

WHEREAS, One of every three residents in Montgomery County is in some way touched by services supported by this campaign; and

WHEREAS, Many of our own students and their families receive health care and human care assistance as a result of donations to the campaign; and

WHEREAS, Today's economy makes a financial contribution even more important in addressing basic, day-to-day human needs; and

WHEREAS, The continually increasing rate of previous employee contributions demonstrated one of the best things about the employees of the Montgomery County Public Schools -- their compassion and goodwill and their vast potential for helping others; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Board of Education of Montgomery County does hereby designate the period of October 14 through November 15, 1991, for the Montgomery County Employees' Charity Campaign; and be it further

Resolved, That the Board of Education urges all employees of the Montgomery County Public Schools to participate in the campaign this year as an act of personal kindness for individuals far less fortunate in Montgomery County and throughout the Washington area.

*Mrs. DiFonzo joined the meeting at this point.

Re: REPORT ON EDUCATIONAL TECHNOLOGY

Mrs. Gemberling reported that the Board had had two recent demonstrations of changes in technology. One was the demonstration on social studies where they viewed the use of the hyper-media technology, and the second was the SIMS demonstration. Their purpose today was to provide the Board with a spending plan for a minimal technology level. They had tried to provide a summary of where they were and where they saw themselves going.

Mrs. Gemberling said that the original Board policy had concentrated on computer literacy and computer science courses. They felt they had done a fairly adequate job in that area. The information age was now catching up with them and simply being able to know how a computer functioned was not enough. The real issue was using computers in the educational environment and in the work environment. The Board would see that reflected in the vision and in the spending plan. The focus was on the computer as an educational tool, and when these students became adults it would be a survival tool. Staff had heard a speaker talk about how the first books were chained to a table and people had to sign up to use these books in a library. The world of books

changed when books were sized to fit into a saddlebag. Now MCPS had computer labs, but they knew that the pocket-sized computers were just down the road. They had to re-examine where they were going with technology and what the future would bring.

Mrs. Gemberling suggested that in the future the computer labs would not look like today's lab. Future networks would be wireless. They recognized that the rapidly changing technology would produce some different configurations within those spending plans. However, she believed their major focus should be on the computer as an educational tool. It was necessary for students and for teachers to present information to students in the best way.

Ms. Beverly Sangston, director of the Division of Computer-related Instruction, introduced Mrs. Fran Dean, associate superintendent for Instruction and Program Development; Mrs. Arla Bowers, fourth grade teacher at Beall Elementary; Ms. Pamela Prue, principal of Montgomery Knolls Elementary; and Mr. James Haber, computer science teacher at Springbrook High School. Beall Elementary had a pilot project with four computers in a fourth and fifth grade classroom to focus on writing and reading. Montgomery Knolls was a computer magnet school.

Ms. Sangston indicated that she would update the Board on the use of technology and share their future directions for the next six years. They had started by developing an elective computer science curriculum for students which now consisted of nine semester courses at the high school level. However, they soon recognized the need to train all teachers to integrate the use of computers across the curriculum. Today computers were for all levels of instruction, for all subjects, and for all students. At the beginning, they were using word processors for writing and for business education. Data bases were used in science, social studies, and the media centers. Spread sheets and graphing software had been incorporated into the math instructional program, and as the curriculum was being rewritten in each content area technology was becoming an integral part of those programs. They used tutorial, drill and practice, and simulation programs where appropriate.

Ms. Sangston reported that just as teachers and students were becoming comfortable with that level of technology, more powerful tools came on the marketplace. They now had multimedia tools and networks. This posed another level of training for them but also a great level of opportunity across the curriculum. They found that being able to integrate graphics, video, and audio enabled them to design and present dynamic lessons which brought new excitement to classroom learning. At the same time, their networks allowed teachers and students to use sophisticated interactive software productivity tools and reference materials. In some classrooms, students could tap into the CD-ROM in the

classroom, and they could also do the same from home. This mirrored how technology was being used in society. They had to be sure that their schools were equipped not only for the present but for the future. With these new tools of learning, teachers could become coaches and tutors rather than dispensers of information. Students, no matter what age, could become active discovery-based learners.

Ms. Sangston showed the Board a short video tape on what was going on in the schools.

Dr. Cheung congratulated staff for preparing an outstanding report. They all knew that the technology was here, and living in Montgomery County with the 270 corridor, he thought the school system had to catch up with the private sector. They needed a first rate technological education, and he agreed that technology was a tool for them to use. He said that data became information, information with a focus became knowledge, and knowledge became wisdom. They were now at the point when they were trying to convert data into information. They needed to make the tools available to all the teachers and students. He reported that in industry about 3 percent of their gross was spent in information technology, processing, and analysis in order to be competitive in the global world. Now MCPS was spending less than 1 percent in this area. The goal suggested by staff was realistic if they wanted to catch up. He believed there were resources in the community to help them achieve this goal.

Dr. Cheung thought that the classroom of the future was exciting. He said it would be a classroom without walls and could be at home through networking and telecommunications. The teacher would be able to reach many students. He suggested that teachers should be the leader of instructional teams making the decisions as to what was best for the students. The administration should provide support for the teachers to do the job including the tools and technology. This was a change in the concept of schooling. Schools were laboratories for teachers to do their work. He believed that in the future education would be in settings other than schools. He strongly supported the report and stated that the future of education in Montgomery County depended on how they used and applied technology.

Mrs. Brenneman agreed that the computer should be integrated into the classroom rather than as a separate time for computer studies. She asked whether teachers coming out of college were trained in computers. She also inquired about the ability of present staff to use computers and integrate them into the classroom. When she had visited schools, computers were not in use in the classroom or the laboratory. She agreed that this could be coincidence because of scheduling. She asked how well all levels of staff were trained and were comfortable in using

the computer. Ms. Sangston replied that most of their in-service training programs were voluntary where teachers had taken courses from 4 to 7 p.m. They had about 50 in-service courses from the general to the specific use of a software package. There had been 6,000 registrants for these courses which did not mean 6,000 individual teachers. They also had stipend training for four days in August for teachers in pilot programs. There were a number of work groups meeting after school, and every elementary school had a computer liaison person and every secondary school had a computer coordinator. These were voluntary positions, and these people were brought together for one day each semester. She agreed that initial training was not enough because the technology was changing constantly. They had to build more school-based support to keep that training in the building. They were beginning to see more new teachers with experience in technology, and a lot of the new hires were interested in taking the in-service courses.

Mr. Haber reported that their labs were scheduled every period all day. In addition, students used the computers after school. His lab was supposed to be a computer science/business lab, but the computer science students were the major users.

Mrs. Bowers said she had been in the position of having one computer in her classroom and now she had four. The four computers were used more than the one because every child could get on the computer every day when they had four. With one computer, children were able to use it every four or five days. One computer was almost a disruption to the class. At Beall, all the teachers involved in the pilot program were brought together to learn together and now they were working as a team.

Ms. Gutierrez congratulated staff for an excellent report. She said there was one thread which was how they insured that all teachers were comfortable with the computer. Most children were familiar with computers, but it was really alien to a number of teachers. About a year and a half ago, she had been a member of a review team for Area 1. They had done an inventory of computers and computer usage in the area. It was disturbing to her that many teachers did not use the computer. She recommended that staff take a look at that survey. For the most part, teachers did not feel comfortable using the computer. They had talked about using IBM techniques to support usage. It was her feeling that they had to have a lot more access to computers and use the computers on a daily basis. Teachers had to use computers for themselves. She would like to see technology as part of the instructional approach.

Ms. Gutierrez reported that she had been at the University of Delaware for a conference. Students and parents were visiting the campus, and in one area the university had a book showing how the computers were used in instruction. Agriculture had two

pages on the use of computers; however, education had only two courses on the use of the computer and these were in business management. She felt that many schools of education were not even aware of the need to bring in use of technology into their curriculum. Ms. Gutierrez agreed that this needed to be folded into planning for education for the 21st century. In order to get the most of their investment in hardware and usage they had to focus on making computers part of the everyday teaching experience.

Ms. Prue stated that her school had a computer magnet program, and staff development activities were critical to implement the goals and objectives of the magnet. They were fortunate to have a full-time computer coordinator with responsibilities for teaching children and providing staff development. Therefore, they were able to provide opportunities for staff to build skills and develop expertise. Over the past several years, she had hired two new teachers and both had had computer course work at the college level. The coordinator helped inspire staff to think about the possibilities of the computer as an instructional tool. This summer two staff members and the coordinator had worked on the multimedia approach to present to staff. A number of her staff had decided to go in this direction, and this was being built into training sessions.

Ms. Prue reported that they were now finding that their three-year old machines did not have sufficient memory for a multimedia approach. This presented another challenge for them. She believed that the computer magnet focus drove teachers in terms of wanting to use the computer as a tool throughout the school day. She thought that having computer liaisons might help with the training and support of teachers.

Mrs. DiFonzo asked whether they were behind in the technology and, if so, would the proposed plan enable them to catch up. Ms. Sangston replied that over 50 percent of the equipment they had now was five years or older. This was last generation technology with 128K memory which was not enough for these new programs. She felt that right now they were probably holding the line, but in the future they would be stepping backwards. New and modernized schools had given them the opportunity to try out some of these innovative applications. The spending plan tried to equalize the opportunity to use these applications with schools not being renovated. She thought that the proposed rate of implementation for the plan would be comfortable for staff.

Mrs. DiFonzo asked whether there was more interest from people to be trained to use computers or were they noticing there was resistance to using computers based on the experience of the teachers involved. Ms. Sangston replied that they were turning teachers away from in-service courses each semester. She thought that what it was going to take was access. The computer

companies had run programs so that teachers could buy computers, and many teachers had taken advantage of these opportunities to purchase their own computers. She thought they had to look at providing teachers with access to the computers if they did not have a computer at home. She pointed out that some school systems had provided computers to teachers. They also needed a statement from the school leadership that said technology was going to be an integral part of the instructional program. If this became part of the goals and management plan of a school, it would happen.

Mrs. Gemberling commented that the expectation that technology would be an integral part of a school was a key point. The funds requested provided technology and access in schools that were not new or modernized. When a new school was opened, there was an automatic expectation of technology access. Consequently, a new school drew staff who wanted to use this technology. Mrs. DiFonzo pointed out that if this was happening, the older schools would tend to have teachers who were not as interested in or as competent with computer technology.

Mr. Haber remarked that they had to make it worthwhile for the teacher. For example, why take a computer course if you had no access to computers in your school? He agreed that having only one computer in a classroom was disruptive, and it was not very easy to plan for the use of that computer. If they had four computers, they could use them. They had to achieve a certain critical mass to have effective use of computers. He also thought that students expected the most up-to-date technology in the schools.

Mrs. Bowers reported that a number of the teachers at Beall were not comfortable using computers. However, when they had to take the training, these teachers were now using computers for their own use to write lesson plans and prepare worksheets. She was amazed about how this program had changed people as far as their comfort level and the use of their own time. Many of them were purchasing programs with their own funds.

Mrs. DiFonzo asked about the use of the hypercards and the stacks and whether teachers were using this more. Ms. Sangston replied that they had had two summer workshops for social studies teachers. There were a number of programs developed for use by these teachers. They had worked with resource teachers so that they could train their departments on the use of these multimedia tools. However, they did not have a lot of computers available in the schools for this program. In science, they had another program to develop stacks and videodiscs, but there might be only one or two multimedia stations in a high school. She believed that if they had the funding for the equipment, they had a good base for science and social studies.

Mrs. DiFonzo noted that comments had been made that they should strike up a deal with business and industry to get their outmoded computers when they updated their equipment. She asked whether these computers would address their needs. Ms. Sangston replied that they would have to look at each individual donation for its value. There were some computers they could use for writing labs and wordprocessing; however, they did not want to end up with computers that would cost them more to maintain than they were worth or end up a year from now with obsolete equipment. They had accepted donations from different businesses, but the equipment had to be evaluated to see whether it fit into the instructional program and supported the software they were using.

Mrs. DiFonzo asked for a guess as to how long it would be before the minicomputers obviated the need for student textbooks. Ms. Sangston replied that right now in the media centers they had encyclopedias on CD-ROM, and before long those materials would not be available in hardback. Mr. Haber thought this would happen when the technology was cheap enough and the screens were good enough so that they were as easy to read as books. Mrs. Dean predicted that within five years the reference section of a high school media center would all be on CDs.

Mrs. Fanconi thought they should have had an all-day work session on this because there was much more than they could absorb in a few hours. They had spent a lot of time discussing school system goals, and this would be a way to achieve a lot of those goals. One of their goals was working with individual student success, and the other was to re-engage and re-excite teachers. In regard to obsolete computers, she thought there might be a tie in with the need to give staff their own computers. This was a time of budget crisis, and they had to use the staff they had to work with children. Many of their staff, particularly those working with special education, were tied up filling out forms. It would be easy to do this on a computer, and she hoped that they were not getting rid of classroom computers that could be used for this purpose. There were highly trained staff members who were tied up with paper and pen. She hoped that they were looking at staff needs before they disposed of obsolete computers.

Ms. Sangston replied that they had never had the luxury of giving up any computer. The first computers they had put in media centers at the senior high schools were Apple II-pluses, and those computers had been reassigned to mid-level science. Mrs. Fanconi asked whether the donated computers could be used for staff. Ms. Sangston replied that some donated computers had been provided to the ESOL program. She assured the Board that they had used everything they had received.

Mrs. Fanconi asked for discussion about the implications of training and what they could do to get the PTA, community and business to become involved. The fiscal picture was very grim.

She asked whether they had a prioritized list of what they needed first. She thought that if every school had a list, it would be helpful when they did fund raising. She wondered about research projects where firms would come in to see how students used the equipment and where firms would donate the equipment. She thought that the community was out there waiting to be asked. She felt that they had to be creative in this area.

Dr. Vance remarked that he would expand this idea to include other considerations. Given the potential for training students, they had to look at tradeoffs given the realities of where they were going to be over the next three or four years economically. For example, were there funds they were spending for other programs and personnel that they could trade off to expand their technological capability? He felt that this was a very important discussion in the public context.

Mrs. Fanconi suggested the possibility of a two-day conference on technology in the future and how education fit into this. She would like them to implement the plan, but with the budget situation it looked as if they would not be increasing the budget. Therefore, they had to look at tradeoffs and the possibility of involving the community. She asked about using magnet staffs to provide training. Ms. Sangston replied that the Blair magnet had an outreach program. The teacher specialists in Computer-related Instruction also worked in schools and classrooms during the day. However, there were only two people for 120 elementary schools. In response to the comment on the PTAs, Ms. Sangston reported that MCCPTA had just established a technology committee and Carol Hyatt was the chair of that committee.

Mrs. Fanconi was pleased to see that the staff had addressed the policy changes needed. She asked staff to take into consideration next steps for computer replacements when they looked at annual appropriations for schools.

Mrs. Hobbs called attention to Chart A on page 16. In looking at this, she interpreted it as a higher priority at the senior high school level with a heavy emphasis on science. She asked whether there were other areas they had focused on prior to FY 1993. For example, at the mid level she did not see math listed at all. Ms. Sangston explained that science was the first area they started with at the senior high school in 1984-85, and they were still using that equipment. On the other hand, they had started to upgrade math in the senior high school. They were installing math teacher stations so that the teacher would have a computer to use for presentations and graphing. After the presentation, the math classes would go to the multipurpose labs. This was happening now with the double period algebra. At the mid level they had completed implementation of their math objective which was to put 16 computers in each math department in mid level

schools. For the science departments at the mid level, they had reassigned old equipment. They had five schools that did not have the ten computers for interfacing. BY 1993 they would have access in all schools by reassigning equipment from the senior high schools.

Mrs. Hobbs asked about upgrading for business education courses. Ms. Sangston replied that the multipurpose labs were shared by computer science, business education, and math/science. They were proposing four network labs in each high school; however, Watkins Mill and Quince Orchard had six labs that were in constant use. They believed that aiming for four labs would give them a start.

Mr. Pishavar commented that he enjoyed reading the report. He believed that technology was needed not just for survival but because the students had gone through an evolution of learning skills in the way they learned and took in information. They had students spending four hours a day playing Nintendo or watching television for four to seven hours a day. Students today had a different way of taking information and looking at knowledge. For that reason, technology was needed in the schools. Pete Robinson, a history teacher and former student Board member, demanded that students be more active in the educational process. His tests required students to analyze and come up with their own conclusions. Mr. Pishavar said he was excited to see a computer screen with audio/visual capabilities so that the student was learning the way they played their games. What this was going to do was transform the students from receivers of education to quarterbacks of education where they had control of the ball of knowledge. He had a question about equity in the fact that new schools were better equipped than old schools. He asked how they would overcome this. Ms. Sangston explained that this was the reason for their plan. As they built or modernized schools, they had funds in the furniture and equipment budget to purchase computers. The budget before the Board supported the rest of the schools.

Mr. Ewing pointed out that they were offering students opportunities to learn at a distance. He had not seen any discussion of that in this report. It seemed to him this ought to be something to talk about as they revised their policy. He saw this happening in lots of places and thought it was an area they should explore and use as appropriate. It had the possibility of making available unusual courses such as advanced courses in foreign languages. He assumed the absence of a specific discussion of this did not reflect any lack of interest. Ms. Sangston replied that the report centered around computers and the related technologies attached to computers. She agreed that they were doing some exciting things with interactive television. Mr. Ewing pointed out that distance learning could also employ the computer.

Although Mr. Ewing was delighted to hear there was more demand than available training, he was dismayed that they could not meet all the needs. It was his view that they had to take the next step and move towards mandatory training. He hoped that the Board would move in the direction of policy considerations. It was timely for them to move on this because they would be dealing with the capital budget in the near future. A policy would give them direction as they moved ahead with plans for the capital budget.

In regard to the tables, Ms. Gutierrez said she had difficulty understanding the variabilities and the balances. She would suggest using a standard similar to that used in industry. They could use "computers per student" as a parameter and guidelines to help sell this to the County Council. They had to have more easily understood parameters and compare these to industry standards. Ms. Gutierrez pointed out to Board members that in six years the plan amounted to \$15 million. They were planning a \$6 million cook/chill facility. She thought that the Board had to do some serious weighing as to what would have more of an educational impact in Montgomery County when they did not have all the money they wanted and needed.

Dr. Cheung suggested sending a letter to companies and governmental agencies saying MCPS would like to have any computers with a certain capability and memory. In his own agency, some computers had been declared obsolete but could be used in MCPS for spread sheets and graphics.

Dr. Vance stated that this was a dialogue they would like to continue and perhaps expand to include others at the table. He was speaking of the community that was interested in technology. He would like to invite these people to discuss the implications of this for quality education in MCPS. He would move in that direction.

Re: MODERNIZATION/RENOVATION POLICY

Mrs. DiFonzo 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 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; and

WHEREAS, The Board of Education tentatively adopted a proposed policy on modernization/renovation of school facilities; and

WHEREAS, The proposed policy has been distributed for public comment; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the following policy be adopted:

Related Entries: FAA

MODERNIZATION/RENOVATION

A. PURPOSE

To establish a facilities life-span 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 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

RESOLUTION NO. 833-91 Re: AN AMENDMENT TO THE PROPOSED POLICY
ON MODERNIZATION/RENOVATION

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

Resolved, That new d) Replacement of Buildings be deleted and a new sentence be added to c) Modernization as follows:

Based on life cycle cost analyses and unusual circumstances, it may be necessary to replace buildings.

Board members agreed to delete "short-term" under C.1.

RESOLUTION NO. 834-91 Re: AN AMENDMENT TO THE PROPOSED POLICY
ON MODERNIZATION/RENOVATION

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. Pischevar voting in the negative:

Resolved, That "outstanding planning issues" be added to the last sentence in C.1.

RESOLUTION NO. 835-91 Re: POLICY ON MODERNIZATION/RENOVATION

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

WHEREAS, The Board of Education 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; and

WHEREAS, The Board of Education tentatively adopted a proposed policy on modernization/renovation of school facilities; and

WHEREAS, The proposed policy has been distributed for public comment; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the following policy be adopted:

Related Entries: FAA

MODERNIZATION/RENOVATION

A. PURPOSE

To establish a facilities life-span 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 repairs, renovation, 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 become 30-40 year old school facilities in the 1980's and 1990's, which are difficult and expensive to maintain.

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 the delivery and equity of 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 each county board of education to "maintain throughout its county a reasonably uniform system of public schools that is designed to provide quality education and equal educational opportunity for all children." (Annotated Code of Maryland § 4-107)

4. Definitions

- a) Maintenance/Preventive and Routine Repair - 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.

- 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. The timelines shown in parentheses are intended as suggestions and are not absolutes. The condition of the building will be the determining factor.

a) Maintenance/Preventive 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 Capital 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. Based on life cycle cost analyses and unusual circumstances, it may be necessary to replace buildings. 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 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, outstanding planning issues, 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: EXECUTIVE SESSION

The Board met in executive session from 12:35 p.m. to 2:15 p.m. to discuss serious incidents and appeals.

Re: PUBLIC COMMENTS

The following individuals appeared before the Board of Education:

1. Barbara Ruppert
2. Vincent Foo, MCCSSE

Mr. Ewing temporarily left the meeting and Mrs. Hobbs assumed the chair.

RESOLUTION NO. 836-91 Re: PROCUREMENT CONTRACTS MORE THAN
\$25,000

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

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

WHEREAS, It is recommended that Bid No. 215-91, Stationary Steam Cleaners, be rejected due to a change in requirements; now therefore be it

Resolved, That Bid No. 215-91 be rejected; and be it further

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

2-91	Library Furniture - Extension	
	<u>Awardees</u>	
	Baltimore Stationery	\$14,325
	Dawn's Office Supply Company	5,718*
	Douron, Inc.	26,679
	Gaylord Brothers, Inc.	6,817
	Kunz, Inc.	363
	The Library Store, Ltd.	<u>40,812</u>
	Total	\$94,714
	MORE THAN \$25,000	\$94,714

*Denotes MFD vendors.

WHEREAS, The Westmoreland Children's Center, Inc., has operated a day-care center at Westbrook Elementary School since 1980; and

WHEREAS, The Center has requested permission to install a modular building on the school site to house the day-care program; and

WHEREAS, Staff and legal counsel have developed a lease agreement to permit the Center to place a unit on a portion of the site that is not needed for the school's programs during the term of the lease; and

WHEREAS, The proposed lease is for a term of five years with a five-year renewal option, including a clause that gives the school system the right to terminate the lease if the site is needed for school purposes; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Board authorize the use of a portion of the Westbrook Elementary School site for the installation of a modular building by the Westmoreland Children's Center for child-care purposes during the term of the lease; and be it further

Resolved, That the Board authorize the superintendent and Board president to sign the lease documents.

Mrs. DiFonzo assumed the chair.

RESOLUTION NO. 839-91 Re: ACCEPTANCE OF JUDITH A. RESNIK
ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

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

Resolved, That having been duly inspected on September 27, 1991, Judith A. Resnik Elementary School now be formally accepted, and that the official date of completion be established as that date upon which formal notice is received from the architect that the building has been completed in accordance with the plans and specifications, and all contract requirements have been met.

RESOLUTION NO. 840-91 Re: ACCEPTANCE OF SHERWOOD HIGH SCHOOL

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

Resolved, That having been duly inspected on October 2, 1991, Sherwood High School now be formally accepted, and that the official date of completion be established as that date upon which formal notice is received from the architect that the building has been completed in accordance with the plans and specifications, and all contract requirements have been met.

Mrs. Hobbs assumed the chair.

RESOLUTION NO. 841-91 Re: ACCEPTANCE OF BRIGGS CHANEY MIDDLE SCHOOL

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

Resolved, That having been duly inspected on October 4, 1991, Briggs Chaney Middle School now be formally accepted, and that the official date of completion be established as that date upon which formal notice is received from the architect that the building has been completed in accordance with the plans and specifications, and all contract requirements have been met.

RESOLUTION NO. 842-91 Re: ARCHITECTURAL APPOINTMENT - OAKLAND TERRACE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

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

WHEREAS, It is necessary to appoint an architectural firm to provide professional and technical services during the design and construction phases of the proposed modernization of Oakland Terrace Elementary School; and

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

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

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

Resolved, That the Montgomery County Board of Education enter into a contractual agreement with the architectural firm of Garrison Associates Architects to provide professional architectural services for the Oakland Terrace Elementary School modernization project for a fee of \$231,000, which is 6.6 percent of the estimated cost.

Re: SCHOOL INSPECTIONS

The following school inspections were set:

1. Einstein, October 14, 9 a.m. Mr. Ewing will attend.
2. Sligo, October 16, 9 a.m. Mrs. Fanconi will attend.
3. Beall, October 15, 1 p.m. Mrs. Brenneman will attend.
4. Quince Orchard, October 21, 11:30 a.m. Mrs. Brenneman will attend.
5. Dr. Charles Drew, October 22, 1 p.m. Mrs. Brenneman and Mrs. Fanconi will attend.

RESOLUTION NO. 843-91 Re: FY 1992 SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION
AND CATEGORICAL TRANSFER WITHIN THE
DRUG-FREE SCHOOLS AND COMMUNITIES
PROJECT

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

Resolved, That the superintendent of schools be authorized, subject to County Council approval, to receive and expend an FY 1992 supplemental appropriation of \$110,889 from the United States Department of Education through the Maryland State Department of Education under the Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act of 1986 and the Omnibus Drug Act of 1988 to continue activities in the fourth year of the MCPS Drug-Free Schools and Communities Project, in the following categories:

<u>Categories</u>	<u>Amount</u>
1 Systemwide Support	\$ 4,847
2 Instructional Salaries	33,281
3 Other Instructional Costs	<u>72,761</u>
Total	<u>\$110,889</u>

and be it further

Resolved, That the superintendent of schools be authorized, in accordance with the County Council provision for transfers, to effect the following FY 1992 categorical transfer of \$12,474 within the Drug-Free Schools and Communities Project as funded by the United States Department of Education through the Maryland State Department of Education under the Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act of 1986 and the Omnibus Drug Act of 1988, in the following categories:

<u>Category</u>	<u>From</u>	<u>To</u>
3 Other Instructional Costs		\$12,474
7 Student Transportation	\$ 1,920	
10 Fixed Charges	<u>10,554</u>	<u> </u>
Total	<u>\$12,474</u>	<u>\$12,474</u>

and be it further

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

Mr. Ewing rejoined the meeting at this point and assumed the chair.

Re: PRESENTATION OF PRELIMINARY PLANS -
BROOKHAVEN ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

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

WHEREAS, The architect for the modernization of the Brookhaven Elementary School has prepared a schematic design in accordance with the educational specifications; and

WHEREAS, The Brookhaven Elementary School Facilities Advisory Committee has approved the proposed schematic design; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Board of Education approve the preliminary plan report for the Brookhaven Elementary School modernization developed by Gauthier, Alvarado & Associates.

RESOLUTION NO. 844-91 Re: AN AMENDMENT TO THE PROPOSED
RESOLUTION ON BROOKHAVEN ELEMENTARY
SCHOOL

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

Resolved, That the proposed resolution on Brookhaven Elementary School be amended by the addition of the following resolved clause:

Resolved, That the timetable for construction of Brookhaven Elementary School would be decided in a separate process.

RESOLUTION NO. 845-91 Re: PRESENTATION OF PRELIMINARY PLANS -
BROOKHAVEN ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

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

WHEREAS, The architect for the modernization of the Brookhaven Elementary School has prepared a schematic design in accordance with the educational specifications; and

WHEREAS, The Brookhaven Elementary School Facilities Advisory Committee has approved the proposed schematic design; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Board of Education approve the preliminary plan report for the Brookhaven Elementary School modernization developed by Gauthier, Alvarado & Associates; and be it further

Resolved, That the timetable for construction of Brookhaven Elementary School would be decided in a separate process.

Mr. Ewing temporarily left the meeting and Mrs. Hobbs assumed the chair.

RESOLUTION NO. 846-91 Re: PERSONNEL MONTHLY REPORT

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 appointments, resignations, and leaves of absence for professional and supporting services personnel be approved: (TO BE APPENDED TO THESE MINUTES).

RESOLUTION NO. 847-91 Re: DEATH OF MR. ALFRED T. COOPER, SR.,
MAINTENANCE ELECTRICIAN I, DIVISION
OF MAINTENANCE

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

WHEREAS, The sudden death on September 23, 1991, of Mr. Alfred T. Cooper, Sr., a maintenance electrician I in the Division of Maintenance, has deeply saddened the staff and members of the Board of Education; and

WHEREAS, Mr. Cooper had been a loyal employee of Montgomery County Public Schools and a member of the maintenance staff for more than 20 years; and

WHEREAS, Mr. Cooper's pride in his work and his dedication to duty were recognized by staff and associates alike; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the members of the Board of Education express their sorrow at the death of Mr. Alfred T. Cooper, Sr., and extend deepest sympathy to his family; and be it further

Resolved, That this resolution be made part of the minutes of this meeting and a copy be forwarded to Mr. Cooper's family.

RESOLUTION NO. 848-91 Re: DEATH OF MRS. BARBARA A. CURTIS,
CAFETERIA WORKER I, QUINCE ORCHARD
HIGH SCHOOL

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

WHEREAS, The death on September 4, 1991, of Mrs. Barbara A. Curtis, a cafeteria worker at Quince Orchard High School, has deeply saddened the staff and members of the Board of Education; and

WHEREAS, In the short time Mrs. Curtis was with Montgomery County Public Schools, her pleasant smile and willing spirit made the lunch time more pleasurable for staff, students and parents; and

WHEREAS, Mrs. Curtis demonstrated a high level of cooperation and effectively carried out the duties assigned to her; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the members of the Board of Education express their sorrow at the death of Mrs. Barbara A. Curtis and extend deepest sympathy to her family; and be it further

Resolved, That this resolution be made part of the minutes of this meeting and a copy be forwarded to Mrs. Curtis' family.

RESOLUTION NO. 849-91 Re: DEATH OF MR. LEROY W. THOMAS,
BUILDING SERVICE MANAGER II,
GERMANTOWN ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

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

WHEREAS, The death on September 10, 1991, of Mr. Leroy W. Thomas, a building service manager II at Germantown Elementary School, has deeply saddened the staff and members of the Board of Education; and

WHEREAS, Mr. Thomas had been a loyal employee of Montgomery County Public Schools for more than 26 years; and

WHEREAS, Mr. Thomas was a cooperative staff member, giving of himself in time, energy and services to students and staff; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the members of the Board of Education express their sorrow at the death of Mr. Leroy W. Thomas and extend deepest sympathy to his family; and be it further

Resolved, That this resolution be made part of the minutes of this meeting and a copy be forwarded to Mr. Thomas' family.

Re: ARCHITECTURAL APPOINTMENT - CENTRAL
FOOD PRODUCTION FACILITY

Dr. Cheung moved and Mrs. DiFonzo seconded the following:

WHEREAS, It is necessary to appoint an architectural firm to provide professional and technical services during the design and construction phases of the proposed Central Food Production Facility; and

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

WHEREAS, The Architectural Selection Committee, in accordance with procedures adopted by the Board of Education on May 13, 1986, identified John S. Samperton Associates as the most qualified firm to provide the necessary professional architectural and engineering services; and

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

Resolved, That the Montgomery County Board of Education enter into a contract with the firm of John S. Samperton Associates to provide professional architectural services for the Central Food Production Facility project for a fee of \$425,000, which is 7.2 percent of the estimated cost.

Mr. Ewing rejoined the meeting at this point and assumed the chair.

Mrs. Fanconi made the following statement for the record:

"This was approved November 26. That was before many of us were on the Board, but we were sitting at the table that night. Ana and I asked a large number of questions which to my feeling were not adequately answered. One of the things that we asked for was a cost benefit analysis or feasibility study. Although several

Dr. Vance reported that they had met with focus groups including MCPS staff, parents, students, and community members. Most recently they had had a two and a half day retreat with the Board of Education. At each step they had revised the proposed vision and goals. He pointed out that goals were needed when they thought about the massive impact of rapid urbanization along with the changing demographics of the county. Secondly, he thought that the economic hard times were not going to disappear nor would the residual effects. He believed it was time for them to develop a new and updated educational mandate that each citizen would feel vested in.

It was Dr. Vance's sense that a vision today for the next decade in Montgomery County had to be compelling. It had to signify a recommitment by the citizens of the county to the purpose of public education. It was no secret as to why Montgomery County had been a lighthouse school system. Recently they were given very high ratings as a place where major corporate groups would encourage their constituents to relocate. It was because Montgomery County citizens put an increasingly important emphasis on the purpose and role of public education. It was time to ask people to recommit themselves to public education. He hoped the vision would spell out what they wanted to be. Board members now had the opportunity to alter and adjust the statement. He recalled that this item was scheduled for tentative action on October 29. Following that, the statement would be sent out for reaction and comment.

Mr. Ewing said that this effort was timely because they had a new superintendent, a changing school system, and a bleak fiscal situation. They could be consumed with anxiety over fiscal issues, but they could also use this opportunity to think about where they were headed and what they wanted to do, be, and become in the future. Dr. Vance had stated that the Vision document needed to be compelling. Mr. Ewing would go beyond that and say that it needed to be passionate and grip people.

Mrs. Fanconi acknowledged all of the hard work that had gone into the document before the Board received it at its retreat. She recalled that at the retreat they had added Goal 4. There had been an earlier Goal 4, and she liked the wording of the original goal. The old Goal 4 read, "create and sustain a self-renewing organization, develop staff, encourage their creativity and accountability, assess and plan for the future, and provide efficient and effective support for the instructional program."

For the benefit of the audience, Dr. Vance read the Vision statement:

THE MCPS VISION FOR THE 90s

We, the people of Montgomery County, believe that a quality education is a fundamental right of every child. All children will receive the respect, encouragement and opportunities they need to build the knowledge, skills and attitudes to be successful, contributing members of a changing global society.

GOALS TO ACHIEVE THE VISION

- Goal 1 - Ensure Success for Each Student
- Goal 2 - Provide an Effective Instructional Program
- Goal 3 - Strengthen Productive Partnerships for Education
- Goal 4 - Create a Positive Work Environment

Mrs. Fanconi said that as she was going over materials in preparation for the retreat, she was struck by the importance of not creating something that was a list of what they should do in order to survive. It needed to be what they chose to do in order to thrive. The statement needed to be short and powerful. It should create a vision for people when they read it. Another statement she had read was that a vision should differentiate them from other school systems. It seemed to her that people should recognize MCPS from its vision, and she did not think that the present statement captured this. Another thought was that a vision should define what a school system wanted to become. A vision had to be relevant to all groups including teachers, administrators, parents, support staff, and students. It was her dream that everyone in the county would have a bumper sticker that said, "Education is my responsibility -- ask me what I am doing." She believed that education went far beyond the six-hour school day.

Mrs. Fanconi indicated that Barth had stated, "Schools will be places where everyone is a teacher and everyone is a learner." This created a vision for her because she saw teachers working collegially with other teachers and administrators using the skills of parents and teachers to help make decisions. She saw students as teachers helping other students. She saw teachers as learners because they were learning from each other. Barth's statement said to her more than they had in the MCPS Vision statement because it stated that everyone had a responsibility to be a learner as well as a teacher. For example, students had a responsibility to do their homework and apply themselves. Parents had a responsibility to send their children to school ready to learn. Business people should be committed enough to education to let their employees have time off to work with schools.

Mrs. Fanconi said that there was another article which stated that the focus should be directed at student performance and

collegial actions to assure learning and success for all children. As she reviewed the materials, it seemed to her that the collegial part was very important as they looked at what they wanted to create in schools. The Bethel school district had a vision which stated that they offered a secure place where students gain knowledge, grow in wisdom, develop confidence, and value learning for life.

Mrs. Fanconi wanted to see a statement that said the Montgomery County Public Schools would develop collegial schools where adults and students were constantly learning because everyone would be encouraged to reach their full potential. She did like the goals they had developed, but she thought they needed to look carefully at the Vision statement. They had to have something that was concrete enough so that they could check back against it to make sure the decisions they made supported that vision.

Mr. Pishavar called attention to a statement in the Educational Technology Plan that the Board had discussed earlier. The statement was, "The 21st century is only nine years away, and some of its leaders are now attending Montgomery County Public Schools. How well they are prepared for their awesome adult responsibilities depends in large measure on the technological environment of their formative years." He thought that this statement could be modified as an introduction for their Vision statement, and he asked that Board members provide feedback.

Mrs. Brenneman thought that Mrs. Fanconi's point on collegiality was important. She recalled the excitement the day the superintendent's original statement had been distributed to staff. The staff had spent the whole day on this with lots of staff going through it, and collegiality was very strong. She thought it was somewhat strange that the Board would now say this was the kind of collegiality they were going to have. In regard to Mr. Pishavar's comment, she had a different reaction to that statement.

Mrs. Hobbs was glad that Mrs. Brenneman had brought up the A&S conference. It was interesting to sit in on a discussion of the Vision statement as it was presented that day. They needed to remember how much time and effort had already been devoted to what the Board had in front of it. There were focus groups before the Vision and goals were presented to the A&S conference. At the retreat, the Board had an opportunity to review and comment on the statement. She supported what was in front of the Board.

Ms. Gutierrez remarked that she was torn between accepting the statement or trying to make it better. She appreciated the discussions they had had at the retreat, but what she had heard from Mrs. Fanconi and Mr. Ewing was that the statement needed some additional excitement. While the statement did not do this,

she thought it was important for them to move forward. To her this was just a piece of the total package, the development of a strategic plan. She was ready to move forward with what they had here, but she was also looking forward to the October 29 meeting when they would be looking at those other issues. She suggested that they move forward with the statement. If Board members wanted to suggest some changes they could be provided to the superintendent so that the Board could look at it as a total package on October 29. She felt that right now she was only looking at part of the whole, and she would be happier when she had all the pieces.

Dr. Cheung thought that a vision was very important to provide direction. He had been involved with MCPS for many years. They had mission statements, priorities, goals, and plans, and he wondered whether these were connected. He thought that they were. It seemed to him that the statement before the Board was first visionary and then missionary. If Board members were not clear in their own minds about the statement, they might need to take more time to consider the statement. All future goals, priorities, and missions would have to flow from this statement. This should not be adopted by majority vote; it had to be adopted unanimously.

Mrs. Fanconi agreed that all Board members should be committed to the statement. If they decided to change it, this was not to say that the work that had been done previously was useless. It was a part of a process. Some work had been done on the Vision, and now they had to allow students, community members, and parents to have their say so that the statement would be relevant to them. She had a document to share with the Board on issues pulled from the minority education report that might be included in the goals. She thought this was something they should consider as they continued to discuss this issue.

Dr. Vance reported that staff had looked at a good number of vision statements and mission statements from other school systems. He believed that one of the features that would make the MCPS vision unique were the connectors they had been addressing. The Board had developed an agenda with action items which was a mandate to the superintendent. One of those was a mandate on long-range planning for the next decade. It was their sense that a vision was needed. A vision would put that in proper perspective. A vision would have attendant goals and flowing from them would be strategies and tasks. The superintendent would have to bring to the Board a strategic plan for implementation of that. The operating and capital budgets would have to reflect costs, if any. He believed that this would make their plan unique.

Mr. Ewing did not have any disagreement with the sentiments in the Vision statement. His concern was more a matter of the

nature of the expression. He had some concern about the second sentence which stated, "all children will receive...the opportunities they need to build knowledge." It struck him as a more passive role for students than he would like to see. While he did not mind students being receivers, he wanted them to be doers. He was uncomfortable with the opening statement. It opened like the Constitution and then went on to a "right" like the Declaration of Independence. He was not sure they could speak for the people of Montgomery County. This could divert public discussion from the substance of the statement. The document could incorporate these ideas but more in terms of what they wanted to be and to become. It might be couched in terms of transformation of schooling and changes that need to occur to meet the challenges that were already there and would grow more difficult to meet in the future.

Mr. Ewing pointed out that there were some documents where this sort of thing had been said lately. He mentioned a Department of Labor report and the Carnegie Commission report on math and science. He thought there was compelling language in those reports. In his memo to the Board, he had stated the following as his suggestion for the Vision:

"The Montgomery County public school system must be transformed into an organization relentlessly committed to the success of every student. This success will be the result of a commitment to excellence, creativity, a willingness to innovate, hard work and high performance on the part of every person involved in student education: teachers, staff members, administrators, students, parents, and the larger community. The product that will be expected and achieved will be skilled graduates who have well-developed minds, a continued willingness to learn, and who are prepared to live full lives in their communities and in the changing global society, who have learned how to enjoy the leisure that is the result of their work, and who have the ability and will to put knowledge to work for themselves and others. Students have a right to an education that prepares them for the 21st century in this way and an obligation to themselves and their society to obtain and use it."

Mr. Ewing explained that he would not change the goals, but from his point of view the statement he read incorporated the views in the previous statement but said it in a way that was somewhat more inspiring and motivating. It was intended to give people a view that there had to be change and that everyone had to be involved. The notion of collegiality was there. They were preparing students not merely to become successful and contributing members of society but for the other aspects of their lives. He believed that they had to say what distinguished MCPS from other systems. One of them was the notion of the focus

on each student which was in the original statement and emphasized more fully in his statement. He thought that the use of "relentless" was important because it meant a person never gave up. It meant a continuous dedication to task which did characterize Montgomery County. He said they ought to convey the notion that everyone had to work at this.

Mr. Ewing said they needed to focus on the specific people involved and focus on the product. They had to say what they were going to turn out and how they were going to know if they had gotten to where they wanted to be. The original statement had said they wanted to have students who were successful contributing members of a changing global society. He thought they needed to expand on that and say some things about the nature of that product. Dr. Vance had spoken several times to the "mark of a Montgomery County graduate." In addition to talking about students having a right to an education, they had to talk about their obligation to attain that education and to use it. He felt that this, too, would distinguish them from other school systems.

Mr. Ewing explained that he was not proposing his statement as an alternative at this juncture. He was suggesting that they might want to offer other suggestions and ideas to the community. He stated that this was not to suggest that what the staff and others had done was wrong. These were further suggestions about how to articulate what it was they ought to be about in the future. He thought they might want to wait until October 29 to take tentative action on any statement. After that action, they would circulate a draft statement for comments.

Re: MODIFICATIONS TO THE BOARD PROPOSED
POLICY ON POLICYSETTING

Mrs. Fanconi moved and Ms. Gutierrez seconded the following:

WHEREAS, A proposed revision to the Board's policy on policysetting was introduced; and

WHEREAS, On July 9, 1991, the superintendent was requested to provide reactions to the proposed revision; now therefore be it

Resolved, That Policy BFA: Policy on Policysetting, adopted by the Board of Education on August 7, 1984, amended on September 10, 1985, and again on August 12, 1986, be rescinded; and be it further

Resolved, That the following Policysetting policy be adopted:

A. PURPOSE

To establish a definition of policy and a uniform format for policy development and implementation

B. ISSUE

State law provides that the county Board of Education, with the advice of the superintendent, determines the educational policies of the school system. Therefore, there should be a comprehensive and uniform process for policy analysis, formulation, implementation, monitoring, and evaluation.

C. POSITION

1. Definition

Policy is defined as principles adopted by resolution of the Board of Education to guide the development and implementation of educational programs and/or for management of the school system. (State laws, bylaws of the State Board of Education, and federal guidelines are, in effect, mandated policies.)

2. Policy Development

- a) The superintendent and/or Board recognizes the need for a policy and how it relates to Board goals and objectives
- b) The Board requests or receives a policy analysis from the superintendent and staff on the need for a new policy or revisions to or rescissions of a policy and a draft of the policy if appropriate. The analysis may include but is not limited to:
 - (1) The relationship to other policies of the Board of Education and of other governmental agencies, if appropriate
 - (2) Legal aspects, including federal, state, and local laws, court decisions, and other legal limits or conditions
 - (3) Cost implications
 - (4) Effect on school system operation
 - (5) Similar policies adopted by other school systems

- c) The format for the policy analysis will be as follows:
 - (1) Statement of the issue(s) or questions addressed
 - (2) Description of the background, history, nature of the problems or issues, including the location of the problem, its origins, the number and kinds of staff involved, the resources involved, and other relevant background data
 - (3) The options that might address or resolve the problem or issue, including for each option the cost, the benefits, the obstacles to be overcome, the strategies and actions to be employed to achieve the results, and the measures or indicators to be used to demonstrate success or failure
 - (4) A recommendation for selection of an option and reasons that include comparison of options
- d) A policy analysis will be presented to the Board as an item of information.
- e) When the superintendent or Board member presents a proposed policy, a timeline for adoption will accompany it that will include the following elements:
 - (1) A resolution that indicates the policy will lie on the table for at least one week before being voted upon. (The presiding officer rules as to whether any proposed resolution is a policy. If there is an emergency, this provision may be waived without notice if all members are present and there is unanimous agreement.)
 - (2) Opportunity for citizen and staff comment
 - (3) Opportunity for public hearing (if the Board desires)
 - (4) Opportunity for the superintendent to provide advice and recommendations
- f) The Board will adopt a policy with a standard format which will include as appropriate:

- (1) A statement of the purpose of the policy
- (2) A description of the problem or issue that the policy addresses and purports to resolve
- (3) A statement of the policy position or positions adopted by the Board, including a brief statement of the reasons and/or justification for these positions
- (4) A statement of the results or outcomes desired
- (5) The strategies to be used in guiding the implementation of the policy
- (6) Specification of when reports are to be made to the Board of Education and the public on implementation and effectiveness, results achieved, and next steps. The frequency of reports will depend on such factors as high public interest, legal mandates, and the experimental/innovative nature of the activity.

3. Policy Implementation

After adoption, the superintendent will follow up with:

- (a) Regulations for implementation if appropriate
- (b) Publication of policy and regulation in the handbook and distribution to affected parties
- (c) Continuous monitoring of the policy and implementation and reporting to the Board as required under Section F., Review and Reporting

D. DESIRED OUTCOME

Policies that are well researched and analyzed prior to adoption or amendment and monitored by staff with results reported to the Board subsequent to adoption.

E. IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGIES

The superintendent will develop a process for implementing this policy that will include coordination of policy analyses, presentation to the Board, implementing regulations, monitoring reports, and maintaining the process.

F. REVIEW AND REPORTING

1. An annual report is to be made to the Board of Education on the status of the review process, including the number of policies that were reviewed, revised, and rescinded.
2. The superintendent, at his/her discretion or the Board of Education's request, will report progress on or problems in implementation of this policy.
3. The superintendent will review each policy at least every three years, but the Board may call for review at its discretion.
 - (a) When the review results in recommended content changes to the policy including rescinding the policy, the process for policy formulation described above will be followed.
 - (b) When the review reveals that no content changes are recommended, the policy will be reprinted with a new review date in the policy history and will be forwarded to the Board as an item of information. Any member of the Board may identify any of these policies for further review as needed.

RESOLUTION NO. 851-91 Re: AN AMENDMENT TO THE PROPOSED
RESOLUTION ON POLICYSETTING

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

Resolved, That the proposed resolution on policysetting be amended to substitute the following for the Resolved clauses:

Resolved, That the Board of Education take tentative action to approve the proposed policy on policysetting; and be it further

Resolved, That the policy be sent out for comments to be received within 45 days.

RESOLUTION NO. 852-91 Re: TENTATIVE APPROVAL OF THE POLICY ON
POLICYSETTING

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

WHEREAS, On July 9, 1991, the superintendent was requested to provide reactions to the proposed revision; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Board of Education take tentative action to approve the proposed policy on policyssetting; and be it further

Resolved, That the policy be sent out for comments to be received within 45 days.

A. PURPOSE

To establish a definition of policy and a uniform format for policy development and implementation

B. ISSUE

State law provides that the county Board of Education, with the advice of the superintendent, determines the educational policies of the school system. Therefore, there should be a comprehensive and uniform process for policy analysis, formulation, implementation, monitoring, and evaluation.

C. POSITION

1. Definition

Policy is defined as principles adopted by resolution of the Board of Education to guide the development and implementation of educational programs and/or for management of the school system. (State laws, bylaws of the State Board of Education, and federal guidelines are, in effect, mandated policies.)

2. Policy Development

- a) The superintendent and/or Board recognizes the need for a policy and how it relates to Board goals and objectives
- b) The Board requests or receives a policy analysis from the superintendent and staff on the need for a new policy or revisions to or rescissions of a policy and a draft of the policy if appropriate. The analysis may include but is not limited to:
 - (1) The relationship to other policies of the Board of Education and of other governmental agencies, if appropriate

- (2) Legal aspects, including federal, state, and local laws, court decisions, and other legal limits or conditions
 - (3) Cost implications
 - (4) Effect on school system operation
 - (5) Similar policies adopted by other school systems
- c) The format for the policy analysis will be as follows:
- (1) Statement of the issue(s) or questions addressed
 - (2) Description of the background, history, nature of the problems or issues, including the location of the problem, its origins, the number and kinds of staff involved, the resources involved, and other relevant background data
 - (3) The options that might address or resolve the problem or issue, including for each option the cost, the benefits, the obstacles to be overcome, the strategies and actions to be employed to achieve the results, and the measures or indicators to be used to demonstrate success or failure
 - (4) A recommendation for selection of an option and reasons that include comparison of options
- d) A policy analysis will be presented to the Board as an item of information.
- e) When the superintendent or Board member presents a proposed policy, a timeline for adoption will accompany it that will include the following elements:
- (1) A resolution that indicates the policy will lie on the table for at least one week before being voted upon. (The presiding officer rules as to whether any proposed resolution is a policy. If there is an emergency, this provision may be waived without notice if all members are present and there is unanimous agreement.)

- (2) Opportunity for citizen and staff comment
 - (3) Opportunity for public hearing (if the Board desires)
 - (4) Opportunity for the superintendent to provide advice and recommendations
- f) The Board will adopt a policy with a standard format which will include as appropriate:
- (1) A statement of the purpose of the policy
 - (2) A description of the problem or issue that the policy addresses and purports to resolve
 - (3) A statement of the policy position or positions adopted by the Board, including a brief statement of the reasons and/or justification for these positions
 - (4) A statement of the results or outcomes desired
 - (5) The strategies to be used in guiding the implementation of the policy
 - (6) Specification of when reports are to be made to the Board of Education and the public on implementation and effectiveness, results achieved, and next steps. The frequency of reports will depend on such factors as high public interest, legal mandates, and the experimental/innovative nature of the activity.

3. Policy Implementation

After adoption, the superintendent will follow up with:

- (a) Regulations for implementation if appropriate
- (b) Publication of policy and regulation in the handbook and distribution to affected parties
- (c) Continuous monitoring of the policy and implementation and reporting to the Board as required under Section F., Review and Reporting

D. DESIRED OUTCOME

Policies that are well researched and analyzed prior to adoption or amendment and monitored by staff with results reported to the Board subsequent to adoption.

E. IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGIES

The superintendent will develop a process for implementing this policy that will include coordination of policy analyses, presentation to the Board, implementing regulations, monitoring reports, and maintaining the process.

F. REVIEW AND REPORTING

1. An annual report is to be made to the Board of Education on the status of the review process, including the number of policies that were reviewed, revised, and rescinded.
2. The superintendent, at his/her discretion or the Board of Education's request, will report progress on or problems in implementation of this policy.
3. The superintendent will review each policy at least every three years, but the Board may call for review at its discretion.
 - (a) When the review results in recommended content changes to the policy including rescinding the policy, the process for policy formulation described above will be followed.
 - (b) When the review reveals that no content changes are recommended, the policy will be reprinted with a new review date in the policy history and will be forwarded to the Board as an item of information. Any member of the Board may identify any of these policies for further review as needed.

Re: PROPOSED POLICY ON PLACEMENT,
PROMOTION, ACCELERATION, AND
RETENTION

Mrs. Fanconi moved and Ms. Gutierrez seconded the following:

WHEREAS, When PreK-12 policies were revised, language on promotion and retention of students was not included; and

WHEREAS, The Board of Education requested that the language on promotion and retention be retained as policy; and

WHEREAS, Placement, promotion, acceleration, and retention decisions have a profound effect on students; and

WHEREAS, Staff making decisions on placement, promotion, acceleration, and retention must be guided by the belief that all students can learn, progress and achieve when individual differences are recognized and addressed through adjustment in programming; and

WHEREAS, Research indicates that retention increases the likelihood of school dropout and loss of self-esteem, and actually decreases student achievement; and

WHEREAS, Montgomery County Public Schools is committed to providing success for every student; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Board of Education tentatively adopts the policy on Placement, Promotion, Acceleration, and Retention; and be it further

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

PLACEMENT, PROMOTION, ACCELERATION, AND RETENTION

A. PURPOSE

To establish a policy that recognizes the profound effect that placement, promotion, acceleration, and retention decisions have on students

To provide a process that supports the Board of Education's strong commitment to the success of all students

B. PROCESS AND CONTENT

This policy supports the belief that all students in regular and special education can learn, progress, and achieve when individual differences are recognized and addressed through adjustments in programming. Each child's cognitive, physical, emotional, and social developmental rate is unique. Current MCPS practices reflect a commitment to this premise.

The final responsibility for decisions on placement, promotion, acceleration, and retention of students rests with the principal. The decision-making process includes parents and staff. Students are also included where appropriate.

1. Placement and Promotion

- a. In prekindergarten through grade two, placement and promotion are based on age. For Kindergarten, see MCPS Policy JEB: Early Entrance to First Grade and Administrative Regulation JEB-RB: Early Entrance to First Grade and for prekindergarten through grade two, refer to Policy IEF: Early Childhood Education.
- b. In grades three through eight, placement and promotion are based on academic progress and attainment of objectives assigned to the student. Other factors that must be considered are social, emotional, and physical maturity.
- c. In grades nine through twelve, placement and promotion of students are based on the number of credits earned as prescribed by Administrative Regulation JEB-RA: Placement, Promotion, Acceleration, and Retention of Pupils.
- d. For students with documented special education needs, placement and promotion decisions are made through the Admissions, Review, and Dismissal Process (ARD).

2. Acceleration

Before a student in grades one through eight is considered for acceleration, the student's needs must be reviewed by the Educational Management Team, with parent and student involvement. For students in kindergarten, see MCPS Policy JEB: Early Entrance to First Grade and Administrative Regulation JEB-RB: Early Entrance to First Grade. The final responsibility for the decision rests with the principal.

3. Interventions

When a student in grades PreK-8 is not attaining assigned objectives, the teacher will initiate intervention strategies. When the student does not respond to the strategies, the Educational Management Team will develop a plan for educational support. Parents will participate in the development of the plan as will students, when appropriate. The principal will monitor the implementation of this plan.

When a student in grades 9-12 is not attaining the course objectives, the teacher(s) and counselor will

Resolved, That the proposed resolution on placement, promotion, acceleration, and retention be amended to add the following:

WHEREAS, The focus of this policy is on increasing student success through early intervention to assure that all students learn, progress, and achieve and that the policy provides a framework for early, well planned, and documented intervention; and

and be it further

Resolved, That the following be added to A. Purpose:

To provide a framework for increasing individual student success through early, well planned, and documented intervention

Mrs. Fanconi requested that the articles accompanying the policy be included when the proposed policy was sent out for comment.

RESOLUTION NO. 854-91 Re: AN AMENDMENT TO THE PROPOSED POLICY
ON PLACEMENT, PROMOTION,
ACCELERATION, AND RETENTION

On motion of Mrs. DiFonzo seconded by Mrs. Fanconi, 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 being temporarily absent:

Resolved, That the following sentence be added to Sections 1 and 4 as a new section e:

The final responsibility for the(se) decision(s) rests with the principal.

RESOLUTION NO. 855-91 Re: AN AMENDMENT TO THE PROPOSED POLICY
ON PLACEMENT, PROMOTION,
ACCELERATION, AND RETENTION

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

Resolved, That "other factors that meet the needs of the whole child must be considered" be substituted for "other factors that must be considered are social, emotional, and physical maturity" in Section B.1.b of the proposed policy on placement, promotion, acceleration, and retention.

RESOLUTION NO. 856-91 Re: AN AMENDMENT TO THE PROPOSED POLICY
ON PLACEMENT, PROMOTION,
ACCELERATION, AND RETENTION

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

Resolved, That the proposed policy on placement, promotion, acceleration, and retention be amended to substitute "should be based" for "are based" in Section B.1.c.

RESOLUTION NO. 857-91 Re: AN AMENDMENT TO THE PROPOSED POLICY
ON PLACEMENT, PROMOTION,
ACCELERATION, AND RETENTION

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

Resolved, That the proposed policy on placement, promotion, acceleration, and retention be amended to substitute "will be encouraged to participate" for "will participate" in Section B.3.

There was agreement to add "will be encouraged to participate" in the second paragraph under Section B.3.

RESOLUTION NO. 858-91 Re: AN AMENDMENT TO THE PROPOSED POLICY
ON PLACEMENT, PROMOTION,
ACCELERATION, AND RETENTION

On motion of Mrs. Fanconi seconded by Mr. Pischevar, 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 being temporarily absent:

Resolved, That the proposed policy on placement, promotion, acceleration, and retention be amended to add "(see EMT-ARD Procedures Manual)" after any reference to the Educational Management Team in each section, if appropriate.

There was agreement to substitute "retention should be based" for "retention is based" under B.4.c.

RESOLUTION NO. 859-91 Re: AN AMENDMENT TO THE PROPOSED POLICY
ON PLACEMENT, PROMOTION,
ACCELERATION, AND RETENTION

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

Resolved, That the proposed policy on placement, promotion, acceleration, and retention be amended to substitute "only when planned intervention efforts" for "when efforts" in B.4.b.

RESOLUTION NO. 860-91 Re: AN AMENDMENT TO THE PROPOSED POLICY
ON PLACEMENT, PROMOTION,
ACCELERATION, AND RETENTION

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

Resolved, That the proposed policy on placement, promotion, acceleration, and retention be amended to add a sentence to C. Review and Reporting: " An annual report on retentions will be submitted to the Board of Education."

RESOLUTION NO. 861-91 Re: AN AMENDMENT TO THE PROPOSED
RESOLUTION ON PLACEMENT, PROMOTION,
ACCELERATION, AND RETENTION

On motion of Mrs. Fanconi seconded by Mr. Ewing, 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 abstaining:

Resolved, That the following resolved clauses be added to the proposed resolution on placement, promotion, acceleration, and retention:

Resolved, That the Department of Educational Accountability be directed to do a baseline report (including characteristics other than grade level) on the success of students who have been retained; and be it further

Resolved, That the superintendent will develop regulations on the proposed policy and those regulations would come to the Board for review and approval.

The Board agreed to substitute "The Montgomery County Public Schools is committed to success for every student" for the sixth Whereas clause.

RESOLUTION NO. 862-91 Re: PROPOSED POLICY ON PLACEMENT,
PROMOTION, ACCELERATION, AND
RETENTION

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Mrs. Fanconi seconded by Ms. Gutierrez, 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 abstaining:

WHEREAS, When PreK-12 policies were revised, language on promotion and retention of students was not included; and

WHEREAS, The Board of Education requested that the language on promotion and retention be retained as policy; and

WHEREAS, Placement, promotion, acceleration, and retention decisions have a profound effect on students; and

WHEREAS, Staff making decisions on placement, promotion, acceleration, and retention must be guided by the belief that all students can learn, progress and achieve when individual differences are recognized and addressed through adjustment in programming; and

WHEREAS, Research indicates that retention increases the likelihood of school dropout and loss of self-esteem, and actually decreases student achievement; and

WHEREAS, The focus of this policy is on increasing student success through early intervention to assure that all students learn, progress, and achieve and that the policy provides a framework for early, well planned, and documented intervention; and

WHEREAS, The Montgomery County Public Schools is committed to success for every student; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Department of Educational Accountability be directed to do a baseline report (including characteristics other than grade level) on the success of students who have been retained; and be it further

Resolved, That the superintendent will develop regulations on the proposed policy and those regulations would come to the Board for review and approval; and be it further

Resolved, That the Board of Education tentatively adopts the policy on Placement, Promotion, Acceleration, and Retention; and be it further

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

PLACEMENT, PROMOTION, ACCELERATION, AND RETENTION

A. PURPOSE

To establish a policy that recognizes the profound effect that placement, promotion, acceleration, and retention decisions have on students

To provide a process that supports the Board of Education's strong commitment to the success of all students

To provide a framework for increasing individual student success through early, well planned, and documented intervention

B. PROCESS AND CONTENT

This policy supports the belief that all students in regular and special education can learn, progress, and achieve when individual differences are recognized and addressed through adjustments in programming. Each child's cognitive, physical, emotional, and social developmental rate is unique. Current MCPS practices reflect a commitment to this premise.

The final responsibility for decisions on placement, promotion, acceleration, and retention of students rests with the principal. The decision-making process includes parents and staff. Students are also included where appropriate.

1. Placement and Promotion

- a. In prekindergarten through grade two, placement and promotion are based on age. For Kindergarten, see MCPS Policy JEB: Early Entrance to First Grade and Administrative Regulation JEB-RB: Early Entrance to First Grade and for prekindergarten through grade two, refer to Policy IEF: Early Childhood Education.
- b. In grades three through eight, placement and promotion are based on academic progress and attainment of objectives assigned to the student. Other factors that meet the needs of the whole child must be considered.
- c. In grades nine through twelve, placement and promotion of students should be based on the number of credits earned as prescribed by

Administrative Regulation JEB-RA: Placement, Promotion, Acceleration, and Retention of Pupils.

- d. For students with documented special education needs, placement and promotion decisions are made through the Admissions, Review, and Dismissal Process (ARD).
- e. The final responsibility for these decisions rests with the principal.

2. Acceleration

Before a student in grades one through eight is considered for acceleration, the student's needs must be reviewed by the Educational Management Team (see EMT-ARD Procedures Manual), with parent and student involvement. For students in kindergarten, see MCPS Policy JEB: Early Entrance to First Grade and Administrative Regulation JEB-RB: Early Entrance to First Grade. The final responsibility for the decision rests with the principal.

3. Interventions

When a student in grades PreK-8 is not attaining assigned objectives, the teacher will initiate intervention strategies. When the student does not respond to the strategies, the Educational Management Team (see EMT-ARD Procedures Manual) will develop a plan for educational support. Parents will be encouraged to participate in the development of the plan as will students, when appropriate. The principal will monitor the implementation of this plan.

When a student in grades 9-12 is not attaining the course objectives, the teacher(s) and counselor will develop a plan of intervention strategies. If these strategies are not successful, the Educational Management Team (see EMT-ARD Procedures Manual) will modify the plan. Parents and students will be encouraged to participate in the process. The principal will monitor the implementation of the plan.

4. Retention

- a. In prekindergarten through grade two, retention is not expected to occur. Students who are not performing according to expectations are provided additional assistance. See the policy on Early Childhood Education.

- b. In grades three through eight, retention is to be used only when planned intervention efforts to assist the student in achieving the assigned objectives have been unsuccessful. When retention is considered, the Educational Management Team (see EMT-ARD Procedures Manual), together with parents, develops a plan for educational support for the school year in which the retention is to occur. The student is included in the process. The principal will monitor the implementation of this plan.
- c. In grades nine through twelve, retention is based on the number of credits that the student has earned as prescribed in Administrative Regulation JEB-RA: Placement, Promotion, Acceleration, and Retention.
- d. The principal will report the proposed plan of support to each retained student in elementary and mid-level schools to the Area Director of Educational Services.
- e. The final responsibility for this decision rests with the principal.

C. REVIEW AND REPORTING

This policy will be reviewed every three years in accordance with the Board of Education policy review process.

An annual report on retentions will be submitted to the Board of Education.

RESOLUTION NO. 863-91 Re: BOE Appeal No. 1991-07

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education adopt its Decision and Order dismissing BOE Appeal No. 1991-07 (a personnel matter).

RESOLUTION NO. 864-91 Re: BOE APPEALS NO. 1991-33, -48, -54, -72, -83, -84, -98, -107, -108, and -111

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education adopt its Decision and Orders dismissing the following transfer appeals: BOE Appeals No. 1991-33, -48, -54, -72, -83, -84, -98, -107, -108, and -111.

RESOLUTION NO. 865-91 Re: BOE APPEAL NO. 1991-80

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education adopt its Decision and Order in BOE Appeal No. 1991-80, a transfer matter.

*Mrs. Brenneman left the meeting at this point.

Re: LEGISLATIVE UPDATE

Mr. Ewing welcomed Mrs. Lois Stoner, legislative aide, and Mr. Larry Bowers, budget director. The Board had been concerned over the last several days over prospects of cuts by the Legislature in education funding. They had been in communication with the Legislature and the county about the Board's views in this matter.

Mr. Bowers reported that the situation had been in constant flux. The figure proposed by the governor and the Board of Public Works was now \$786,000 which would go into effect on November 1. In a memo to the Board he had highlighted the impact of these cuts to MCPS. These included cuts in Adult Education, food services, the Extended Elementary Education Program, Maryland's Tomorrow, and RICA.

Mrs. Stoner called attention to another attachment to the memo which was a legislative proposal to restore some of these reductions. This would require legislative action and was being proposed by the House leadership. She noted that there was a good possibility that this would not be supported because of its devastating effect on education. The reductions totalled about \$45 million, and three-fourths of that was state allocations to LEAs. Most LEAs would receive a 2 to 2.5 percent cut across the board including retirement and Social Security. The total cut for MCPS would be \$4.3 million.

Mrs. Stoner reported that there would be no tax increases as part of this compromise. There might be taxes passed during the session in January. She believed there was no consensus for this proposal in the Montgomery County Delegation.

Mrs. Fanconi noted that this would be the first time the state had touched Social Security and teachers' retirement. Mrs. Stoner explained that they would have to pay the Social Security locally, but the picture was not clear on the retirement issue. It might mean an increase in the UAL to balance the fund. She said that the precedent was set this year when the state said

that if LEAs increased the COLA they would not pay retirement and Social Security for the increase.

Board members thanked Mrs. Stoner for her efforts in Annapolis. Mr. Ewing said that the Board had sent messages to members of the Delegation and other leaders in Annapolis. The messages had urged the Delegation to seek alternative sources of revenue. Mrs. Fanconi requested a list from the staff on the potential impact of actions in Annapolis and options for handling this crisis. Dr. Vance commented that they had had a concerted team effort during this crisis. He acknowledged the efforts of Brian Porter, the director of information.

Re: BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS

1. Mrs. Hobbs requested that an additional item be included on the monthly construction progress report. They now listed the contract award date, scheduled contract completion, etc. She requested a new item called "construction start date."
2. Mrs. Hobbs noted that the Board had a recommendation from Dr. Lancaster that the Board review Resolution No. 60-79 which dealt with human relations. She requested further clarification on this as to whether it should be a new business item or whether it could be accomplished some other way.
3. Mrs. Fanconi stated that for the television audience she was reporting that the Maryland Senate did agree with the House and the proposal would go to the governor tomorrow. They proposed to replace the governor's cuts with a number of cuts that hit education very heavily. Mr. Ewing pointed out that this could only take place if the governor agreed.
4. Mrs. Fanconi suggested that the construction report could be amended by putting the starting date under the award-of-contract date. Dr. Rohr indicated that he would provide a memo on this issue because they would have to decide on a definition of when construction started.
5. Mr. Ewing stated that he would be proposing a new business item on security. He felt it was time for the Board to consider what steps needed to be taken to increase assurances that they were doing everything in their power to provide as much security as they could in the schools to make certain they were safe places for students and staff. He reported that at every event he had attended last weekend people were talking about the shooting at Blair High School and the implications of that for school safety.
6. Mr. Ewing commented that there were a great many people in the county who were very supportive of the public schools. There were also many who did not have children in the public schools

and who expressed the view that they did not see why they should pay taxes to support the schools. He thought they needed to address that issue head-on. He said that the average cost to educate a child was about \$7,000 a year, but most families did not pay taxes that were equal to this amount. They had, in effect, a revolving fund in which people paid and were subsidized and then subsidized others. He suggested that this needed to be made clearer to the general population in some fashion.

RESOLUTION NO. 866-91 Re: EXECUTIVE SESSION - OCTOBER 21,
1991

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Mrs. DiFonzo seconded by Dr. Cheung, 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 October 21, 1991, at 7:30 p.m. to discuss, consider, deliberate, and/or otherwise decide the employment, assignment, appointment, promotion, demotion, compensation, discipline, removal, or resignation of employees, appointees, or officials over whom it has jurisdiction, or any other personnel matter affecting one or more particular individuals and to comply with a specific constitutional, statutory or judicially imposed requirement that prevents public disclosures about a particular proceeding or matter as permitted under the State Government Article, Section 10-508; and that such meeting shall continue in executive closed session until the completion of business.

RESOLUTION NO. 867-91 Re: MINUTES OF AUGUST 8, 1991

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

Resolved, That the minutes of August 8, 1991, be approved.

RESOLUTION NO. 868-91 Re: GOALS OF EDUCATION

On motion of Mrs. DiFonzo seconded by Mrs. Brenneman (on October 8, 1991), the following resolution was adopted unanimously:

Resolved, That the Board of Education schedule a time to discuss the Goals of Education with the intention of reaffirming their commitment to those goals.

RESOLUTION NO. 869-91 Re: STAFF RESPONSE TO THE ANNUAL REPORT
OF THE MENTAL HEALTH ADVISORY
COMMITTEE

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education schedule a meeting for discussion and action on the superintendent's response to the recommendations contained in the Annual Report of the Mental Health Advisory Committee.

Mrs. Hobbs assumed the chair.

Re: NEW BUSINESS

1. Mr. Ewing moved and Mrs. DiFonzo seconded that the Board of Education schedule a time to review the superintendent's recommendations to correct gaps in Board compliance with the new Open Meetings Law.
2. Mr. Ewing moved and Mr. Pishevar seconded that the Board of Education request the superintendent to review the procedures, policies, and resources that MCPS has with regard to the security and safety of schools in the county and that the superintendent make such recommendations as seem to him appropriate and necessary to ensure improved levels of safety and security at the earliest possible date.

Re: ITEMS OF INFORMATION

Board members received the following items of information:

1. Report on the Transfer Process
2. Items in Process
3. Construction Progress Report
4. Residency and Tuition Review Committee Annual Report

Re: ADJOURNMENT

The president adjourned the meeting at 7:05 p.m.

PRESIDENT

SECRETARY

