

C. POSITION AND RATIONALE

1. Policy is defined as the principles adopted by resolution of the Board to Education to guide implementation of educational programs and/or for management of the school system. (Policy includes what is required and may include the reasons for the policy and the impact. State laws, bylaws of the State Board of Education, and federal guidelines are, in effect, mandated policies.)

2. Format for Policy Development and Implementation

- a) The superintendent and/or the Board recognizes the need for a policy and how this need relates to Board goals and objectives
- b) The Board requests or receives a policy analysis from the superintendent and staff on the need for a new policy or revisions to or rescissions of a policy, including but not limited to:
 - (1) Relationship to other policies of the Board of Education and of other governmental agencies, if appropriate
 - (2) Legal aspects, including Federal, State and local laws, court decisions, and other legal limits or conditions
 - (3) Cost implications
 - (4) Effect on school system operation
 - (5) Research on similar policies adopted by other school systems
- c) The format for the policy analysis shall be as follows:
 - (1) Statement of the issue or issues or questions that are addressed
 - (2) Description of the background, history, nature of the problems or issues, including the location of the problem, its origins, the number and kinds of staff involved, the resources (\$) involved, and other relevant background data
 - (3) The options that might address or resolve the problem or issue, including for each option the cost, the benefits, the obstacles to be overcome, the strategies and actions to be

employed to achieve the results, and the measures or indicators to be used to demonstrate success or failure

- (4) A recommendation for selection of an option, and reasons that include comparison of options
- d) The policy recommendations that come to the Board of Education shall be presented following the receipt by the Board of a fully developed staff analysis. Both the analysis and the policy proposed shall be presented on the initiative of either the superintendent or one or more Board members. If the latter is the case, the Board member(s) may call on either the Board staff or on a person temporarily assigned to the Board staff to complete the policy analysis. If the Board wants to generate a policy, it must do so using the time and effort of the Board members, the Board staff, or both.
 - e) When the superintendent or Board member presents a proposed policy, the timeline for adoption must accompany it and include these elements:
 - (1) Any resolution introduced which involved a matter of policy shall lie on the table for at least one week before being voted upon. (The presiding officer rules as to whether any proposed resolution is a policy. If there is an emergency, this provision may be waived without notice if all members are present and there is unanimous agreement.)
 - (2) Opportunity for citizen and staff comment
 - (3) Opportunity for public hearing (if the Board desires)
 - (4) Opportunity for the superintendent to provide advice and recommendations
 - f) The Board shall adopt policies with a standard format which includes at least the following:
 - (1) A statement of the purpose of the policy
 - (2) A description of the problem or issue that the policy addresses and purports to resolve
 - (3) A statement of the policy position or

positions adopted by the Board, including a brief statement of the reasons and/or justification for these positions

- (4) A statement of the results or outcomes desired, stated in quantified terms where possible, but also stated in qualitative terms where desirable
 - (5) A statement of the implementation strategies to be employed, including actions to be taken and the assignment of responsibility for implementation to a single senior official in MCPS
 - (6) A schedule for implementation with key milestones
 - (7) Indicators/measures of outcomes/results
 - (8) Specification of when reports are to be made to the Board of Education and the public on implementation and effectiveness, results achieved, and next steps. Reports should normally be presented to the Board once a year unless there is reason for more or less frequent reporting
- g) After adoption, the superintendent follows up with:
- (1) Regulation for implementation
 - (2) Publication of policy and regulation in handbook and/or distribution to affected parties
 - (3) Continuous monitoring of policy and implementation and reporting to the Board as required under Review and Reporting

D. DESIRED OUTCOMES

- 1. Policies that are better researched and analyzed prior to adoption or changes and that are better monitored by staff with results reported to the Board subsequent to adoption.
- 2. Quantitative measurement of outcomes shall be the frequency at which section C.2 is used and the number of reports on implementation made to the Board.

3. Qualitative measurement of outcomes shall be the degree to which policies are better understood by the public and the improved perception that the policies in the handbook are necessary and up-to-date.

E. IMPLEMENTATION

The superintendent shall establish regulations that include a monitoring and reporting plan that specifies the actions to be taken, a detailed schedule for implementation, and the assignment of responsibility for this monitoring and reporting plan.

All regulations developed in support of this policy shall be sent to the Board as items of information.

F. TIMETABLE FOR REGULATION

Regulations for implementing the policy and the monitoring and reporting plan shall be established no later than ninety days following adoption of a policy by the Board.

G. OUTCOME INDICATORS

The existence of the superintendent's regulations, conduct of monitoring by staff, and scheduling of reports to the Board.

H. REPORTING AND REVIEW

Annual reports, due in the fall, are to be made to the Board of Education and the public on the implementation and effectiveness, results achieved and next steps, unless the Board agrees to less or more frequent reports.

The Board and superintendent shall review this policy and all policies at least every three years, but the Board may call for review at its discretion.

The superintendent, at his/her discretion or on the Board of Education's request, will report progress on or problems in implementation of this policy.

Board members agreed to change "better researched and analyzed" in Section D to "well researched and analyzed." Mr. Ewing said that the proposed policy would remain on the table and come back to the Board when the superintendent was prepared to respond.

Re: PROPOSED POLICY ON SITE-BASED
MANAGEMENT

Dr. Vance indicated that he would reserve the prerogative to get back to the Board with specific recommendations. Mr. Ewing reported that originally the policy had been scheduled for action today, but they had deferred action to give the superintendent time to study the proposed policy. The policy was now scheduled for action on August 8.

Dr. Vance invited the following individuals to the table: Dr. Patricia Sweeney, Mr. Peter Robertson, Mrs. Mary Ann Bowen, Ms. Susan Marks, Dr. Jevoner Adams, Ms. Diane Davidson, and Dr. Roberto Perez.

Mr. Ewing noted that the Board had before it two separate draft policies, one proposed by the superintendent and one proposed by the site-based participatory management advisory committee. Dr. Vance asked the sense of the committee relative to the impact that site-based management would have on instruction and teaching and learning and student outcomes.

Mr. Robertson replied that not having been a participant in a site-based management school, he would have to make a judgment from the literature and discussions. He felt that the impact would be hard to quantify, but in qualitative terms he felt they would increase the commitment and have more involvement of all the constituencies in a school to meet the needs of students. For example, at Blair they had a high number of students from other countries; therefore, Blair had needs that differed from those of other schools. Site-based management would allow schools to allocate resources to meet the specific needs of their students.

Ms. Marks commented that over the last two and a half years all their discussions had been on how to make their school better for the students in terms of student achievement. They looked at decisions in terms of their impact on students. She felt that they would have difficulty with the Maryland School Performance Plan in terms of how to quantify change in a short period of time. The other aspect was the relationship between the constituency groups and levels of trust and commitment they were continuing to build through this process which was an important part of site-based management and difficult to quantify.

In regard to MSPP, Dr. Vance said that the state had used "site-based instruction" rather than "management." Ms. Marks thought that perhaps this was just semantics; however, everything that they did had to focus on the instruction of children and improving the instruction and achievement of children. Dr. Adams felt that participatory management could be two-fold. There could be decisions that were purely management, and then there

were instructional decisions. In many schools, participatory management was taking place on the instructional level. Principals already had liaison groups or an instructional decision-making group. One of the problems was that they were calling this different things in different schools, and they needed to standardize their terms in all schools. In her school over the last two years, they had gained commitment. Teachers felt committed when they were taking part in the decision-making process. She reported that she had found that teachers backed off from making pure management decisions, but they did want to be involved in decisions about how money was spent and what went on in the classrooms.

Dr. Perez reported that while he was new to the county, he was not new to the concept of site-based management because his Ph.D. work was on decentralization. In Montgomery County he had found staff was reluctant to be involved in hard decisions about management. Staff had neither the time nor the propensity to make those hard management decisions, but they did want to be involved in instructional decision-making. Dr. Perez would like to see the policy emphasize instructional decision-making rather than management decision-making. He, as a principal, was trained to provide leadership and manage the school, but in the area of instruction he wanted the benefit of the teachers' experiences.

Mr. Robertson agreed that they were primarily talking about instruction, but some of these issues were a little bit of both. If teachers were able to work through how the resources were delineated, they would buy into it because they would see the limitations in the resources. He felt that if he were involved and saw problems in resources, he personally would be more willing to extend himself.

Mr. Ewing commented that one of the things they were struggling with here was what words to use to describe the change they wanted to make. This was always difficult when one was proposing to make change because words had a specific meaning, and they frequently got misunderstood. They had asked the question, "Who makes decisions?" He thought that a better question would be, "Who participates in the decision-making process?" He thought they would be poorly served if the end product undermined the ability of principals to give leadership and direction to the schools. On the other hand, leadership meant that the person exercising it had to know a great deal more than many people and to know what it was that the community and the staff wanted. The person had to put all of that together with the available resources in a way that would benefit children. He thought there was nothing inconsistent with good, solid leadership on the part of principals with what they were calling site-based participatory management. The trouble they were having was not figuring out whether they wanted to move in that direction, but what that really meant in terms of change and how did they

describe it. They used the words, "autonomy" and "decentralization," which meant specific things, but people used them in different ways. Frankly, he did not think they were talking about autonomy. They were talking about the ability of schools to recommend or make decisions that would permit greater flexibility at the school level to achieve the goals of that school. They were not talking about 200 schools each doing its own thing, but the word, "autonomy," could suggest that to some people.

Mr. Ewing said that the policy had to have a good description of what it was that they wanted to get done. This had to be set forth in terms that everyone could understand. To some extent, they would not get it right the first time because it did reflect change, and change was difficult to do. He thought they were saying that they wanted to make a change involving staff at the school level much more in making decisions because they had confidence that those decisions made in that manner would benefit teachers, principals, and students. He thought that the committee understood all of that, and their task now was to try to craft the right words and phrases to explain to the larger community what it was they were about here.

Ms. Davidson pointed out that Mr. Ewing had left out the parents. Up until now, parents had had input into policy-making but very little input into the implementation of policy. As parents received more opportunity to be participants in change, she believed they would see more of a sense of community. The other group not mentioned was the support workers, who were left out of instructional decisions. They participated slightly in building grounds decisions. In the pilots all of these groups were represented. For many children, supporting services employees were role models. When these people were not part of the school family, children saw this. When all staff in the school participated fully, this improved the climate in a school and would be picked up by students.

Mrs. Fanconi thought it was more than input. It was a way of involving support staff in problem-solving when it came to individual student success. Many times they had not used secretaries and custodians as being involved in the success of individual students. These people were regarded as just being there to support the building. She suggested they needed to look more to the skills of these people and their knowledge of students. Many times these people could have a very positive impact on that child's ability to learn. Mrs. Fanconi said that the advantage of site-based decision-making was involving everyone in that building in the success of every child.

Mrs. Fanconi had a concern about the allocation of resources and whether the mechanism was there to actually do that. A Prince George's teacher had talked to her about their site-based plan

and the problems they had in the community with a decision not to have a librarian. The community had felt left out of this process. This was definitely an allocation of resources, and she did not know enough about how they were going to do this, what the problems might be, and how they would set up to avoid that community problem.

Dr. Sweeney replied that individual pilot schools had had control over the monies they received to be pilot schools. The first 18 months each school had \$10,000, and most of these funds were spent for substitute time in order to release the teachers to plan the activities. Limited funds were used for EYE, especially with respect to some of the curriculum development projects. This year each school received \$3,000 and could spend the money they chose to within certain categories. If Mrs. Fanconi was asking about autonomy for spending money for textbooks, Dr. Sweeney thought that the principal could share information about how funds were spent to support various curriculum areas. The Prince George's County's situation was a little different because there principals were told how much to spend on what kinds of texts. MCPS principals had always had a lot more flexibility. In Prince George's County, the initial plan did not have the same kind of parent involvement that Montgomery County had had.

Ms. Marks added that the flexibility of materials and textbook accounts had always been there, and this information was now shared with a wider population. At Oakland Terrace, this had not been an issue. She said that they worked very hard to make sure that what was discussed at their meetings was communicated through the PTA newsletters. For example, anyone in the community could bring up an agenda item at their steering committee meetings.

Mrs. Fanconi noted that in the committee's proposed policy it stated that they would allocate personnel, resources, and time to achieve these goals. She asked whether this was a change or whether it was saying what they already did. She wondered if they needed a mechanism to do this. Dr. Sweeney explained that this referred to the eight schools in the pilot. They hoped to have three more next year, and some of the needs of those schools revolved around staff training. They had been trying to do that on a limited budget. They were saying that if the school system were to decide to expand and add many more schools each year, the school system had to consider personnel, time, and money. Dr. Adams explained that they were now in the process of making decisions for the next school year, and they did not have staff during the summer to do this. In her school, she had staff coming back on their own time to participate.

Ms. Gutierrez asked whether the eight schools had followed the same pattern with regard to the issue of allocation of resources. She asked if some schools focused more narrowly on instruction

or whether others had run the full gamut and shared budgets and information. Dr. Sweeney replied that as new schools came into the pilot they wanted to share information with them about the budget, staffing, and resource allocation processes. They did not systematically do that with the first eight schools, and those schools had to find out about it on their own. Ms. Gutierrez asked whether some schools were more risk-takers, and Dr. Sweeney replied that some were. However, all the schools did different things, and it was hard to generalize. In some schools they worked more on the process than the product. At Kennedy they worked on changes in the curriculum, and they came together more quickly as a group and got product-oriented.

Mrs. Bowen stated that one of the largest differences in dealing with this whole issue was the fact that they were really talking about process. Initially the pilot schools were very comfortable with getting into the process which took a tremendous amount of time. Since then, the schools had been heavily involved in instructional decisions. She believed that this was going to be an on-going process and a growth process for the schools. She thought they would be looking at a time when the schools were ready to begin to make even management decisions. This would be fine because schools would be comfortable with the process and mature enough to make those decisions, but the school system would have to support them.

Ms. Gutierrez said the committee's proposed policy had a very broad scope. It would permit each school to move in the full spectrum of assuming responsibility. She asked whether it provided sufficient guidelines for that to happen. Did it have any limitations for that full growth process inherent in implementing site-based participatory management? Did it need to provide more guidelines? Did it need to be broadened? Did it have inherent limitations?

Dr. Sweeney replied that it might be that the procedures developed after the policy was approved would have to be specific enough so that people understood what it was that they could really do. Mr. Robertson said that the policy had to define the scope of decision-making adequately and had to be clear about the emphasis on training. He did not see any inherent limitations to growth, but he agreed that the Board would have to revisit the policy in a few years. The Board had to be clear about what it was it intended to evaluate the program on. If the Board were to intervene in a school's program, it would create problems.

Dr. Cheung commented that site-based participatory management tried to involve staff, parents, and the community in terms of sharing information and providing input in decision-making. If they looked at the model of corporate America, there were few companies that had double digit growth over the past 30 years. Successful companies had happier employees because they were

better informed. In some cases these companies operated under something called site-based management, total quality management, etc. These theories had been around for many years, but many companies did not buy into these theories. Some staff had mentioned improved achievement of students. He had not heard mentioned that better involvement meant higher expectations. He asked how the system would address this. Another issue was that the leadership was very important. Not all principals were willing to allow the staff and community to participate. He asked how they would deal with this. How much was a principal willing to share? Dr. Cheung felt that leadership was the key; therefore, they had to look at how they selected, trained and evaluated the principal.

Mrs. DiFonzo suggested that they turn to the proposed April policy. The first was the "Purpose" section which said it was to define site-based management. What they had under definition was empowerment, but she did not know that she would define that as a definition of site-based management. She was troubled by the language that students would be involved "when appropriate." On page four, 3 a), "and needed training for staff and parents from schools that are in their first or second years of site-based participatory management" struck her as being a bit exclusive and rather limiting. On page seven, "waiver requests must be submitted to the facilitator, endorsed by, etc." read as though it was extraordinarily directive.

Mrs. DiFonzo was concerned that the policy did not speak to youngsters strongly enough. In terms of accountability, she wondered who was accountable -- the superintendent, the principal, or the Board. In regard to Prince George's, it seemed to her that the school's decision to eliminate the media specialist could be a way to make personnel decisions. For example, the school could eliminate the position one year, restore it the next year, and hire someone else to fill it. She was still concerned about the "measurable outcomes" issue.

Mrs. Fanconi said that staff development had a great deal to do with the success of the pilots. Teachers were classroom trained, not management trained, and they needed assistance in assuming new roles. She would not be in support of a policy that would have every school move to something called site-based participatory management if they could not afford the staff development. She would like to know what they had learned about staff development, and if they had learned enough so that it took less time or learned enough to know they needed more time. She asked about budget implications for doing this with more schools. In addition to budget information, she would like to see any evaluations they had from the current pilots in terms of the success they had had.

In regard to Prince George's, Mr. Robertson agreed that the

decision about the media specialist was troubling. He would look to the process they set up in those schools, and the way in which that was developed. He thought that one of the strong concerns of the committee was that it be consensus decision-making. It should be developed carefully, and he had heard that the decisions the pilots got involved in were tentative, conservative, and careful. He did not get the sense that many bad decisions had been made. He felt that if enough attention was paid to the process, they would not have bad decisions.

Dr. Sweeney said it would be important to involve all employee organizations in the policy. She indicated that they did have an implementation plan developed and along with that a training budget that they would share with Mrs. Fanconi. She agreed that they could not have gotten where they were now without the training provided by staff development.

Dr. Adams said that administrators also needed staff development and training to open their minds. She had written her dissertation on open climates which tied into this, and she wanted to participate in this type of project. She told Mrs. DiFonzo that staff issues were a real concern, and her school had a similar situation this spring with cuts in staffing. They had had an opportunity to discuss how they were going to use their positions. In an open climate, everyone knew everyone's strengths and weaknesses. This process opened up everything, and the staff and the community knew what was going on in the school. The students knew the strengths and weaknesses as well. It would work to the detriment of an individual if they did not carry their full share. There was the danger of eliminating someone, but it was also positive because it created within people the desire to fulfill their full share and perform to a maximum.

Dr. Vance stated that the superintendent was obligated to review the proposed policy, and he had had to look at analyzing the policy prior to making any recommendations. He asked Mrs. Bowen what problems or issues the policy resolved from the point of view of parents. Mrs. Bowen replied that she was not sure she would use the word, "resolved." In their pilot schools, it had made parents far more aware of what an entire school was all about. This was parent involvement in a real way, and she had heard from parents who felt this was the best thing they had ever been involved in.

Mrs. Fanconi wanted to know how this related to peer review. If they were going to be moving into this, peer review became more important. When she had visited Oakland Terrace, she had found that parents were involved in a qualitative way. They were not involved in fund raising. They were involved in the instructional and behavioral goals and outcomes of students. This impressed her.

Mrs. Hobbs asked whether they would receive the superintendent's recommendation on August 8 with final action in September. Dr. Vance said the Board would have his recommendations by August 8, and Mr. Ewing thought the Board might want to schedule more time for final action.

Ms. Gutierrez commented that this issue was very exciting because the whole world was moving in this direction. This was a trend in industry, government, and education. She hoped that they would move forward with this policy, and she preferred the committee's version. Mr. Ewing thanked the committee for being remarkably patient with the Board. The committee had done an outstanding job, and he believed that the Board was ready to take that next step.

Re: EXECUTIVE SESSION

The Board meet in executive session from 12:10 p.m. to 1:40 p.m. to discuss personnel and site issues. Mr. Ewing left the meeting during this time to deliver testimony in Annapolis on behalf of the Board of Education, and Mrs. Hobbs assumed the chair.

Re: ANNOUNCEMENT

Mrs. Hobbs announced that Mr. Pischevar was in Costa Rica on a community service project.

Re: PUBLIC COMMENTS

The following individuals appeared before the Board:

1. Hope Sukin and Trudy Small
2. Martin Klauberg
3. George Havill
4. Linda Lang, Whitman Cluster
5. Jack Berr
6. Allan Prettyman, Damascus ES #6
7. Barbara Henry, Blair Cluster
8. Penny Dix, Meadow Hall PTA

RESOLUTION NO. 556-91 Re: PROCUREMENT CONTRACTS MORE THAN
\$25,000

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Mrs. Fanconi seconded by Mrs. Brenneman, 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 Bid No. 195-91, Electric Pallet

Trucks, be rejected due to lack of funding; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That Bid No. 195-91 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:

6-90	Copier Maintenance Service - Extension AWARDEE Waugh Enterprises, Inc.	\$ 250,020*
152-90	Milk, Milk Shake Mixes, Cottage Cheese, Yogurt and Fruit Juices - Extension AWARDEE Shenandoah's Pride Dairy	\$1,290,518
149-91	Power Mowers, Lawn and Garden Tractors AWARDEES Gaithersburg Ford Tractor Company Gaithersburg Rental Center Gladhill Brothers Virginia Turf and Equipment Company	\$ 55,397 23,673 32,325 14,070
	TOTAL	<u>\$ 125,465</u>
153-91	Health Room Supplies and Equipment AWARDEES Amzura Enterprises, Inc. Armstrong Medical Industries, Inc. Cole Medical, Inc. Culpepper Drug, Inc. District Scientific and Medical Express Physicians Supply Gamma Medical Systems, Inc. Dr. Robert Kelly Lyons Safety, Inc. William V. MacGill and Company Marlow Sports Micro Bio-Medics, Inc. National Health Supply Corporation Zuckerman Dental Products Corporation	\$ 7,502* 5,076 13,356 198* 3,321* 412 34,526 4,868 3,058 7,484 824 34,580 4,970 1,675
	TOTAL	<u>\$ 121,850</u>

156-91	MS/DOS Computer and Peripherals AWARDEES	
	ACC Business Machine Center	\$ 10,311*
	CFC Equipment Sales and Service	666
	Club American Technologies	125*
	Collins Electronics, Inc.	1,531*
	Data Systems Integration, Inc.	28,955*
	Federal Sales Service, Inc.	3,491
	International Computer Networks	335
	Landon Systems Corporation	7,652
	The New MMI Corporation	8,619
	On-Line/Off-Line, Inc.	1,406
	Sands and Associates, Inc.	55,200
	SMAC Data Systems	1,084*
	United Data Products, Inc.	1,472
	TOTAL	<u>\$ 120,847</u>
162-91	Administrative Microcomputer Equipment AWARDEES	
	Advanced Computer Concepts	\$ 1,975*
	Computerland of Frederick	62,877
	Connecting Point Computer Centers	133,901
	Data Connect Enterprises	4,940
	Micro Age	59,172*
	SSI Business Centers	173,810*
	Sync Data	14,896
	TOTAL	<u>\$ 451,571</u>
163-91	Student Accident Insurance AWARDEE	
	Mass Benefits Consultants, Inc.	\$ 101,347
166-91	Poultry Products, Frozen and Processed AWARDEES	
	Baer Foods, Inc.	\$ 84,840
	Carroll County Foods	4,980
	Chaimson Brokerage Company, Inc.	4,800
	Kraft/Feldman Foodservice	34,920
	Mazo-Lerch Company, Inc.	38,100
	Smelkinson/Sysco	97,200
	TOTAL	<u>\$ 264,840</u>
167-91	Frozen Foods AWARDEES	
	Baer Foods, Inc.	\$ 34,384
	Carroll County Foods	13,650
	Davals Food Distributors	21,888
	Free State Food Brokers, Inc.	9,330

July 9, 1991

	Institutional and Industrial Food	10,295
	Kraft/Feldman Foodservice	10,490
	Smelkinson/Sysco	3,566
	Washington Beef Company	30,800
	TOTAL	<u>\$ 134,403</u>
168-91	Snack Foods, Chips and Popcorn AWARDEE Herr Foods, Inc.	\$ 104,488
169-91	Processed Meats AWARDEES Carroll County Foods J. P. Foodservice, Inc. (Monarch/Balt.) Professional Food Systems	\$ 24,900 3,660 3,312
	TOTAL	<u>\$ 31,872</u>
170-91	Custodial Supplies AWARDEES Acme Paper and Supply Company, Inc. Antietam Paper Company, Inc. Atlantic Coast Chemicals, Inc. Baer Group, Inc. Calico Industries, Inc. Chaselle, Inc. City Group, Inc. Crown Supply DC Plastics, Inc. Daycon Products Company, Inc. District Supply, Inc. Institutional Buyers Mart Lynn Ladder and Scaffold Company/WACO Marland Enterprises, Inc. Marstan Industries, Inc. Monumental Paper Company National Supply Company Noland Company P & L Products, Inc. Porter's Supply Company, Inc. Pyramid School Products Sky Resources Superior Supply Limited Frank W. Winne and Son, Inc. Zion Maid Services	\$ 14,953 19,400 19,727 1,744 2,136 3,624 1,467 7,800 84,129 62,576* 44,926* 11,762* 2,330 30,119 10,018 172,780 3,317 4,579 421 110,044 23,872 1,648 5,527 1,792 1,287
	TOTAL	<u>\$ 641,978</u>

July 9, 1991

172-91	Piano Tuning and Maintenance AWARDEES	
	Rick Amelang	\$ 15,344
	Clark Piano	9,280
	Victor Haas	5,400
	Winzer Piano	12,580
	TOTAL	<u>\$ 42,604</u>
176-91	Frozen Baked Pizza AWARDEES	
	Better Baked Pizza, Inc.	\$ 99,716
	Bravo-Midwest	480,152
	TOTAL	<u>\$ 579,868</u>
177-91	Ice Cream, Ice Milk and Novelties AWARDEE	
	Briggs Ice Cream Company	\$ 25,450
178-91	Saltines, Specialty Crackers and Taco Shells AWARDEES	
	Carroll County Foods	\$ 28,178
	Smelkinson/Sysco	5,768
	TOTAL	<u>\$ 33,946</u>
179-91	Groceries and Staples AWARDEES	
	Atlantic Seasoning	\$ 3,610
	Carroll County Foods	46,633
	GPR Company	9,538
	Interstate Coffee Services Company, Inc.	1,174
	J. P. Foodservice (Monarch/Baltimore)	616
	Kraft/Feldman Foodservice	72,299
	Mazo-Lerch Company, Inc.	3,737
	Sandler Foods	130,213
	Smelkinson/Sysco	798
	Tova Industries	6,388
	Wechsler Coffee Corporation	753
	TOTAL	<u>\$ 275,759</u>
183-91	Bread and Rolls AWARDEE	
	Schmidt Baking Company, Inc.	\$ 213,325
184-91	Fruit Juices/Drinks for Vending AWARDEE	
	American Vending Systems	\$ 403,809

189-91	Computer Supplies and Recycled Toner Cartridges AWARDEES	
	Allstate Office Products	\$ 18,975
	Bits N Bytes Computer Supplies, Inc.	9,809*
	Boise Cascade Office Products	1,563
	Compumart, Inc.	9,658
	DK & R Company	8,815*
	Emtec Data, Inc.	557*
	International Business Supplies	14,418*
	Inmac Computer Supplies	24,272
	M & M Computer Supplies, Inc.	213*
	Martin Associates, Inc.	273*
	Matrix Data Corporation	332*
	P. S. Data Supply	11,853
	Price-Modern, Inc.	940
	Virginia Impression Products Company, Inc.	353
	TOTAL	<u>\$ 142,675</u>
191-91	Photographic Supplies and Equipment for Sherwood High School AWARDEES	
	Ace Scientific	\$ 4,514
	American Printing Equipment and Supply Kunz, Inc.	495 306
	Penn Camera Exchange, Inc.	20,831
	Photopro	349
	47th Street Photo	3,817
	TOTAL	<u>\$ 30,312</u>
196-91	Wiping/Polishing Cloths AWARDEES	
	Consolidated Maintenance Supply, Inc.	\$ 43,400*
	General Wiping Cloth Company, Inc.	5,460
	TOTAL	<u>\$ 48,860</u>
197-91	Cafeteria Disposable Supplies, Supplement AWARDEES	
	Acme Paper and Supply Company, Inc.	\$ 8,686
	Calico Industries, Inc.	326
	S. Freedman and Sons, Inc.	20,100
	Kahn Paper Company, Inc.	51,678
	TOTAL	<u>\$ 80,790</u>
	MORE THAN \$25,000	\$5,516,597

*Denotes MFD vendors

RESOLUTION NO. 557-91 Re: BID NO. 110-91, PURCHASE,

WHEREAS, The low bids are below the staff estimates of \$70,000 and \$64,000, respectively; and

WHEREAS, It is more efficient to have the project contractors coordinate and supervise the EMS installations; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education approve the following contracts for energy management system installations and assign them through change orders to the project general contractors for implementation and supervision:

	PROJECT
Damascus Elementary School #6	Contractor: Hess Construction Company, Inc. Subcontractor: Systems 4, Inc. Change Order: \$59,370
Fairland Elementary School	Contractor: Columbia Construct. Co., Inc. Subcontractor: Systems 4, Inc. Change Order: \$58,190

RESOLUTION NO. 559-91 Re: CABLE TV/TELECOMMUNICATIONS NETWORK INSTALLATION AT BURNING TREE AND VIERS MILL ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS, BRIGGS CHANEY MIDDLE SCHOOL, AND SHERWOOD HIGH SCHOOL

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

WHEREAS, The following sealed bids for cable TV/telecommunications network installations were received on June 26, 1991:

SCHOOL	BIDDER	BID
Burning Tree ES	B & W Communications	\$ 11,950
	Lite-Way Communications, Inc.	13,997
	B & L Services, Inc.	14,400
Viers Mill ES	B & W Communications	12,025
	Lite-Way Communications, Inc.	14,113
	B & L Services, Inc.	15,400
Briggs Chaney MS	Lite-Way Communications, Inc.	22,280
	B & L Services, Inc.	26,700
	B & W Communications	34,880

July 9, 1991

Banneker Middle School and Poolesville
 Junior/Senior High School
 LOW BIDDER: Metro Metal Services, Inc. \$ 93,915

HVAC Renovation

Piney Branch Elementary School
 LOW BIDDER: E. J. Murray Co., Inc. 129,900

RESOLUTION NO. 561-91 Re: AWARD OF CONTRACT - TRAVILAH
 ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

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

WHEREAS, The following bids were received on June 20, 1991, for the modernization and addition to Travilah Elementary School, which is scheduled to begin in July and be completed by August 1, 1992:

BIDDER	AMOUNT
1. Bildon, Inc.	\$2,652,800
2. Dustin Construction, Inc.	2,750,000
3. Hess Construction Company	2,777,800
4. Triangle General Contractors, Inc.	2,807,500
5. Kettler Bros. Construction Co., Inc.	2,821,500
6. Henley Construction Co., Inc.	2,884,000
7. The Gassman Corporation	2,891,000
8. Coakley Williams Construction Co.Inc	2,927,300
9. Lynmar Corporation of Virginia, Inc.	3,229,720

and

WHEREAS, The low bidder, Bildon, Inc., has successfully completed similar projects in the Washington Metropolitan area and the Richard Montgomery concession stand/fieldhouse, and their bid is below the staff estimate of \$2,700,00; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That a \$2,652,800 contract be awarded to Bildon, Inc., for the modernization and addition to Travilah Elementary School, in accordance with plans and specifications prepared by Wiencek + Zavos, Architects, P.C.

RESOLUTION NO. 562-91 Re: AWARD OF CONTRACT - BEL PRE
ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

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

WHEREAS, Bids were received on June 25, 1991, for the addition to Bel Pre Elementary School, with work to begin in July and be completed by August 1, 1992:

BIDDER	AMOUNT
1. 722 Construction Corporation	\$ 962,722
2. Smith & Haines, Inc.	1,014,100
3. Lynmar Corp. of Virginia, Inc.	1,022,000
4. Ruppert Bros. Constr. Co., Inc.	1,045,580
5. Caldwell and Santmyer Inc.	1,063,000
6. Henley Construction Co., Inc.	1,068,000
7. Northwood Contractors, Inc.	1,097,000
8. Tri-M Construction, Inc.	1,118,000
9. R. J. Crowley, Inc.	1,119,000
10. H. V. Lancon Construction Co.	1,179,000
11. Jenkins Construction Mgmt., Inc.	1,263,000
12. Ronald Hsu Construction Co., Inc.	1,287,400

and

WHEREAS, The low bidder, 722 Construction Corporation, is successfully completing similar work for Montgomery County Public Schools, and their bid is below the staff estimate of \$1,300,000; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That a \$962,722 contract be awarded to 722 Construction Corporation for the addition to Bel Pre Elementary School, in accordance with plans and specifications prepared by Arley J. Koran, Inc.

RESOLUTION NO. 563-91 Re: AWARD OF CONTRACT - CARDEROCK
SPRINGS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

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

WHEREAS, Bids were received on June 26, 1991 for the IMC modifications at Carderock Springs Elementary School, with work to begin in July and be completed by August 15, 1991:

July 9, 1991

BIDDER	AMOUNT
1. Heritage Builders, Inc.	\$ 97,000
2. Smith & Haines, Inc.	105,150
3. Hanlon Construction Company, Inc.	113,380

and

WHEREAS, The low bidder, Heritage Builders, Inc., has successfully completed similar projects in the Washington metropolitan area; and

WHEREAS, The low bid is below the staff estimate of \$100,000; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That a \$97,000 contract be awarded to Heritage Builders, Inc., for the IMC modifications at Carderock Springs Elementary School, in accordance with plans and specifications prepared by the Department of School Facilities.

RESOLUTION NO. 564-91 Re: AWARD OF CONTRACT - GLENALLAN
ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

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

WHEREAS, The following bids were received on June 27, 1991, for the addition to Glenallan Elementary School, which is scheduled to begin in July and be completed by August 1, 1992:

BIDDER	AMOUNT
1. Tri-M Construction, Inc.	\$614,201
2. Smith & Haines, Inc.	637,000
3. Ruppert Bros. Constr. Co., Inc.	639,130
4. Heritage Builders, Inc.	647,600
5. Caldwell and Santmyer Inc.	651,000
6. J. Shaw Construction, Inc.	652,252
7. Henley Construction Co., Inc.	656,000
8. 722 Construction Corporation	667,722
9. Keller Brothers, Inc.	676,000
10. Lynmar Corporation	696,140
11. Ronald Hsu Construction Co., Inc.	713,600
12. Northwood Contractors, Inc.	721,000

and

WHEREAS, The low bidder, Tri-M Construction, Inc., has successfully completed similar work in other local jurisdictions and their bid is below the staff estimate of \$700,000; now

therefore be it

RESOLVED, That a \$614,201 contract be awarded to Tri-M Construction, Inc., for the addition to Glenallan Elementary School, in accordance with plans and specifications prepared by Wanchul Lee Associates, P. C.

RESOLUTION NO. 565-91 Re: ARCHITECTURAL CONTRACT EXTENSION -
MONOCACY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL (PHASE
II)

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

WHEREAS, It is necessary to obtain professional and technical services during the design and construction phases of the proposed addition to Monocacy Elementary School; and

WHEREAS, Funds for architectural planning were appropriated as part of the FY 1992 budget; and

WHEREAS, Staff has negotiated a fee with the architect of the recent modernization of Monocacy Elementary School and recommends retention of that firm to provide design and construction administration services for the Phase II classroom addition; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education approve an increase of \$42,500 to the contract with Fox-Hanna, Architects, to provide professional design and construction administration services for the Monocacy Elementary School addition, which is 8.5 percent of the estimated construction cost.

RESOLUTION NO. 566-91 Re: REDUCTION OF RETAINAGE - DR.
CHARLES R. DREW ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

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

WHEREAS, Donohoe Construction Company, general contractor for Dr. Charles R. Drew Elementary School, has completed 92 percent of all specified requirements, and has requested that the 10 percent retainage, which is based on the completed work to date, be reduced to 5 percent; and

WHEREAS, The project bonding company, Seaboard Surety Company, has consented to this reduction; and

WHEREAS, The project architect, Grimm & Parker, Architects, recommended this request for reduction be approved; now therefore

July 9, 1991

WHEREAS, The project architect and staff have reviewed the cost proposal and feel it is equitable; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That a \$28,696 change order to the contract with The Gassman Corporation for the fire code changes for Briggs Chaney Middle School be approved.

RESOLUTION NO. 569-91 Re: FY 1992 SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION
FOR A SUMMER MARYLAND'S TOMORROW
PROGRAM

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Mrs. DiFonzo seconded by Mrs. Brenneman, 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 1992 supplemental appropriation of \$97,465 in federal funds under the Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA) through the Montgomery County Private Industry Council (PIC) for a summer Maryland's Tomorrow program in the following categories:

CATEGORY	AMOUNT
2 Instructional Salaries	\$69,318
3 Other Instructional Costs	11,500
7 Student Transportation	11,100
10 Fixed Charges	5,547
TOTAL	<u>\$97,465</u>

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.

RESOLUTION NO. 570-91 Re: FY 1992 SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION
FOR THE HOWARD HUGHES MEDICAL
INSTITUTE STUDENT/TEACHER
INTERNSHIP PROGRAM AT THE NATIONAL
INSTITUTES OF HEALTH (NIH)

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

RESOLVED, That in accordance with the resolution from the MCPS Educational Foundation, Inc., the Board of Education accept the funds awarded to the Foundation by the Howard Hughes Medical Institute; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the superintendent of schools be authorized, subject to County Council approval, to receive and expend an FY 1992 supplemental appropriation of \$140,000 from the Howard Hughes Medical Institute, in cooperation with the National Institutes of Health (NIH), through the Educational Foundation, Inc., to continue an internship program for biology teachers and students, in the following categories:

CATEGORY	POSITIONS*	AMOUNT
2 Instructional Salaries	1.5	\$ 85,025
3 Other Instructional Costs		33,956
10 Fixed Charges	—	21,019

Total	1.5	\$140,000

*1.5 Teacher, A-D (10 month)

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.

RESOLUTION NO. 571-91 Re: TUITION FOR OUT-OF-COUNTY PUPILS
FOR FY 1992

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

WHEREAS, Resolution 364-77 that established the basis for nonresident tuition charges provides that the per pupil cost shall be based on the current year's estimated cost including debt service; and

WHEREAS, The basis for the calculation of cost per pupil for tuition purposes in FY 1992 is as follows:

	KINDERGARTEN	ELEMENTARY	MIDDLE INTERMEDIATE SENIOR	SPECIAL
Estimated Number of pupils	8,984	46,582	46,039	4,626

COST

Regular Program	\$32,754,229	\$259,575,172	\$303,314,983	\$64,327,735
Debt Service	2,270,938	17,976,976	17,767,421	1,785,271

Re: SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION PROGRESS REPORT

Mr. Richard Hawes, director of the Division of Construction, reviewed the status of school modernization and construction programs. They hoped to occupy Viers Mill Elementary School in August, but with some slight slippages in one or two projects, all other projects were on schedule.

Mrs. Hobbs pointed out that they had almost reached a point when they would be equally divided between new contractors and those working for MCPS previously. Mr. Hawes commented that all of the MCPS construction inspectors were seasoned; therefore, a veteran inspector would be assigned to every project. Ms. Gutierrez asked Mr. Hawes to state for the record that there was no project that was in trouble and would not be completed by the beginning of school, and Mr. Hawes assured her that this was correct.

RESOLUTION NO. 573-91 Re: ORGANIZATIONAL CHANGES IN THE
OFFICE OF THE SUPERINTENDENT OF
SCHOOLS

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Ms. Gutierrez seconded by Mrs. Brenneman, the following resolution was adopted with Mrs. Brenneman, Dr. Cheung, Mrs. Fanconi, Ms. Gutierrez, and Mrs. Hobbs voting in the affirmative; Mrs. DiFonzo abstaining*:

WHEREAS, The Office of the Superintendent of Schools now includes one deputy superintendent with executive management responsibilities for all offices and departments of MCPS; and

WHEREAS, The ongoing improvement of our school system would be enhanced through a unified approach to the development and implementation of instructional programs and a unified approach to the management of central office services to local schools; and

WHEREAS, There needs to be an even stronger emphasis on instructional leadership, locally and centrally, allowing more attention for program development and performance accountability, as well as assistance to the Board of Education in establishing effective educational policy; and

WHEREAS, Efficiency and effectiveness can be further improved within the administration of MCPS through an organizational change in the Office of the Superintendent of Schools that creates a more focused approach to the instructional and administrative functions with fewer executive staff positions; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education approves the abolishment of

REASSIGNMENT	FROM	TO
Arlie Kingery	Principal Academic Lv.	Principal Bradley Hills ES Effective: 7-10-91
APPOINTMENT	PRESENT POSITION	AS
Kathy Brake	Prev. Act. Princ. Kemp Mill ES	Principal Washington Grove ES Effective: 7-10-91
Sandra Dugoff	Principal Trainee Goshen ES	Principal Goshen ES Effective: 7-10-91
Jane Litchko	Principal Trainee Stedwick ES	Principal Jackson Rd. ES Effective: 7-10-91
Jeffrey Martinez	Principal Trainee Rolling Terr. ES	Principal Rosemary Hills ES Effective: 7-10-91
Sandra McAmis	Principal Trainee Georgian For. ES	Principal Fox Chapel ES Effective: 7-10-91
Janice M. Geletka	Act. Coordinator of Career Ed. Div. of Career & Voc. Ed.	Coordinator of Career Ed. Div. of Career & Voc Ed. Grade N Effective: 7-10-91
REASSIGNMENT	FROM	TO
Ann Richardson	Coordinator of Inter. Arts Div. of Aesthetic Education	Coordinator of Secondary Art Div. of Aesthetic Education Grade N Effective: 7-10-91
Judith Docca	Asst. Principal Academic Leave	Asst. Principal Montgomery Blair HS Effective: 7-10-91

RESOLUTION NO. 578-91 Re: PERSONNEL APPOINTMENTS

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Mrs. Fanconi seconded by Dr. Cheung, the following resolution was adopted with Mrs. Brenneman, Dr. Cheung, Mrs. Fanconi, Ms. Gutierrez, and Mrs. Hobbs voting in the affirmative; Mrs. DiFonzo abstaining:

RESOLVED, That the following personnel appointments be approved:

APPOINTMENT	PRESENT POSITION	AS
Katheryn Gemberling	Assoc. Supt. Office of Instruc. & Program Dev.	Deputy Supt. for Instruction Effective: 7-10-91
H. Philip Rohr	Assoc. Supt. for Suppt. Svs.	Deputy Supt. for Planning, Tech. & Suppt. Svs. Effective: 7-10-91

RESOLUTION NO. 579-91 Re: MODERNIZATION/RENOVATIONS

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Ms. Gutierrez seconded by Dr. Cheung, the following resolution was adopted with Mrs. Brenneman, Dr. Cheung, Mrs. DiFonzo, Ms. Gutierrez, and Mrs. Hobbs voting in the affirmative; Mrs. Fanconi voting in the negative#:

RESOLVED, That modernization planning continue for six elementary schools: Ashburton, Brookhaven, Clarksburg, Forest Knolls, Meadow Hall, and Oakland Terrace; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education will adopt its FY 1992-98 Capital Improvements Program following consideration of a Modernization/Renovation policy in Fall, 1991.

Mr. Ewing rejoined the meeting and assumed the chair.

RESOLUTION NO. 580-91 Re: AVAILABLE CAPITAL FUNDS

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

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education defer a decision on the expenditure of available funds from the Damascus #6 and the Pine Crest projects until bids are received for White Oak and Pyle; and be it further

RESOLVED, That during the summer, staff will pursue ways to accommodate Meadow Hall students and program beginning mid-year

1991-92 to eliminate a potential impact on interim housing for the FY 1993 modernization schedule.

Re: A MOTION BY MRS. FANCONI ON
DAMASCUS ELEMENTARY #6 (FAILED)

A motion by Mrs. Fanconi that the superintendent direct staff to explore options to build a gym at Damascus ES #6 failed for lack of a second.

Re: SCIENCE AND MATHEMATICS EDUCATION

Dr. Vance reported that he had provided the Board with some materials for this discussion including the June 12 resolution, a memo from him, and additional information about national and state trends in mathematics and science education. He had asked Mrs. Gemberling and staff if they could convene several focus groups to look at the recommendation to change graduation requirements for Montgomery County.

Mrs. Gemberling stated that the paper before the Board focused on the high school graduation issue in the original resolution on science and mathematics education. She indicated that the State of Maryland was still considering changes in graduation requirements, and it appeared that they might be backing off from requiring three credits in science. There was nothing to prohibit MCPS from having a higher requirement for graduation. However, she was concerned that the state might have a requirement for a credit in technical education. She felt that the implications of the state changes did not have much of an impact on the MCPS student population, particularly as they looked at the program changes and new initiatives in Montgomery County. However, teachers and administrators were concerned about some students and some issues if the requirements were increased. There were issues about vocational programs because they would have to be able to do some curricular accommodations there to allow those students to be able to meet the increased math and science requirements. These students would not have enough hours in their day to meet the increased requirements and to take advanced technical training.

Mrs. Gemberling commented that another issue was staffing. If they increased math and science requirements, this would affect other content areas. They would also need to do some retraining with teachers who had been accustomed to a select audience. If the requirements were extended to all students, they would have to consider this in their instructional strategies and presentations.

Mrs. Gemberling noted that they suggested that in addition to considering the proposed four math and four science credits, they should consider a combined seven credits. This would give

students an option in terms of interests and special needs. Increased math did not seem to affect their ESOL population as much as the increase in the science did. However, for their special education students, the increase would be significant. For math, well over 85 percent of the students would be affected.

Even an increase to three in science would affect 90 percent of their special education students. To go to four credits would affect them all.

Mrs. Fanconi asked how this would affect the WOC program. Mrs. Gemberling replied that they would have to be able to make accommodations through the outcomes within the on-the-job training. It would depend on when the student started that program. Students had to get an English credit every year, and if they went to four and four, they would have to do math and science every year. They would still have to get in three social studies, a fine arts, and a physical education. Therefore, they would have to be able to incorporate outcomes from the internship, WOC, and Edison Center programs.

In regard to the use of computers, Dr. Cheung thought they would facilitate learning in math and science, especially in this information-oriented society. Computers could even reduce the time for learning in terms of math. He felt that it was important for children to acquire analytical skills and use computer graphics. He asked if staff could expand in terms of computer technology and information technology in regard to the curriculum. He had attended a conference on the future, and he understood that Texas, Florida, and California had a goal of providing one computer terminal for each student by the year 2000. While MCPS did not have to go that far, he thought they needed links to local area networks for each secondary student. Mrs. Gemberling replied that no one would disagree with Dr. Cheung's remarks. She reported that technology was an integral part of what they were trying to do with new programs; however, they did not try to tie in a particular technological requirement to the credit requirements.

Mrs. Brenneman remarked that conceptually this was a good idea to encourage more math and science. The question was which students were they trying to affect by this requirement. Were colleges asking for more? Were students not getting into colleges because they did not have enough credits? The second part of the question was the business community and whether they were requiring more math and science courses. She had done an informal survey at the Education Breakfast, and no one appeared to be asking for this. Dr. Cheung said that three people from the Connection had told him that math and science should be strengthened because it was important for the workforce in the year 2000. While workers might not need a college education, they should know about statistical and quality control. Right now, business people needed mathematical analysis to be

competitive. American workers needed to have basic math and science skills to be competitive globally.

Mr. Ewing recalled that about a year ago the president of the University of Maryland had spoken to him about increasing math and science requirements because of the skills of MCPS graduates attending the University. The president had indicated his support for Mr. Ewing's proposal and offered to come to speak to the Board about this issue. Mr. Ewing said his work at the Pentagon involved improving the efficiency of the Department of Defense. In one case, he had visited a site where the employees had to be retrained by the government because they used algebra, statistics, and computers on a daily basis. Federal Express was using college students rather than high school graduates because of their requirements for a knowledge of statistical analysis.

Mr. Ewing said they had to prepare students for success. The evidence was all around them that they needed to do things they had never done before. Since he had been on the Board, the level of math courses had gone up. However, they still had students who did not know how math and science related to their lives and being good citizens. He believed they should increase requirements in this area so that they would have students graduating who were really competitive. Math and science were ideas whose time had come and was even overdue. There was a long standing view that math and science were only for a select few, but if math and science were required for everyone, everyone would have to be taught, and teachers would have to figure out how to teach all students. He believed that citizens were not educated if they did not have a knowledge of math and science.

Assuming that at some point they did require four years of math and science, Mrs. Brenneman thought that the important part was at the elementary school level. She said that in many cases at the elementary school, science was fit in as it could. Math might be everyday, but science was not, and this was unfortunate.

Mr. Pishevar had submitted a paper about his feelings on how math was taught at the elementary level. From talking with students, she believed that very often math at the elementary level was repetitive which stifled enthusiasm for math at that level. Therefore, they would have to focus at the elementary level if they increased high school requirements.

Mrs. Fanconi said that the paper talked a little bit about hiring elementary teachers having more math preparation. In Dr. Pitt's memo there was mention that this was not how elementary teachers were being prepared. She would like some discussion about this and about what was happening at the high school level in terms of their math and science teachers who were reaching retirement age.

She reported that at the University of Maryland no one was going into the math and science education curriculum.

Ms. Joy Odom, mathematics supervisor, replied that last year they had not hired many math teachers. They had 300 applicants for four positions, and in the math area they were not seeing a lack of qualified teachers. Dr. Wayne Moyer, science supervisor, added that a similar situation prevailed in science because of the reputation of Montgomery County. Ms. Odom remarked that they tried to hire those doing student teaching in MCPS because of their technology skills. Dr. Moyer stated that every year he received three or four calls from Ph.D. people interested in changing careers. Mrs. Gemberling commented that education as a second career was a growing phenomenon.

Mrs. Fanconi asked staff to speak to the issue of the preparation of elementary school teachers. Mrs. Gemberling replied that the requirements for elementary teachers were minimal in the area of science and math; however, MCPS did try to do its own in-service training. Dr. Vance thought that Dr. Pitt was on target when he recommended that they start talking with colleges and universities about their standards and course requirements in teacher training programs. Now that the president and secretary of education had spoken to this issue, he felt that something might be done.

Mr. Ewing recalled that in September of 1990 he had asked the MCPS personnel director about the percentage of elementary school teachers who would meet the increased requirement for science and math. The reply was about 30 percent; therefore, this was not a requirement they would find it easy to live with. They might have to find other ways through staff training to get at this. MCPS was already doing quite a bit of that.

Mrs. Fanconi asked whether it would be more practical to recommend requiring teachers to get X-amount of training in the first two years of employment. Dr. Vance replied that there would be a number of options, but these were contingent upon the Board's actions in this area. Economically, they were moving more and more into a buyer's market even with teachers. He thought that universities might be much more amenable for preparing their graduates for the job market if they knew this was an increasing requirement.

Mr. Ewing said it was important to note that the issue on which Mrs. Gemberling had spoken had been the secondary issue rather than the elementary issue. They were closely related because they could hardly raise the requirements for graduation without its having an effect all the way through the school system. He said that it was the judgment of Dr. Pitt, Dr. Vance, and Mrs. Gemberling that the place to focus first was on the high school graduation requirements.

Ms. Gutierrez remarked that she heard two answers to the question raised by Mrs. Fanconi. The first was they had ample candidates

who were more than well qualified at the secondary level, but this seemed to contradict the other comment that elementary school teachers did not have the qualifications. Mrs. Gemberling explained that there were different requirements for elementary and secondary teachers. Secondary people had to have a content specialty area, and the elementary teachers were trained across all the content areas. Ms. Gutierrez asked if they had been looking at the science and math training of elementary school candidates. Mrs. Gemberling replied that if they wanted to increase the requirements for the elementary teachers, they would have to make adjustments such as provisional hiring with some additional training required during a certain time period. If they were focusing on increasing the graduation requirements, that was not as critical an issue in terms of hiring. However, there was another hiring issue. If they increased graduation requirements, there would be a shift in terms of enrollment because there would be enrollment drops in other areas which could affect staffing and hiring practices.

Mrs. Brenneman requested information on teacher hiring requirements from other Maryland counties as well as Fairfax. She thought they might be able to work with other counties to influence the course work at the University of Maryland. She asked whether they interacted with the other counties as far as letting the University know their needs. Ms. Odom replied that every year all the math coordinators in the state had met with the University of Maryland. They had worked through issues, and everyone was concerned about updating math and science. The question was how could they do this fast enough to keep up with Florida, California, and Texas. Recently they had met with Montgomery College and the University about a graphing calculator that would be used in MCPS. In her experience, the University had said that the school system had to do a better job in math and science. However, she had challenged them about Montgomery County and had been told that MCPS students were doing fine. She hoped that they would not lose the idea of the four credits because from repairing copy machines to automobiles, students needed more math.

Mr. Ewing pointed out that Dr. Vance had stated that they were in a buyer's market, and if they wanted to be responsive to what the president of the University of Maryland had told them about having more students with more preparation and also wanted something from the University, they had a nice bargain to strike. He suggested that maybe the Board needed to meet with the University. He also thought that Mrs. Brenneman's suggestion about getting together with other school systems was an excellent one.

Dr. Ben Marlin, principal of Gaithersburg High School, said that his concern would be the timing and not getting into something they were not prepared to do well. They were going to have to do

a lot of serious in-service training with staff. He noted that he had been trained as an elementary school teacher. They tended to forget that in most school systems in the country, the elementary teacher taught everything. They had to be generalists, and he did not think that colleges would change their programs to accommodate Montgomery County.

Mrs. DiFonzo pointed out that one of the things that universities held near and dear was the follow-up data from their graduates about how many of them were able to get jobs. It seemed to her that if their graduates were not able to land jobs in Montgomery County, they would get the message real quick. Dr. Marlin thought that when recruiting they should get the word out that teachers should consider a minor in math or science to get a job in Montgomery County. Mrs. DiFonzo thought that his point about the timing was crucial. They should not fly in and try to do something they were not prepared to do. If they did this, they had to do it for the right reason and at the right time.

Mrs. Hobbs asked what effect additional requirements would have on health, physical education, and vocational programs. Dr. Marlin replied that electives would be dropped. By increasing the graduation requirements they limited options for students which affected staffing.

Ms. Gutierrez thought that they needed to break out of the mold of the seven-period day or the six-period day. They were already doing this with the algebra program. She had spoken with other Board members at the National School Boards Association and there was a school in Utah that had eight-period days but only on alternate days. She believed that they could be creative in accommodating the needs of students and were already doing this with the vocational program. Dr. Marlin explained that they were bound by the number of hours for credit which was a state law. A lot of schools had eight-period days, but the bottom line was a student had to have 135 hours to get that credit.

Mrs. Gemberling pointed out that one of the things the state Board was wrestling with around new graduation requirements was the possibility of moving away from the hours for determining a credit to an outcomes based approach. Montgomery County needed to look at that carefully because it did make a lot of difference in looking at what they wanted students to know and to demonstrate as opposed to sitting in a classroom for a fixed number of hours. This might happen in two or three years. Ms. Gutierrez inquired about the impact on special education and ESOL. She wondered whether the state was considering this impact. Mrs. Gemberling did not know whether this had come up for discussion. The state was still debating whether they would increase to three science credits because they were considering

an alternative of three science and two science and a tech ed. She remarked that many of the special education students did not get full diplomas which was another reason the state did not deal with this. MCPS tried very hard to have their students earn full diplomas, and this would be a factor for those students.

Mrs. Fanconi said she would like to talk about three issues: gender equity, the timing of the recommendations, and expanding math options without changing the number of credits. On gender equity, a study was being done at Harvard where girls and boys did math problems and submitted a journal of what they were thinking as they were doing the problems. Girls were saying they were too dumb to do the problems, and the boys were saying that the teacher gave them a dumb problem. Gender equity issues affected math and science and it even went to culture. Japanese parents told students not succeeding in math that they just hadn't done it yet and had to work a little harder. Americans were more likely to say that girls were not good at math anyway. She believed they had to look at how teachers in early childhood education were dealing with gender stereotypes.

Dr. Vance asked Dr. Joy Frechtling, director of the Department of Educational Accountability, to comment. Dr. Frechtling stated that they had done a study about three years ago looking at the participation of women and minorities in mathematics. In Montgomery County they seemed to be ahead of the curve in the sense of having quite equitable participation in math, especially the higher level math. In addition, girls were being very successful in these courses. She recalled that some parents had stated that girls did not need to do math, but there was less gender stereotyping on the part of students. The picture painted from the Harvard research was not something they got from MCPS students three or four years ago. She thought that the lack of stereotyping would be even stronger now.

Mrs. Fanconi thought this was something they needed to keep in mind. In terms of timing, she asked when they would be looking at the state's decisions and how this compared to Mr. Ewing's plan. Mr. Ewing said he had suggested some dates for implementation which would need to change. He believed that timing was an educational decision, and they needed to time this in the way that made the most sense from the point of view of the superintendent. They would hear about the state's decisions when they were made. Dr. Vance indicated that staff would need time to consider all the implications for implementation if the Board adopted the proposal.

Mrs. Fanconi asked whether the superintendent would be bringing the Board recommendations about the timing or whether the Board would make the decision first and then the superintendent would consider the timing. Dr. Vance replied that he would like to submit a plan to plan when the Board returned to this topic.

Ms. Gutierrez hoped that it would not take a very long time to implement these recommendations. She felt that they were facing a crisis in this area and there was an urgency for them to be competitive in the world. They had to begin to produce those scientists and mathematicians needed. In some cases, these people would have college degrees, and in other cases they would be technical people. In her job, there was a need for people to interpret and analyze data. She felt they were going to need incredible capabilities to look at their own survival as a human race. When compared with Japan and European countries, the United States ranked near the bottom in terms of math and science. She would like MCPS to move as quickly as possible in this area.

Mrs. Brenneman agreed that an increase in science and math was important. Her concern was which students they were trying to affect. If it was going to be for all students, that had to be clearly understood. The second point was whether they had the resources to do this including staff development funds.

Mrs. Fanconi agreed with Ms. Gutierrez that they should be completely committed to improving the success of individual students. However, changing a graduation requirement might not be the best way. She would like a plan on what was likely to be the most successful way of doing this. It might be a combination of staff training, complete implementation of the ISM, involving business, expanding current options, etc. It might not be saying they were just going to do four math and four science. She wanted to see a plan and how this would be timed. She believed in the double period algebra, but she pointed out that they were not requiring all students to take algebra. They were looking at successful teaching strategies for students, and that was the kind of analysis they needed. The purpose of the policy was to improve the capabilities of all students in math and science, and that began in early childhood education, with better elementary math teachers, with new teaching strategies, etc.

Mr. Ewing explained that the intent of the policy statement was to start the process of getting everyone in the school system and the Board and the community thinking about what they ought to do about math and science. In that sense, even though the Board had not adopted it, it had had that effect. The Board should say what it thought the goal ought to be. In his view, the goal was not just more math and science. There were some specifics in there that stated the things that students ought to know by the time they graduated from high school. In that sense, he thought the clear direction of the proposal was that all students would be affected because all students could and should learn this. In Montgomery County most students took math and science well beyond the minimum, but not all students did this. He thought that the concern over special education and vocational students was real,

and they needed to address that. He felt that in the field of vocational education, the courses that students took in advanced vocational education required mathematical understanding of all sorts. Therefore, there should be some creative thinking to devise modules of courses that addressed the requirements for four years of math. The same thing was true with regard to special education, although this was a tougher problem. Public policy was made for the general case and not the special case, and these were special cases. However, policy should allow for exceptions. The superintendent should be requested to provide information on how to deal with these exceptions. As far as the matter of culture, Mr. Ewing pointed out that culture sometimes got changed by policy decisions. A decision that all students were to take math and science could constitute such a culture change because everyone from the kindergarten teacher to the high school senior would know that the expectation in the school system was that everyone would learn math regardless of sex, race, creed, and color.

As far as there being a crisis, Mr. Ewing agreed with Ms. Gutierrez. For example, the Defense Department was hobbled because so many defense industries belonged to foreign countries.

It was not the case that American industry was so inefficient, but it was because they did not have scientifically and technologically trained people to manage those enterprises. This put them at great risk as a nation. Dr. Cheung expressed his agreement with those views.

Mr. Ewing reported that the Board had raised a number of questions and made a number of suggestions that the superintendent should address in his recommendations. They should start with the secondary emphasis and ask the superintendent to show the Board the different impacts of an eight and a seven credit requirement, to respond to the question of vocational, special education, and ESOL students, and to make some recommendations for actions. Mrs. Gemberling explained that if the Board wanted a formal set of recommendations, the staff would need more time. If the Board wanted information around the broader issues, the staff could have this for discussion on September 10. It seemed to Mr. Ewing that most Board members would like a number of questions answered in more detail. Dr. Vance stated that he shared the desire to move on this. At the September meeting, he would share a plan to plan.

RESOLUTION NO. 581-91 Re: REDISTRIBUTION OF CLUSTERS TO THREE
ADMINISTRATIVE AREAS

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

WHEREAS, The Executive Staff considered five options that would

redistribute the management of county schools from four to three area offices; and

WHEREAS, The fiscal year began on July 1 with reduced area staffing; and

WHEREAS, Copies of the recommended three-area reorganization have been distributed to school community representatives for information and comments; and

WHEREAS, Community comments have been forwarded to the Board of Education; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education approves a reorganization into three administrative areas, effective July 10, 1991, with the areas to be composed of the following high school clusters:

AREA 1	AREA 2	AREA 3
B-CC	Kennedy	Damascus
Blair	Magruder	Gaithersburg
Churchill	Paint Branch	R. Montgomery
Einstein	Rockville	Poolesville
W. Johnson	Sherwood	Quince Orchard
Whitman	Springbrook	Seneca Valley
Wootton	Wheaton	Watkins Mill

Re: BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS

Mrs. Brenneman reported that on June 30 she had attended the ceremony for Lincoln Park's 100th anniversary. The event had been attended by a lot of people from MCPS. For example, Hiawatha Fountain, Tom Evans, and Billy Gordon had participated in the program. She thought that it was a very nice celebration, and she extended congratulations to the community.

RESOLUTION NO. 582-91 Re: EXECUTIVE SESSION - JULY 22, 1991

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Mrs. DiFonzo seconded by Mrs. Fanconi, 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 July 22, 1991, at 6:45 p.m. to discuss, consider, deliberate, and/or otherwise decide the employment, assignment, appointment, promotion, demotion, compensation, discipline, removal, or

RESOLUTION NO. 586-91 Re: RECEPTION FOR FORMER BOARD MEMBERS

On motion of Mr. Ewing seconded by Dr. Cheung, the following resolution was adopted with Mrs. Brenneman, Dr. Cheung, Mrs. DiFonzo, Mr. Ewing, Mrs. Fanconi, and Ms. Gutierrez voting in the affirmative; Mrs. Hobbs abstaining:

RESOLVED, That the Board schedule a reception or other event for all present and former Board members.

RESOLUTION NO. 587-91 Re: BOE APPEAL NOS. 1991-9, - 28, and - 31

On motion of Mrs. Hobbs seconded by Mrs. DiFonzo, the following resolution was adopted unanimously:

RESOLVED, That BOE Appeals Nos. 1991-9, -28, and -31 be dismissed at the request of the appellants.

Re: LEGISLATIVE UPDATE

Mr. Ewing thanked MCPS staff who put together the testimony he delivered in Annapolis. He cited Lois Stoner, Larry Bowers, Brian Porter, and Paul Vance. No other school system showed up with testimony in hand, and he was glad that MCPS had made the effort to testify before the Joint Expenditure Group on Education and Human Resources. Mrs. Stoner and Barbara Heyman of the county staff had worked on July 4 to put the testimony together.

Mr. Ewing reported that there were many questions for him about Montgomery County and its concerns. He did not talk about problems but rather changes in the county that they regarded as challenges. He had told the group that Montgomery County needed the help of the state in meeting those challenges. The state needed to recognize that Montgomery County was an increasingly urban place with urban characteristics. Both he and Mrs. Stoner thought the statement was well received. He hoped that the committee would understand that it was a united position of the county executive, County Council, and Board of Education. The committee had requested copies of the Board's reports on efficiencies and other issues.

Re: ITEMS OF INFORMATION

Board members received the following items of information:

1. Items in Process
2. Approval of Computer Applications Revisions (for future action)
3. Proposal on Adult Education Fees for Senior Citizens (for future action)

Re: ADJOURNMENT

The president adjourned the meeting to an executive session on appeals at 5:20 p.m.

PRESIDENT

SECRETARY

PLV:mlw