

Appropriate behavior guidelines will be developed and included in the Student Rights and Responsibilities handbook; appropriate and inappropriate behaviors will be discussed in all classrooms in age-appropriate ways

and be it further

Resolved, That the superintendent report regularly to the Board on sexual harassment incidents reported in MCPS and the steps being taken in MCPS facilities to assure that the proper educational and work climate exists.

Re: COST/BENEFIT ANALYSIS - CENTRAL
FOOD PRODUCTION FACILITY

Dr. Rohr introduced Mr. William Eaton, senior vice president of Cini Little International, Inc.; Mr. Mitch Brown, assistant director of construction; Mr. William Wilder, director of the Department of School Facilities; Mrs. Joanne Styer, director of food services; and Ms. Scottie Brown, assistant director of food services. He recalled that the central production facility project was initiated in 1990. Architectural planning funds were requested and approved in FY 1992 with the understanding that construction funding for this project would not come from general obligation bonds. It had been proposed that funds be obtained through the sale of revenue bonds by the county revenue authority. Legislation had been introduced in Maryland which would change the Montgomery County Charter and permit the sale of bonds for this project.

Dr. Rohr reported that design work was scheduled to begin immediately, assuming Board approval, with construction to begin in March, 1993 and occupancy in the summer of 1994. In October, 1991, the Board passed a resolution directing staff to obtain a cost/benefit analysis of the project by an independent consultant. Cini Little was appointed to do such a study and their report was a favorable one showing the cost effectiveness of the proposed facility. Mr. Eaton would be summarizing the results of the report and answering questions regarding the report. Ms. Gutierrez and Mrs. Fanconi had submitted questions that Mr. Eaton would be addressing. Mr. Wilder would address the question of the land for the facility.

Mr. Eaton described his professional background and the research and projects his firm had conducted. The first charge to his firm was to evaluate as much available information as possible in order to evaluate the current system of delivery of meals to schools and with that material establish a basis for calculating per meal and total system costs for operating in the current mode for the next ten years. They then set about to establish a

similar set of statistics which would relate to a centralized cook-chill production facility serving the students of Montgomery County and defining the per meal and total system cost for that system projected over the next ten years. They took into consideration existing and project labor rates, existing staffing structures, proposed staffing structures, specialized staff requirements for centralized facility, and any other staff and labor related concerns they could identify. They evaluated all major areas of cost including transportation, new equipment capital purchases, replacements, and food processing costs.

Mr. Eaton said that after completing their analysis, they determined that conservatively over the period 1995 through the year 2000 a cumulative savings of almost \$22 million could be realized. He noted that 85 percent of those savings were related to labor, and they had determined that all savings could be accomplished by attrition and that no reduction in force would be required. They evaluated the capital cost requirements for the facility, and they determined that excluding the cost of land, the facility could be completed for less than \$6 million. They believed that the pay-back for the entire facility would occur during the early part of the third full year of operation.

Mr. Eaton reported that a number of other school jurisdictions were currently operating cook/chill systems and that they found it highly beneficial relative to overall system savings and to the delivery of consistently high quality meals. Based on the results of their study and the subsequent investigations prompted by questions from the Board, Cini Little recommended the development of the central production facility to serve MCPS and other county agencies as deemed appropriate and cost effective.

In response to questions raised by Ms. Gutierrez and Mrs. Fanconi, Mr. Eaton stated that he had tried to group the questions into similar categories. The first group dealt with labor and staffing and the first request was to rework projections using the average operating statistics over the last three years. This was not requested in the scope of their study, and Cini Little had determined that the most recent operating statistics, the 1990-91 year, would be most be most valid because they included the most recent increases in cost. There was no reason to expect that the costs in the future would decrease. Therefore, they believed that a valid comparison was developed.

Mr. Eaton said that the second question from Mrs. Fanconi was to utilize operating statistics from other schools to compare with projections of cost. Again, their charge was to develop a cost benefit analysis, not a comparison. As they addressed the Peat Marwick letter of February 7, they indicated that the comparison with other systems was extremely complex and time-consuming because each system operated in a different manner. A specific reference was made to the Norfolk, Virginia system which Mrs.

Fanconi identified as having 53 employees. The Cini Little projection dealt with full-time equivalents and not employees. A review of the actual hours contributed by each employee and a further review of the employee job categories revealed that 304 hours total were devoted to the system and approximately 36 of those hours were devoted to sanitation and clerical activities. The resulting 258 hours related to 32 FTE. With the high level of efficiency in the food service operation in MCPS, there was every expectation that they would be able to operate the facility using the labor projections included in the cost benefit analysis.

Mr. Eaton said that in regard to Mrs. Fanconi's third question, there was a reference in the Peat Marwick letter to labor savings of 85 percent which went on to request a detailed plan for reduction of employees. In Cini Little's response, there was reference to both attrition that had been experienced in the past year and the number of staff currently on the payroll who would reach retirement age by the time the facility was activated. Therefore, there was no reduction in employees as such. Attrition would more than equal the reduction in labor slots. The question of reducing staff while enrollment increased was answered by the fact that highly efficient centralized systems did just that. Increased student population and increased meal services would not result in increased costs to the citizens of Montgomery County. The projections were not assumptions but related to current levels of staffing within the schools where centralized production was being used in the elementary schools.

In regard to the question about transition, Mr. Eaton said this was included in the response to Peat Marwick. The training process was on-going and was being implemented in the existing central facilities. Based on the highly efficient centralized administration, this could easily be accomplished.

A question was raised about utilities, Mr. Eaton stated that while this was a valid question and utilities were a line item expense for a production facility, they were omitted from the study because no parallel cost reduction could be effectively quantified. Utilities were not separately metered in schools. Cini Little believed that the cost of utilities for the central production facility would be no greater and would be less than that currently experienced in operating a multitude of secondary schools and the four elementary school production centers. In regard to transportation, there was a very extensive section within the report, and they believed that the projected costs for transportation were well documented. The MCPS warehouse system had been cited as being extremely efficient, and he believed their costs for mileage, labor, and truck costs were a valid basis for projecting costs in the future. He believed that the transportation questions raised by Mrs. Fanconi and Ms. Gutierrez were responded to in the Cini Little report because the section

of the report on transportation addressed every aspect they felt was valid.

In regard to the question on building costs, Mr. Eaton said their projection was \$105 per square foot. A school was a structure with many different areas with different cost considerations. For example, hallways cost less than classrooms and classrooms cost less than laboratories. The central production facility was a complex facility with complex utility considerations and very expensive finishes such as tile floors and walls. The cost was similar to that of a similar facility in Reston, Virginia which was constructed as a flight production kitchen.

Mr. Eaton reported that they had made reference to the cost of the equipment that would be eliminated as schools were built under a central production facility. They had also identified the cost of the equipment for the central production facility. In regard to other school systems, he indicated that the systems he had contacted regarded the central production facility as a benefit. There was a question about refrigeration and maintenance staff in Norfolk, and Mr. Eaton replied that this system was operated at a less than efficient level for its early years and now operated efficiently. They believed that with the high level of maintenance in Montgomery County that there would be a drop in the cost of maintenance. They also felt that the maintenance for the central production facility would be more than offset by the reduction in maintenance of a multitude of secondary schools where cook-service systems were currently operating and the four production centers.

Mr. Eaton said that the final question was on labor costs which were referred to in the Peat Marwick response. Longevity and merit increases were a fact and happened in any staff situation. While Cini Little had not included them, they increased the potential for cost savings.

Mr. Wilder reported that the county government held title to the county service park. County agencies and MCPS had a long-term lease arrangement through the county government at no cost. They had agreement with the county service park committee to use more than a half an acre of land adjacent to the current food service warehouse and the liquor warehouse. They had reviewed the soil data for the original building, and there were no known problems with the subsoil. The director of the revenue authority was willing to work with MCPS to provide funds for the project. If the state legislation was approved, the project description form in the capital budget would continue the request for funds for this facility and would be shown in the budget of the revenue authority. It would be cross referenced in the capital budget, but it would be funded from non-general obligation bonds which would not compete with either capital or operating funds.

Mrs. DiFonzo requested some further explanation of how they came up with the projected food expense and how this was calculated. Mr. Eaton replied that they had established the current level of food production cost on a per meal basis of \$0.524. There was a table in the report related to the cost of processing the USDA commodities in house. They subtracted this from the \$0.524 to obtain \$0.49. In the text, they referred to an 8 to 10 percent food cost savings which had been experienced by most systems. They chose not to use that because MCPS already operated an extremely efficient system. Mrs. DiFonzo said they referred to the cost per day at 185 days a year, and she wondered what happened to that cost if they had snow days. Mr. Eaton replied that if the food were not used that day, it had a shelf life. Therefore, the food produced was not lost.

Mrs. DiFonzo noted that the Board members had just been handed a fax, and she wondered where it came from and who asked for it. Mrs. Fanconi explained that she had a call last evening on her voice mail, and she returned the call this morning and gave the individual their fax number. She did not talk to the person other than hearing that he had additional information on the central production facility.

Mrs. DiFonzo asked if anyone had information about Mr. Hopkins and his motives for sending the information. Dr. Rohr replied that the Hopkins consulting firm was considered for doing this study and also was considered as a potential design consultant and was not successful. Mrs. DiFonzo said that in her quick review of the Hopkins paper, many of the questions were answered in the Cini Little report. She did not see a lot of value in what was faxed to the Board and could not give the report credibility because it had been given to them at the eleventh hour. Mrs. Fanconi commented that she didn't have anything to say other than the fact that somebody wanted to get this information to the Board. Dr. Rohr stated that he had been informed that this firm did not have experience with cook/chill but rather they were involved in the design of kitchens in secondary schools. He pointed out that Marty Strombotne was in the audience who was manager of food services at Gaithersburg High School, one of the managers of the cook/chill pilot program, and secretary-treasurer of MCCSSE.

Mrs. Fanconi commented that the Board felt it was important to have a study when they considered this project. They now had the study even though she felt there were some limitations to it. They had asked that the study go to Peat Marwick, the Board's auditor, for their comments on the methodology and the analysis. Most of her questions addressed concerns raised by Peat Marwick because she took their concerns seriously. She thought that what they were looking at was the technology of the next century. She thought they needed to move to a very automated facility, but practically she felt the important thing was for her to ask those

questions in order to be convinced that this kind of expenditure was necessary and timely. With the fiscal climate, they needed to consider very seriously any additional outlays of capital.

Although it was not in the original specifications, Mrs. Fanconi was somewhat disappointed that there was not a comparison with other school systems that were up and running because that would have strengthened the recommendations. She pointed out that they had not had experience with the revenue authority. She wanted to know what was going to happen, who was going to sell the bonds, and how long the payback would have to be. Dr. Rohr replied that the revenue authority would be selling the bonds. The enabling legislation expands the authority of the revenue authority to sell bonds; however, the details would have to be worked out. The county Department of Finance would assist MCPS in working through those details. This would be paid off through the savings out of the enterprise fund and not out of the general fund of MCPS. The bonds would not be needed until a year from now at the earliest. They would work out a schedule with the revenue authority on the payoff schedule. Normally these were 20-year bonds, but the staff thought the bonds would be paid off more rapidly probably in the first few years of operation of the facility.

Mrs. Fanconi asked whether MCPS would be taking on a debt service. Dr. Rohr explained that technically they would not. In the sale of these bonds, the revenue authority would be citing the enterprise fund as the source of the revenue to pay off the bonds. MCPS would sign an agreement that they would be paying off this through Category 61. Mrs. Fanconi said she was having a difficult time understanding this because when the county built the landfill they had a debt service which they had to pay off every year. She asked where this debt service would show up. She assumed it would be in their operating budget. Mr. Eaton remarked that by the third year they could have this paid off. Ms. Gutierrez asked where the money was going to come from, and Mr. Eaton explained that the money would come from the food that was sold to students which generated revenue. Dr. Rohr said that over a period of years they would use the savings to retire the bonds that the revenue authority was going to sell. If they paid for it over the first three years, there would be no savings until the middle of the third year. It might be better to pay this off over ten years so that they could have some savings each year. It was his personal leaning to pay for this over five to ten years so that they would get some of those savings into the food service program right away.

Mrs. Fanconi said that the savings were built on labor and asked how they would pay off the debt service if they did not have the labor savings. Dr. Rohr explained that this would come out of the enterprise fund. Mrs. Fanconi pointed out that in this case the enterprise fund would have to make money, and if it didn't,

this would have to come out of their operating budget. Dr. Rohr replied that it would not come out of the operating budget, but rather the enterprise fund. If it came to pass, and he did not believe it would, they would have to increase the price of breakfasts and lunches. For example, if the price of food went up 20 percent, they would not come back to the general operating budget for that. They adjusted the price of breakfasts and lunches in order to pay for that increase. Mrs. Styer added the potential for saving was very definitely there. They did look at what they needed in order to increase revenue or to lower their operating costs so they could meet the expenses that they had.

In regard to staffing, Mrs. Fanconi said they had talked about attrition; however, they did have to feed students right up until the day they opened the facility. They would have to have employees to do that. If employees retired now, they would have to hire young employees to replace them. She was concerned about how they would shift in a two-week period. Ms. Brown explained that they would be looking at attrition, the turnover rate, and upward mobility. In spite of the pay equity study, cafeteria workers were still the lowest paid grades in the school system. When they hired new people, they did not keep them forever because they progressed through promotion into other positions. Right now they had 76 FTE people in all levels who were age 60 this year. Their average age of retirement in food service was 63, and every year more people reached 60, 62, 63. They would continue to have people who were eligible for retirement. They would continue to recruit people in the meantime, but they saw no problem of meeting their expectations without having to let anyone go. They had promised that no employee would lose their position because of this facility.

Mrs. Fanconi stated that she needed to be shown this because 85 percent of the savings was based on that. Mrs. Styer replied that the cook/chili pilot study was an excellent idea. They had modified Watkins Mill and Gaithersburg high schools so that they had a limited number of people involved in cook/chill production.

As a result of that, they had been able to take 19 positions from secondary schools and relocate them to vacancies in the elementary schools. The positions in the high schools had been converted to Worker I's with less hours. This showed the efficiency of the system. She commented that they had no idea they would be this advanced in their production capability with the equipment that they had. They saw this as another way they would be able to bridge the gap because Mrs. Fanconi was right; they did have to continue to operate. Enrollment was going up and participation was going up, and they wanted to maintain quality and provide variety. Mrs. Fanconi felt that she had not received an answer to her question.

Mr. Ewing commented that in his fifteen years on the Board he had never had more information about one facility than he had about

this one. Furthermore, it was the only building that told them what their return on their investment was going to be. It seemed to him that one could not expect that all the information one might like to have would be available. He was convinced that they should go forward with this as quickly as they could. There would never be a time when they could build it more cheaply given the market. No one in the school system had demonstrated more conclusively that she knew how to operate a business efficiently than Joanne Styer. This was true of all of the changes they had gone through that had been difficult to manage in the past. One did not have to rely solely on faith, but they did have the study which showed conclusively that they would have savings. If for some reason they did not realize enough money, they could extend the payment term. He did not see any flaws in the proposal and thought it was a good idea and a good investment.

Dr. Cheung asked whether in Mr. Eaton's experience anyone had encountered problems or failed to reach projections. Mr. Eaton replied that Pittsburgh's system was implemented 20 years ago, was ten times bigger than it should have been, and never reached its expectations. In the current series of systems built in the last five years, they had had no experience with a system that failed to generally meet its objectives. Very small systems had a little more difficult time in achieving their goals, but the figures for MCPS were underestimated in savings to allow for the transition from June to July that Mrs. Fanconi had identified. Dr. Cheung remarked that the public expected them to operate their programs in the most efficient and effective way. He thought that Mrs. Styer's operation was one of the few very well managed and efficient systems as he had observed from the standpoint of management. He believed that the probability for success here was very, very great. He agreed that they should act as soon as possible to support the project.

Ms. Gutierrez agreed that they had a lot of data, but she still thought there were a lot of questions. She thought this was probably the first time they had looked at a major investment in such detail. A lot of the information in the study had left some questions in her mind. She did not feel they had gotten specific answers to transportation costs. She still felt that they were buying a bridge in Brooklyn. The fact that everything was so positive and there were no risks bothered her. She was looking for a risk analysis. She was bothered by the fact there seemed to be no other options on than this and what they currently had.

In NASA projects, they had to have data to predict staffing levels to the year 2000, and in this case they did not have that information. She wondered whether they had investigated co-ownership with the county and having them build the facility. She asked whether they were creating a hospitality service empire in MCPS. In order to pay for this facility they would have to serve more and more people outside of MCPS, and she would really like to see what those long-term results would be. She did not

and be it further

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

RESOLUTION NO. 213-92 Re: UTILIZATION OF FY 1992 FUTURE
SUPPORTED PROJECT FUNDS FOR THE
INTENSIVE VOCATIONAL ENGLISH AND
SKILLS (VESL) PROGRAM

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

Resolved, That the superintendent of schools be authorized to receive and expend a \$38,058 grant award from the Maryland Department of Human Resources, Community Services Administration, Office of Refugee Affairs, Title IV of the Refugee Act of 1980 (P.L. 96-212), for the FY 1992 Intensive Vocational English and Skills (VESL) Program, in the following categories:

<u>Category</u>	<u>Amount</u>
2 Instructional Salaries	\$33,146
3 Other Instructional Costs	2,260
10 Fixed Charges	<u>2,652</u>
 Total	 \$38,058

and be it further

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

RESOLUTION NO. 214-92 Re: FY 1992 SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION
FOR THE HOWARD HUGHES MEDICAL
INSTITUTE STUDENT/TEACHER
INTERNSHIP PROGRAM AT THE NATIONAL
INSTITUTES OF HEALTH (NIH)

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

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

Resolved, That the superintendent of schools be authorized, subject to County Council approval, to receive and expend an FY

1992 supplemental appropriation of \$150,000 from the Howard Hughes Medical Institute, in cooperation with the National Institutes of Health (NIH), through the MCPS Educational Foundation, Inc., to continue an internship program for biology teachers and students, in the following categories:

<u>Category</u>	<u>Positions*</u>	<u>Amount</u>
2 Instructional Salaries	1.5	\$ 94,212
3 Other Instructional Costs		33,110
10 Fixed Charges		
Total	1.5	\$150,000

*1.5 Teacher, A-D (10-month)

and be it further

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

*Mrs. DiFonzo rejoined the meeting at this point.

RESOLUTION NO. 215-92 Re: SUBMISSION OF AN FY 1992 GRANT
PROPOSAL TO DEVELOP TELEVISION
CURRICULUM AND TRAINING METHODS

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

Resolved, That the superintendent of schools be authorized to submit an FY 1992 grant proposal for \$221,882 to the United States Department of Education (USDE), under the Fund for the Improvement and Reform of Schools and Teaching (FIRST), for a one-year program to develop a television curriculum model and training methods for classroom teachers; and be it further

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

RESOLUTION NO. 216-92 Re: SUBMISSION OF AN FY 1992 GRANT
PROPOSAL FOR THE FAMILY-SCHOOL
PARTNERSHIP PROGRAM

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

Cheung seconded by Mr. Pishevar, 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. 57-92, Purchase and/or Lease/Purchase of Institutional Administrative and Media Center Microcomputers, be rejected and rebid due to lack of competition; now therefore be it

Resolved, That Bid No. 57-92 be rejected; and be it further

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

243-2	Rocks, Sand and Soil Science Kit - First Grade <u>Awardee</u> Science Kit, Inc.	\$ 25,000
91-05	Maintenance Service on Microscopes and Balances - Extension <u>Awardee</u> Alpha and Omega Service	\$ 28,350
113-89	Fresh Produce - Extension <u>Awardee</u> Lexington Produce Company	\$280,000
121-91	Clocks - Extension <u>Awardee</u> W. W. Grainger, Inc.	\$ 30,000
65-92	Industrial and Technology Education Lumber <u>Awardees</u> Allied International Allied Plywood Corporation Institutional Buyers Mart Lisa Lumber Company, Inc. Mann and Parker Lumber Company Northeastern Nelco Lumber Company	\$ 66 915 13,437* 10,240* 53,826 <u>9,345</u>
	Total	\$ 87,829
71-92	Frozen Foods <u>Awardees</u> Baer Foods, Inc. Briggs Ice Cream Carroll County Foods Continental Foods, Inc. Free State Food Brokers	\$ 6,184 8,860 24,376 5,024 8,718

March 10, 1992

1. J. E. Wood & Sons Co., Inc.	\$ 92,406
2. R. D. Bean, Inc.	92,650
3. Kalkreuth Roofing & Sheet Metal, Inc.	107,819
4. Orndorff & Spaid, Inc.	111,292
5. John H. Cole & Son, Inc.	113,887
6. Korb Roofers, Inc.	114,397
7. CitiRoof Corp.	115,693
8. AEO Construction Co., Inc.	126,800

and

WHEREAS, The low bidder, J. E. Wood & Sons Co., Inc., has completed similar projects successfully for Montgomery County Public Schools; and

WHEREAS, The low bid is below the staff estimate of \$110,000; now therefore be it

Resolved, That a \$92,406 contract be awarded to J. E. Wood & Sons Co., Inc., for the reroofing at Bells Mill Elementary School, in accordance with plans and specifications prepared by the Department of School Facilities and subject to final action by the County Council on the FY 1993 Capital Budget.

RESOLUTION NO. 225-92 Re: REROOFING - BEVERLY FARMS
ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

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

WHEREAS, The following sealed bids were received on January 23, 1992, for the reroofing at Beverly Farms Elementary School which will begin on June 22, 1992, and be completed by August 17, 1992:

<u>Bidder</u>	<u>Amount</u>
1. R. D. Bean, Inc.	\$103,052
2. J. E. Wood & Sons Co., Inc.	118,400
3. CitiRoof Corp.	119,369
4. Orndorff & Spaid, Inc.	121,693
5. Kalkreuth Roofing & Sheet Metal, Inc.	128,649
6. Rayco Roof Services, Inc.	136,643
7. John H. Cole & Sons, Inc.	139,116
8. Korb Roofers, Inc.	139,670

and

WHEREAS, The low bidder, R. D. Bean, Inc., has completed similar projects successfully for Montgomery County Public Schools; and

WHEREAS, The low bid is below the staff estimate of \$120,000; now

therefore be it

Resolved, That a \$103,052 contract be awarded to R. D. Bean, Inc., for the reroofing at Beverly Farms Elementary School, in accordance with plans and specifications prepared by the Department of School Facilities and subject to final action by the County Council on the FY 1993 Capital Budget.

RESOLUTION NO. 226-92 Re: REROOFING - CONNECTICUT PARK CENTER

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

WHEREAS, The following sealed bids were received on February 6, 1992, for the reroofing at Connecticut Park Center which will begin on June 22, 1992, and be completed by August 17, 1992:

<u>Bidder</u>	<u>Amount</u>
1. R. D. Bean, Inc.	\$45,837
2. Orndorff & Spaid, Inc.	48,168
3. J. E. Wood & Sons Co., Inc.	49,320
4. Virginia Roofing Corporation	49,326
5. Kalkreuth Roofing & Sheet Metal, Inc.	52,629
6. Rayco Roof Service, Inc.	56,065
7. Korb Roofers	58,000
8. John H. Cole & Son	61,262

and

WHEREAS, The low bidder, R. D. Bean, Inc., has completed similar projects successfully for Montgomery County Public Schools; and

WHEREAS, The low bid is below the staff estimate of \$50,000; now therefore be it

Resolved, That a \$45,837 contract be awarded to R. D. Bean, Inc., for the reroofing at Connecticut Park Center, in accordance with plans and specifications prepared by the Department of School Facilities and subject to final action by the County Council on the FY 1993 Capital Budget.

RESOLUTION NO. 227-92 Re: REROOFING - COLONEL E. BROOKE LEE MIDDLE SCHOOL

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

WHEREAS, The following sealed bids were received on February 6, 1992, for the reroofing at Colonel E. Brooke Lee Middle School

which will begin on June 22, 1992, and be completed by August 17, 1992:

March 10, 1992

3. R. D. Bean, Inc.	175,765
4. CitiRoof Corp.	177,411
5. Kalkreuth Roofing & Sheet Metal, Inc.	181,907
6. J. E. Wood & Sons Co., Inc.	194,190
7. J. R. Roofing Co., Inc.	201,309

and

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

WHEREAS, The low bid is below the staff estimate of \$175,000; now therefore be it

Resolved, That a \$155,606 contract be awarded to Orndorff & Spaid, Inc., for the reroofing at DuFief Elementary School, in accordance with plans and specifications prepared by the Department of School Facilities and subject to final action by the County Council on the FY 1993 Capital Budget.

RESOLUTION NO. 229-92 Re: REROOFING - FIELDS ROAD ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

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

WHEREAS, The following sealed bids were received on February 20, 1992, for the reroofing at Fields Road Elementary School which will begin on June 22, 1992, and be completed by August 17, 1992:

<u>Bidder</u>	<u>Amount</u>
1. Orndorff & Spaid, Inc.	\$124,493
2. Kalkreuth Roofing & Sheet Metal, Inc.	129,594
3. CitiRoof Corp.	131,558
4. J. E. Wood & Sons Co., Inc.	137,137
5. R. D. Bean, Inc.	138,692
6. Virginia Roofing Corporation	139,120
7. Korb Roofers, Inc.	153,900
8. Rayco Roof Services, Inc.	198,725

and

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

WHEREAS, The low bid is below the staff estimate of \$130,000; now therefore be it

Resolved, That a \$124,493 contract be awarded to Orndorff & Spaid, Inc., for the reroofing at Fields Road Elementary School, in accordance with plans and specifications prepared by the Department of School Facilities and subject to final action by the County Council on the FY 1993 Capital Budget.

RESOLUTION NO. 230-92 Re: REROOFING - CONCORD FACILITY

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

WHEREAS, The following sealed bids were received on January 30, 1992, for the reroofing at Concord Facility which will begin on June 22, 1992, and be completed by August 17, 1992:

<u>Bidder</u>	<u>Amount</u>
1. J. E. Wood & Sons Co., Inc.	\$122,017
2. Kalkreuth Roofing Sheet Metal, Inc.	123,386
3. CitiRoof, Inc.	123,446
4. R. D. Bean, Inc.	125,765
5. Orndorff & Spaid, Inc.	128,350
6. Rayco Roof Service, Inc.	129,980
7. John H. Cole & Sons, Inc.	129,980
8. AEO Construction Co., Inc.	138,000
9. Korb Roofers, Inc.	139,500

and

WHEREAS, The low bidder, J. E. Wood & Sons Co., Inc., has completed similar projects successfully for Montgomery County Public Schools; and

WHEREAS, The low bid is below the staff estimate of \$127,000; now therefore be it

Resolved, That a \$122,017 contract be awarded to J. E. Wood & Sons Co., Inc., for the reroofing at Concord Facility, in accordance with plans and specifications prepared by the Department of School Facilities and subject to final action by the County Council on the FY 1992 Capital Budget.

RESOLUTION NO. 231-92 Re: ARCHITECTURAL APPOINTMENT - SENECA VALLEY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL #8

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Mrs. Fanconi seconded by Dr. Cheung, 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

*Mrs. Brenneman temporarily left the meeting at this point.

RESOLUTION NO. 233-92 Re: MONTHLY PERSONNEL REPORT

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Dr. Cheung seconded by Mrs. Fanconi, 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. 234-92 Re: DEATH OF MR. JOHN H. COHEN, PLANT
EQUIPMENT OPERATOR II, SLIGO MIDDLE
SCHOOL

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

WHEREAS, The death on January 31, 1992, of Mr. John H. Cohen, a plant equipment operator II at Sligo Middle School, has deeply saddened the staff and members of the Board of Education; and

WHEREAS, Mr. Cohen had been an exemplary employee of Montgomery County Public Schools and a member of the building services staff for 26 years; and

WHEREAS, Mr. Cohen's knowledge of his position, extra effort in the total operation of the school, and good rapport were recognized by students and staff alike; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the members of the Board of Education express their sorrow at the death of Mr. John H. Cohen 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. Cohen's family.

Re: PRESENTATION ON MFD PROCUREMENT

Dr. Rohr introduced Mr. David Fischer, director of the Division of Procurement; Mr. William Wilder, director of the Department of School Facilities; and Mr. Richard Hawes, director of the Division of School Construction.

Mr. Fischer reported that for the last ten years the Board had had a minority procurement goal of 10 percent, and for the last four years they had been able to meet or exceed that goal for the last four years. For this current fiscal year they were up to 15 percent; however, at certain times during the year, it would not

be as high.

Ms. Gutierrez remarked that she was glad they were on a positive trend. The third paragraph of the paper spoke to the Maryland Education Code requiring them to go with the lowest responsible bidder. She thought that when the Charter had been amended they did not have to select a bidder based on lowest cost. Mr. Fischer explained that the Charter amendment did not impact the public schools. It was for the county government. Ms. Gutierrez requested information on whether or not they should seek a change in the Maryland educational code. This would provide for consideration of other factors other than the lowest bid. For example, the lowest bidder did not necessarily provide the best services or products.

Ms. Gutierrez inquired about the process followed in identifying minority vendors. She understood that the state list of minority vendors came from the Transportation Department and did not cover an enormous amount of other services and products for the school system. Mr. Fischer replied that MCPS did keep its own vendor file, and they had done so for about ten years. They worked closely with the county government on adding to the list. Vendors were called, came in, and were added to the list. Ms. Gutierrez pointed out that the Hispanic community had its own yellow pages, and she wondered whether they had consulted these yellow pages. Mr. Fischer assured her that they had done this.

Mrs. Fanconi mentioned that the report stated there were two procurement arms in MCPS. She would like to discuss the construction part and plans for the future for both offices to try and improve on the percentage. The county government had a 20 percent rate, but she understood that many of their bids were small firms involved in human services.

Mr. Wilder reported for the past two years they had averaged nearly 19 percent minority participation in contracts and subcontracts. This did require constant contact with minority communities and relating that information to general contractors and subcontractors. They, too, updated their list periodically. They met with minority contractors frequently to update the lists. They would continue to do this and find ways to maintain this activity.

Mrs. Fanconi asked whether Mr. Fischer also met with the minority community and worked with contractors. Mr. Fischer replied that they did meet, and twice each year they attended fairs. They found that it helped to meet one on one. Up until last spring he was meeting with one to five new MFD vendors each week. During the last six months, he had only met with about one per month which showed that the competition had dried up. They were not getting new vendors as they had in the past; therefore, they had been calling the old vendors. They had been particularly

successful on items less than \$7,500. They spent about \$1.3 million on this, and they put out about 1,200 quotes each year. If they knew an MFD vendor was available, that vendor was contacted. As a result of that, about 16 percent of what they were doing was going to MFD. They had done this on their own, and Mr. Fischer believed that it had worked well.

Mrs. Hobbs thanked staff for their report.

Re: MONTHLY FINANCIAL REPORT

Dr. Vance pointed out the projected revenue deficit of over \$1 million. Dr. Rohr noted that in regard to expenditures this was a report as of January 31, and it was exacerbated by the lag in receipt of utility bills; however, they were starting to see the impact of the warm winter. They were now showing a projected year-end balance of \$600,000 in Category 8, Operation of Plant and Equipment. They anticipated that the surplus would increase if the weather continued to be mild.

Mrs. Brenneman requested an update on how efficient they had been in cost-saving measures such as turning down the thermometers, cutting phone use, and turning off lights. Dr. Vance replied that they thought this was having an effect, and they would provide information on cost-saving measures. Mrs. Brenneman suggested that they remind people about the fiscal crisis. Dr. Vance indicated that responses from employees had been very supportive of these initiatives. Some teachers had approached him about the idea of paybacks to schools for cost-saving efforts. Mrs. Brenneman requested a quick estimate of the savings.

Mr. Ewing commented that the revenue shortfall was not a new experience, and he wondered what they planned to do about this. Mr. Larry Bowers, director of the Department of Management, Budget, and Planning, replied that they had notified the county executive and the County Council of the shortfall. Before discussing this with the county, staff wanted more time to see the expenditure accounts to see what was projected for the end of the year. Once they had a fix on the number, they would go over and meet with the county executive and County Council about the extent of the revenue problem that would have to be covered. He explained that \$500,000 of this was because of an over-estimation of how much would be left over from last year. He believed that the county would need to cover the shortfall, and he expected to have a better picture of this with the March report.

Ms. Gutierrez noted that in Category 10, Fixed Charges, there was an increase of \$3.7 million beyond the amount authorized by the County Council. She asked whether they would balance this with savings in other categories. Mr. Bowers replied that this would be balanced with the savings from the other categories. It was

their intent to wait until the year-end categorical transfer to balance this. He anticipated this coming before the Board at the all-day meeting in August. They might consider a two-step process beginning in early May and concluding in August.

Mrs. Hobbs thanked staff for the report.

Re: A MOTION BY MR. EWING ON THE
INTERAGENCY COORDINATING BOARD
(FAILED)

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

WHEREAS, There have been several MCPS staff reports on the community use of schools that have suggested that there are continuing unresolved difficulties with the community use of schools programs as it affects MCPS operations and costs; and

WHEREAS, It is essential in times of severe fiscal constraint to seek cost reductions in programs, to pursue alternative management structures, and to eliminate management layers, while maintaining high quality services; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Board of Education request that the county executive and County Council consider the transfer of the functions of the program that provides for the Community Use of Schools to the Montgomery County Public Schools; and be it further

Resolved, That the rules that govern the operation of the program should remain essentially the same, guaranteeing community use of school facilities; and be it further

Resolved, That the Interagency Coordinating Board be retained in essentially its present form to provide overall guidance for the program; and be it further

Resolved, That the costs of the program should be reduced by 5 percent in FY 1993 to reflect efficiencies that can be achieved through MCPS operation of the program.

RESOLUTION NO. 235-92 Re: INTERAGENCY COORDINATING BOARD

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

Resolved, That the superintendent be requested by the Board of Education to discuss with the County Council's and county executive's representatives the options in his memorandum of March 10, 1992, on the Interagency Coordinating Board, with a view to seeing whether those are alternatives to the present arrangement and with special focus on Option 4; and be it further

Resolved, That a letter be sent to the Interagency Coordinating Board indicating what the Board of Education is doing in this regard and why.

Re: COMMITMENT TO MIDDLE SCHOOL
ORGANIZATION

Mr. Ewing moved and Dr. Cheung seconded the following:

WHEREAS, In 1974 the Montgomery County Board of Education established a policy which recommended that area offices "should explore with the community the desirability of establishing middle schools or converting existing junior high schools to middle schools"; and

WHEREAS, On December 13, 1977, the Board of Education adopted a Middle School Policy; and

WHEREAS, On June 27, 1988, the Board of Education adopted a Policy on the Framework and Structure of Middle Level Education which states that "each school should include Grades 6 through 8 whenever possible"; and

WHEREAS, On February 12, 1991, the Board of Education adopted a series of Action Areas which included middle school implementation; and

WHEREAS, On August 28, 1991, the Board of Education adopted a resolution instructing the superintendent to develop "a comprehensive middle school policy that replaces all other policies dealing with the structure, organization, and educational program for those students of middle school age"; and

WHEREAS, On May 12, 1992, the superintendent will present a proposed Middle School Policy to the Board of Education; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Board of Education affirm its commitment to middle schools as the form of organization for students in Grades 6, 7, and 8; and be it further

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

*Mrs. DiFonzo temporarily left the room at this point.

RESOLUTION NO. 236-92 Re: AN AMENDMENT TO THE PROPOSED
RESOLUTION ON A COMMITMENT TO
MIDDLE SCHOOL ORGANIZATION

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

Resolved, That the proposed resolution on a commitment to middle school organization be amended in the first Resolved clause to add "to the programmatic benefits of middle schools as described in the Policy on the Framework and Structure of Middle Level Education of June 27, 1988."

RESOLUTION NO. 237-92 Re: COMMITMENT TO MIDDLE SCHOOL
ORGANIZATION

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

WHEREAS, In 1974 the Montgomery County Board of Education established a policy which recommended that area offices "should explore with the community the desirability of establishing middle schools or converting existing junior high schools to middle schools"; and

WHEREAS, On December 13, 1977, the Board of Education adopted a Middle School Policy; and

WHEREAS, On June 27, 1988, the Board of Education adopted a Policy on the Framework and Structure of Middle Level Education which states that "each school should include Grades 6 through 8 whenever possible"; and

WHEREAS, On February 12, 1991, the Board of Education adopted a series of Action Areas which included middle school implementation; and

WHEREAS, On August 28, 1991, the Board of Education adopted a resolution instructing the superintendent to develop "a comprehensive middle school policy that replaces all other policies dealing with the structure, organization, and educational program for those students of middle school age"; and

WHEREAS, On May 12, 1992, the superintendent will present a proposed Middle School Policy to the Board of Education; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Board of Education affirm its commitment to middle schools as the form of organization for students in Grades 6, 7, and 8 and to the programmatic benefits of middle schools as

described in the Policy on the Framework and Structure of Middle Level Education of June 27, 1988; and be it further

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

* Mrs. DiFonzo rejoined the meeting at this point.

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

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

WHEREAS, When prekindergarten through grade 12 policies were revised, language on promotion and retention of students was not included, and 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 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 intervention to assure that all students will learn, progress and achieve; and

WHEREAS, Montgomery County Public Schools is committed to success for every student; and

WHEREAS, The Board of Education tentatively adopted the proposed policy on October 8, 1991, and distributed it for public comment; and

WHEREAS, The proposed, tentatively adopted policy has been revised to reflect the public comments; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the following policy on Placement, Promotion, Acceleration, and Retention be adopted:

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 framework for increasing individual student success through early, well-planned, and documented intervention

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 except for students with documented special education needs where decisions are made through the Admissions, Review, and Dismissal (ARD) process. The decision-making process includes parents and staff. Students are also included when 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. The decision-making process includes parents and staff. Students are included when appropriate. The final responsibility for these decisions rests with the principal except for students with documented special education needs where decisions are made through the Admissions, Review, and Dismissal (ARD) process.

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. For students in kindergarten, see MCPS Policy JEB: Early Entrance to First Grade and Administrative Regulation JEB-RB: Early Entrance to First Grade. The decision-making process includes parents and staff. Students are included when appropriate. 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. (See EMT and ARD Procedures Manual) Parents will be included 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 will modify the plan. (see EMT and ARD Procedures Manual) Parents and students will be included 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, including parents and students, develops a plan for educational support for the school year in which the retention is to occur. The principal will monitor the implementation of this plan.
- c. In grades nine through twelve, retention should be based on the number of credits that the student has earned as prescribed in Administrative Regulation JEB-RA: Placement, Promotion, Acceleration, and Retention. Parents and students will be included in the process.
- d. In elementary and mid-level schools, the principal will report the proposed plan of support for each retained student to the Area Associate Superintendent.
- e. In prekindergarten through grade twelve the final responsibility for the decision rests with the principal except for students with documented special education needs where decisions are made through the Admissions, Review, and Dismissal (ARD) process.

C. REVIEW AND REPORTING

1. An annual report on retentions will be sent to the Board of Education.
2. This policy will be reviewed every three years in accordance with the Board of Education policy review process.

RESOLUTION NO. 238-92 Re: AN AMENDMENT TO THE PROPOSED POLICY
ON PLACEMENT, PROMOTION,
ACCELERATION, AND RETENTION

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

Resolved, That the proposed policy on placement, promotion, acceleration, and retention be amended in section B, last paragraph by adding, "The following rules guide decision-making on placement and promotion, acceleration, intervention, and

Acceleration, and Retention be adopted:

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 framework for increasing individual student success through early, well-planned, and documented intervention

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 except for students with documented special education needs where decisions are made through the Admissions, Review, and Dismissal (ARD) process. The decision-making process includes parents/guardians and staff. Students are also included when appropriate. The following rules guide decision-making on placement and promotion, acceleration, intervention, and retention:

1. Placement and Promotion

- a. In prekindergarten through grade two, placement and promotion should be 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 should be based on academic progress and attainment of objectives assigned to the student. The needs of the whole child must be considered

in making these decisions.

- 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. The decision-making process includes parents/guardians and staff. Students are included when appropriate. The final responsibility for these decisions rests with the principal except for students with documented special education needs where decisions are made through the Admissions, Review, and Dismissal (ARD) process.

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. For students in kindergarten, see MCPS Policy JEB: Early Entrance to First Grade and Administrative Regulation JEB-RB: Early Entrance to First Grade. The decision-making process includes parents/guardians and staff. Students are included when appropriate. 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. (See EMT and ARD Procedures Manual) Parents/guardians will be included 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 will modify the plan. (see EMT and ARD Procedures Manual) Parents/guardians and students will be included 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, including parents/guardians and students, develops a plan for educational support for the school year in which the retention is to occur. The principal will monitor the implementation of this plan.
- c. In grades nine through twelve, retention should be based on the number of credits that the student has earned as prescribed in Administrative Regulation JEB-RA: Placement, Promotion, Acceleration, and Retention. Parents/guardians and students will be included in the process.
- d. In elementary and mid-level schools, the principal will report the proposed plan of support for each retained student to the Area Associate Superintendent.
- e. In prekindergarten through grade twelve the final responsibility for the decision rests with the principal except for students with documented special education needs where decisions are made through the Admissions, Review, and Dismissal (ARD) process.

C. REVIEW AND REPORTING

1. An annual report on retentions will be sent to the Board of Education.
2. This policy will be reviewed every three years in accordance with the Board of Education policy review process.

Re: BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS

1. Mrs. Fanconi drew the Board's attention to an April 4 conference on inclusion which was sponsored by the Maryland Coalition for Integrated Education. This was a Saturday conference at BWI airport, and she planned to attend.

2. Mrs. Fanconi reported that she had been reviewing the county budget for her job. She pointed out that there were a number of major reductions in the Health Department recommended by the county executive that would affect MCPS students. She would provide a memo on these cuts, and she hoped that staff would review the cuts. She thought that they needed to begin a dialogue immediately as advocates for children and because she was concerned about these major reductions. For example, the Health Department had been cut 50.8 work years since FY 1981 with a decrease of half a million dollars in the current budget.

3. Mr. Pishavar stated that on March 4 two candidates were selected to run for the student member seat on the Board of Education. The candidates were Jon Sims from Richard Montgomery and Pedro Baker from Churchill. He also thanked Dr. Vance for his eloquent speech at the nominating convention.

4. Mr. Ewing reported that the Education Foundation had met recently. The Success for Every Student policy contained a task for the Foundation which was raising money to reward schools that met the objectives. The Foundation agreed to take on that task, and they were exploring the possibility of hiring someone to help raise funds. The Foundation also agreed to continue its programs of small grants and planned to require that these grants support SES. They also planned to continue the visiting scholar lecture program.

5. Mr. Ewing commented that one school was using food as rewards for student performance in the classroom. The parent called him because her daughter was diabetic and was receiving sweets. He would share this information with Dr. Vance, and he asked him to follow up on this.

6. Mr. Ewing noted they were preparing for a future discussion on values. He hoped that the superintendent would be looking at which values the public schools should advocate. Dr. Vance indicated that it would be his intention to look at this, and he would charge the task group to do this.

7. Mr. Ewing remarked that the improvement in test scores was impressive. At the same time, it was important that they recognize that although system work supported that, they should give enormous credit to staff members who made the difference. Systems like SIMS were great tools, but systems did not change people. People changed people, but people using systems like SIMS could change people more easily. The Washington Post had an article which distressed some teachers because it emphasized SIMS and not the contribution of the teachers. When they were asking so much of teachers, it was important to recognize their contributions fully.

8. Mr. Ewing commented that this morning they had discussed the

suggestion that Mr. Shulman made that MCPS needed to do a better job of communicating with the business community. He would propose again that they approach the eight or nine largest companies and ask them to designate someone to look at the business side of MCPS. This would permit business to see what MCPS did, how they did it, and suggest improvements. He urged the superintendent to follow up on this suggestion because it offered a real opportunity for the business community to become involved with the schools. Dr. Vance indicated that he would get back to Mr. Ewing on this issue.

9. Mr. Pishevar stated that in regard to the discussion on values. He had a list of 18 values he would present for Board adoption.

10. Ms. Gutierrez reported that yesterday she had participated in a ceremony with Senator Barbara Mikulski and the president of the National Science Foundation. NSF had granted MCPS \$1.3 million in science for middle schools, and Dr. Russell Wright of MCPS had prepared the proposal.

12. Ms. Gutierrez stated that she would be out of the country for two weeks as part of a delegation from La Raisia, a national policy group, that would be visiting European models of vocational education. She thanked Mr. Jack Schoendorfer for the briefing she had received on vocational education to prepare her for this trip which was being sponsored by the Ford Foundation and would look at apprenticeships and how minority students were faring in these programs.

13. Ms. Gutierrez indicated that she had attended the open house at Edison Career Center and was impressed by the activities there. She wished that the general public knew more about the positive educational results that were occurring at Edison.

14. Ms. Gutierrez thanked the staff for the support they were giving to the Amer-Asian students at Springbrook High School.

15. Ms. Gutierrez expressed her support for Mr. Ewing's proposal about the business community. At an earlier time, she had spoken to the superintendent about establishing a technology advisory group for MCPS.

16. Ms. Gutierrez reported that she had been inundated with letters written to her by students in the ESOL adult program. She would share these letters with the Board, but the letters were concerned about the proposal to house the French Immersion Program at the Connecticut Park Center. She asked the superintendent to provide the Board with information on where the ESOL program would be located if the French Immersion Program went to Connecticut Park.

RESOLUTION NO. 240-92 Re: EXECUTIVE SESSION - MARCH 23, 1992

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

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education of Montgomery County hereby conduct its meeting in executive closed session beginning on March 23, 1992, at 7 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. 241-92 Re: MINUTES OF JANUARY 14, 1992

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

Resolved, That the minutes of January 14, 1992, be approved.

RESOLUTION NO. 242-92 Re: MINUTES OF JANUARY 27, 1992

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

Resolved, That the minutes of January 27, 1992, be approved as corrected.

RESOLUTION NO. 243-92 Re: MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 5, 6, AND 12, 1992

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 February 5, 6, and 12, 1992, be approved.

RESOLUTION NO. 244-92 Re: MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 25, 1992

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

Resolved, That the minutes of February 25, 1992, be approved as amended.

RESOLUTION NO. 245-92 Re: MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 11, 1992

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

Resolved, That the minutes of February 11, 1992, be approved.

RESOLUTION NO. 246-92 Re: GRADING AND REPORTING

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

Resolved, That the following resolution be scheduled for discussion/action at the March 23 Board meeting:

WHEREAS, Our grading system should strive to represent the academic work of the student accurately; and

WHEREAS, The current grading scale is too broad in representing the students' work (i.e. a student who earns an 89% in a class and a student who earns an 80% receive the same grade of B); and

WHEREAS, A system of +/- better reflects the amount of work that a student does in class; and

WHEREAS, This system will not affect the GPA calculation (i.e. a D-, D, and D+ will still have the same weight of 1.0) and is only a better visual representation of the level of a student's performance; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Board of Education take tentative action to amend the grading and reporting policy so that students will receive +/- letter grades.

RESOLUTION NO. 247-92 Re: GIFTED AND TALENTED REPORT

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education schedule time to discuss the Report of the Superintendent's Advisory Committee on the

March 10, 1992

Education of the Gifted and Talented and the staff response to that report.

Re: ITEMS OF INFORMATION

Board members received the following items of information:

1. Items in Process
2. Construction Progress Report

Re: ADJOURNMENT

The president adjourned the meeting at 5:35 p.m.

PRESIDENT

SECRETARY

PLV:mlw