





89-05	Occupational Therapy and Physical Therapy Service - Extension <u>Awardee</u> Polcari Therapy Services, Inc.	\$ 258,230*
91-01	Physical Examinations for School Bus Drivers - Extension <u>Awardees</u> Dr. George Kenton Secure Medical Care White Flint Medical Building Medical Access Dr. Hugo Arias Potomac Patient Care	*
	Total	\$ 54,000
92-01	Dataflex Programming Analysis Documentation and Technical Writing <u>Awardees</u> Compusearch Software Systems Executive Tactics Corporation	\$ 25,000 <u>10,000</u>
	Total	\$ 35,000
68-2	Purchase of School Buses <u>Awardee</u> Centers for the Handicapped, Inc.	\$ 84,000
77-2	Computer Assisted Software Engineering Productivity Tools <u>Awardee</u> Computer Associates International, Inc.	\$ 60,149
132-90	Administrative Microcomputer Equipment - Extension <u>Awardee</u> HLA Connecting Point Computer Centers	\$ 150,000
193-91	Telephone Systems and Equipment <u>Awardees</u> Alarm-It Distributors Alltel Supply, Inc. Arius Security Distribution Atlas Communications, Inc. Graybar Electric Company, Inc. Mid Atlantic Cable North Supply	\$ 57,414* 10,340 11,913 11,706* 109,480 6,793 <u>105,947</u>
	Total	\$ 313,593



<u>Project</u>	<u>Amount</u>
Heating Systems Revision Bus Garage, Shady Grove Depot <u>Low Bidder</u> : G. W. Mechanical Contractors, Inc.	\$43,974
Boiler and Fuel Burner Replacements Bethesda Elementary School <u>Low Bidder</u> : Mech-Air, Inc.	50,400

RESOLUTION NO. 728-91 Re: CHANGE ORDER OVER \$25,000

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

WHEREAS, The Department of School Facilities has received a change order proposal for a capital project that exceeds \$25,000; and

WHEREAS, Staff and the project architect have reviewed this change order and found it to be equitable; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Board of Education approve the following change order for the amount and contract indicated:

Project:	Burning Tree Elementary School
Description:	The architect included venetian blinds and window shades in the contract documents for Burning Tree Elementary School. Only one of these items is needed. Since venetian blinds are preferred, a credit change order has been proposed for the window shades.
Contractor:	Donohoe Construction Co., Inc.
Amount:	(\$41,321)

RESOLUTION NO. 729-91 Re: CEILING FAN INSTALLATIONS AT VARIOUS SCHOOLS

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

WHEREAS, Sealed bids were received on August 15, 1991, to install ceiling fans at Cabin John Middle School, Flower Valley, Mill Creek Towne, and Watkins Mill elementary schools, with work to begin immediately and be completed by October 3, 1991; and

August 28, 1991

WHEREAS, The low bid is below the staff estimate of \$78,000, and Hanlon Construction Co., Inc., and Bethesda Armature Co., Inc., have successfully completed similar projects for Montgomery County Public Schools, and funds are available for contract award; now therefore be it

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

<u>Project</u>	<u>Amount</u>
Cabin John Middle School Low bidder: Bethesda Armature Co., Inc.	\$12,350
Flower Valley Elementary School Low bidder: Hanlon Construction Co., Inc.	15,729
Mill Creek Towne Elementary School Low bidder: Hanlon Construction Co., Inc.	20,286
Watkins Mill Elementary School Low bidder: Hanlon Construction Co., Inc.	14,406
TOTAL	\$62,771

RESOLUTION NO. 730-91      Re: STORM WATER POND AT BRIGGS CHANEY  
MIDDLE SCHOOL

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

WHEREAS, On August 8, 1991, the following bids were received to retrofit the storm water pond for Briggs Chaney Middle School, with work to begin immediately and be completed by October 15, 1991:

<u>Bidder</u>	<u>Amount</u>
1. Mike Davidson Excavating	\$ 54,740
2. Gebaut Samen Development Corp.	81,600
3. Concrete General, Inc.	89,878
4. Orchard Land Excavating, Inc.	94,320
5. Busy Ditch, Inc.	108,500
6. Accubid Excavation, Inc.	147,400

and

WHEREAS, Mike Davidson Excavating has performed similar projects satisfactorily in the Washington metropolitan area; and







WHEREAS, The proposed easement will not affect any land anticipated to be utilized for school programming and recreational activities; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the president and secretary be authorized to execute a floodplain easement for the land required at the Julius West Middle School site.

RESOLUTION NO. 736-91      Re:    FY 1992 FUTURE SUPPORTED PROJECT FUNDS FOR THE TRINITY COLLEGE STUDY CENTER PROJECT

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

Resolved, That the superintendent of schools be authorized to receive and expend within the FY 1992 Provision for Future Supported Projects a grant award of \$14,063 from Trinity College to operate a special education professional materials and study center in the following categories:

<u>Category</u>	<u>Amount</u>
4    Special Education	\$12,868
10   Fixed Charges	<u>1,195</u>
Total	<u>\$14,063</u>

and be it further

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

\*Mrs. DiFonzo rejoined the meeting at this point.

RESOLUTION NO. 737-91      Re:    UTILIZATION OF FY 1992 FUTURE SUPPORTED PROJECT FUNDS FOR THE STATE LITERACY WORKS PROGRAM

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

Resolved, That the superintendent of schools be authorized to receive and expend within the FY 1992 Provision for Future Supported Projects a grant award of \$30,993 from the Maryland State Department of Education (MSDE) for the State Literacy Works Project, in the following categories:

<u>Category</u>	<u>Amount</u>
2 Instructional Salaries	\$17,397
3 Other Instructional Costs	12,010
10 Fixed Charges	<u>1,586</u>
Total	<u>\$30,993</u>

and be it further

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

RESOLUTION NO. 738-91      Re:    UTILIZATION OF FY 1992 FUTURE  
SUPPORTED PROJECT FUNDS AND  
CATEGORICAL TRANSFER WITHIN THE  
STATE AID FOR VOCATIONAL-TECHNICAL  
PROGRAMS

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

Resolved, That the superintendent of schools be authorized to receive and expend within the FY 1992 Provision for Future Supported Projects a grant award of \$4,353 from the Maryland State Department of Education under state categorical aid for the vocational-technical education program in Category 3 -- Other Instructional Costs; and be it further

Resolved, That the superintendent of schools be authorized to effect within the FY 1992 state categorical aid program for vocational-technical education, the following categorical transfer in accordance with the County Council provision for transfers:

<u>Category</u>	<u>From</u>	<u>To</u>
2 Instructional Salaries	\$3,974	
3 Other Instructional Costs	<u>          </u>	<u>\$3,974</u>
Total	<u>\$3,974</u>	<u>\$3,974</u>

and be it further

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

RESOLUTION NO. 739-91      Re:    FY 1992 CATEGORICAL TRANSFER WITHIN  
THE PROVISION FOR FUTURE SUPPORTED  
PROJECTS

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

Resolved, That the superintendent of schools be authorized to effect a categorical transfer of \$45,000 within the FY 1992 Provision for Future Supported Projects in the following categories:

<u>Category</u>	<u>From</u>	<u>To</u>
1 Administration	\$30,000	
2 Instructional Salaries	15,000	
3 Other Instructional Costs		\$15,000
10 Fixed Charges	_____	<u>30,000</u>
 Total	 <u>\$45,000</u>	 <u>\$45,000</u>

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. 740-91      Re:    UTILIZATION OF FY 1992 FUTURE  
SUPPORTED PROJECT FUNDS FOR THE  
STATE COMPENSATORY EDUCATION (SCE)  
PROJECT

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

Resolved, That the superintendent of schools be authorized to receive and expend within the FY 1992 Provision for Future Supported Projects in Category 10--Fixed Charges, an additional \$48,874 in state compensatory education funds from the Maryland State Department of Education (MSDE) for the State Compensatory Education (SCE) Project; and be it further

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

RESOLUTION NO. 741-91      Re:    FY 1992 SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION  
FOR THE MARYLAND'S TOMORROW PROGRAM

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Mr. Pischevar 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 \$79,658 from Montgomery College, administrative entity for Montgomery County Private Industry Council, financed by state and federal Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA) funds, of which \$63,114 is state and \$16,544 is federal, for the Maryland's Tomorrow Program in the following categories:

<u>Category</u>	<u>Positions*</u>	<u>Amount</u>
2 Instructional Salaries	1.0	\$63,190
3 Other Instructional Costs		7,618
7 Student Transportation		2,000
10 Fixed Charges		<u>6,850</u>
Total		<u>\$79,658</u>

\* 1.0 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. 742-91      Re:    SUBMISSION OF AN FY 1992 GRANT  
PROPOSAL FOR A CHILDREN WITH  
SERIOUS EMOTIONAL DISTURBANCE (SED)  
PROGRAM

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

Resolved, That the superintendent of schools be authorized to submit an FY 1992 grant proposal for \$150,000 to the United States Department of Education (USDE) for an 18-month special education program to design and assess a comprehensive system for educating and supporting children with a serious emotional disturbance; and be it further

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

## RESOLUTION NO. 743-91 Re: PERSONNEL APPOINTMENT

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

Resolved, That the following personnel appointment be approved:

<u>Appointment</u>	<u>Present Position</u>	<u>As</u>
Jane A. Parra	Teacher Specialist Spec. Ed. Curr. Unit	Coordinator Programs for LD Students Grade N Effective: 8-29-91

## RESOLUTION NO. 744-91 Re: PERSONNEL APPOINTMENT

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

Resolved, That the following personnel appointment be approved:

<u>Appointment</u>	<u>Present Position</u>	<u>As</u>
Nancy H. Schultze	Asst. Principal Redland MS	Principal Redland MS Effective: 8-29-91

## Re: FIVE-YEAR MAGNET SCHOOL PLAN

Dr. Vance stated that he had asked Dr. Sandy Robinson, magnet program coordinator, to provide the Board with an overview of the magnet school plan. He introduced Dr. Mary Helen Smith, curriculum director, and Dr. Carl W. Smith, newly appointed superintendent of the Brandywine School District in Delaware.

Dr. Robinson reported that for the past year each magnet school was involved in a self-evaluation. The schools and the magnet school parents had developed the plans before the Board, and she thanked the principals, staff, and community for their commitment and dedication to their schools. This evening she would focus on the historical background of the magnet program and how they used magnet programs as centers for innovation.

Dr. Robinson commented that in order to achieve the Board's policy on quality integrated education, the Board approved the concept of magnet programs in 1976. The QIE policy stated that implementing programs was one alternative to providing equity and quality in schools with high minority populations. Without the magnet programs, many of these schools would have minority

populations greater than their current enrollments. For example, Blair High School currently had a 67 percent minority enrollment. Without the magnet and the communication arts program, the minority enrollment would be above 75 percent.

The original mission had two main components. The first was to stabilize each school's enrollment by providing programs that would be innovative and attractive to parents who might otherwise send their children to other public or private schools. The second was to improve racial balance by attracting majority students from outside the cluster. The 1976 mission was still critical to today's magnet programs because they provided neighborhood stability as well as racial balance in the schools. They were also examples of innovative instructional programs.

Dr. Robinson stated that in Montgomery County parents had a high degree of confidence in the schools. In order for a magnet to draw students from all over the county, they had to offer something different. Teachers and principals in magnet schools were willing to take risks by creating and developing new curriculum ideas and by using an interdisciplinary approach to instruction. Staff understood the commitment families made to magnet programs by transferring their children to schools that were in many cases far from home.

For their investment in magnet schools, parents and students got a staff willing to be at the forefront of innovative instructional and curriculum development. The plans before the Board demonstrated how staff had been able to maintain these programs. Dr. Robinson remarked that the staff had enriched the school system's already exceptional programs. The staff also had assumed a responsibility going beyond their students and their schools. Staffs contributed to their profession through outreach programs, presentations, special training, and in-service activities. In addition, many of the magnet programs were exemplary models because of their ties with business, government, and community organizations. These organizations were committed to the development and growth of the magnet programs. In the case of secondary magnets, they had participated in the design of these programs. Today they continued their valuable support as professional mentors to students and as business partners to the school.

Dr. Robinson commented that magnets provided products and services that were shared with the community, businesses, and government. Information was shared with other schools at a local and national level. In the magnet program, they felt that their students produced a real product for a real audience. For example, a student had produced a video tape on trash which was being used by schools and community groups to increase understanding of recycling efforts. There were Saturday programs for females and minorities on science and math which provided

role models for students. They had workshops and seminars for non-magnet teachers where resources and successful ideas were shared. They had produced a student video tape which had been funded by the National Institute of Drug Abuse and would be shared with the 50 state departments of education. She also cited elementary peer programs, whole language instruction, and research into the learning styles of first graders as products of magnet schools. Dr. Robinson thought that these programs should continue to serve as innovative centers for instruction and curriculum practices within MCPS. They also served educators throughout the United States and abroad who looked at MCPS programs as models for their own magnet programs.

Dr. Robinson felt that if MCPS was to continue to provide the very best instructional program they needed centers where staff could try new ideas. The Board's goals for academic excellence for all students would be furthered by these centers. Their challenge was how they continued their outstanding magnet programs in the next five years so that they maintained their excellence and used their knowledge as a resource to achieve the Board's goal. She thought that there was still a great deal to be done. Several issues had emerged from the magnet self studies which had been outlined in the document before the Board. She said that the mission of the magnet programs remained as current and as critical as the day it was developed. The programs still provided neighborhood stability and racial balance. The five-year magnet plan represented each school's vision of the future of this program and its impact on the school community.

Mr. Ewing pointed out that the Board had two documents. One was on the five-year plan and the other was a study of secondary magnets. He assumed that the five-year plan was in part based on the secondary study completed last October. In addition, the Board had a memorandum from Dr. Vance which contained a summary of the issues, conclusions, and recommendations.

Dr. Vance recalled that he had been the area superintendent when the great surge in the implementation of magnet programs took place. He believed that the mission of the magnet programs had been fulfilled. They saw schools and communities being stabilized. With the secondary magnets they saw a much needed improvement in racial balance in the schools. He considered this to be one of the highlights of his career in Montgomery County.

Mr. Ewing reported that he had been on the Board most of the time during the implementation of magnet schools. He said that the comments made by Dr. Robinson about stabilization were true. He had lived in the Blair area since 1968, and when he moved there the community was in turmoil about the future of public schools in that area. People were not moving away now, but this was not to say they had had unmitigated success with every school. He had also chaired the 1974 Board advisory committee on magnet

schools in the Blair area. He thought that the mission developed then had been followed by staff, parents, and most boards of education. He said they could be extremely proud about what they had today, not only because of the quality of the programs in the schools but because of the impact it had had on the community. He believed that they had done some remarkable things with the magnet schools.

Ms. Gutierrez recalled that in 1975 her oldest son was entering kindergarten, and this was the time the B-CC cluster went into operation. He was now attending law school, and she had been living with the magnet concept for a long time. She would echo everything that had been said about the success of the magnets. Mr. Ewing had pointed to some of her concerns as to where they were now and where they went in the future with the magnet concept. While she believed the QIE original objectives had been met, she thought they had to update the concept. The concept was still valid, but it needed to be expanded. They had different issues that should be included in looking at magnets. Their focus had changed from looking at averages and groups of minorities to a focus on individual students. When she had read through this information, her initial reaction was "does the five-year plan continue doing what they had been doing all along?" She thought they had to do something more. She had looked in the study for issues raised by the Gordon report, and she had not seen these coming through. She suggested that the Board and staff had to address these issues.

Ms. Gutierrez said that the most valuable parts of this discussion for her were the issues raised. The issues were valuable because the magnets themselves had raised them. It seemed to her that before the Board voted yes or no to continue the plan they had to make sure what they were planning to do addressed those issues. She did not think they had a proposal on how to address those issues in the next five years. She believed that the value of the magnet program would be weakened if they did not address these issues. She would suggest that they look at secondary magnets first. She would like to have some real options and recommendations of what the alternatives were to the current configuration.

Coming from the B-CC cluster, she should say it was wonderful and they should stay with what they had, and it was a wonderful program. However, they had other issues of perceived inequities and use of resources in a budgetary crunch that had to be addressed. It would be her recommendation that they entertain a motion to ask DEA to propose specific alternative recommendations that took in the Gordon report and demographic changes. Minorities were no longer in the same two clusters. They should have specific recommendations in terms of expanding, decreasing, or terminating some of the current programs or schools. They did not need another study because they had the raw data, but they

needed a new way to formulate their decisions on magnets. They would have to make those decisions very soon because they would be preparing the budget. In her personal opinion, the Board needed to come up with some hard questions and hard answers to ensure that the long list of issues began to get addressed.

Dr. Cheung remarked that he agreed with Mr. Ewing about the success of the magnets, but he was also supportive of the concerns raised by Ms. Gutierrez about the magnet programs vis-a-vis the Gordon report. He had looked at the DEA report and the five-year plan to look at student achievement and outcomes. Knowing that Mrs. Gemberling had innovated the SIMS programs meant they did have some information on individual student performance. He asked whether they could compare magnet school students with their peers in the non-magnet program in the same school as well as with other students in comparable groups. He hoped that they would be able to see how well these students did over the last five years. He also thought that they should look at a comparison nationally.

Dr. Cheung asked whether magnet school successes had been disseminated to other schools within MCPS. What was the evidence that other schools were being helped? Did these schools increase the performance of their students? They had recently learned that SAT scores were going down including those in Montgomery County. He wanted to know if they had disseminated this information throughout the school system to help all children. He believed that they did need to have the data base expanded to include all students.

Dr. Carl Smith replied that at the time when they went forward to do the self studies, the purpose of the study was to give the Board of Education the information that a five-year plan would provide that would enable the Board to look toward the future of the magnet programs themselves as they now existed. They wanted to see what had to be done in order for the programs to continue to achieve the purpose for which they were originally designed. There was recognition on the part of all involved in the self studies that there were broader issues facing the county in terms of the needs of other clusters. He agreed that the issues had to be raised and addressed; however, the magnet programs themselves played a unique role. In that setting they had continued to play that role effectively. The self-study process was to advise the Board by taking the knowledge and expertise of those involved with magnets and pointing the way for the programs for the next five years. This was the purpose of the study.

Dr. Smith pointed out that achievement was never one of the criteria for assessing the success of the magnet programs. Dr. Cheung called attention to the executive summary of the secondary magnet document which talked about student outcomes, and Dr. Smith explained that this was not the five-year plan. The

secondary study had begun almost three years ago and had a somewhat different origin and a somewhat different purpose than the five-year study. He agreed that there were broader issues, and he had helped raise them several years ago. He said that other cluster needs might need to be addressed and might involve other magnets, but this was a decision by the Board and superintendent. He wanted to draw a distinction between that and the purpose of the self studies.

Mrs. Fanconi felt that the self-studies were useful for the Board and for the schools. She knew that schools had put a lot of energy and thought into the studies. It seemed to her that the study raised some other issues. One issue was whether the Board wanted to continue to have a voluntary desegregation policy. The second was the Board's commitment or re-commitment to the magnet program. The other policy issue was the QIE policy itself because there had been changes. She wondered whether the superintendent would include this when he brought in his recommendations on the Gordon report. If not, she would recommend the Board put this on an agenda.

In terms of resolving the equity issue about a school within a school, Mrs. Fanconi said that Dr. Gordon had spoken to this. There were issues about the Spanish and French immersion programs and whether these were magnets or special programs. There was also the equity issue with other schools that now had problems similar to those in schools when the magnets were set up. She thought that the superintendent should come back to the Board with a timeline on these issues and others so that the Board could get to these before the budget had to be adopted.

Mrs. Fanconi said that the other issue was magnet schools as laboratories for innovation and model programs. She wondered whether Dr. Vance was going to include this when he talked about improving student achievement. She thought they had marvelous programs and staffs, and they served as research and development units within the school system. She suggested there might be ways of rotating staff through some of these schools in order to disseminate those ideas. She asked if they were using Dr. Haney to work with other MCPS high schools. For example, Eastern had the concept of a school within a school, and she wondered whether they were looking at that for other schools. The Eastern report had mentioned that a magnet program raised the expectations and achievement for all students, and she wanted to know whether this was true of other magnets and whether it could be transferred to other schools. She felt that this was appropriate in a tight budget time.

Mrs. Fanconi inquired about the timeline and how the Board could use this document as a budget document. It seemed to her that they could not make decisions on the budget for these schools until they made some decisions about whether the programs would

continue or whether there would be some adjustments. She would like to have a discussion on how to bring this to fruition and use this as a planning document for the budget.

Mr. Ewing asked if staff would comment on dissemination activities because there was a history of efforts in this direction particularly on the secondary level. Mrs. Gemberling reported that there had been training programs, and they were now working with the elementary schools and the feeder schools in the area of the sciences. Eastern had formed a trained team to go into another mid-level school to work with those teachers. They had worked out a teacher coverage arrangement which was fairly low cost. Dr. Robinson added that several elementary schools had dissemination projects. Forest Knolls had started a program that was now used in several other elementary schools. New Hampshire Estates had done significant work on the whole language approach with other elementary schools. She felt that the magnet schools had made a real effort to go out and share information with other schools. She believed that Mr. Ewing had asked them to develop a dissemination program at Blair High School several years ago.

Dr. Michael Haney, Blair magnet program coordinator, reported that there had been a numbers of effort over the last six years. The idea was that the magnet would pioneer some efforts, and if they were successful, other elements in the county would adopt them. For interdisciplinary studies, they had done some professional sharing with other staff members in the county. They had funds for in-service training and consultants, and they had run a professional seminar series. They had opened up the instrumentation labs for teachers in other schools. Last year they had made an effort to tie in an upper county school so that school could use the Blair instruments; however, they had run into some technical problems.

Dr. Haney said that for three summers they ran institutes for teachers where they taught teachers the latest techniques and offered access to the equipment at Blair. They even sponsored bus trips so that students could visit the school for special training. For the last two summers, funds had not been available. They had partnerships with a number of elementary schools, and one of their teachers was spending a portion of the day in eight elementary schools working on science and inquiry. This year they would be sponsoring a national conference and would make information available to the rest of the schools in the county. The October student conference would bring students in from across the country, and they were sponsoring this with Eleanor Roosevelt High School. They had major corporate sponsors for every part of the conference and the National Institutes of Standards and Technology was also involved. They would be using 30 or 40 major research facilities in the Washington area, and they had asked that MCPS provide time so that teachers from across the county could attend these workshops.

Dr. Haney explained that they had applied for two grants. If these grants were funded, over \$600,000 would be available to wire schools together across the country. In turn, these schools would be wired into the super computers at Cornell, Illinois, and Lawrence Livermore. One of the grants would be for Blair to write the course for the super computers which would be adopted nationally.

Dr. Haney said they had supported the Females in Science and Technology conferences. These were Saturday series that were run twice a year, and there would be one in November. They were trying to sustain interest in math and science which seemed to change around the seventh and eighth grade. All of their seniors did special research projects, and last year 186 Montgomery County scientists donated their time to work with these students. The student projects often reached out to students in other schools. They were working with some of the learning disabled students in the elementary schools and developing technology projects to help those students. He had all of this information in his computer, and two years ago he had shared this information with the Board. He would make the most recent information available to Dr. Vance.

Mr. Phil Gainous, principal of Montgomery Blair High School, commented that every concern he had heard raised at this table was addressed in the reports before the Board and the study done by DEA. He explained that the plans before the Board were not static plans, and they had looked at the changing demographics and had projected for the next five years. He recalled that when they had first started the magnet they were primarily interested in getting white students into Blair High School and making the program work. Now their focus was to get students who represented the racial make-up of the county.

Mr. Gainous pointed out that the comparison of test scores was in the DEA study. They had a number of initiatives to correct either real or perceived inequities within the school by sharing equipment, facilities, and knowledge. For the last two years this had been one of their major objectives in their management plan. Every student in the building including the non-academic students could get into programs and end up with usable skills. Now they were trying to train teachers in using the technology. Dr. Haney added that last year they had formed a "transfer of technology" project. They worked with four departments and provided equipment, training, and software. This year they would double that effort and establish a desktop publishing center. On October 8, they would have in-service training for the entire staff of Blair High School.

Dr. Cheung stated that he was very excited about all this innovation. While they had individual school plans, he wondered whether they had a systemwide five-year plan. He pointed out

that in the Chevy Chase report they had talked about assessment, but for data collection they were depending on state information. He commented that so often reports were descriptive rather than data-based. He asked whether they followed people to make sure they had applied what they had learned to benefit students in their school. He encouraged the superintendent to consider a five-year plan for MCPS.

Mrs. Brenneman said she had looked at Mrs. Praisner's original resolution which requested these five-year plans. The plans submitted were extremely detailed; however, she thought they were going to have a discussion about what was going to happen in the next five years. While there was no doubt that the magnets were doing a great job, her question was whether the programs would still work in the next five years. The 1990 paper had talked about the surrounding clusters that now resembled the Blair cluster as to minority percentages. The draw for majority students had to come from outside. She thought they would be discussing what the magnets would look like in the next five years and what was happening to the part of the school that was not a magnet.

Mrs. Brenneman said they had to talk about allocation of resources. For example, there were schools right now that were getting QIE resources that did not necessarily qualify according to the QIE guidelines. There were schools that did qualify for QIE but were not receiving resources. She pointed out that at the elementary level, many of the magnet schools were overutilized and could not draw in students from outside the cluster because of a lack of space. Would the magnets work in the next five years if the schools were overutilized right now? The Board had been sitting through transfer appeals because these schools were overutilized. She thought they had to discuss where they would be in five years, whether the magnets would still work, and what the Board wanted to do with these resources.

Dr. Carl Smith replied that as individual schools conducted the self studies this was one of the perspectives they brought to it which was what had to be done in the coming years to keep the magnet program doing the job for which it was created. He agreed that they should look at the QIE policy and revise it. There were two objectives in the QIE policy. The first was to attract majority students into the cluster, and the second objective was to stem flight from the neighborhoods and stabilize those communities. Most of the people engaged in the self studies concluded that the stabilization had taken place in every one of their communities. The first objective of bringing students in was affected by the facilities issue. They had been more successful in doing that at the secondary level because they had space.

Dr. Smith pointed out that most of the elementary school programs were all-school magnet programs. They were always intended to serve all of the children. In regard to achievement, they had looked at test scores when they did the self studies. However, this was not one of the objectives for creating the magnet programs. It was an important outcome of any educational program.

Mrs. Brenneman commented that they were putting a lot of money into the magnet programs. It ranged from \$450 per pupil at Blair to a low of \$19 at Montgomery Knolls. She thought the Board had to decide if the money and resources should continue on. They also had to look at resources for the non-magnet part of the program.

Mr. Ewing suggested that there was a need to focus on what Dr. Vance had recommended. Dr. Vance had said the Board should accept the document, and he would then develop guidelines for future planning for programs and budgets. Mr. Ewing had heard several Board members suggest the Board might wish to address the QIE policy, the transfer policy, and the magnet school policy. There was also the question of budget and the whole issue of resources for these schools. Related to that was the policy issue of equity within schools and equity with other neighborhood schools where there were similar concerns about the strength of the community to hold their population. The question was whether the Board needed to make a special effort for some of those other schools. Einstein was already before the Board. The Board might wish to ask the superintendent to help identify a set of policy issues that the Board could discuss between now and budget adoption because every one of these policies had budget implications.

Ms. Gutierrez stated that she did not think the Board could accept the recommendation because there were too many issues still up in the air. She thought they should take some action that would be clear to the community because it would not be fair to leave all the schools hanging. However, she did not think the Board was ready to move forward with the status quo. She thought that while there were successful magnets, there were others that needed revisiting. There were also demographic changes in some neighborhoods, and the Board might not want to continue funding those programs. She suggested that the Board request the superintendent to recommend specific alternatives both in program continuation and in policy changes that the Board could move on as quickly as possible.

Dr. Vance asked what these program alternatives would be designed to do, and Ms. Gutierrez replied that they would be to help the Board make decisions. Dr. Vance asked whether her proposal addressed a modification of the mission of magnet programs. Ms. Gutierrez said she would like to incorporate the magnet issue

into the larger issue of improving student achievement. She believed the Board had an item scheduled in October for the superintendent's recommendations for minority achievement. She felt that these issues were very closely related to those decisions. The superintendent's recommendation could be that the Board not move forward with the five-year plan but rather come up with specific criteria that more clearly reflected the changing demographics and other issues including those from Dr. Gordon.

Mr. Ewing pointed out that the matter before the Board was for discussion only. Any motions could be brought up under new business, or the Board could reach some consensus on next steps. It seemed to Mrs. Fanconi that the first issue was clarifying the future purpose and direction of magnet programs in MCPS. This was a critical issue given the context of the Gordon report and the issues of equity. She agreed that they wanted to stabilize neighborhoods but wondered whether all neighborhoods had equal needs to be stabilized. She asked whether this was a doable piece. Dr. Vance thought that this would go part of the way in clarifying the Board's intent. However, they would not be able to resolve this in a short period of time because added to that today was case law.

Ms. Gutierrez asked how they could go from where they were to a series of recommendations to take some action. She asked whether DEA could propose some steps. Dr. Vance explained that part of the intent of his conclusion was to identify with the Board some of the policy issues and bring them back to the Board for further discussion. Once they could clarify these issues, the rest would follow.

Mrs. Fanconi said it would be helpful to her if the superintendent would recommend which magnets would continue for the next few years and which magnets should continue for the next year. In this way the Board could identify some things they needed to study and move on.

Mrs. Hobbs thought they had to get back to the equity issue. There were clusters that looked at the QIE positions and magnet services with envy. There were other clusters watching to see what the Board did with the Blair and B-CC magnets because they wanted some of the same resources.

It seemed to Mr. Ewing that the social and economic structure of the Blair area in particular remained fragile and so did the public confidence in the viability of the community. If the Board sent a message that it was going to pull back on the magnet schools in the Blair cluster, it would be devastating to people in the community and the staff of the schools and what the Board had attempted to accomplish over the last decade and a half. It would be possible to make improvements, and the Board ought to do that. If something had failed, the Board needed to identify that

and decide what to do about it. He would oppose a redistribution of resources because they had never sent that message. They had always said that this part of the county represented a litmus test of their willingness to assure that schools and neighborhoods with high numbers of minority students and a large proportion of low-income people would receive extra assistance. If others in the county did not understand that, he felt they had a job to do to explain that. He was not going to back away from that because he had no intention of seeing what they had done over the last few years brought down just because there were complainers elsewhere.

Mr. Ewing suggested that if they wanted to improve on what they had done that would be good. If they wanted to restructure or reorganize, that would be fine. If they wanted to give other people additional resources, the Board should ask for them. They should ask for them for Einstein, Kennedy, and Gaithersburg. The Board needed help where they had rapidly increasing urbanization. They should not assume that the lid was on so tight that the Board would never be able to get additional resources regardless of need. He believed that to destroy what they had done in the name of redistributing resources would hurt the county as a whole. He said they needed to be careful here about the message they wanted to send. He was a great believer in evaluation, but he also knew that evaluations could be misused.

Mr. Ewing said they might want to ask Dr. Vance to come to the Board with a series of policy and budgetary issues. He thought that there were things that needed to be done with the transfer policy and the QIE policy. They needed to wrestle with the issue of attracting students who reflected the characteristics of the county as a whole to the magnet programs. He cautioned that they had to be careful about sending a message that they were going to undo what they had done.

Mrs. Hobbs requested information on Broad Acres as to the minority percentage and how majority students were attracted to that school. She asked about QIE support for the school and any other information that would give the Board some idea of how they were supporting schools that were not labelled as magnets. Dr. Vance agreed to provide information on other schools that exceeded the countywide average as well as Broad Acres. Mrs. Hobbs said she would like a comparison of Broad Acres with the elementary schools in the Blair and B-CC clusters as to the supports received.

Mrs. Fanconi felt they had been clear about their commitment to schools and individual student success for those children coming from disadvantaged neighborhoods. She said they needed to put this in context with how they looked at individual student success in every school. For example, she wanted to know how a school became a QIE school, how a school became a magnet school,

and whether they had ever uncoupled a school once it had been identified.

It seemed to Mr. Ewing that the Board was eager to take that intermediate step before they got to the budget to review both the specific policy issues and also program and facilities issues. The Board wanted to come to grips with those in some fashion early on. At the least they should look at the QIE, magnet, and transfer policies. He suggested that Board members might want to identify the issues they wanted to see addressed.

Ms. Gutierrez said they did not have information on how to go about deciding if they wanted to expand and go into other clusters to achieve the same kind of objectives. They knew the magnet concept worked, but they also knew that they were going to have limited resources. There were clusters desperately in need of additional help. She hoped that the superintendent's recommendations would help them address these issues and move forward with a new understanding of the current situation.

Mr. Pishevar remarked that one of the reasons they were having a problem reaching consensus was that they were confusing two related but separate issues. One was the existing magnet program and the five-year plan. They should deal with that in this discussion. If they wanted to talk about the needs in the other parts of the county, that was a separate discussion. He had attended the Eastern magnet and Blair for the communication arts program. From friends who were from non-magnet schools, he had been told they were afraid that the magnet programs would subsume the attention that would be given to them. The 1976 objective of the magnets was to bring majority students into the schools, and that had been achieved to some extent. Now the magnets were trying to improve the quality of education for all students in those schools, not just the magnet students. The other issue now was that Montgomery County was changing, and a lot of the other schools needed magnets. He felt that they should be dealing with this as a separate issue. They should help the magnet schools with their goals, and then move on to needs in other schools.

Mrs. DiFonzo said she had a number of questions. She had been able to do some cross-referencing between the profiles and the plans; however, there were some issues that were unresolved, and she would be calling the principals for the answers. She stated for the record that she did support the recommendation in the August 28 paper that supported this report as a planning document. She thought it was an excellent report that gave them a good handle on what was going on in the schools.

Mr. Ewing indicated that it was clear that the next step was to ask the superintendent to identify those policies and those issues that needed to be addressed. Board members could contribute to that by writing down those policies and issues they

thought ought to be addressed. The Board would find the time before the budget to address those issues. He remarked that one thing he did not read in the plans was a commitment to the status quo. He did feel that a good many of the schools had wrestled hard with some tough issues. He thanked staff for their presentation.

Re: PROPOSED POLICY ON MODERNIZATION/  
RENOVATION OF SCHOOL FACILITIES

Mrs. Hobbs moved and Mrs. Fanconi seconded the following:

WHEREAS, The Board of Education is guided by the Long-Range Educational Facilities Planning Policy that recognizes modernization of school facilities to current educational program standards is necessary to maintain program quality; and

WHEREAS, Montgomery County Public Schools has one continuum of maintenance activities that begins at first occupancy of a new facility so that buildings, components and equipment achieve their expected useful life; and

WHEREAS, A modernization/renovation policy describing these activities will assist the Board of Education in determining when funds should be spent to bring facilities up to current educational and building standards; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Board of Education tentatively adopt the following proposed policy on modernization/renovation of school facilities; and be it further

Resolved, That the proposed policy be distributed for public comment.

Related Entries: FAA

MODERNIZATION/RENOVATION

A. PURPOSE

To establish a facilities life-span process for Montgomery County Public Schools (MCPS) that maintains a safe and healthy physical environment for students and staff and that determines steps to address changing educational program standards and deteriorating physical conditions

## B. PROCESS AND CONTENT

### 1. Issue

Buildings, building components, and equipment all require various and continuing levels of maintenance to achieve their expected useful life. MCPS views maintenance as being on a continuum encompassing preventative maintenance, routine repairs, local projects, major maintenance, and modernization.

The Board of Education should determine when funds will be spent on aging school facilities:

- a) To maintain the plant's existing physical capabilities
- b) To renew building systems and/or site components by replacement or other means
- c) To bring the facility up to current educational and building standards through either modernization or replacement because of an outdated educational environment as well as deteriorated building and site conditions

### 2. Background

Following a period of extensive school closures and consolidations in the 1970's and early 1980's, the Board of Education reactivated a capital program to schedule the orderly modernization of its aging schools still in operation. Closing more than 60 schools had eliminated many of those in the poorest condition, but the remaining facilities, built in the 1950's and 1960's, have progressed to 30-40 year old school facilities in the 1980's and 1990's.

The County Council has urged MCPS to consider whether schools must be modernized, or whether some, instead, could be renovated at a lower cost. The school system is committed to using its resources as efficiently as possible while providing an appropriate learning environment for all children. For these reasons, a step-by-step approach to the care and modification of facilities from the time of their construction will continue to be followed.

### 3. Applicable Laws, Rules, and Regulations

The first goal of the MCPS Policy FAA: Long-Range Educational Facilities Planning is to provide the facilities necessary to sustain high quality educational programs at reasonable cost. Among the objectives of this policy are to consider the impact of facility changes on educational programs; to provide adequate school space to accommodate future improvements in educational programs and services to the extent these can be anticipated; and to recognize that **"older school buildings must be renovated to continue their use on a cost-effective basis and that modernization to current educational program standards is necessary to maintain program quality."**

State and county fire/life safety and health codes, national standards for accessibility for the physically handicapped, Department of General Service criteria for energy conservation, and applicable rules of the State Interagency Committee for School Construction must be considered when any changes to facilities are contemplated. The Annotated Code of Maryland and the Charter of Montgomery County require a comprehensive six-year program for capital improvements.

### 4. Definitions

- a) Maintenance - On a day-to-day basis, the ongoing upkeep of property and equipment that includes an annual physical assessment by school and area maintenance staff, as well as the repair and minor replacement activities necessary to support a safe and healthy environment. In practice, MCPS maintenance is the broad continuum described under Issue, above.
- b) Local Capital Projects - Specific projects to restore and/or improve school environments for students, staff, and community. Examples are modifications for handicapped accessibility, space modifications for program, installation of ceiling fans, and school security systems. These are renovation-type projects that provide minor modifications to a facility to restore/continue its physical and educational functionality.
- c) Planned Life-Cycle Asset Replacement (PLAR) - The comprehensive replacement of key facility and site components, based on age and condition, in order

to anticipate and avoid potential failures, and to prolong the useful life of the facility. Related to PLAR projects are roof replacement and mechanical systems rehabilitation projects funded through the capital budget. These major maintenance projects are renovative in nature.

- d) Renovation - The design, construction, and equipping process through which a school facility and its systems are renewed and updated to meet county, state, and federal codes and requirements. An addition, or major redesign of building spaces for program reasons is not included.
- e) Modernization - The design, construction, and equipping process through which an aging school facility is brought up to current educational standards, and through which its systems are renewed and updated to meet school, county, state, and federal codes and requirements. Modernizations may require an addition or redesign of space to meet educational program requirements.

## 5. Continuum of Activities

To maintain and extend the life of facilities, MCPS initiates and follows a continuum of activities from the first day of new school occupancy.

- a) Preventative Maintenance and Routine Repairs  
(Occupancy - Onward)

Preventative maintenance is provided to ensure that a building component or item of equipment will achieve its expected useful life. This effort begins when the item is new and continues until it is replaced or modernized. Facilities receive regular operational care such as cleaning and maintenance of systems and finishes, lubricating, checking for proper operation, adjusting and aligning, and identifying items to be repaired or modified.

Preventative maintenance is accomplished by a team of electricians, plumbers, carpenters, heating mechanics, and general maintenance workers. The program is scheduled and directed by each maintenance trade. Schools and users are not expected to request preventative maintenance services. The program is staffed and funded

through the operating budget of the Division of Maintenance.

Routine maintenance restores items and components to their normal operating condition. Planned repairs are made while the component is still operational to avoid a breakdown. "Broken-fix-it" repairs may require immediate attention to prevent damage to other building or equipment components. Repairs are initiated by maintenance staff, preventative maintenance reports, manufacturers' recommendations, and school requests. Both planned and "broken-fix-it" repairs are funded from operating budget accounts.

b) Local Projects (5-25 years)

Capital projects are scheduled that enhance, protect, or restore physical environments in schools. Recent examples include modifications to lights and windows to increase energy conservation, installation of ceiling fans in non-air-conditioned buildings, and replacement of identified environmental hazards such as contaminated plumbing systems. Minor modifications also may be made to existing spaces/components to allow the educational program or activity to operate effectively and efficiently. These capital projects are not intended, primarily, to lengthen the life of the facility and probably will not lessen the needs of facilities in the 30-year-old range. School and area administrators and area maintenance staff identify these needs. These projects are funded through the capital budget.

c) Major Maintenance (15 - 30 years)

The major maintenance program completely overhauls or replaces worn-out building components. Based on annual maintenance requests submitted by principals, trade/manufacture recommendations, and analyses by maintenance technicians, a comprehensive, six-year, school-by-school major maintenance plan is developed each fiscal year.

Facilities are evaluated and components scheduled for replacement. These include roofs, mechanical systems, and key facility components such as classroom and hallway lighting, floor surfaces, doors and partitions, as well as exterior asphalt, fields, fencing, and concrete. A replacement

program (Planned Life-Cycle Asset Replacement - PLAR) has been initiated to replace components that do not last 30 years. Major replacement projects are expected to extend the useful life of a facility and may reduce the overall needs of a 30-year-old facility. For this reason, schools identified on the six-year modernization schedule are excluded from replacement projects, such as PLAR, for the same period.

The program is funded through the capital budget and reduces impact on the operating budget because resources will not be applied to continuing, costly routine repairs to worn-out building components/equipment.

d) Modernization (30-Plus Years)

An evaluation of physical conditions and educational standards are reviewed along with long-term projections for schools in the 30-plus year-old range. A ranking of facilities based on these factors is developed, with those schools most in need of educational and physical improvements assessed for estimated modernization costs. When previous capital projects at a school have impacted the scope of its anticipated modernization, these are identified. The departments of school facilities and facilities planning develop this schedule. The superintendent will recommend and the Board of Education will approve and request funds for modernization projects for the six years of the Capital Improvements Program.

Public comment and testimony on the recommendations are provided through the MCPS annual capital budget and CIP process. Public comments on the Board-adopted request are directed to the County Executive and County Council.



WHEREAS, The Board of Education is also guided by its commitment to build educationally sound facilities while being responsive to cost effective policies and practices; and

RESOLUTION NO. 747-91      Re:    AN AMENDMENT TO THE MODERNIZATION  
POLICY - PURPOSE

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

Resolved, That the Purpose section of the Modernization Policy contain suggested wording as follows:

To establish a facilities life-space process for Montgomery County Public Schools (MCPS) that addresses changing educational program standards and deteriorating physical conditions while providing appropriate spaces for educational programs and services and maintaining a safe and healthy physical environment for students and staff.

RESOLUTION NO. 748-91      Re:    AN AMENDMENT TO THE MODERNIZATION  
POLICY - PURPOSE

On motion of Ms. Gutierrez seconded by Dr. Cheung, the following resolution was adopted unanimously#:

Resolved, That the Purpose section of the Modernization Policy be amended to add "at reasonable cost" after "physical conditions."

Mrs. Hobbs assumed the chair.

RESOLUTION NO. 749-91      Re:    AN AMENDMENT TO THE MODERNIZATION  
POLICY - PURPOSE

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

Resolved, That the Purpose section of the Modernization Policy be amended to add "secure" after "a safe."

Mr. Ewing assumed the chair.

Board members agreed that "renovation" would be added to B. Process and Content 1. Issue and that "preventative" should be changed to "preventive." They also agreed to substitute "or" for "as well as" in B. 1. c.

Under 3. Applicable Laws, Rules, and Regulations, Board members agreed to add the following:

State law requires county boards of education to "maintain throughout its county a reasonable uniform system of public schools that is designed to provide quality education and equal educational opportunity for all children."

Board members agreed to substitute "systematic" for "orderly" in 2. Background and to delete "still in operation" from the same sentence.

RESOLUTION NO. 750-91      Re:    AN AMENDMENT TO THE PROPOSED POLICY  
ON MODERNIZATION

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

Resolved, That the proposed policy on modernization be amended by the following:

Under Definitions - take d) Renovation and make it a new b), renumber Local Capital Projects as 1, Planned Life Cycle and 2, and Modernization as a new c).

RESOLUTION NO. 751-91      Re:    AN AMENDMENT TO THE PROPOSED POLICY  
ON MODERNIZATION

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

Resolved, That the proposed policy on modernization be amended by the following:

5. a. Insert the word "Maintenance" as the title followed by "Preventive Maintenance" etc. Change b) Local Projects to b) Renovation with a new 1. Local Projects and 2. Major Maintenance, and "modernization" would become a new c).

Board members agreed that in 4. e. Modernization they would add "as established by MCPS" after "current educational standards."

Board members agreed that "extenuating" would be substituted for "emergency" under C. Review and Reporting 2.

RESOLUTION NO. 752-91      Re:    AN AMENDMENT TO THE PROPOSED POLICY  
ON MODERNIZATION

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

Resolved, That the proposed policy on modernization be amended by adding "given priority consideration," after "be moved forward" under C. 2.

RESOLUTION NO. 753-91      Re:    AN AMENDMENT TO THE PROPOSED POLICY  
ON MODERNIZATION

On motion of Ms. Gutierrez seconded by Mrs. Fanconi, the following resolution was adopted unanimously#:

Resolved, That the proposed policy on modernization be amended by adding "generally" after "future modernizations are" in C. 2.

RESOLUTION NO. 754-91      Re:    AN AMENDMENT TO THE PROPOSED  
RESOLUTION ON THE POLICY ON  
MODERNIZATION

On motion of Mrs. Fanconi seconded by Ms. Gutierrez, the following resolution was adopted unanimously#:

Resolved, That the proposed resolution on the policy on modernization be amended to add the following Resolved clause:

Resolved, That the record be left open for public comment until October 2 with Board action scheduled for October 8.

RESOLUTION NO. 755-91      Re:    PROPOSED POLICY ON MODERNIZATION/  
RENOVATION

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

WHEREAS, The Board of Education is guided by the Long-Range Educational Facilities Planning Policy that recognizes modernization of school facilities to current educational program standards is necessary to maintain program quality and equity; and

WHEREAS, The Board of Education is also guided by its commitment to building educationally sound facilities while being responsive to cost effective policies and practices; and

WHEREAS, Montgomery County Public Schools has a continuum of maintenance activities that begin at first occupancy of a new

facility so that buildings, components and equipment achieve their expected useful life; and

WHEREAS, A modernization/renovation policy describing these activities will assist the Board of Education in determining when funds should be spent to bring facilities up to current educational and building standards; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Board of Education tentatively adopt the following proposed policy on modernization/renovation of school facilities; and be it further

Resolved, That the proposed policy be distributed for public comment; and be it further

Resolved, That the record be left open for public comment until October 2, 1991, with Board action scheduled for October 8, 1991.

Related Entries: FAA

#### MODERNIZATION/RENOVATION

##### A. PURPOSE

To establish a facilities life-span process for Montgomery County Public Schools (MCPS) that maintains a safe, secure and healthy physical environment for students and staff and that determines steps to address changing educational program standards and deteriorating physical conditions at reasonable cost

##### **Board members have suggested the following wording change:**

To establish a facilities life-space process for Montgomery County Public Schools (MCPS) that addresses changing educational program standards and deteriorating physical conditions at reasonable cost while providing appropriate spaces for educational programs and services and maintaining a safe, secure and healthy physical environment for students and staff.

##### B. PROCESS AND CONTENT

###### 1. Issue

Buildings, building components, and equipment all require various and continuing levels of maintenance to achieve their expected useful life. MCPS views maintenance as being on a continuum encompassing preventive maintenance, renovation, routine repairs, local projects, major maintenance, and modernization.

The Board of Education should determine when funds will be spent on aging school facilities:

- a) To maintain the plant's existing physical capabilities
- b) To renew building systems and/or site components by replacement or other means
- c) To bring the facility up to current educational and building standards through either modernization or replacement because of an outdated educational environment or deteriorated building and site conditions

## 2. Background

Following a period of extensive school closures and consolidations in the 1970's and early 1980's, the Board of Education reactivated a capital program to schedule the systematic modernization of its aging schools still in operation. Closing more than 60 schools had eliminated many of those in the poorest condition, but the remaining facilities, built in the 1950's and 1960's, have progressed to 30-40 year old school facilities in the 1980's and 1990's.

The County Council has urged MCPS to consider whether schools must be modernized, or whether some, instead, could be renovated at a lower cost. The school system is committed to using its resources as efficiently as possible while providing an appropriate learning environment for all children. For these reasons, a step-by-step approach to the care and modification of facilities from the time of their construction will continue to be followed.

## 3. Applicable Laws, Rules, and Regulations

The first goal of the MCPS Policy FAA: Long-Range Educational Facilities Planning is to provide the facilities necessary to sustain high quality educational programs at reasonable cost. Among the objectives of this policy are to consider the impact of facility changes on educational programs; to provide adequate school space to accommodate future improvements in educational programs and services to the extent these can be anticipated; and to recognize that **"older school buildings must be renovated to continue their use on a cost-effective basis and that modernization to current educational program standards is necessary to maintain program quality."**

State and county fire/life safety and health codes, national standards for accessibility for the physically handicapped, Department of General Service criteria for energy conservation, and applicable rules of the State Interagency Committee for School Construction must be considered when any changes to facilities are contemplated. The Annotated Code of Maryland and the Charter of Montgomery County require a comprehensive six-year program for capital improvements. State law requires county boards of education to "maintain throughout its county a reasonable uniform system of public schools that is designed to provide quality education and equal educational opportunity for all children."

#### 4. Definitions

- a) Maintenance - On a day-to-day basis, the ongoing upkeep of property and equipment that includes an annual physical assessment by school and area maintenance staff, as well as the repair and minor replacement activities necessary to support a safe and healthy environment. In practice, MCPS maintenance is the broad continuum described under Issue, above.
- b) Renovation - The design, construction, and equipping process through which a school facility and its systems are renewed and updated to meet county, state, and federal codes and requirements. An addition, or major redesign of building spaces for program reasons is not included.
  - 1) Local Capital Projects - Specific projects to restore and/or improve school environments for students, staff, and community. Examples are modifications for handicapped accessibility, space modifications for program, installation of ceiling fans, and school security systems. These are renovation-type projects that provide minor modifications to a facility to restore/continue its physical and educational functionality.
  - 2) Planned Life-Cycle Asset Replacement (PLAR) - The comprehensive replacement of key facility and site components, based on age and condition, in order to anticipate and avoid potential failures, and to prolong the useful life of the facility. Related to PLAR projects are roof replacement and mechanical

systems rehabilitation projects funded through the capital budget. These major maintenance projects are renovative in nature.

- c) Modernization - The design, construction, and equipping process through which an aging school facility is brought up to current educational standards as established by MCPS, and through which its systems are renewed and updated to meet school, county, state, and federal codes and requirements. Modernizations may require an addition or redesign of space to meet educational program requirements.

## 5. Continuum of Activities

To maintain and extend the life of facilities, MCPS initiates and follows a continuum of activities from the first day of new school occupancy.

- a) Maintenance/Preventive Maintenance and Routine Repairs (Occupancy - Onward)

Preventive maintenance is provided to ensure that a building component or item of equipment will achieve its expected useful life. This effort begins when the item is new and continues until it is replaced or modernized. Facilities receive regular operational care such as cleaning and maintenance of systems and finishes, lubricating, checking for proper operation, adjusting and aligning, and identifying items to be repaired or modified.

Preventive maintenance is accomplished by a team of electricians, plumbers, carpenters, heating mechanics, and general maintenance workers. The program is scheduled and directed by each maintenance trade. Schools and users are not expected to request preventive maintenance services. The program is staffed and funded through the operating budget of the Division of Maintenance.

Routine maintenance restores items and components to their normal operating condition. Planned repairs are made while the component is still operational to avoid a breakdown. "Broken-fix-it" repairs may require immediate attention to prevent damage to other building or equipment components. Repairs are initiated by maintenance staff,

preventive maintenance reports, manufacturers' recommendations, and school requests. Both planned and "broken-fix-it" repairs are funded from operating budget accounts.

b) Renovation

1) Local Projects (5-25 years)

Capital projects are scheduled that enhance, protect, or restore physical environments in schools. Recent examples include modifications to lights and windows to increase energy conservation, installation of ceiling fans in non-air-conditioned buildings, and replacement of identified environmental hazards such as contaminated plumbing systems. Minor modifications also may be made to existing spaces/components to allow the educational program or activity to operate effectively and efficiently. These capital projects are not intended, primarily, to lengthen the life of the facility and probably will not lessen the needs of facilities in the 30-year-old range. School and area administrators and area maintenance staff identify these needs. These projects are funded through the capital budget.

2) Major Maintenance (15 - 30 years)

The major maintenance program completely overhauls or replaces worn-out building components. Based on annual maintenance requests submitted by principals, trade/manufacture recommendations, and analyses by maintenance technicians, a comprehensive, six-year, school-by-school major maintenance plan is developed each fiscal year.

Facilities are evaluated and components scheduled for replacement. These include roofs, mechanical systems, and key facility components such as classroom and hallway lighting, floor surfaces, doors and partitions, as well as exterior asphalt, fields, fencing, and concrete. A replacement program (Planned Life-Cycle Asset Replacement - PLAR) has been initiated to replace components that do not last 30 years. Major replacement projects are expected to extend

the useful life of a facility and may reduce the overall needs of a 30-year-old facility. For this reason, schools identified on the six-year modernization schedule are excluded from replacement projects, such as PLAR, for the same period.

The program is funded through the capital budget and reduces impact on the operating budget because resources will not be applied to continuing, costly routine repairs to worn-out building components/equipment.

c) Modernization (30-Plus Years)

An evaluation of physical conditions and educational standards are reviewed along with long-term projections for schools in the 30-plus year-old range. A ranking of facilities based on these factors is developed, with those schools most in need of educational and physical improvements assessed for estimated modernization costs. When previous capital projects at a school have impacted the scope of its anticipated modernization, these are identified. The departments of school facilities and facilities planning develop this schedule. The superintendent will recommend and the Board of Education will approve and request funds for modernization projects for the six years of the Capital Improvements Program.

Public comment and testimony on the recommendations are provided through the MCPS annual capital budget and CIP process. Public comments on the Board-adopted request are directed to the County Executive and County Council.

C. REVIEW AND REPORTING

1. The superintendent, through the annual capital budget process, will review with the Board and the public which facility improvements have been accomplished through short-term replacement or modernization projects. For schools identified as eligible for future modernization, an annual assessment will confirm or modify the previously adopted schedule based on physical condition, educational standards, enrollment projections, available funds, holding schools, and other factors as appropriate.

2. Because schools identified for future modernization are generally excluded from other six-year renovation/replacement projects, modernization projects are expected to move forward in a systematic manner based on assessment procedures. When extenuating circumstances are identified, a project may be moved forward, given priority consideration, or receive other unusual capital remedies until such time as modernization can occur.
3. This policy will be reviewed every three years in accordance with the Board of Education policy review process.

Re: PLAN TO PLAN, EASTERN AREA  
SECONDARY SOLUTIONS

Dr. Vance explained that he had submitted to the Board a proposed calendar which outlined a work schedule. He asked Ms. Ann Briggs, director of the Department of Educational Facilities Planning, to walk the Board through the calendar.

Ms. Briggs stated that the Blair component dealt with the Board adopted action and the development of details for program delivery for students in a school of 2800 students, site security, neighborhood issues, and costs. These were in answer to the Council's direction that the Board provide an integrated, comprehensive plan. The second piece had to do with the adjacent clusters. There had been no discussion with these communities about what the proposals might be, and staff needed to meet with cluster leadership to develop pre-planning priorities. After that, the staff would explore possible ideas to discuss with the superintendent.

Ms. Briggs reported that a third set of tasks was to bring out the original discussion of Northwood and see if all the aspects of that were fully developed. In September and October, the staff anticipated having draft papers. In case of Blair, these papers would be coming from the staff worksessions. They would also have from the superintendent some kinds of proposals he might consider for space needs in adjacent clusters that would be published in connection with the CIP in November. In November the Board would discuss these, and there would be public hearings. They would begin at the staff level to have an information exchange with the County Council, county executive, and Park and Planning.

In December and January they would have extensive workshops with each of the clusters involved in the adjacent areas. By February the superintendent's proposals would have had full community input. In March the Board would be asked to act on the total

capital budget with a fully integrated plan for this area of the county.

Ms. Briggs explained that they had already started on this because of the time crunch. They had a program delivery group and a site security/neighborhood group. All of the Blair groups had their meetings mapped out, and in the eastern area group they had sent letters to all of the cluster coordinators and the area vice presidents inviting them to a meeting in the Area 2 office. Mrs. Brenneman asked why only the eastern area was being considered, and Ms. Briggs explained that this was the direction of the County Council. They wanted to see the details of the Blair plan in that area of the county and spoke to clusters adjacent to Blair that had long-term secondary overutilization. These included Sherwood, Paint Branch, Springbrook, Kennedy, Einstein, and Wheaton.

Mr. Ewing indicated that he was disappointed that this was taking so long. The Council had said they would be happy to see this sooner rather than later. While he did not object to the calendar, it seemed to him that it had the disadvantage of coming very late after last year. Mrs. Fanconi asked about the possibility of including B-CC and Whitman, and Ms. Briggs explained that in the long-term they would not be underutilized. Mr. Ewing suggested that this probably needed to be said someplace. He assumed that absent any strong objections that the superintendent should be encouraged to move ahead with this expeditiously.

Re: BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS

1. Mrs. Hobbs reported that she had attended the summer school graduation, and she would like to thank Marion Bell and her staff for an excellent graduation.
2. Mrs. Hobbs knew that the Board would have a resolution for Hispanic American Heritage Month on its September 11 agenda. She would be interested in knowing which schools did not observe this particular resolution.
3. Mrs. Hobbs noted that MCPS recognized several individuals for their outstanding transportation record. For example, Mr. Arthur Talley had been recognized for his exceptional record. She asked whether the Board could recognize and honor bus drivers in the same way they honored food service workers. Dr. Rohr indicated that it could be done, but criteria would have to be developed for a selection process. He would recommend expanding it beyond bus drivers to attendants, mechanics, etc.
4. Ms. Gutierrez pointed out that human relations programs were taking place this week in the schools. She asked the superintendent to provide the response and evaluation from the

schools on how the program was received. Dr. Vance said he would make the materials available to Ms. Gutierrez and ask Dr. Lancaster to meet with her.

5. Mrs. Fanconi commended the special education staff for applying for and receiving a three-year grant to train regular and special education teachers to support the inclusion of students with disabilities in the general school environment. She had noticed that they were receiving a lot of these grants, and she was delighted that they had one that trained both regular and special education teachers.

6. Ms. Gutierrez welcomed all the new teachers. She and others had attended the welcoming ceremony, and she wanted to welcome them on behalf of the Board.

7. Dr. Cheung reported that the Korean community had made a contribution to the school system for teaching Korean language in a pilot program at Richard Montgomery. They were very interested in gaining support for the continuation of this program.

RESOLUTION NO. 756-91      Re: EXECUTIVE SESSION - SEPTEMBER 11,  
1991

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Mrs. Hobbs seconded by Mr. Pishevar, 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 September 11, 1991, at 9 a.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; and be it further

Resolved, That such meeting continue in executive closed session at noon to discuss the matters listed above as permitted under Article 76A, Section 11(a) and that such meeting shall continue in executive closed session until the completion of business.

RESOLUTION NO. 757-91 Re: MINUTES OF JUNE 13, 1991

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

Resolved, That the minutes of June 13, 1991, be approved as corrected.

RESOLUTION NO. 758-91 Re: MINUTES OF JUNE 17 AND 24 AND JULY 1, 22, AND 24, 1991

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

Resolved, That the minutes of June 17 and 24 and July 1, 22, and 24, 1991, be approved.

RESOLUTION NO. 759-91 Re: MIDDLE SCHOOL POLICY

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education instruct the superintendent to develop a comprehensive middle school policy that replaces all other policies dealing with the structure, organization and educational program for those students of middle school age.

Re: RECEIPT OF BOARD MATERIALS

On August 8, 1991, Mr. Ewing moved and Dr. Cheung seconded the following:

Resolved, That all materials for Board discussion and action must reach the Board ten days in advance of the Board meeting for which they are scheduled; and be it further

Resolved, That the Board will not consider for discussion or action any materials that arrive any later, unless the superintendent declares that an emergency exists that requires action and the Board agrees.

Re: A MOTION BY MRS. HOBBS TO AMEND THE PROPOSED RESOLUTION ON RECEIPT OF BOARD MATERIALS (FAILED)

A motion by Mrs. Hobbs to amend the proposed resolution by changing "ten days" to "at least five days" with a waiver for some consent, budget, and personnel items failed with Mrs. Hobbs

and Mr. Pischevar voting in the affirmative; Mrs. Brenneman, Dr. Cheung, Mr. Ewing, Mrs. Fanconi, and Ms. Gutierrez voting in the negative; Mrs. DiFonzo abstaining.

Mr. Ewing stated that there appeared to be general agreement that his motion would include waivers for those items involving such things as bids and that the superintendent would determine which items had to come to the Board for action in a short time frame.

Re: A MOTION BY MR. EWING ON RECEIPT OF BOARD MATERIALS (FAILED)

The following motion by Mr. Ewing failed of adoption with Dr. Cheung, Mr. Ewing, Mrs. Fanconi, and Ms. Gutierrez voting in the affirmative; Mrs. Brenneman, Mrs. DiFonzo, Mrs. Hobbs, and Mr. Pischevar voting in the negative:

Resolved, That all materials for Board discussion and action must reach the Board ten days in advance of the Board meeting for which they are scheduled; and be it further

Resolved, That the Board will not consider for discussion or action any materials that arrive any later with the exception of those items the superintendent determined had to come to the Board for action in a short time frame.

RESOLUTION NO. 760-91 Re: MINORITY-, FEMALE-, DISABLED- OWNED (MFD) PROCUREMENT REPORT

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education schedule a discussion of the Minority-, Female-, and Disabled-owned (MFD) Procurement Report.

RESOLUTION NO. 761-91 Re: APPOINTMENT TO THE INTERAGENCY COORDINATING BOARD

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

WHEREAS, Montgomery County Council Bill No. 43-78, enacted October 17, 1978, created a School Facilities Utilization Act by adding a new Article I to Chapter 33, title "Schools and Camps," of the Montgomery County Code (1972 edition, as amended); and

WHEREAS, This act created the Interagency Coordinating Board for Community Use of Educational Facilities and Services; and

WHEREAS, The Interagency Coordinating Board's nine members include the chief administrative officer of the county government, superintendent of schools, president of Montgomery College, a member of the County Planning Board, staff director of the County Council, two citizens appointed by the county executive and confirmed by the County Council, and two citizens appointed by the superintendent and confirmed by the Board of Education; and

WHEREAS, On April 25, 1988, Mrs. Linda Burgin was reappointed to a two-year term (to stagger membership) on the ICB which expired June 30, 1990; and

WHEREAS, Mrs. Burgin has agreed to continue to serve on the ICB for another term; now therefore be it

Resolved, That on the recommendation of the superintendent of schools, the Board of Education confirms the reappointment of Mrs. Linda Burgin to the ICB for a four-year term ending June 30, 1994; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the Montgomery County Council, county executive, the director of the Community Use of Schools, and to members of the Interagency Coordinating Board for Community Use of Schools.

Re: LEGISLATIVE UPDATE

Mrs. Lois Stoner, legislative aide, reported that the first phase of the legislative summer fiscal study had just ended. The Joint Expenditure Committee had reported on Monday and made some recommendations that were a modification of the draft proposal. There were two changes that were rather major. While there was a recommendation to maintain the commitment to APEX funding of \$177 million, there was no longer a recommendation that some of these funds be reallocated. If there were to be an additional allocation for special education, to low wealth counties, or for special needs, this would have to be from additional funds. It seemed to her that the Metropolitan Education Coalition had had influence here. The other major change was rather than recommending that the state social security/retirement payments be based on a regional salary scale, they only proposed an examination of this and of local authority to offer early retirement. Both of those changes would be beneficial to Montgomery County.

Mrs. Stoner indicated that Delegate Heller had been appointed as the presiding chair for the Joint Study Group on Education and Local Government which was the committee that would go into the

revenue part. They would be looking at state aid formulas, local taxing authority, tax effort, etc. The first meeting of that group would be next Tuesday. On Wednesday there would be an opportunity for public testimony; however, most agencies were not aware that that opportunity was being offered. Larry Bowers would be in contact with the county government about this.

Mr. Ewing said that the Board was planning to meet with the Delegation much earlier than usual. This year the meeting would be in October. On September 11, they had time on the Board's agenda to discuss the agenda for this legislative meeting.

RESOLUTION NO. 762-91 Re: PUBLIC COMMENTS

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

Resolved, That the Board staff be directed to make the sign-up sheet for Public Comments available to the public one half-hour prior to the Public Comments agenda item at the all-day business meeting.

Re: NEW BUSINESS

Mr. Pischevar moved and Mrs. DiFonzo seconded the following:

Resolved, That the Board of Education hold a discussion on the Loss of Credit (LC) Attendance Policy.

Re: EXECUTIVE SESSION

The Board met in executive session from 12:55 to 1:15 a.m. to consider appeals.

RESOLUTION NO. 763-91 Re: BOE APPEAL NO. 1990-2

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education adopt its Decision and Order in BOE Appeal No. 1990-2 (a personnel matter).

RESOLUTION NO. 764-91 Re: BOE APPEAL NO. 1991-26

On motion of Dr. Cheung seconded by Mrs. DiFonzo, the following resolution was adopted with Mrs. Brenneman, Dr. Cheung, Mrs.

DiFonzo, Mr. Ewing, Mrs. Fanconi, and Mr. Pischevar voting in the affirmative; Ms. Gutierrez and Mrs. Hobbs voting in the negative:

Resolved, That the Board of Education adopt its Amended Decision and Order in BOE Appeal No. 1991-26 (a transfer matter).

RESOLUTION NO. 765-91 Re: BOE APPEAL NO. 1991-73

On motion of Ms. Gutierrez seconded by Dr. Cheung, the following resolution was adopted unanimously:

Resolved, That the Board of Education dismiss BOE Appeal No. 1991-73 (a transfer matter), with a written Decision and Order to follow.

RESOLUTION NO. 766-91 Re: BOE APPEAL NO. 1991-85

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education affirm the superintendent in BOE Appeal No. 1991-85 (a transfer matter), with a written Decision and Order to follow.

Re: ITEMS OF INFORMATION

Board members received the following items of information:

1. A Report on Closing Non-airconditioned Schools
2. Quarterly Change Order Report

Re: ADJOURNMENT

The president adjourned the meeting at 1:20 a.m.

---

PRESIDENT

---

SECRETARY

PLV:mlw