that he was not picking on career and vocational education because he could have made the same statement about English language arts or social studies. He was talking about considering the possibility of some major surgery and going with the principle of "less is more."

In regard to Dr. Fountain's statement, Dr. Cronin thought they had to include values education, but he did not think they should have a single course in values. Values education should be a part of every curriculum and a part of everything a teacher did.

Teachers should encourage these discussions in the classroom from kindergarten through twelfth grade. He cited the example of a college professor using the Roman concept of law versus laws and how that professor brought the discussion around to the relationship of students to laws in their own society. In science they could discuss the ethics of science versus what they could do medically. He suggested that curriculum changes ought to be done with the senior staff, the practitioners of the curriculum, and students. He felt that this discussion should only be an opening wedge which would continue with MCEA, to the

classroom with students involved in that process.

Dr. Vance commented that of all the topics this one had given him the most difficulty. The conversation at the table had reinforced his concern. If their current norms and values which directed assessment of outcomes were currently in place and did not seem to be broken, he wondered what was there to fix. If they fixed it, at what risk? He wondered about the peril of looking at outcomes and determining what an MCPS graduate should look like, do, and know. He kept asking himself what there was to change and why. He thought this was critical because the county was undergoing a rather intensive period of urbanization.

Today they probably had more parents and other citizens who were looking at other options and were watching their local schools very carefully. They could very easily misinterpret efforts and intentions when the Board and staff began to look at measurable outcomes and what a graduate should look like. This was not to say they shouldn't proceed, but those questions had loomed large in his mind, and he did not have answers for them.

Mr. Ewing remarked that there was a parallel in failing to address themselves to the issues of moral and ethical values they perhaps would amplify the moral confusion that was growing in America today. He would argue that the school system itself was frequently ambivalent. There were some things they chose to emphasize as important values. They had emphasized the importance of integration in the public schools, but they sometimes did not go as far as they should. For example, integration within schools was a highly ranked item on the executive staff's list. This suggested that there was a recognition that while they had been attentive at a policy level to supporting integration, they might not have done what needed to be done in an action way at the local level to insure that the job was completed. Beyond that, they were officially morally and ethically neutral most of the time, but teachers were not morally and ethically neutral in the classroom and probably shouldn't be.

They had to enforce some rules in order for learning to take place, and they wanted to enforce some learning about morals and ethics because they themselves were bearers of this tradition of morality and ethics.

Mr. Ewing commented that there probably always would be a lot of ambivalence. However, it seemed to him there was nothing wrong with focusing on what it was that they were in fact doing and what it was that they in fact did support and what it was they wanted to discourage. At the Bronx High School of Science there was one of the nation's earliest centers dedicated to the study of the Holocaust and the values, ethics, and problems that that raised, and the students flocked to that center. He thought they were doing students, community, and the nation a disservice if

they did not press as far as they could to provide students with the kind of information and experience and questions about these sorts of issues. He suspected that at the secondary level most teachers were leery about pursuing that issue very far because it got to be very problematic for most of them.

Dr. Pitt expressed his strong agreement with Mr. Ewing. The question was how they taught it and what the ethical and moral concepts ought to be. He did not see how anyone could teach any history without getting into that kind of issue. History could not be taught in a sterile environment; therefore, teachers made their own moral judgments and needed some guidance in this area.

The problem was there had to be broad concepts upon which they could all agree because if they got beyond that they got into the whole morass of whose morality they were talking about.

Dr. Vance stated that Dr. Pitt and Mr. Ewing had touched upon an issue that was unsettling to him. He had tried to go through a thought process on this. For example, if they looked at American and world history with new outcomes, this meant they had to teach history differently. They would have to have a different process, and the content would have to be different. He wondered if they were really prepared for that because up to this point their content in American and world history had been decidedly western-centric. He asked if they were prepared to go into a new curriculum that focused on non-western cultures, perceptions, and values. Primarily they had taught history through battles, wars, successions, and economic and political conquests. He pointed out that American history was a protest movement which included women and minorities and the evolution of the American family. This was part of his ambivalence when they started talking about outcomes.

Dr. Shoenberg remarked that it was very clear that this whole question of values and a curriculum organized along certain values and orientation was a topic that was on a lot of minds. He agreed that they did need to deal with this question.

Mrs. Praisner assumed that this was a preface discussion for subsequent discussions. It seemed to her that they needed to look at the values education recommendations that were made years ago and also what Baltimore County was doing in its values education program. She thought they also needed to look at how MCPS had responded or infused values into what they were doing. She pointed out that there had been attempts in the past to do some thematic organization with the existing curriculum. Again this was a sense of teachers working together and carrying the themes and issues across disciplines.

Dr. Smith reported that several years ago an article had appeared

in the KAPPAN entitled, "McGuffey's Reader and the Ghost of Moral Education Today." The author of the article had made an interesting case for including discussions of ethical issues and ethical principles that he argued undergirded much of society. He thought that the issue was not so much teaching values. It was the extent to which in the curriculum and the activities through which they carried out the curriculum, children had a chance to examine the issues and to look at questions and discuss them. This did not mean that they were taught a particular view, but they would have the opportunity to see and examine issues and to sort out what they believed and why.

Dr. Cronin thought that they had to address these kinds of issues. He pointed out that the county 30 years ago was drastically different from what they had at the present time. He felt that this dialogue could even go into the way a teacher approached students. A teacher faced with a class that was 50 percent immigrant with minimal learning skills had a vastly different world from the teacher back in 1970 or 1960. If they did not address this issue, they would miss one of the fundamental levels of education which was how they adapted to the world they lived in now and in the future.

Dr. Robert Shekletski, associate superintendent, said that when they looked at the definition and assessment of outcomes and the extent of the curriculum, they could look at that in several ways. For example, given their curriculum how did they define it and what ways could they assess it? The discussion had gone to what their outcomes should be. Should they be the same as they had now or should they be a different set of outcomes? If they subscribed to a different set of outcomes, they would have to change the curriculum, not just add or reduce courses. The whole approach to the curriculum would have to be modified. Dr. Fountain thought they could keep the same high quality they had, but they had to go about preparing the youngster for that outcome and to infuse values into the curriculum. Dr. Shekletski pointed out that this involved more than the student. It was the teacher and MCPS in general.

Dr. Pitt stressed that they were making some assumptions about what freedoms they had to do what they were talking about doing.

He was not clear in his mind about how much freedom they had now in terms of what the state was planning.

Dr. Shoenberg said that the next topic was the extent of services to students. This was second in the Board's ranking and lower with the staff. He reported that this was one of the first topics he thought of because this was an issue that they were going to have to deal with over the next five years whether they wanted to or not. During his presidency, Dr. Cronin had reopened

discussions between the school system and county agencies dealing with school-aged children. This had become a national issue. There were problems having to do with family services, social services, criminal justice, health, and so on. Whether they dealt with this subject in the context of the retreat or not, he thought it was an issue they would have to deal with. He would expect that the Board of Education in future years was going to spend a lot of time on this one.

Mr. Goldensohn agreed and pointed out that one of the major increases in school expenditures in the past few years had been for counselors and psychologists. Those people were working on areas that children had problems with much of the time from outside the school environment. There were family problems and societal problems that interfered with the learning ability of the child. However, MCPS had to address those because they affected the performance of the child in school. This was the new area of expense for them. They had to help the special education child, but they also needed assistance from the public agencies and the private agencies. MCPS had to be involved in the coordination of these services.

Mrs. DiFonzo stated that for her the issue on this one was not the more obvious one of psychologists and counselors. The piece of this that jumped out at her was the extension of that. It was the youngster who came to school unfed and improperly clothed. She said the question was the level of services a school system provided. Were they obligated as a school system within the education budget to provide a warm coat for a child or should that money come from other places? This came up during the budget process this year. To her this was a big piece of this. It was not just preparing a child emotionally vis-a-vis dealing with a divorce or a drug situation at home. At what point did they say these things had to come from other agencies of government? Dr. Shoenberg said another way to say it was "to what degree did they need to reorient their budgeting processes to address those issues?"

Mrs. Praisner said she would not like to see this as a budget issue or a school system budget issue. It was the extent to which MCPS participated with the other agencies that were associated with families in Montgomery County. This was the question they needed to look at from the standpoint of a school system that had a piece of an obligation, to a county that had a piece of an obligation, to certain private agencies that might have pieces of responsibility. Rather than raise the question, she would jump to what she would like to see as an outcome.

Mrs. Praisner would like to see an evolution of the scope and obligation areas so that all within the county would recognize

that although certain monies would come from certain pockets, there were appropriate individuals across the board who could and should serve as the case manager for certain issues. They were going to have to be more involved. The question was how they could insure that their involvement was such that they could participate with the recognition of the need of that involvement.

For example, they could not just sit there and say they were responsible for this piece of a child or for this time in a child's life and that was the only component. It might be the only component that was in the school system's budget, but they were going to have to be more involved as a county, both for efficiencies and effectiveness, in working together as institutions for the families in this county.

Ms. Ann Meyer, associate superintendent, reported that they were providing some services to parents. They were helping parents fill in complex forms to apply for various kinds of assistance, and they were encouraging the county government to bring employment counselors in. They were connecting parents with jobs, and they were connecting parents with drug and alcohol abuse treatment programs. She pointed out that if they took the initiative too much they would get the responsibility. The more they started to connect parents with agencies, the more they were expected to make the connection. This required them to give a lot of thought as to how they could be active in working with county and city governments without being responsible for all activities.

Mr. Ewing saw this as having a variety of aspects. He said they could be engaged with the county government in asking them for additional efforts on their part to meet needs that MCPS saw. Another was to take over the responsibility for doing things which MCPS had not previously done. There was another role of service facilitator. The school system could pursue the role of child advocate and make a distinct, continuing and systematic effort to identify the needs of children and to be an advocate for those. In that process, they ought to sort out those which were appropriate for them to perform themselves, those which they might perform if no one else would, and those which were more appropriate for others to perform. He thought that the role of MCPS had to expand. He said there was no other institution including county government that had the kind of comprehensive information about children and their needs. There was no one else who would be an advocate for the whole child. He suggested they needed an expansion of administration to provide an office to perform this role.

Dr. Cronin noted that when he started the push for cooperation, he was concerned about the magnitude of services. The county was providing services, and the school system was providing services.

The focal point was how they bridged this. The discussion today was on what the school system should be in the classroom and what should it be outside the classroom. People had said that administration must be cut, and yet if the cuts were made, what would they put back on the teacher in the classroom? This was not easily answered because the problem was complex. If the entire county did not address this, MCPS would drown in those needs for services.

Dr. Pitt stated that for the last 30 years the question had been raised. The bottom line was that they had added dramatically to the services the school system itself provided for young people. They had added to support areas for children. They kept pushing for coordination, but if no one else was going to provide these services, MCPS would have to find a way to do it.

Dr. Shoenberg suggested that they turn to next steps. If they looked at Dr. Muir's memorandum, they had had a preliminary discussion of the first two, the extent of curriculum and definition and assessment of outcomes. They had also discussed the involvement of business and industry. They could prepare for a discussion of those topics for the May agenda. He suggested that they take fifteen minutes at the beginning of the discussion on May 8 to canvass the next two issues so that those issues could be prepared for discussion the following time. At the June meeting they would take 15 minutes or so on the last three items. Staff would provide some background reading and give Board members the opportunity to explore these topics in more depth at succeeding meetings. He noted that Dr. Cronin had a memo recommending they hold a forum on these topics.

Dr. Cronin explained that he was proposing a four-part plan. The first piece was a continuation of this kind of discussion, and a second part was the Board retreat as scheduled in July. He thought that they need to broaden this kind of discussion and go out to the community. Therefore, he was proposing a public town meeting in June or July. They could have a discussion of the future in the county in the next ten years with representatives from county, the College, and MCPS. This could be a round table discussion followed by a public discussion of the very issues they were now talking about. This would give them input from the minority community, business community, political community, parent community, etc. They would be provided with a touchstone similar to what occurred in 1982-83 when they went back to the community for the priorities for the school system. Following that, he would propose that the superintendent prepare a 10-year plan of action. For example, they had to plan for the teacher training they needed and for resources. Therefore, he was proposing that the superintendent come back to the Board in June, 1991 with a ten-year plan to accomplish these goals. The Board

had also talked about holding off on some things until the minority education consultant had made his report. This would give them a way to incorporate his recommendations.

Dr. Pitt recalled an earlier discussion where the issue of Board elections was raised. One of the concerns was that they not get too directive prior to the election. It would be one thing for the Board to leave a legacy of discussion to the new Board coming in, but the Board would be giving the superintendent very specific direction before a new Board had an opportunity to review the situation. He liked the idea of long-range planning, but he thought this should be for the new Board. Dr. Cronin explained that if they did not do something to follow up these discussions in terms of some action plans, they would waste an entire year of potential planning. They would go through two budget cycles without having an opportunity to act. While there would be new Board members, the Board members would have an opportunity by June to react to what the superintendent would be doing.

Mr. Ewing pointed out that the Board had gone into this with a commitment that they would not follow this up with formal recommendations. Dr. Cronin's proposal would be a reversal of that, and he could not support this. However, he thought that the idea of a town meeting was a good one. Dr. Shoenberg recalled that they had agreed there would not be an action plan, but he would be prepared to discuss the idea of a town meeting.

Mrs. Praisner commented that over the years they had held Board retreats to talk about these issues. She had been a strong advocate for strategic planning and for budgets reflecting that planning process, but she did not think the timing was right for Dr. Cronin's proposal. She would rather see them focus on the materials they had and some sense of where Board members were and on a discussion of how they might want to evolve the budget process so that it would be more reflective of some long-term strategic planning and provide for input from the community at an earlier time.

Dr. Shoenberg suggested that they add this topic to the Board agenda for April 30 under the Board of Education items. Mr. Goldensohn pointed out that they had already decided on their program leading to the retreat in July. Anything further was almost a new business item and should not be part of this discussion.

Re: PROPOSED POLICY ON DRUG ABUSE

Board members discussed the proposed policy on drug abuse and offered several suggestions for changes in the policy. It was

decided that Mr. Ewing, Mrs. Praisner, Ms. Serino, and three staff members would form a committee to look at the policy. Dr. Shoenberg asked that the committee return to the Board within a month, and Ms. Serino would chair the committee.

## Re: EXECUTIVE SESSION

The Board of Education met in executive session from 12:25 to 2:30 p.m. to discuss school security, school sites, personnel matters, and legal issues.

## Re: PUBLIC COMMENTS

The following individuals appeared before the Board of Education:

1. Mary Schaheen, All-day Kindergarten Committee - Bowie Mill ES
2. Cindy Retterer, Brooke Grove ES Naming Committee

RESOLUTION NO. 236-90      Re: APPROVAL OF PROGRAM OF STUDIES FOR  
BUSINESS EDUCATION

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

WHEREAS, The public school laws of Maryland specify that the county superintendent shall prepare courses of study and recommend them for adoption by the county board (THE ANNOTATED CODE OF THE PUBLIC GENERAL LAWS OF MARYLAND, EDUCATION, Article 77, Sec. 4-205); and

WHEREAS, The public school laws of Maryland also state that the county Board, on the written recommendation of the county superintendent, shall establish courses of study for the schools under its jurisdiction (IBID., Sec. 4-110); and

WHEREAS, The PROGRAM OF STUDIES is the document that contains the prescribed curriculum elements, including instructional objectives, of all MCPS curriculum programs and courses (MCPS Regulation IFB-RA: Development and Approval of Curriculum and Supporting Materials); and

WHEREAS, The Council on Instruction, charged by the superintendent with considering recommendations for curriculum change, has recommended approval of the revised PROGRAM OF STUDIES for business education; and

WHEREAS, The superintendent recommends approval of this revised PROGRAM OF STUDIES; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education approve the PROGRAM OF STUDIES for business education.

RESOLUTION NO. 237-90 Re: PROCUREMENT CONTRACTS OVER \$25,000

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

WHEREAS, Funds have been budgeted for the purchase of equipment, supplies, and contractual services; and

WHEREAS, It is recommended that RFP No. 90-09, Materials Management System, be rejected and rebid due to lack of competition; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That RFP No. 90-09 be rejected; and be it further

RESOLVED, That having been duly advertised, the following contracts be awarded to the low bidders meeting specifications as shown for the bids as follows:

96-90	Floor Maintenance Supplies	
	AWARDEES	
	District Supply, Inc.	\$ 138,570*
	Hillyard, Inc.	7,335
	Huntington Laboratories, Inc.	10,660
		-----
	TOTAL	\$ 156,565
97-90	Ceiling Board and Grid System Material	
	AWARDEES	
	Clevenger Corporation	\$ 8,648
	J. B. Acoustical Supply	27,877
		-----
	TOTAL	\$ 36,525
100-90	Paint and Paint Sundries	
	AWARDEES	
	C. M. Athey	\$ 1,798
	Budeke's Paint	540
	Chaselle, Inc.	57
	Duron, Inc.	20,002
	Glidden Paint Company	5,433
	Lasting Paints, Inc.	8,548
	The Sherwin-Williams Company	1,967
		-----
	TOTAL	\$ 38,345

106-90	Industrial Arts Electronic Supplies		
	AWARDEES		
	H. C. Baker Sales Company, Inc.	\$	7,853
	Brodhead-Garrett Company		584
	Capitol Radio Wholesalers, Inc.		4,457
	Collins Electronics		3,560*
	Cox Electronics		518
	FIC Corporation		84
	Fairway Electronics Company		263
	Graves-Humphreys, Inc.		2,401
	Harco Electronics, Inc.		14,861
	Mark Electronics Supply, Inc.		191
	Metco Electronics Supply, Inc.		1,067
	Pioneer Technologies		232
	Print Products International, Inc.		340
	Pyttronic Industries, Inc.		5,398
			-----
	TOTAL	\$	41,809
110-90	Industrial Arts Graphic Arts Supplies		
	AWARDEES		
	John H. Burke & Company, Inc.	\$	4,472
	Chaselle, Inc.		2,573
	A. B. Dick Company		585
	Multigraphics		6,637
	P & L Products, Inc.		126
	Patton Printing Supplies, Inc.		1,805
	Harold M. Pitman Company, Inc.		678
	VGC/Meeks Printing Supply Company, Inc.		3,580
	Visual Graphics Corporation		753
	E. H. Walker		9,680
	Western Newspaper Litho Supply, Inc.		2,200
			-----
	TOTAL	\$	33,089
112-90	Duplicating Supplies		
	AWARDEES		
	Advanced Business Systems	\$	24,950*
	Carolina Ribbon		4,609
	Eastman Kodak Company		118,689
	Educational Marketing System		323*
	General Binding Corporation		14,868
	Globe Office Supply, Inc.		9,645*
	Heritage Business Products		500*
	Home Oil Company		1,365
	International Business Supplies		5,804*
	Interstate Office Supply Company		1,313*
	Landon Systems Corporation		4,767
	Nashua Corporation		34,667

April 17, 1990

	N. P. Pipino & Associates	5,161
	Single Source, Inc.	616*
	Visual Systems Company, Inc.	15,528*
	Xerox Corporation	5,000
	TOTAL	\$ 247,805
113-90	Vinyl Clad Drywall Panels AWARDEE Hudson Supply and Equipment, Inc.	\$ 26,656*
116-90	Playground Equipment AWARDEES Delmer F. Harris Company, Inc. Iron Mountain Forge John W. Taylor Associates Macro Management Inc. West Recreation Company	\$ 16,870 1,800 2,177 78,596* 146,941
	TOTAL	\$ 246,384
120-90	Color Television Communication Studio Systems AWARDEES CTL Communications Televideo Harco Electronics, Inc. Midwest Communications Corporation Theatre Service and Supply Corporation	\$ 163,109* 105 1,553 21,132
	TOTAL	\$ 185,899
126-90	Wood Mulch AWARDEE Edrich Lumber, Inc.	\$ 77,616
128-90	Pressure Treated Timbers AWARDEE Nelco Lumber and Home Center	\$ 38,088
	TOTAL OVER \$25,000	\$1,128,781

\*Denotes MFD vendors

RESOLUTION NO. 238-90      Re:    RELATED CONTRACT - STEDWICK  
ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

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

WHEREAS, The roof on the existing building at Stedwick Elementary School was scheduled for replacement in FY 1992; and

WHEREAS, There have been several leaks throughout the building this past year, and staff feels that the existing roof replacement should be accelerated and completed in conjunction with the new addition project currently being constructed; and

WHEREAS, The roof contractor for the new addition has completed numerous projects for MCPS and has submitted a cost proposal which is below current prices recently received on roof projects; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That a related contract be entered into with Orndorff & Spaid, Inc., to reroof the existing Stedwick Elementary School in accordance with their proposal of March 12 for \$142,704, with completion of work by August 1, 1990.

RESOLUTION NO. 239-90      Re:    ACCEPTANCE OF HIGHLAND ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

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

RESOLVED, That having been duly inspected on April 4, 1990, Highland Elementary School now be formally accepted, and that the official date of completion be established as that date upon which formal notice is received from the architect that the building has been completed in accordance with the plans and specifications, and all contract requirements have been met.

RESOLUTION NO. 240-90      Re:    ACCEPTANCE OF MONTGOMERY KNOLLS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

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

RESOLVED, That having been duly inspected on April 2, 1990, Montgomery Knolls Elementary School now be formally accepted, and that the official date of completion be established as that date upon which formal notice is received from the architect that the building has been completed in accordance with the plans and specifications, and all contract requirements have been met.

RESOLUTION NO. 241-90      Re:    ACCEPTANCE OF LAYTONSVILLE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Dr.

Cronin seconded by Ms. Serino, the following resolution was adopted unanimously:

RESOLVED, That having been duly inspected on March 30, 1990, Laytonsville Elementary School now be formally accepted, and that the official date of completion be established as that date upon which formal notice is received from the architect that the building has been completed in accordance with the plans and specifications, and all contract requirements have been met.

RESOLUTION NO. 242-90      Re:    NAME FOR NEW BRIGGS CHANEY MIDDLE SCHOOL

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

WHEREAS, A meeting of parents, representing every section of the Briggs Chaney Middle School attendance area, students, and staff members was held on February 15, 1990, in accordance with MCPS Regulation FFA-RA NAMING OF SCHOOLS, to select a name for the new Briggs Chaney Middle School; and

WHEREAS, A list of names of distinguished persons and geographic locations was considered, and a vote taken to determine the favored name; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the new middle school officially be named the Briggs Chaney Middle School.

RESOLUTION NO. 243-90      Re:    GRANT OF RIGHT-OF-WAY TO WASHINGTON SUBURBAN SANITARY COMMISSION AT FUTURE FAIRLAND ELEMENTARY SCHOOL SITE

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

WHEREAS, The Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission (WSSC) is planning to extend sanitary sewer service through the northern portion of the future Fairland Elementary School site on Fairdale Road; and

WHEREAS, All construction, restoration, and future maintenance will be performed at no cost to the Board of Education, with the WSSC and its contractors assuming liability for all damages or injury; and

WHEREAS, The proposed sewer extension will not adversely affect

any land anticipated to be utilized for school programming and recreational activities; and

WHEREAS, This grant of right-of-way will benefit the future school construction by eliminating the cost of extending the sewer to the school later and by providing service connections; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the president and secretary be authorized to execute a right-of-way for the additional land required to install a sewer line on the future Fairland Elementary School site.

RESOLUTION NO. 244-90 Re: UTILIZATION OF FY 1990 FUTURE SUPPORTED PROJECT FUNDS FOR THE MARYLAND EDUCATION TECHNOLOGY NETWORK (METN) PROJECT

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

RESOLVED, That the superintendent of schools be authorized to receive and expend within the FY 1990 Provision for Future Supported Projects a grant award of \$2,000 from the Maryland State Department of Education to develop a Grades 4-6 in-service course for social studies and computers and to identify appropriate software for a Grades K-1 in-service course in the following categories:

CATEGORY	AMOUNT
1 Administration	\$1,852
10 Fixed Charges	148
	-----
TOTAL	\$2,000

and be it further

RESOLVED, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the county executive and the County Council.

RESOLUTION NO. 245-90 Re: FY 1990 CATEGORICAL TRANSFER WITHIN PROJECT HIGH HOPES AT MONTGOMERY BLAIR HIGH SCHOOL

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







CATEGORY	AMOUNT
2 Instructional Salaries	\$12,261
3 Instructional Other	500
10 Fixed Charges	1,225
	-----
TOTAL	\$13,986

and be it further

RESOLVED, That the county executive be requested to recommend approval of this resolution to the County Council and copies of this resolution be transmitted to the county executive and the County Council.

RESOLUTION NO. 251-90      Re:    FY 1990 SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION  
AND CATEGORICAL TRANSFER FOR THE  
EDUCATION FOR ALL HANDICAPPED  
CHILDREN PROGRAM

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

RESOLVED, That the superintendent of schools be authorized, subject to County Council approval, to receive and expend an FY 1990 supplemental appropriation of \$41,424 from the Maryland State Department of Education under the Education for All Handicapped Act, PL 94-142, in Category 4 -- Special Education; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the superintendent of schools be authorized, subject to County Council approval, to effect within the FY 1990 education for all handicapped program the following categorical transfer:

CATEGORY	FROM	TO
4 Special Education		\$45,708
10 Fixed Charges	\$45,708	
	-----	-----
TOTAL	\$45,708	\$45,708

and be it further

RESOLVED, That the county executive be requested to recommend approval of this resolution to the County Council and a copy be transmitted to the county executive and the County Council.



implement the process. He felt that the idea of getting more citizen involvement was a good idea. His concern was that the process itself could take so much time and so much energy. For example, a neighboring county just went through a process that took three years. He said it was very important that they think about the amount of staff time and energy involved and the outcomes related to the energy put into it.

Dr. Muir explained that this was a process that the superintendent and Board of Education adopted back in 1968 when the Board was first required to negotiate with teachers. It was designed to give citizens an opportunity to say what they wanted to see in a budget while employees were negotiating with the Board about what they wanted to see in the budget. They had used the "Choices" process for eight years and had abandoned it in the late 1970's when they had double digit inflation, a decline in enrollment, and there were not many choices left. Since then they had used documents that were much less explanatory.

Dr. Pitt commented that they went through this whole budget process and took time to involve community, then the Council education committee acted almost as another Board of Education. They cut out money for projects such as all-day kindergarten and told the Board they could have all-day kindergarten if they found the money someplace else.

Dr. Cronin stated that they generally built the budget out of same services and with some improvements with a three to five year plan to see how far they could go in the future. They had to keep in mind the need to go to the Council and defend the budget. They also got information from the community about perceived needs. However, none of that process took into account any trimming or cutting. He asked if the proposals before the Board gave them that possibility.

Dr. Muir replied that this year in the Citizens' Budget they included a section on ways to save money. He thought they had made significant savings in different parts of the budget, but the problem was that these savings were never so dramatic that they overcame the need to increase. While there might be small decreases in certain areas, the total budget kept growing. Dr. Cronin added that there was a fear on the part of the Board to make some recommendations because it advertised to the county government that these were viable cut areas.

Mr. Ewing thought that the "Choices" document was an excellent device for affording the public a much fuller explanation of not merely what they were proposing to do but what they had done and how the school system was funded. Every year there was evidence that lots of people spent time studying the budget and

understanding it thoroughly and a lot of other people who found it absolutely daunting. While the Citizens' Budget had helped a great deal, it did not do all the things that "Choices" did. He thought that the notion of choices was an important one in the sense that it was always open to the Board to choose within some categorical limits what it was they thought it was the most important thing to do. For those reasons, he liked the suggestion for such a document. He did not know they needed to associate with that all of the process proposals in the paper before the Board. He felt that the "Choices" document should get out early so that the public would have opportunity to make its comments. It seemed to him that the Board should give serious consideration to this.

Dr. Pitt asked how they would relate this to the Board's making a decision to move over a period of three or four years in a general area. He thought that "Choices" itself was not a bad idea, but he was concerned about the total processes involved here. For example, the Board would make a decision in 1990 to go a certain way. How did they deal with this in the next issue of "Choices"? Dr. Shoenberg suggested they could do something like this every other year. One year they might do a multi-year plan and have that be the primary opportunity for community input. Another year they could do hearings similar to what they had now.

Mr. Brian Porter, director of the Department of Information, pointed out that one of the advantages of going to a more staggered process would be to avoid a community reaction to the county government's reaction to the Board's budget. This was followed by Board decisions and implementation which would translate into a year-round budget cycle. Another thing was to consider whether or not to have this type of process in synch with the Board's own priorities and long-range planning. It was Dr. Muir's assumption that they really couldn't carry this process out as envisioned without those goals which the budget would implement. Dr. Pitt's concern was a real one in the sense that if they decided on a multiyear plan to implement some goals, they would have nothing to discuss in the second, third, and fourth year. Right now they had multiyear budget goals which used up about 60 to 70 percent of improvements. However, there were always some single year improvements in there which this year amounted to about \$2.5 million.

Mr. Ewing said it seemed possible to argue that the public might want to propose accelerating multiyear proposals. He worried that if they had a different process one year from the next year this would lead to a lot of public confusion.

Mrs. Praisner said that this morning when they were talking about Board priorities she had stated she was interested in strategic

planning that had a budget process supporting it. She wanted community input and participation earlier in the process so that there was a better understanding of the budget and the elements of the budget. She thought that with participation came ownership and with ownership came support and with support came funding. Funding would achieve their goals. She appreciated what Dr. Pitt was saying about the "Choices" process being time consuming. It was her hope that as they looked at a new budget process and long-term goals they would find some savings in time or energy at the other end of the involvement. She pointed out that if they had a formal report to the public annually that included some of this information, it would all be tied together in one piece. They would be doing a variety of things with one document. They would report the status of education in the county, soliciting their views on where they should be going, and also developing the budget in that process.

Dr. Cronin liked the idea of long-range strategic planning. This gave all the elements of the school community a sense of direction. By laying out a multiyear goal it established what they were trying to do in that time period for the Council and county executive. It also informed the community that this was the process they would follow. It would then begin to direct testimony in support of that process. However, they would do themselves a disservice if they advertised that the process could be speeded up. The value of a long-range plan was locking something in place for a certain period of time.

Dr. Shoenberg found the "Choices" document very attractive, and he liked the idea of that early input from the public. He would not favor a process that included extensive participation by the community with both a pre-superintendent's budget and a post-superintendent's budget. He noted that one of the advantages of having the public testimony in January was sustaining community interest in the budget all the way through the budget season. If people testified in the fall, they would have to wait until March to testify before the Council. There might be some falling off of involvement and a problem in sustaining that public support for the budget which they now had. However, he might be willing to take this risk to get community input at a time when the community felt it was likely to be more effective.

It seemed to Dr. Pitt that the key part was the long-range planning. They needed to move to a process that spelled out their goals and the way they would attain those goals. Too often the budget shaped their goals rather than goals shaping the budget. He thought they could develop some kind of process that would get at some of the major ideas. He asked about combining an annual report with "Choices." Mr. Porter replied that they would almost have to do this because in setting up the choices

they would have to say where they were and where they had been so that people could decide based on a body of knowledge as opposed to picking A, B, C, or D.

Mr. Ewing recalled that "Choices" was abandoned for a variety of reasons. At that time there were people on the Board who were concerned about an issue that arose out of negotiations with MCEA. They had put in "Choices" some choices that had to do with salaries and other negotiable items. MCEA had raised the question of whether or not the Board was engaged in good faith bargaining given that those items were listed in "Choices." While it was not the primary reason for giving up "Choices," it was a factor. It was a matter that they would have to be somewhat cautious about as they prepared the document.

Dr. Shoenberg asked how the "Choices" document fit into the overall plan for the school system. Mr. Porter replied that it would set up their budgetary process at the beginning of the school year. It would have to be mailed out to people throughout the county. It would set up where they had been, where they were, and where they were going. It would provide background information and questions and answers about goals and objectives of the Board. It would also set up the schedule for the rest of the year so that the public would know when to respond. The point about short circuiting the budgetary process was a real one. When the public testified in October, it would provide a huge window between those dates and testifying before the Council in the spring. There might have to be another boosting piece somewhere along the line to regenerate that kind of activity.

Dr. Muir said he had envisioned that they would continue to do the citizens' budget because it was the document that explained what was in the Board's adopted budget. Dr. Shoenberg agreed and stated that he did not know whether this was as involving as the several nights of public testimony. He saw another problem. They would be hearing from a variety of people. There were times when the Board deliberately left something out, and they would hear from people that the Board ignored their input. When people had the opportunity to give input before the superintendent's budget came out, they would see the opportunity for influencing those choices as being much greater. Mrs. Praisner thought that this was more a case of the way they shaped the questions and the kind of information they solicited. She said that if they talked about broad goals rather than specifics for the schools, they would not get that kind of reaction. Dr. Shoenberg explained that he was talking about broad goals. He recalled that for several years the PTA told them that class size reduction was the highest priority of parents, and the Board was not responding to it. There were good and sound reasons for the Board's decisions.

Mr. Larry Bowers, director of the Department of Management, Budget and Planning, pointed out that in the last several years they had talked about multi-year initiatives and set up plans for achieving these goals. He thought this had added to the process.

Even when the Board and superintendent decided they could not go very far, that initiative was still in front of the public. The process still allowed them to indicate that although there might not be much progress this year, it could stay for the following year and the year after that. This all fit in with staff's plan to do multi-year budgeting.

Dr. Pitt said they were not talking about this coming year because they needed to develop budget planning. If they had a plan and goals, they could come out with a report in tabloid form. The community could respond in some way, and the superintendent would develop his budget. They would still have the hearings, and the Board could point out where the superintendent was responsive or was not.

Dr. Cronin stated that in one sense the superintendent was expected to make a recommendation to the Board of a budget. He asked whether the superintendent's prerogative would be taken away if they had Board-sponsored hearings before the superintendent developed the budget. He asked whether they could have superintendent budget hearings in the fall and Board budget hearings in January. Dr. Pitt felt that the Board needed an opportunity to listen to citizens aside from what the superintendent did. For example, instead of hearings they could have written input to "Choices." Dr. Cronin pointed out that often after public hearings the Board reacted and started to give directions. Dr. Pitt explained that he wasn't talking about hearings. He was talking about putting the "Choices" document out and having citizens give input in writing to the superintendent. The superintendent would develop his budget, and then they would have the normal hearing process.

Mr. Ewing commented that to the extent the budget process was reflective of the Board's goals and objectives, it was the most important document the Board acted on. The process, therefore, became the most important process. If it lasted all year, there was nothing wrong with that because the Board would be spending its time on the most important thing to do. It seemed to him in terms of who had what prerogative that the Board had the ultimate choice to make about what went into the budget. If the Board made multi-year plans, it was constraining the superintendent in subsequent years. It could conceivably so limit the superintendent's options that he would not have any. However, he did not think the Board would want to do that, and the superintendent would probably resist that. In any event, it would be possible to do what they did before when they had

"Choices." The Board and superintendent received written comments, and the superintendent used them in putting the budget together and the Board had them available for reference in reviewing the budget. Dr. Muir pointed out that they did "Choices" in a variety of ways. The calendar he had provided the Board showed hearings in October, but in different years they had done it in different ways.

Dr. Shoenberg asked if staff could try another iteration of this process. Dr. Muir suggested that they could provide a broad table of contents as to what the document might deal with. Dr. Shoenberg asked that they include an annual timetable of what happened when. Dr. Pitt said that at this point Mr. Porter had to get into the process and develop a working relationship between the Information Office and the Budget Office.

Dr. Cronin asked whether they were planning to do this this fall or were they waiting a year. He would like to see it this summer, and Mr. Goldensohn agreed. Dr. Shoenberg asked staff to give some thought to this.

Re: REPORT ON SCHOOL PLANNING AND  
CONSTRUCTION PROCESS

Dr. Pitt explained that Dr. Maxine Counihan had planned to attend the meeting; however, she was a new grandmother and Mr. Gene Counihan would be filling in for her. The report was an example of county and school system staff getting together to discuss school construction issues. He felt that they had had excellent cooperation with county government staff on these issues. He commended all the people involved in the report.

Dr. Phil Rohr, associate superintendent for supportive services, introduced Mr. William Wilder, director of school facilities; Mr. Gene Counihan, Area 3 facilities planner; Mr. Richard Hawes, director of construction; Mr. Charles Loehr, deputy planning director of M-NCPPC; Myron Goldberg, chief of park planning and development of M-NCPPC; Dreck Wilson, chief of plan review of the Department of Environmental Protection; Catherine Stover, senior management and budget specialist for the county government; and Mr. Mitchell Brown, assistant director of construction. Dr. Rohr reported that the work of the committee and subcommittee had been extremely helpful to MCPS in implementing a very large capital program. MCPS had had an impact on a lot of other agencies in the county because it was such a large developer. This impact was felt through regulatory and legal processes. The opportunity to get together and discuss issues had been helpful to MCPS and other agencies involved.

Mr. Counihan reported that the committee had had its beginnings a

little over two years ago. The need for it became apparent in working with the opening of Quince Orchard High School and six new elementary schools. Quince Orchard High School is located at the intersection of two very busy roads, and there was a lot of community concern about state and county Department of Transportation coordination with the improvements necessary for the opening of the school. The group started off as a school transportation efficiency planning group, and the officials of the state and county DOT's had been very active and involved in the regular meetings of the group. As the group started meeting, they found a need to bring in more and more different agencies of county government. For example, with the opening of those schools they had a number of problems of working with the fire department and decided to involve them with the group. They had worked out a whole series of agreements and understandings about how they would proceed with opening of schools. Because of that, this past fall they had had a very smooth opening.

Mr. Counihan thought that the group had helped all agencies of county government to know in advance the expectations and plans of the school system for three or four years in advance. When they started planning for a school, they could involve people in site selection, transportation, traffic, etc. MCPS was generating schools more quickly than the county offices could often respond to them in terms of their own budget planning if road improvements or whatever had to be made. He believed that as a result of this coordinated planning that they were better able to more efficiently deliver on their school capital projects. It had helped to have the individuals making decisions working together on a regular basis and solving problems together.

Mr. Counihan reported that a year ago the education committee recommended that this group take a hard look at the planning process for opening schools. As a result of that, a subcommittee headed by Mr. Hawes was formed. This resulted in the report before the Board.

Mr. Hawes felt that this had been an extremely helpful process for MCPS. They had had problems in constructing schools from a code review and permit process standpoint over the past several years because they were trying to do things so quickly. The subcommittee was formed to deal with problems they had experienced in planning some of their projects. They had a lot of new regulatory issues and site requirements that were being developed at the federal, state and local level that were having a significant impact on the coordination and planning of schools. As a result of the problems, the STEP committee recognized the need to form an intergovernmental subcommittee to look at the planning, review, and construction process.

Mr. Hawes indicated that the committee worked for about two months and met bi-weekly and developed a draft plan. The draft was reviewed with the STEP committee as a whole, and the STEP committee refined the draft. The recommendations in the report centered around standard planning schedules and standard timeframes for planning and constructing school projects. They had developed a series of schedules along with a step-by-step process to plan, obtain building permits, and construct schools.

These schedules represented the optimal way to plan and construct a school project if they took into account the regulatory requirements and the legal mandates that the various reviewing agencies had to follow. For example, the Department of Environmental Protection was responsible for issuing building permits for all county projects. There were numerous steps involved in obtaining a building permit, and some of these steps were outside the purview of DEP. Therefore, the planning schedules took this into consideration.

Mr. Hawes reported that the committee felt that there should be standard planning and construction schedules for school projects that were based on realistic projections of the time it actually took to plan and construct a project. These processes were outlined in the appendices of the report. The remainder of the recommendations were developed to facilitate the step-by-step process for obtaining permits. In general, they were intended to assure that each step stayed on the timeframe it was supposed to stay on. He said it was important to recognize that the schedules were typical schedules and were based on allowing two years for planning and 18 months for construction. It was agreed by the STEP committee that if a project had to be accelerated that the STEP committee would treat that project on an individual basis and do whatever was necessary to assure governmental coordination.

Mrs. Praisner thought that the document was very useful, and it was helpful to have everyone working together given the numbers of projects MCPS had. It would be useful to have this in responding to questions from citizens. Her first question related to how they were planning to share the report with the general community. Dr. Rohr replied that he assumed the report would be discussed by the education committee and perhaps the full Council. As a staff, they planned to share the document with planning committees for individual schools so that they would have an idea of the process. He thought this would go a long way toward answering questions raised by the community. However, he did not know about a general distribution of the report.

Mrs. Praisner suggested that the Council might want to provide

information about the process in its weekly newsletters to the community. It seemed to her that it might be useful to tell citizens that these procedures had been established and that they could obtain copies of the timetable. She thought it was important for the public to have some understanding of the complexity of building a school. In discussions with a cluster, the issue of construction timetables had been raised along with the timing of community involvement. She said that this could be tied together in one document, and she would like to see a copy of whatever they planned to send out. It would be useful to citizens to know when and what their involvement would be.

In regard to the site selection process, Mrs. Praisner said there was a lot of involvement by citizens and representatives of government before the action was taken by the Board to select and acquire a site. Often the Board received letters on a particular site before the Board discussed the issue in executive session. It seemed to her they needed to look at what directions they gave site selection groups as to the confidentiality of the site selection process. Dr. Pitt suggested that Dr. Rohr might want to consider how this could be accomplished because the site selection process as now constituted did cause awkward moments for the Board. In terms of communicating about the report, he asked whether the Council would adopt the document. Dr. Rohr did not believe it would be scheduled for adoption but thought it would be discussed by the Council. Dr. Pitt thought the school system should take the initiative and get this material out to the public.

Dr. Cronin asked whether there would be one timeframe for new schools and one for modernizations. Mr. Hawes replied that there were timeframes for each type of project including additions, modernizations, new secondary schools, and new elementary schools. Dr. Cronin inquired about compliance with the schedule, and Mr. Hawes replied that they should be able to follow this on 90 percent of their projects.

Dr. Cronin asked about the possibility of accelerating certain projects. Mr. Hawes explained that this was possible under the plan. For example, they planned to accelerate the Germantown 1992 elementary school, and this would go to the Council for approval and to the STEP committee to consider on an individual basis. Mrs. Stover commented that she had recommended including the additional costs involved with accelerated projects. Dr. Cronin pointed out that there were additional costs incurred when a project was delayed as well.

Mr. Ewing gathered that there was general agreement on the part of MCPS staff that the school system ought to follow these recommendations. It seemed to him that the superintendent or the

Board ought to formally accept these recommendations as the plan they would follow in school construction. He thought that this would help with community understanding of the process. He also suggested that they might want to execute some memoranda of understanding with other agencies involved. Dr. Rohr indicated that this could be put on the next committee agenda for consideration. Mr. Counihan suggested holding off on this until after the presentation to the County Council so that there were be opportunity to have their views included.

Mrs. Hobbs asked if they had had any discussion on negotiated fees or the responsibility of architects on projects. Mr. Hawes replied that they had discussed the county's process for negotiating fees and any problems they had encountered. The county had a procedure similar to that employed by MCPS, but their fees were a little bit higher. Dr. Rohr understood that their process was identical to that of MCPS.

Dr. Shoenberg pointed out that when MCPS was operating on three- and four-year time schedules, the developers had their own schedule and might speed up or slow down development during a two-year period. For example, in the Olney area they had been able to postpone building a school. Dr. Rohr explained that as a committee they were continually reviewing the six-year program and its impact. They reviewed the superintendent's request at the committee level, and following Board action they reviewed any changes that were made and the impact that had on agencies. They also reviewed the plan following the executive's recommendations and following County Council action.

Dr. Shoenberg said that he understood that, but in the case of Olney they would have been well along in the process and found that development was not occurring as fast as they thought. However, next year the developers might speed up their construction, and MCPS would be behind again. Dr. Rohr explained that the key to all of this to allow them to do the proper job occurred in the planning stage. Dr. Pitt commented that Dr. Shoenberg's point was well taken. What they were doing was providing more structure, but by doing that they were limiting flexibility somewhat. He suggested that flexibility had to be built into the work of the committee. Dr. Shoenberg stated that they needed to be sure the public understood why things might move a little more slowly than they would like them to in the future. He thanked the members of the committee for their good work.

Re: CODICIL TO SCHOOL NAMING POLICY

On February 28, 1990, Dr. Cronin moved and Ms. Serino seconded the following:

WHEREAS, On November 14, 1989, the Board of Education adopted a resolution giving tentative approval to a resolution which would suspend the School Naming Policy for a period of three years; and

WHEREAS, After reviewing comments from the community and staff, on February 28, 1990, the Board of Education modified the proposed resolution and sent it out again for comment; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That effective April 18, 1990, through April 17, 1994, the following limited term exception be made to FFA: Policy on Naming Schools:

1. All new schools will be named in honor of either a woman or a member of a minority group (American Indian, Asian-American, African-American, and Hispanic), who is no longer active in his or her career and who has made an outstanding contribution to the community, county, state or nation.
2. Closed schools being reopened may keep their original name or abide by the exception detailed above.

and be it further

RESOLVED, That the above exception to FFA: Policy on Naming Schools be published as an addendum to the policy; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the superintendent of schools provide a list of suggested names of distinguished women and minorities for use by community groups in considering names for their new school.

Re: A MOTION BY MR. GOLDENSOHN TO AMEND  
THE PROPOSED CODICIL TO THE SCHOOL  
NAMING POLICY (FAILED)

A motion by Mr. Goldensohn to amend the proposed codicil to the school naming policy by adding a clause "exceptions to this policy codicil shall be available to elementary schools via their naming committees and shall be individual decided upon by Board majority vote" failed with Mr. Ewing, Mr. Goldensohn, and Mrs. Hobbs voting in the affirmative; Dr. Cronin, Mrs. DiFonzo, Mrs. Praisner, Ms. Serino, and Dr. Shoenberg voting in the negative.

For the record, Mrs. DiFonzo made the following statement:

"I don't disagree with what Mr. Goldensohn had said, but I don't think that the exception needs to be written into the policy, and



1. All new schools will be named in honor of either a woman or a member of a minority group (American Indian, Asian-American, African-American, and Hispanic), who is no longer active in his or her career and who has made an outstanding contribution to the community, county, state or nation.
2. Closed schools being reopened may keep their original name or abide by the exception detailed above.

and be it further

RESOLVED, That the above exception to FFA: Policy on Naming Schools be published as an addendum to the policy; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the superintendent of schools provide a list of suggested names of distinguished women and minorities for use by community groups in considering names for their new school; and be it further

RESOLVED, That during the period April 18, 1990, through April 17, 1994, MCPS staff is directed to use as a temporary name for all new school projects a cluster or region or area and numerical identification, for example, Olney No. 6.

Re: BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS

1. Mr. Ewing stated that he was still not satisfied with the arguments he had received about space and school population issues in the Blair area. He did not think that the explanation about why it was that some things were not being considered as possibilities was very good. While he would wait until he saw the recommendations, he would hope that there would be better arguments than "it didn't look to staff as if this was a good idea."

2. Mr. Ewing noted that the Board had received the monthly financial report as an item of information. It continued to be the case that the money for transportation and legal fees was coming out of the instructional budget. He thought they had within their power as a Board to do something about the legal fees. The Council had it within its power to do something about transportation. This was the result of the way the Council funded the budget, and it seemed to him to be a continuing outrage. Dr. Pitt said that the Council had acted more responsibly this year than last year, but essentially Mr. Ewing was correct. He agreed that it was within their power to do something constructive related to legal fees, and he would be

making a recommendation in that area within the next several months.

3. In regard to open lunch, Mr. Ewing stated that in the past he had been a strong supporter of open lunch. He was less of a strong supporter today particularly when he read about the consequences of it at some high schools. It seemed to him it was time for the Board and school system to look at whether or not their current policy really made sense given the present circumstances particularly relating to the impact on some communities as well as the relationship to problems with drugs. While he was not prepared today to propose this as a new business item, he would support Mrs. Praisner's request for information on the subject and would strongly suggest to the superintendent that they ought to review this. Dr. Cronin also supported Mrs. Praisner's request.

4. Mrs. Hobbs pointed out that the County Council would be discussing an emergency bill No. 37-90, Art in Public Facilities. She asked whether the Board would be taking a position on that bill, and Dr. Shoenberg said that the Board could and suggested she bring this up under New Business.

5. Mrs. Hobbs reported that April 22 was the twentieth anniversary of Earth Day. She was pleased that Mr. Porter had provided the Board with a news release showing what schools in the county were planning for Earth Day activities. While this was just one day, she hoped they would start thinking about protecting the environment for the future.

6. Mrs. Hobbs reminded people that Friday was the Career Fair at Montgomery Blair High School. She knew that representatives of Area 2 and Area 3 associate superintendents, high school principals, and Dr. Pitt planned to attend. She felt that the fair was going to be something special and different and should be well received by students.

7. Dr. Pitt commended the Smith Center staff. The staff had put together an Earth Day instructional program which had been held in the CESC auditorium from 3 to 6 p.m. He had visited the program around 5 p.m., and there were about 50 or 75 teachers there. About 200 teachers had gone through the program in those three hours. These teachers were all volunteers interested in Earth Day activities.

8. Ms. Serino reported that students had given a lot of attention to Sensitivity Awareness Day. The suggestion had been made that MCPS increase the number of SAS days. It was her intention to work with staff, and she hoped that the solution to the problem could come from individual schools with local

committees established at the schools. She was trying to get in touch with schools that already had committees to see what worked and what did not. She hoped that local schools would have more sensitivity awareness programs directed to different races, religions, and genders.

9. Mrs. Praisner commended the staff responsible for the MCPS television publication. The "TV Guide" for the Montgomery County Public Schools was an excellent document. She wondered what distribution they planned for this document and whether they would make it available in libraries or send it out to communities.

10. Mrs. Praisner said she had received a phone call on another case related to the complications of certification. In this case, it was a foreign born teacher who was certified in another state and having difficulties getting Maryland state certification. The teacher was certified in Virginia, and Mrs. Praisner had been told that Maryland did not recognize Virginia certification. Pennsylvania recognized Virginia certification, and the teacher would have to get her Virginia certification transferred to a Pennsylvania certification which Maryland would recognize. Dr. Pitt indicated that staff would follow up on this; however, this did not surprise him. Mrs. Praisner pointed out that they were already having difficulties in retaining teachers in certain areas especially foreign language. Here was a case where they might lose another individual to the State of Virginia. She suggested that they might need to move to this from the Board chairman level working with the Maryland Association of Boards of Education or talking to the state board themselves.

11. Mrs. Praisner pointed out that in the newspaper there had been a series of articles on athletics in Montgomery County and a reference to the desires of some coaches and principals to modify the MCPS eligibility requirements. She asked whether they could anticipate something coming from staff, and Dr. Cronin indicated that he would have a new business item.

12. Mr. Goldensohn reported that he had talked to some people who had taken a tour of Watkins Mill High School. He asked them their reaction to the school in terms of opulence because he had read this criticism in the newspaper. The only common thread from the six people was the art work. They questioned the relationship of the art work and the educational process.

13. Mr. Goldensohn said he had asked that staff prepare a listing of all schools donating some of their Giant and Safeway register tapes to other schools. When he received the list, he sent it back to Dr. Pitt suggesting that it deserved to be a

press release. However, Mr. Porter had already done this. He noted that it was not only schools donating the tapes but it was staff and area offices pooling receipts to give to schools.

14. Mr. Goldensohn indicated that the state finals for Odyssey of the Mind would be held on April 28 at the University of Maryland, Baltimore campus.

15. Mr. Goldensohn said that several weeks ago he had asked about the number of sixth grade teachers at middle schools who had teaching experience at the elementary school level. It turned out that about two-thirds of them had elementary school experience, but it also meant that 34 percent of the teachers teaching the sixth graders had never taught in an elementary school. He was not indicating that this was bad or dangerous. He understood that there were teachers who certified K-8. He would hope that as more schools moved over to the middle school process that they would make a strong push to have a greater percentage of teachers with an elementary school background. He pointed out that if all of those students had moved on to the middle school, and one third of them were not being taught by elementary experienced teachers, he wondered where all the sixth grade teachers were who did not move on up to the middle school.

RESOLUTION NO. 257-90 Re: EXECUTIVE SESSION - APRIL 30, 1990

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

WHEREAS, The Board of Education of Montgomery County is authorized by Section 10-508, State Government Article of the ANNOTATED CODE OF MARYLAND to conduct certain of its meetings in executive closed session; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education of Montgomery County hereby conduct its meeting in executive closed session beginning on April 30, 1990, at 7:30 p.m. to discuss, consider, deliberate, and/or otherwise decide the employment, assignment, appointment, promotion, demotion, compensation, discipline, removal, or resignation of employees, appointees, or officials over whom it has jurisdiction, or any other personnel matter affecting one or more particular individuals and to comply with a specific constitutional, statutory or judicially imposed requirement that prevents public disclosures about a particular proceeding or matter as permitted under the State Government Article, Section 10-508; and that such meeting shall continue in executive closed session until the completion of business.

RESOLUTION NO. 258-90 Re: MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 28, MARCH 5,



further

RESOLVED, That the Board request from mid-level schools the views of the PTA's, SGA's, and principals and MCR and MCJC with regard to their views on whether or not the National Junior Honor Society should be, in fact, eliminated.

RESOLUTION NO. 261-90 Re: BOE APPEAL NO. 1990-5

On motion of Mr. Goldensohn seconded by Mrs. DiFonzo, the following resolution was adopted with Dr. Cronin, Mrs. DiFonzo, Mr. Ewing, Mr. Goldensohn, Mrs. Praisner, Ms. Serino, and Dr. Shoenberg voting in the affirmative; Mrs. Hobbs voting in the negative:

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education adopt its Decision and Order in BOE Appeal No. 1990-5 (a personnel matter).

Re: NEW BUSINESS

1. Dr. Cronin moved and Ms. Serino seconded that the Board hold a discussion of the minimum academic standards required of students who participate in athletics or yearbook, newspaper or dramatics.
2. Mrs. Hobbs moved and Ms. Serino seconded that the Board of Education support Emergency County Council Bill 37-90, Art in Public Facilities. Staff was instructed to find out when the Council would take action on this bill because the next business meeting of the Board might be after the Council took action on this bill.

Re: ITEMS OF INFORMATION

Board members received the following items of information:

1. Items in Process
2. Construction Progress Report
3. Monthly Financial Report
4. Staff Response to Advisory Council on Vocational-technical Education
5. Recommended Approval of the Student Community Service Course
6. Recommended Approval of Programs of Studies for Technology Education, Grades 6-8, and Industrial and Technology Education, Grades 9-12
7. Recommended Approval of the Special Education Fundamental Life Skills Subject of the Program of Studies

Re: ADJOURNMENT

The president adjourned the meeting at 5:40 p.m. to an executive session on legal issues.

-----  
PRESIDENT

-----  
SECRETARY

HP:mlw