



April 14, 1992

WHEREAS, In this time when the resources necessary to provide quality education for the youth of Montgomery County are being dramatically diminished, it is appropriate for youth leaders to speak out; and

WHEREAS, An open dialogue between the Board of Education, County Government and student organizations is productive and useful; and

WHEREAS, Participation by our youth is valued by the Board of Education; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Board of Education hereby designate the week of April 27 - May 3, 1992, as STUDENT LEADERSHIP WEEK in Montgomery County Public Schools; and be it further

Resolved, That April 30, 1992, shall be designated STUDENT LEADERSHIP DAY in Montgomery County Public Schools; and be it further

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

RESOLUTION NO. 276-92      Re:    NATIONAL PROFESSIONAL SECRETARIES' WEEK

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

WHEREAS, Professional Secretaries' Week will be celebrated nationally the week of April 19-25, 1992, during the spring break in the Montgomery County Public Schools; and

WHEREAS, This is the 40th anniversary of National Professional Secretaries' Week; and

WHEREAS, The Board of Education wishes to recognize publicly the competence and dedication of its staff of secretarial and clerical employees and express its appreciation for their efforts in the effective, courteous, and economical operation of MCPS; and

WHEREAS, The Board of Education thanks its secretarial staff for their contributions to excellence in education and for their commitment to "Success for Every Student;" now therefore be it

Resolved, That National Professional Secretaries' Week with its theme of "A Past with a Future" be observed by the school system during the week of April 27 through May 1, 1992; and be it further

Resolved, That Wednesday, April 29, 1992, be designated as Professional Secretaries' Day for the Montgomery County Public Schools.

Re: PERSONNEL POLICIES AND PRACTICES  
AND RESIDENT TEACHER CERTIFICATION  
PROGRAM

Mrs. Hobbs announced that this was one of the Board's Action Areas which the Board had adopted after its retreat last year.

Dr. Rohr introduced Dr. Elfreda Massie, director of the Department of Personnel Services; Mr. Armando Gutierrez, director of the Division of Employment Standards; Mr. Gary Levine, personnel specialist; Dr. William Monie, team leader; and Ms. Dale Shimoda Horos, staffing assistant. They had a video tape as well as presentations by members of the Department.

Dr. Massie reported that the Department had spent time working on issues raised by the Board, and the Success for Every Student Plan had provided additional initiatives. They had been discussing strategies to improve their image; broaden their skills; build more trusting relationships among people within the school system, members of their department, and the community; use technology more effectively to enhance the delivery of their services; improve recruitment strategies, and be more responsive to applicants and employees. As a result of working together on goals, members of her department had developed a more cooperative spirit in terms of working with each other. She hoped that over time they would be able to see some positive changes in the Department of Personnel. In their video they had highlighted service and people. Board members viewed the video which was a project involving the entire Department.

Dr. Massie explained that the people responsible for implementing practices in the Department would make the presentations. Their first topic was recruitment.

Mr. Levine stated that they had to first talk about supply and demand. For the past four years they had been using a model to identify and project the teachers they would need. The model was based on a computer data base they had developed. They looked at the operating budget and counted the new positions by subject area and then they added the current vacancies to that number. Next they added the projected turnover using historical data from the past several years. Then they subtracted the number of people they projected would return from leave. In the past four years they had projected within 5 percent of the actual number that they had hired. He introduced Ms. Carol Burke.

Ms. Burke commented that they were very fortunate to have an

applicant pool of teacher candidates of around 4,000. They ranged from being highly competitive to non-employable. At the elementary level in early childhood, they had 322 applicants and employed only 38. At the elementary level, they had 1,338 applicants, and they employed 111 elementary teachers. At the secondary level, in social studies, for example, they only employed 2 percent of the applicants. She explained that even in areas where they were oversupplied, they had difficulty in staffing a particular position. For example, a principal might ask for an English teacher who was also certified in drama and who could take over a TV production class. In mathematics, a principal might want someone who was also certified in computer science or someone who could teach both math and science. There were 212 math candidates and 234 science candidates, but currently only one person was dually certified.

Ms. Burke reported that in special education their applicant pool exceeded demands except in certain areas such as severely and profoundly handicapped, vision, and emotionally impaired. Maryland had ESOL requirements for certification, and many candidates coming from other states did not meet these requirements. She said there were several areas where the pool was lacking although they did not hire a lot of Spanish immersion teachers and teachers of Japanese and Italian. The same thing was true in ROTC and trades and industry. There was always a shortage of applicants for occupational and physical therapy. She introduced Ms. Lucy Hayes, team leader for the recruitment team.

Ms. Hayes remarked that recruitment was often viewed as being a trip to a college campus, but they did work from sun-up to sun-down on these trips. They gathered data and information from various sources, and they tried to look where other school systems had not found candidates with great potential. They tried to recruit only the best. After they prepared their recruitment schedule, they got input from staff, principals, supervisors, and even Board policies. Outreach was done with community, civic, and religious organizations, fraternities, sororities, and with other government agencies. They worked with the Spanish-speaking Community of Maryland, the Korean schools, etc. Linkages were made with schools so that they might send their student teachers to MCPS. At the Paint Branch teacher center, they had teachers from Bowie State University and Benedict College, which was one of their projects.

Ms. Hayes said they were now part of an on-line system to help them connect with Hispanic and African-American colleges. This was called the Minority On-line Information System. When they visited college campuses they attended career and teacher fairs, and they tried to visit with department chairs. They also made presentations to student groups. They held interviews and followed up with phone calls and letters. Referrals were made by

the community, Board members, and executive staff. They attended national and international conferences looking for minority candidates. They used radio and television, and they used the Bulletin within the county, professional journals, campus newsletters, and flyers. They placed posters in student union buildings on campus.

Ms. Hayes indicated that they provided training for MCPS staff to help with recruitment. Once they had recruited teachers, they wanted them to stay. A crucial aspect of retention was to make them feel welcome and wanted and to support them in their professional endeavors. In addition to new teacher orientation, they also had orientation provided by the Montgomery County Association for Black School Educators and by Asian and Hispanic groups. They knew that if the first impression was not a positive one, many of the teachers would be overwhelmed and would not stay in Montgomery County or in teaching.

Dealing with the Washington metropolitan area was a difficult adjustment for some people, and they tried to have teachers work with these new teachers. Social contacts were identified, and teachers were helped with personal needs from housing to child care. MCPS offered a National Teachers Exam preparation course to assist these new teachers. They worked with the credit union to help new teachers, and they provided career counseling and encouraged professional development through seminars and courses.

Ms. Hayes explained that they provided individual conferences and follow-up with staff. Personnel always tried to be available to them. They participated with the Maryland State Department of Education in an outreach program. They also visited new teachers in schools and encouraged new teachers to come back to Personnel.

Nurturing was done through phone calls, sharing ideas, and locating supports for teachers. They had the help of the Employee Assistance Program. She introduced Barbara Robinson.

Ms. Robinson said that she was very excited about the Creative Initiatives in Teacher Education (CITE). They had two missions.

The first was to prepare and attract talented people from their support personnel. They sent personnel letters to everyone who was a Grade 14 and below to tell them about the program and to invite them to apply for the program. They also had a general meeting where they invited people who were interested in teaching. Principals also provided referrals. Their second mission was an emphasis on recruiting culturally and ethnically diverse teaching staff to MCPS. In doing this, they were meeting the affirmative action goals of MCPS, and this was a collaborative effort with the University of Maryland.

Ms. Robinson explained that the program involved staff with students from the very beginning. They started working with small groups and built up to where they were taking over the entire classroom. Their coaching team involved a teacher, a

principal, and a representative from the University of Maryland.

In the first group there were nine students, in the second group there were 12 students, and the third group would have 18 students. These people took their classes together. It gave them an opportunity to be committed to Montgomery County for at least two years. The first group had graduated two years ago, and they would have 12 more graduating in June.

Ms. Judy Zauderer commented that it all began with the completed application. Staff looked carefully at the student teaching experiences, work-related experiences, and other experience. They wanted every person interested in employment to have official transcripts on file from every college they had attended. MCPS had its own reference forms that had to be completed, and they had a pre-employment test of English and math. Once all the data was assembled, staff reviewed the files and outstanding candidates were invited for an interview. They felt strongly that the personal interview was the opportunity to tie everything together. The NTE had to be completed before an individual was recommended to a principal for later employment. They looked at transcripts, the references, the pre-employment tests, and their interview.

Mr. Gutierrez stated that the employment and testing program was a vital component of their selection process. Currently 29 tests were administered to 2,500 applicants and employees each year including supporting services and professional employees. The testing methods were varied in order to measure the essential elements of effective job performance. For example, they had paper and pencil tests as well as performance tests where hands-on skills were actually assessed. He had provided Board members with a list of the 29 tests and a brochure explaining the teacher testing program. They did provide for some flexibility in accommodating individuals who had testing difficulties. They provided interpreters and readers, and they had removed testing time limits. They adjusted test stations for physically disabled applicants, and they permitted retesting when requested.

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

Dr. Monie explained that much of what they did in supporting services paralleled what had just been described for the employment of teachers. They used essentially the same applications, and they had testing standards. They had a range of credentials for instructional assistants involving transcripts. For bus drivers, they needed clean driving records. They stored information in the same way. This year they were applying the applicant tracking system to supporting services. During the last fiscal year they staffed 1,375 supporting services positions, and 776 were filled through the transfer and promotion process. He explained that in accordance with the MCCSSE contract they had to advertise every individual supporting

services position as opposed to advertising a job class such as elementary teacher. They had to track all internal candidates interested in these positions, and employees had the first opportunity to fill these positions through promotion and transfer. Most of their external appointments occurred in six major job classes: instructional assistants, maintenance workers, clerk typists, building service workers, cafeteria workers, and bus operators.

Ms. Horos reported that in FY 1991 they employed 125 permanent bus operators from an active pool of substitute drivers. This afforded Transportation an opportunity to review performance of these people. One of their jobs was to hire the most qualified bus attendants so that Transportation could meet projected needed. They advertised in the Bulletin and in local newspapers.

They worked with the Jewish Vocational Services which was a program to help Jewish immigrants. They also worked with Maryland Unemployment. On a monthly basis they received between 60 and 75 bus operator applicants. They were screened, and the most qualified 20 to 25 applicants were invited for interviews. Upon successful completion of the interview, applicants were sent for drug testing and a physical examination. When the candidates completed these successfully, they were referred to Transportation for training to become a bus operator. They were trained in MCPS policies and procedures and became state certified to drive a school bus. Individuals had to earn a commercial driver's license, and Transportation provided behind-the-wheel training and assessment. Once these people had completed the training program, they were fingerprinted, given a bus lot assignment, and began work as a substitute bus operator.

Ms. Horos indicated that they had met all of their affirmative action goals in terms of ethnic and gender diversity.

Dr. Monie stated that in addition to employment in these large employment classes last year they staffed positions as diverse as an accountant, a buyer, a television producer/director, and a demographic data analyst. When they filled these positions, they used the same resources they used for administrative positions. They would advertise in newspapers and professional journals. In addition, their team staffed a number of internships for special education students. Ann Kamenstein would describe this program.

Dr. Massie suggested that they take a pause to allow Board questions. Mrs. Hobbs commented that their presentation was excellent.

Mrs. Fanconi remarked that it was clear their unit was excited about what they were doing. As they went forward, they would be setting the tone for the quality of MCPS because of the large number of retirements that were pending. The job of Personnel would affect their ability to provide services to the entire school system. She asked Dr. Massie to speak to the things she

was changing in the Department.

Dr. Massie replied that they had already changed their application form because of recent ADA legislation. They had looked at every line on the application to determine whether all of the information they were requesting was essential or whether they needed to gather additional information. Another form that was really critical was their reference form, and this had to be reviewed because some questions put some applicants at a disadvantage. They had changed the fingerprinting forms, and they were moving away from using NCR forms because of the expense. They were also looking at the tests they gave as well as the need to "time" tests.

Dr. Massie commented that they were also re-examining the application process and contacts with potential applicants. They had heard a lot of horror stories from people about how they were treated and what happened to their applications. They had tried to address this in restructuring their office. They were looking at how systems might be changed so that fewer people would handle an applicant's file. She could not say they had easy answers to these problems, but they were addressing this issue. Another concern the Board had raised was why in December they were still getting names on the personnel reports when people had actually started in September. They were looking at ways of getting contracts signed before people actually started work. They had combined their certification and selection procedures. They were developing a plan to address these issues in a systematic way.

Mrs. Fanconi said she was concerned about open contracts and their ability to get the best candidates when they visited a campus. She thought they might be missing good minority candidates or the top students in classes because they were not able to offer the open contract. Dr. Vance said he would like staff to comment on the validity of that observation.

Mrs. Fanconi said that another issue was the time it took from the time they talked to a new graduate to the stage when they offered a contract. She knew that this issue was also impacted by the transfer policy, and she would like to know more about the restraints in that policy so they could be more responsive to new graduates. Her third issue was the personal contact. For example, another county had made personal contacts with her daughter when she was looking for a teaching job. She was also concerned about the answering machine used by Personnel when people tried to find out about their applications.

Dr. Massie replied that yesterday her Department had discussed early contracts. When they interviewed students on campus, some of those students had applications on file. What happened when they visited a campus was that all they knew about that person was what he or she said that day. They did not know anything

about their test scores or references. She had found that the interview and the references were critical factors in determining the future success of teachers. When they were only making that judgment based on that interview on campus, it was based only on the initial impression. The reality was that there were times when they were almost afraid to encourage the person because they knew they probably would not have any vacancies. While they would like to offer early contracts, there was still a caution about giving an offer of employment without having enough data. They recommended that people come to the interview with letters of reference, their placement file, and their transcripts. She did not think that many school systems were handing out contracts, but rather they were making verbal promises.

Dr. Monie added that they had recently done an analysis to look at the people they had employed over the last five years. They looked at those who were offered early contracts and those employed after school started. The data affirmed that the people who were open contracted were better qualified and gave them a 9 percent improvement in terms of meeting affirmative action objectives. They also employed these people at an average salary that was about \$3,000 less than the people employed when school opened. However, there were risks when they employed based on projections rather than actual identified vacancies. They had tended to wait for the vacancies. For example, had they opened contracted all of the teachers they employed after school started it would have cost them approximately \$23,000 more a year after they factored in that these people could have been doing short-term substituting until they were employed. They would need guidance on how much risk they should take in order to meet their affirmative action goals and employ teachers with the strongest credentials at the most reasonable price.

Dr. Massie reported that she was working with a group of administrators to look at their involuntary transfer process and the voluntary transfer process. The agreement stated that they could not hire and place new employees until those transfers were completed. Mrs. Fanconi was correct that they lost people who had offers from other systems because people were afraid to wait for that offer from MCPS. When possible, they did try to look at where people lived because most people relocated near where they were going to be employed. The secondary and elementary administrators associations were working with Personnel to remove some of those barriers. One of their goals was to have the final deadline for involuntary transfer approximately a month earlier.

In terms of the voluntary transfer process, they had already begun to ask administrators to tell them where they anticipated vacancies. Unfortunately, the last minute vacancies were usually the combinations--someone certified in English and French, and the people left in the pool were people who were not the most sought after. She believed there were some internal changes that would help them.

In terms of early contracts, Dr. Massie thought they might begin to make some offers earlier. They were looking at a process to assure that these contracts would be offered to their top people.

They would rather take a gamble rather than wait until September when they were forced to hire people who were more expensive and whose credentials might not be of the same calibre.

Dr. Cheung commented that the assets of the school system were really people. Getting the best people was very, very important.

There were people who were in the scarcity area such as math, science, and computers, and they wanted to do outreach for minority candidates. He asked about the creative incentive approaches that they used to attract these people. Dr. Massie replied that there were several initiatives that they had been exploring. One of the possibilities was the retraining of their present staff members. They were working with colleges and universities to look for people who were not necessarily in education programs. As long as they had the opportunity to issue a provisional certificate, they had the authority to consider people who came to them with a non-traditional background. They had talked about looking at a program with Johns Hopkins and possibly the University of Maryland to train non-education majors to work in areas of need. In Baltimore City and Baltimore County, they were doing this in math and special education. In Anne Arundel County they were looking at math and science. They knew that private industry was downsizing and that Fairfax had qualified people they would be releasing. They were working with the State Department of Education on these issues. With ESOL, they had talked with MSDE, and there were competency tests given by George Washington University that the state would accept in lieu of course work.

It seemed to Ms. Gutierrez that it was evident that things were changing for the better. She would like some sense of their priorities in all of these efforts, especially in hiring versus retaining staff. While they had an enormous number of applicants, they were also hiring a smaller number of people. She knew that handling that much of a volume could be overwhelming. She would like them to be sensitive to multicultural issues when they looked at goals and forms. They had to be cautious that they did not put in place barriers to hiring diverse people. She requested a copy of the slides and a copy of the specific EEO and affirmative goals they had, particularly in different levels of positions. She also requested a list of the places they did recruit last year.

Mr. Pishevar complimented staff on the video that was produced in two weeks which reflected the Personnel team and the quality of the television production staff. He asked about the process used to evaluate the actual teaching style of the people they hired. For example, a person might look great on paper, but when they

were in the classroom their style was not appropriate.

Mr. Gutierrez replied that the teacher evaluation system required that each probationary teacher be observed twice each semester by the principal and a second observer. If there were a problem, the teacher was sent a mid-year notice which indicated their contract would not be renewed unless there was progress during the second semester. During the second semester there were two observations and two conferences at the local school level. The action taken could be non-renewal of a contract at the end of the first year.

Dr. Massie added that one of the best indicators was the reference from the student teaching. Usually the credential files contained observation reports. The principals also conducted an in-school interview, and they asked a number of questions to help them assess how teachers might interact with students in that particular school.

Mr. Ewing said he wanted to discuss hiring standards and performance evaluation. Over the years, he had heard from lots of people about Personnel. He was hearing steadily less which was all to the good. He thought there had been some important change in the way in which the Department was dealing with the issues. He was pleased that they were considering options with regard to alternative certification. In the past, the Board had always opposed that, and he hoped they could persuade the Board to support that.

With regard to hiring standards, he was still concerned that what they had in the pre-employment test and the NTE were minimum standards. He had looked at those and thought they were high school level competency tests, and this worried him. He knew that they looked at a lot of other parts of the credentials, but this worried him. He would like to see them set much higher standards. He asked whether they were looking at grades as a specific criterion or experience as a specific criterion. He thought this needed re-examination.

With regard to performance evaluation, Mr. Ewing said that the system had not changed in 20 years and it desperately needed changing. The system did not work satisfactorily from his point of view. The Commission on Excellence in Teaching made some major recommendations for change, and nothing happened. He hoped that the Department would address this. As they looked for new elementary teachers, he hoped they would keep in mind the Board-adopted math and science initiative. Schools of education steadily increased the requirements for education courses but never looked at increases for requirements for substantive knowledge. When he came on the Board, a teacher did not have to have 60 hours of elementary education courses to get a degree in education from the University of Maryland, but they did now.

Teachers did not have to take many courses in math and science. If they raised hiring standards and if they intensified performance evaluation, he thought they had to balance their needs with other considerations in terms of the kinds of people they wanted to hire. This was a challenge they needed to face squarely and deal with honestly and directly. He asked whether they had changed hiring standards or performance evaluation.

Mr. Levine replied that the tests had not been changed, and this was probably low on their list of priorities. They had anecdotal evidence about the difficulty of the tests because applicants had told them it was much more difficult compared to the NTE. He had also received a number of comments from people who were impressed with how stringent the test standards were in MCPS. He believed that the tests were developed several years ago and should be reviewed periodically.

Dr. Massie agreed with Mr. Ewing that the tests needed to be reviewed, and Mr. Levine had also suggested looking at criteria and evaluation procedures. While they agreed with these suggestions, they had not had the time to do this. She thought they would move this up on their list of priorities.

Mrs. Brenneman hoped that the animation and sensitivity they were bringing to the Board would be brought to employees and potential employees. She had previously visited personnel as an applicant for substitute teaching and as a Board member. As an English teacher, she was concerned when MCPS put out papers that were grammatically incorrect or contained factual errors. She had found errors in the packet provided to the Board from the mission statement on down. She thought that MCPS needed to be very careful about what kinds of information they put out to the public because they needed better editing.

Mrs. Brenneman stated that she had some questions on the teacher consultant model. She wanted to talk about the standards they used when they hired new teachers. For example, why were they spending time teaching teachers how to arrange classrooms or set up bulletin boards or do a planning book? She knew that they were in communication with the universities, and she wondered why the universities were not teaching these skills. She also noticed in the teacher consultant model there was a statement that retention rates for first year teachers had been 90 to 95 percent, but she did not know what had happened before. For example, did they improve by 1 percent or by a lot? She also wanted to know what follow-ups had been done since the DEA study. She thought there was a special certification for special educators, and she wondered what would happen with the regular classroom teacher if they started mainstreaming more and more students.

Ms. Alice Moskowitz, certification specialist, replied that if an

elementary teacher had special education students being mainstreamed in her class, she wouldn't necessarily have to meet special education requirements. With mainstreaming, there were supposed to be special education professionals with certification working to help the teacher learn how to absorb that kind of a child into the classroom. MCPS was now working with Johns Hopkins on this program. Dr. Massie requested examples of the differences in requirements for these two types of teachers. Ms. Moskowitz replied that there were a number of different ways of getting special education certification. If an individual already had certification in some teaching area, he or she would have to take assessment courses, measuring, and diagnosing. The special education certification they had now was generic with three different age/grade levels. A teacher would need courses for assessing that age group, and a teacher would also need curriculum courses and methodology for that age/grade level. A certified teacher would probably need about 15 additional class hours in special areas and then supervised experience plus the NTE test.

Mrs. DiFonzo asked whether they still had the recruitment program with Benedict College. Ms. Hayes replied that in the last two years they had had 12 juniors in a practicum, and while they had been impressed with the county, many of them had had to do their student teaching in South Carolina. These young teachers had not come to Montgomery County because they felt overwhelmed and thought they needed experience someplace else first. Mrs. DiFonzo asked whether graduates were not inclined to come here because of the cost of living. Ms. Hayes thought this happened, but she pointed out that they offered suggestions for housing or families who would volunteer to house these teachers. Mrs. DiFonzo asked whether it really was the issue of their curriculum and their expectations, and Ms. Hayes agreed.

Mrs. DiFonzo pointed out that there was a lot of talk about site-based management and allowing principals to trade off positions. If principals were allowed that flexibility, she wondered what the impact would be on Personnel. Dr. Massie replied that they would still need system-wide screening procedures. A key piece would have to do with the timing and identification of these vacancies. The sooner they knew what the projected vacancies were, the better they could do their job. If principals had this flexibility, MCPS would have to look at more dually certified candidates and timing was critical. Personnel would have to be very creative in terms of where they looked for candidates. There were a number of issues with regard to certification that they would be working on with MSDE. She had talked with the state superintendent about the role of the state in terms of certification, and she thought the local system might have a little more autonomy in this area. The biggest impact from her perspective was having the pool of candidates. Another issue was how often the system changed. In a system the size of MCPS, they

already had a lot of movement of staff, and it took time for that to occur, and they did have to follow the negotiated agreements.

Mrs. DiFonzo asked what happened when a principal decided he or she wanted a reading teacher instead of a media specialist and there was no position for the media specialist. Dr. Massie replied that they still had the obligation to place people. They would either be in an overhire situation or have people who were working out of their field. It would be a major issue to be addressed. As long as they had negotiated agreements, they had some restrictions and restraints.

Dr. Monie commented that in their use of technology they wanted to be able to provide principals, on site, with more meaningful information about the candidates they could select from to fill their vacancies. He had talked with a staffing director in a Canadian system where they had site-based management and where they staffed by giving schools a dollar amount. However, the principal had to adhere to certain staffing ratios and to certain periods for transfers.

Dr. Massie stated that they would like to share information about their human resources system. Dr. Monie explained that the heart of their computer system was their human resources data base which had been on line since 1986. It stored records for 20,000 employees, 10,000 to 15,000 applicants, and another 50,000 inactive applicants. Mr. Levine said that for the past seven years they had been using a prototype of their applicant tracking system. However, it had not been developed to handle all of the applicants. They were working with DMICS to develop a fully functioning applicant tracking system that tied into the human resources data base. It would allow principals and supervisors from other buildings to access all credentials for all applicants and employees and make personnel decisions and transactions. These people would not have to come to Personnel or handle paper files. It would no longer be one file per candidate, and ten principals could be looking at the same person. He believed that this would improve the efficiency of personnel processes.

Mr. Levine said they were looking into some technology advances to provide better service. They had an interactive telecommunications system for substitute calling which was a success. They were looking at the idea of expanding that to allow on-line applications from candidates. They were examining digital imaging technology to eliminate some of their massive paper files. They wanted to scan these papers into a computer system which would enable them to file and index electronically. They were expanding the applicant tracking system to allow applicants to come in and self-enter their information into terminals to speed up the process.

Dr. Monie reported that there were three specific PC applications

they used in Personnel because they provided more personalized service. One system was a certification renewal process where they notified all teachers of their obligations for certificate renewal. A second application was attaching numbers to supporting services positions advertised in the Bulletin. The ads were stored in a PC and transmitted electronically to the Bulletin. They used the same data base to store information on internal candidates applying for those positions. Through this method they had virtually eliminated grievances about the process of filling supporting services vacancies.

Dr. Monie commented that the most exciting new technology was the automated substitute calling system. They were the first large school system to use this, and now 60 school systems were using it. Teachers could call in and report absences up to 30 days in advance, and it worked 24 hours a day, seven days a week. It was available to principals from any touch-tone phone. Teachers could also leave voice messages for substitutes. He thought they could tie this technology to their supporting services data base so that internal candidates could call in, and principals could call in to report a supporting services vacancy. It might be possible for external candidates to have access to this system so they could know which positions had internal candidates applying.

This technology could be linked to TTY machines so that they could communicate with their deaf staff. They could link it to the mainframe to simplify payroll procedures. He felt that they had returned a lot of administrator and secretary time to schools by using this technology. If they were to provide these services manually it would cost \$250,000 annually, and the services would not be as personal.

Dr. Massie stated that she was prepared to end their presentation with a discussion of the resident teacher certification process.

She suggested that they defer a discussion of the assessment process. Mrs. Hobbs agreed with this suggestion.

Dr. Massie pointed out that the Board had a memo on the Maryland Resident Teacher Certificate, and she wanted to be sure the Board understood the requirements of the program and why MCPS had not yet adopted this particular program. Frederick County was now considering working with one of the colleges to develop the program. This was considered an alternative route to certification. She noted that another route was through the provisional certificate. The resident teacher program had a staff development piece and was geared for people with a bachelor's degree with a B average who were not education majors.

The first thing that had to happen was that an offer of employment be made to the person prior to their beginning the resident teacher program. Before they walked into a classroom, they had to complete 90 clock hours of study. For that reason, school systems had not developed programs to meet the resident teacher requirements. It was major staff development piece that

needed fleshing out in terms of what the requirements were.

Dr. Massie explained that in order for MCPS to participate they would have to make an offer in May to a candidate. During the summer, the individual would have to complete two graduate level programs including five specific components. The colleges and universities had not addressed the issue of how to get these five components into a program. The school system had to develop this in-service plan, and the training had to be in the area in which they were hiring the person. For example, they would need one program for a math person and another program for a science person.

Once the individual was hired, he or she faced a two-year residency program. During the first year, the person would receive some type of provisional certificate. They would be assigned to a supervisor or a mentor who would be required to provide a number of hours of supervised internship. For at least one semester if not the entire year, they would need to have two people assigned to one classroom. At the end of the year, the individual would have had to have completely successfully the three parts of the National Teacher Exam. At the end of the first year they would qualify for a standardized professional certificate and were obligated to stay in the program for one more year. This last point was a concern to staff because teachers coming through a traditional route could not get a standardized professional certificate after one year.

Dr. Massie felt that they could not give a person 90 hours, put them in a classroom, and assume their professional development was complete. The 90 clock hours were another area of concern. They must include adolescent development, which for most teachers was a full 45-hour course. The course must include principles and theories of teaching and learning, strategies and models of teaching, planning and classroom management skills, and the Maryland "essential teaching knowledge." She did not know how they could put all of this into 90 hours and assume that someone had enough training in these areas. There were seven working committees defining what the Maryland essential teaching knowledge was. The committees were working in the areas of English, math, special education, elementary education, social studies, and science. Maryland had suggested that this program be done in connection with a college or university. However, in her work with deans, there was a reluctance to develop this program because of competing interests.

Mrs. Hobbs assumed that the Board would have some questions, and she suggested postponing the item on awards for service to public education.

RESOLUTION NO. 277-92      Re:    POSTPONING DISCUSSION OF AWARDS FOR  
SERVICE TO PUBLIC EDUCATION

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

Resolved, That the discussion of awards for service to public education be rescheduled as soon as possible but not later than May, 1992.

Re:    CONTINUATION OF PERSONNEL  
DISCUSSION

Mrs. DiFonzo asked whether these individuals could be fresh out of school or retired. Dr. Massie replied that the trainee could be a retired person; however, they would have to develop a screening process. Mrs. DiFonzo said they then had to offer that person a contract predicated on their successful completion of the program. When they came on board, they had a teacher/mentor and were paid. Dr. Massie explained that these individuals would be paid as a bachelor, step 1 teacher. The contract stated that any person who had a certificate was paid at this rate. Ms. Gutierrez thought that the pay rate would have to be defined.

Mr. Gutierrez pointed out that these individuals would be teaching in the classroom. Dr. Massie explained that when the certificate was discussed, the intent was that these people would go in as fully certified teachers and would be handled no differently than first year teachers. There was a recommendation from the Professional Standards Board that these people be given a standard certificate with a new title.

Mrs. Hobbs thanked staff for their presentation and discussion. The Board would reschedule the discussion on assessment.

Re:    EXECUTIVE SESSION

The Board met from 1:05 p.m. to 2:20 p.m. to discuss legal and personnel issues and appeals and to consult with the Board's attorney.

Re:    PUBLIC COMMENTS

The following individuals appeared before the Board:

1. Dawn Maynard
2. Dan Clevenden
3. Chris Doyle, New Hampshire Estates PTA
4. Janelle Haskell
5. Sarah Cotterill
6. Carolyn Veiga and Brenda Harris



Cannon Sports, Inc.	30,533
Collegiate Sports	18,099
Dita USA, Inc.	1,375*
DVF Sporting Goods Company	33,394
Edko Net Company	490
Fit For U, Inc.	7,753*
Bill Fritz Sports Corporation	32,295
Gerstung/Gym-Thing, Inc.	22,834
Marty Gilman, Inc.	190*
The Goal, Inc.	60
Grebb Sports, Inc.	20,673
Heartline Fitness Industries	157,950
H. L. Corporation	855
House of Sports	1,319*
Lax World, Inc.	1,362
Longstreth Sporting Goods	4,750*
Louisville Badminton Supply	763*
M-F Athletic Company	828
Mancino Manufacturing Company, Inc.	300*
Marlow Sports, Inc.	102,158
McArthur Towels, Inc.	2,104
Mico Bio-Medics, Inc.	120
The Mini-Gym Company	3,245
Morley Athletic Supply Company, Inc.	30,830
Municipal Supply Company	4,915
Off The Net	2,265
Passon's Sports	76,973
Penn Monto, Inc.	5,826*
Pioneer Manufacturing	5,645
Resilite Sports Products, Inc.	14,710
George Santelli, Inc.	3,700*
School Health Supply Company	550
Second Chance Gold Ball Recyclers	444
Spieth-Anderson USA Inc.	8,768
Sport Tech	3,899
Sportime Select Service and Supplies	13,192
Sportmaster	18,879
Sports Imports	22,843
Tiffin Athletic Mats, Inc.	3,381*
Time Out for Sports	527*
Tomark Sports, Inc.	1,560
Total Sports Source	1,180
UCS, Inc.	496
Unique Sports Products, Inc.	968
Total	<u>\$ 697,859</u>

68-92 Wood Mulch for Replenishing Playgrounds  
Awardee  
Earl Center Company

\$ 41,160





WHEREAS, The project bonding company, Fidelity and Deposit, has consented to this reduction; and

WHEREAS, The project architect, The Lukmire Partnership, Inc., recommends approval of the reduction; and

WHEREAS, The contractor's progress has been satisfactory throughout the project, and it is currently ahead of scheduled completion; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the 10 percent retainage withheld from periodic payments to Merando, Inc., general contractor for Seneca Valley Middle School #1, be reduced to 5 percent, with the remaining 5 percent to become due and payable after completion of all remaining requirements and formal acceptance of the completed project.

RESOLUTION NO. 281-92      Re:    REROOFING - FALLSMEAD ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

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

WHEREAS, The following sealed bids were received on March 5, 1992, for the reroofing at Fallsmead Elementary School which will begin on June 22, 1992, and be completed by August 17, 1992:

<u>Bidder</u>	<u>Amount</u>
1. AEO Construction Co., Inc.	\$199,000
2. J. E. Wood & Sons Co., Inc.	211,900
3. CitiRoof Corp.	231,869
4. Kalkreuth Roofing & Sheet Metal, Inc.	240,194
5. Virginia Roofing Corporation	241,772
6. Orndorff & Spaid, Inc.	263,757
7. Agmilu & Co., Inc.	292,599

and

WHEREAS, The apparent low bidder, AEO Construction Co., Inc., has requested that their bid be withdrawn from consideration for this project because they are not able to provide the roofing systems required in the specifications; and

WHEREAS, Staff concurs with the request to withdraw the bid; and

WHEREAS, J. E. Wood & Sons, Inc. can comply with the contract specifications and has completed similar projects successfully for Montgomery County Public Schools; and

WHEREAS, The estimate for this project was \$225,000; now

therefore be it

Resolved, That a \$211,900 contract be awarded to J. E. Wood & Sons Co., Inc., for the reroofing at Fallsmead 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 1992 Capital Budget.

RESOLUTION NO. 282-92 Re: ROCKING HORSE ROAD CENTER

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

WHEREAS, The following sealed bids were received on March 26, 1992, for the reroofing at Rocking Horse Road Center which will begin on June 22, 1992, and be completed by August 17, 1992:

<u>Bidder</u>	<u>Amount</u>
1. Orndorff & Spaid, Inc.	\$141,321
2. J. E. Wood & Sons Co., Inc.	150,229
3. CitiRoof Corp.	162,519
4. Virginia Roofing Corporation	183,490

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 \$145,000; now therefore be it

Resolved, That a \$141,321 contract be awarded to Orndorff & Spaid, Inc., for the reroofing at Rocking Horse Road 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. 283-92 Re: REROOFING - STEPHEN KNOLLS SCHOOL

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

WHEREAS, The following sealed bids were received on March 19, 1992, for the reroofing at Stephen Knolls School 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.	\$154,208
2. Virginia Roofing Corporation	162,450
3. Orndorff & Spaid, Inc.	178,751
4. John H. Cole & Sons, Inc.	185,222
5. CitiRoof Corp.	196,427

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 \$160,000; now therefore be it

Resolved, That a \$154,208 contract be awarded to J. E. Wood & Sons Co., Inc. for the reroofing at Stephen Knolls 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 1992 Capital Budget.

Re: SUMMER SCHOOL FEES

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

WHEREAS, As a result of County Council action on the FY 92 Operating Budget, an enterprise fund was established for summer school programs; and

WHEREAS, As a result of the Board of Education's operating budget request for FY 93, the senior high summer school program will be shifted to the Adult Education and Summer School Enterprise Fund; and

WHEREAS, This enterprise fund must generate revenue to make the programs self-supporting; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Board of Education set summer school fees for FY 93 as shown on the FY 1992 Summer School Fee Schedule.

RESOLUTION NO. 284-92      Re: POSTPONEMENT OF PROPOSED SUMMER  
SCHOOL FEES

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

Resolved, That the proposed resolution on summer school fees be



projected deficit was likely to continue. He asked when the Board would have recommendations to deal with that issue. Mr. Larry Bowers, budget director, replied that they would wait until the next report which would be the third quarter before they had a recommendation. He explained that there was about a \$575,000 difference between that revenue failure and the savings in the expenditure area.

Mrs. Brenneman asked why there were changes in the Category 2 instructional salaries accounts. Mr. Bowers replied that they continued to monitor all of the salary accounts, and as they made some estimates about filling some positions with long-term substitutes, they would see month by month how these accounts unfolded.

Mrs. Fanconi asked about the item on anticipated revenue from summer school, and she thought all of this was in the enterprise fund. Mr. Bowers explained that this was for this year. The Board of Education approved a supplemental at the end of the past summer because they had increased the revenue above what they had projected. They went back to the County Council and asked for the authority to spend that money. However, this was well below what their original estimates had been because they had not had the enrollment they anticipated.

Re: FRENCH IMMERSION PROGRAM

Mrs. Hobbs announced that the following resolution adopted by the Board of Education on November 25, 1991, was on the table:

WHEREAS, The Board of Education acted on March 12, 1991, to continue the French Immersion Program as part of the Blair Cluster and to house it in the Northwood facility as a separate elementary school beginning September 1993; and

WHEREAS, The Board allowed the French Immersion Program to expand to two classes per grade beginning with Kindergarten only in September 1991; and

WHEREAS, The Northwood facility will still be in use as a high school holding facility until September 1994; and

WHEREAS, The superintendent recommended and the Board of Education conducted a public hearing on November 19, 1991, to relocate the French Immersion Program until 1994 either to a stand-alone school or as a school-within-a-school at Maryvale Elementary School; and

WHEREAS, A stand-alone school would add more than \$500,000 to the FY 1993 operating budget during a time of grave fiscal concerns; and

WHEREAS, The Maryvale facility can accommodate the immersion program and students as a school-within-a-school; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the French Immersion Program be housed for the school years 1992 and 1993 until space is available in the Northwood facility; and be it further

Resolved, That the area office would work with the parents of the French Immersion Program to effect a smooth transition; and be it further

Resolved, That the program continue to grow to two classes per grade as adopted by the Board in March 1991.

RESOLUTION NO. 287-92      Re:    A SUBSTITUTE MOTION BY MR. EWING ON  
THE LOCATION OF THE FRENCH  
IMMERSION PROGRAM

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

Resolved, That the French Immersion Program be housed at Maryvale for two years beginning in the fall of 1992 and until space is available in the Northwood building or elsewhere within the Blair cluster; and be it further

Resolved, That the superintendent will review with the Board in the spring of 1992 the methods of operation of the French Immersion Program, the effectiveness of the program, and its effect on integration with a view to developing appropriate recommendations; and be it further

Resolved, That the area office will work with staff and parents of French Immersion and with staff and parents of Maryvale to ensure that the concerns of all those affected by the move are reasonably addressed by the date on which the French Immersion Program moves to Maryvale; and be it further

Resolved, That the program continue to grow to two classes per grade as adopted by the Board in March 1991.

For the record, Ms. Gutierrez stated that they were moving away from the school-within-a-school concept.

Re:    NEW BLAIR HIGH SCHOOL

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

WHEREAS, Blair High School serves a large and growing population and offers a richly diverse program to meet student needs; and

WHEREAS, The Blair service area as a whole, and the varied Blair educational programs, have stabilized the school and strengthened the community; and

WHEREAS, Student enrollment is projected to be 2,800 by 2005 and the Blair facility has capacity for 2,200; and

WHEREAS, The Montgomery County Planning Board, county executive, and County Council have not supported an addition to Blair High School on the Blair site; and

WHEREAS, Constructing a new Blair on an appropriate site would allow Montgomery County Public Schools to design a high school with the desirable characteristics of both large and small schools; and

WHEREAS, Forging a program and facilities link between the Blair, Einstein, and Kennedy clusters would extend the educational benefits of each to the other; now therefore be it

Resolved, That, pending acquisition of the site, a new Blair High School should be constructed on the Kay Tract and linked programmatically and technologically with the modernized Einstein and Kennedy high schools; and be it further

Resolved, That the Blair cluster mid-level students be housed in the current Blair Wayne Avenue facility, Eastern, and Takoma Park Intermediate School facilities when the new Blair High School is available, and that the Einstein and Kennedy cluster mid-level students be housed in the Argyle, Lee, and Sligo facilities; and be it further

Resolved, That detailed site, cost, and traffic analyses be developed for Board review by November, 1992; and be it further

Resolved, That the analyses will be comprehensive in scope, including a forward-looking educational program of requirements, expenditures and savings, a time schedule to include site acquisition and development, and process for community/governmental involvement; and be it further

Resolved, That the county executive be requested to recommend approval of these actions to the County Council.

For the record, Mr. Pischevar stated that he had stated his feelings before and everyone knew how he felt. It was important to have the new building on the Kay tract to revitalize the Silver Spring area and the community.

\*Mr. Pischevar left the meeting at this point because of a medical appointment.

RESOLUTION NO. 288-92      Re:    AN AMENDMENT TO THE PROPOSED  
RESOLUTION ON BLAIR HIGH SCHOOL

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

Resolved, That the proposed resolution on Blair High School be amended by the addition of two WHEREAS clauses, one Resolved clause, and an amendment to a Resolved clause:

"WHEREAS, The Board of Education sought and obtained widespread community involvement and participation in the decisions about how to manage change in enrollment in the whole eastern area of the county and in the Blair cluster; and

"WHEREAS, The Eastern Area Study Group reviewed the option of wholesale redistricting in the eastern area of the county including the Blair cluster and rejected that option as undesirable and unworkable, given the demographic characteristics of the eastern part of the county and the rapidly rising enrollment throughout the county; and"

Insert in first Resolved "to serve students living in the Blair service area as well as to serve students attending the magnet programs, and to provide for a jointly planned programmatic and technological link"

Resolved, That the Board of Education has examined the option of redistricting the schools in the eastern area of the county and the option of county-wide redistricting and has determined that these options will not serve the best interests of students and will be only temporary in any event, given the rapid county-wide rise in student enrollment, affecting every school in the county, and will cause massive disruption throughout the county for non-discernible benefit; and be it further"

RESOLUTION NO. 289-92      Re:    NEW BLAIR HIGH SCHOOL

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

WHEREAS, Blair High School serves a large and growing population and offers a richly diverse program to meet student needs; and

WHEREAS, The Blair service area as a whole, and the varied Blair educational programs, have stabilized the school and strengthened

the community; and

WHEREAS, Student enrollment is projected to be 2,800 by 2005 and the Blair facility has capacity for 2,200; and

WHEREAS, The Montgomery County Planning Board, county executive, and County Council have not supported an addition to Blair High School on the Blair site; and

WHEREAS, The Board of Education sought and obtained widespread community involvement and participation in the decisions about how to manage change in enrollment in the whole eastern area of the county and in the Blair cluster; and

WHEREAS, The Eastern Area Study Group reviewed the option of wholesale redistricting in the eastern area of the county including the Blair cluster and rejected that option as undesirable and unworkable, given the demographic characteristics of the eastern part of the county and the rapidly rising enrollment throughout the county; and

WHEREAS, Constructing a new Blair on an appropriate site would allow Montgomery County Public Schools to design a high school with the desirable characteristics of both large and small schools; and

WHEREAS, Forging a program and facilities link between the Blair, Einstein, and Kennedy clusters would extend the educational benefits of each to the other; now therefore be it

Resolved, That, pending acquisition of the site, a new Blair High School should be constructed on the Kay Tract to serve students living in the Blair service area as well as to serve students attending the magnet programs, and to provide for a jointly planned programmatic and technological link with the modernized Einstein and Kennedy high schools; and be it further

Resolved, That the Board of Education has examined the option of redistricting the schools in the eastern area of the county and the option of county-wide redistricting and has determined that these options will not serve the best interests of students and will be only temporary in any event, given the rapid county-wide rise in student enrollment, affecting every school in the county, and will cause massive disruption throughout the county for non-discernible benefit; and be it further

Resolved, That the Blair cluster mid-level students be housed in the current Blair Wayne Avenue facility, Eastern, and Takoma Park Intermediate School facilities when the new Blair High School is available, and that the Einstein and Kennedy cluster mid-level students be housed in the Argyle, Lee, and Sligo facilities; and be it further

Resolved, That detailed site, cost, and traffic analyses be developed for Board review by November, 1992; and be it further

Resolved, That the analyses will be comprehensive in scope, including a forward-looking educational program of requirements, expenditures and savings, a time schedule to include site acquisition and development, and process for community/governmental involvement; and be it further

Resolved, That the county executive be requested to recommend approval of these actions to the County Council.

Re: EASTERN AREA HIGH SCHOOL SPACE

Mrs. Hobbs made the following statement for the record:

"I am going to abstain on this. I do give full credit to staff and to the group that spent four weeks coming up with the recommendations; however, I do not feel that a comprehensive review of all school facilities has been done. I am referring to all school facilities as those schools that are closed and perhaps leased to a community group, those schools that are closed and sitting vacant, and those schools that are special ed schools now but may become available several years from now. So I will be abstaining."

RESOLUTION NO. 290-92      Re: HIGH SCHOOL SPACE RECOMMENDATIONS  
FOR THE EASTERN AREA AND AMENDMENT  
OF THE FY 1993-98 CAPITAL  
IMPROVEMENTS PROGRAM

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

WHEREAS, In May, 1991 the County Council requested MCPS to develop a comprehensive plan for secondary space needs in the eastern area of the county; and

WHEREAS, From December, 1991 through January, 1992 a community advisory group met to develop recommendations on ways to address high school space shortages in the eastern area of the county; and

WHEREAS, The Eastern Area Study Group recommended the following:

- o A new high school (1,600 capacity) should be constructed in the northeastern part of the county

- o Additions should be constructed at existing high schools as required
- o A community workgroup should help plan for mid-level facilities
- o Program needs and cluster boundaries will need additional study to ensure quality integrated education and equity in program delivery
- o Schools with less than 300 students per grade should be given extra support for programs; and

WHEREAS, The superintendent concurred with the group's facilities proposals and recommended construction of a new high school in the eastern area and additions at existing schools totalling 42 teaching stations; and

WHEREAS, Staff will identify sites from existing inventory to use or trade in order to minimize or avoid site acquisition costs; and

WHEREAS, The Success for Every Student plan has the mechanisms to address many of the program issues raised by the study group; and

WHEREAS, The superintendent has charged staff with developing a plan to address those schools with the greatest needs; and

WHEREAS, The Board of Education conducted a public hearing on April 7 on the recommendations; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Board of Education amend its FY 1993-98 CIP as follows:

- o Request \$23,250,000 in the FY 1992-98 CIP for a new northeastern high school to open September, 1997
- o Request \$6,535,000 in the FY 1993-98 CIP (begin with planning in FY 1995) for 42 classroom additions at eastern area high schools totalling 42 teaching stations (Einstein, Walter Johnson, Kennedy, Rockville, Wheaton) as required; and be it further

Resolved, That the county executive be requested to recommend approval of these actions to the County Council.

Re: RELOCATION OF THE KENSINGTON-  
PARKWOOD CENTER  
FOR THE HIGHLY GIFTED

Mrs. Hobbs explained the following November 25, 1991, decision was before the Board:

WHEREAS, Establishing a Center for the Highly Gifted at Kensington-Parkwood Elementary School was predicated on funding approval for a four-classroom addition; and

WHEREAS, The County Council denied funding which requires the Board of Education to consider other available elementary space for this program; and

WHEREAS, Parents agreeing to enter their students in the program as fourth graders at Kensington-Parkwood in September 1991 were informed that the program would be relocated for Grades 4 and 5 in 1992; and

WHEREAS, The superintendent recommended, and the Board conducted public hearings on November 18 and 19, on housing the Grades 4-5 program at Lucy Barnsley Elementary School; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Center for the Highly Gifted currently located at Kensington-Parkwood Elementary School be established at Lucy Barnsley Elementary School in September 1992 for Grades 4 and 5; and be it further

Resolved, That the Area 1 and 2 Offices, school principals, and staff work with parents of the respective schools to effect a smooth transition for all students and programs.

Mrs. Fanconi made the following statement for the record:

"This move of the Center resulted from the County Council's denial of the four-room addition at Kensington-Parkwood, and I did vote for the reconsideration because I wanted to look at whether or not the portables were staying and how that might affect it. I did consider this, but I really feel that it would have a negative impact on both programs and it is better for the program to go to Lucy Barnsley as we originally voted, and that is how I will be voting."

RESOLUTION NO. 291-92      Re: AN AMENDMENT TO THE RESOLUTION ON  
THE RELOCATION OF THE KENSINGTON-  
PARKWOOD CENTER FOR THE HIGHLY  
GIFTED

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

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

Resolved, That the resolution on the relocation of the Kensington-Parkwood Center for the Highly Gifted be amended to grandfather the current fourth grade in Kensington-Parkwood.

RESOLUTION NO. 292-92      Re:    THE RELOCATION OF THE KENSINGTON-PARKWOOD CENTER FOR THE HIGHLY GIFTED

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

WHEREAS, Establishing a Center for the Highly Gifted at Kensington-Parkwood Elementary School was predicated on funding approval for a four-classroom addition; and

WHEREAS, The County Council denied funding which requires the Board of Education to consider other available elementary space for this program; and

WHEREAS, Parents agreeing to enter their students in the program as fourth graders at Kensington-Parkwood in September 1991 were informed that the program would be relocated for Grades 4 and 5 in 1992; and

WHEREAS, The superintendent recommended, and the Board conducted public hearings on November 18 and 19, on housing the Grades 4-5 program at Lucy Barnsley Elementary School; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Center for the Highly Gifted currently located at Kensington-Parkwood Elementary School be established at Lucy Barnsley Elementary School in September 1992 for Grade 4 and 5; and be it further

Resolved, That the current Grade 4 be "grandfathered" in Kensington-Parkwood for their fifth grade in September 1992; and be it further

Resolved, That the Area 1 and 2 Offices, school principals, and staff work with parents of the respective schools to effect a smooth transition for all students and programs.



1. Executive sessions may be called by the president at any time at the request of any member or the superintendent. However, the Board must take a public vote to go into executive session and must give public notice of the meeting by delivering a notice to the news media or posting the notice at the meeting site.
2. All final decisions reached during executive session must be confirmed at a public meeting.
3. It is the responsibility of Board members to monitor the topics discussed in executive session to assure that the topics discussed are appropriate for executive session.
4. Board members and staff are expected to maintain the confidentiality of executive session.
5. The attorney general has ruled that although the Montgomery County Board of Education is without power to discipline its members, it is free to adopt a resolution that expresses its disapproval of a member's action in disclosing the contents of an executive session discussion.

#### **Record of Meetings**

The Board of Education maintains records of meeting as follows:

1. Tape recordings of all public meetings and video tapes of major meetings.
2. Minutes of all public meetings. The minutes are limited to action taken by the Board unless a Board member specifically requests that a statement on a subject be reflected in the minutes. The minutes record the vote of the student member in parentheses when the student's vote does not count.
3. ~~Notes of executive session.~~ Minutes of executive session.

The tape recordings and minutes of public meetings are available as a matter of public record. Arrangements can be made ~~to listen to or~~ to purchase audio and video tape recordings of Board meetings.

#### **Meetings of the Board of Education**

##### **Regular Meetings**

3. At every business meeting, 15 minutes are set aside for Public Comments ~~a Board/Press/Visitor Conference~~ to encourage public participation. It is practice to use a sign-up sheet which is posted 30 minutes prior to the start of Public Comments. Speakers are granted a few minutes and

are requested to adhere to the rules for public participation in Board meetings.

5. At every business meeting, an item is scheduled on future and past executive sessions. For future executive sessions, the Board will adopt a resolution citing the reasons for the sessions as well as the time and place of the sessions. For past executive sessions, a statement will be made on the time, place, and purpose of the closed session; a record of the vote of each member as to closing the session; a citation of the authority for closing the session; and a listing of topics of discussions, persons present, and each action taken during the session.

and be it further

Resolved, That the Board of Education adopt the following guidelines for the conduct of persons attending Board meetings and direct that these guidelines be included in the Board handbook and displayed in Board meeting rooms:

Conduct of Persons Attending Board Meetings  
and  
Videotaping, Televising, Photography,  
Broadcasting or Recording Meetings

Under State law, the Board of Education is required to adopt and enforce reasonable rules regarding the conduct of persons attending its open meetings. The Board expects, therefore, that order and decorum will be maintained by the members of the Board of Education and all persons and groups in attendance at Board Meetings. Orderly conduct of a meeting does not permit spontaneous discussion from the audience. If the presiding officer determines that the behavior of an individual or groups of individuals is disrupting an open meeting, the Board may have the individual(s) removed. No citizens participating in a Board meeting in a lawful and appropriate way should be intimidated by the actions of others, and sufficient order will be maintained so that all participants may hear and be heard when giving testimony, hearing the testimony of others, or otherwise participating in the meeting.

The Board of Education must be in compliance with County laws and regulations regarding the capacity of the meeting room and will, when necessary, limit the number of individuals who are allowed to enter the room. At no time shall the hallways and egress from the meeting room to the outside of the building be obstructed, and, when necessary, public safety officers (police or fire marshals) will be requested to maintain safe entrances and exits to the meeting room.

The Board of Education welcomes the public, its representatives

and the media to attend, report on and broadcast its open meetings. However, under State law, the Board has a duty to adopt and enforce reasonable rules regarding the videotaping, televising, photographing, broadcasting or recording of its meetings. The Board expects, therefore, that any recording and transmitting of open Board meetings will be unobtrusive and will not in any way interfere with or disrupt the meeting. Should the presiding officer determine that a specific use of a recording, transmitting, or photographing device is disrupting an open session, the Board will request that the individual(s) using the device move the device or cease using the device. If the interference or disruption continues, the Board may have the individual(s) using the device removed from the meeting room.

The intent of these guidelines is to allow the Board of Education to conduct its business in an atmosphere of decorum and to assure the safety and security of the public when attending and participating in Board meetings.

and be it further

Resolved, That the Board handbook be reissued as soon as possible and include other revisions adopted by the Board of Education since its last publishing in 1988.

Re: BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS

1. Mrs. Hobbs stated that the Board received copies of a memo from Dr. Vance to Mrs. Brenneman regarding international students. She felt that after the Board's discussion on loss of credit and absences, she strongly objected to the current procedure outlined in the memo. She had questions pertaining to policy implications, and she wanted some clarification because she had some problems with this. Mrs. Brenneman agreed and thought that the memo brought up more questions than it answered.
2. Mrs. Fanconi reported that Councilmember Gail Ewing had held a press conference about drug and alcohol prevention and a stronger policy about alcohol being served to minors at parties. The superintendent had staff in attendance but Board members could not attend because it took place during today's meeting.
3. Mrs. Fanconi noted that in the Montgomery County Government Prevention Center the following schools had been recognized for their excellent drug and alcohol prevention programs: Bells Mill, Glen Haven, Rock View elementary schools, Rosemary Hills Primary, Noyes Children's Center, and Wheaton High School. She pointed out that teenagers in Montgomery County were 20 percent more likely to use alcohol than the national average. Alcohol was the primary drug of choice for teenagers.
4. Mrs. Fanconi said she had represented the Board at the fourth

annual conference of the Maryland Coalition for Integrated Education called "Inclusion from Vision to Action." She had attended two workshops presented by Michael J. Delaney who worked for the State of Colorado on their inclusion efforts. His presentations were on the strategies for providing positive behavioral supports for students with special needs in an integrated environment, and he specifically spoke to inclusion with the SED population. One of the side benefits of inclusion of the SED population was training for teachers carried over to handling the regular education population. Dr. Delaney had told her that inclusion efforts had improved the morale of teachers despite their budget crisis. Because of the training, teachers felt they had more skills to use with all students. She stated that when the Board did discuss inclusion, it was imperative that they have a major presentation by staff on the pros and cons of inclusion. The Board should really have an opportunity to hear about the directions the staff was moving in. She felt they should have that kind of discussion before making any decisions.

5. Mr. Ewing stated that he had received letters and phone calls regarding the Bridge School. People seemed to think that the study of restructuring of special education was very likely to lead to reductions in or elimination of the Bridge School. He hoped that this was unwarranted anxiety, but he would like to know from the superintendent what the situation was. He said this caught him off guard because he thought they were looking at restructuring the central office and not program elimination. Dr. Vance replied that the commission had been working for three weeks, and he doubted that they had finalized their recommendations. However, if Board members were getting phone calls, he would suspect this was in their recommendations.

6. In regard to the autism program, Mr. Ewing said he had had a number of phone calls about the proposed reduction in the program in the form of the loss of a half-day planning session for teams. Parents seemed to think that this was a foregone conclusion, and he was concerned about that because it was a critical part of the program. He would like information from the superintendent on this.

7. Mr. Ewing was assuming that sometime in the relatively near future the Board would receive Dr. Vance's recommendations about the specific strategies, outcomes, and methods of achieving the outcomes for the Success for Every Student Plan. Dr. Vance replied that the staff was working on a very comprehensive report for the Board's consideration.

8. Mr. Ewing knew that the Board regularly sent letters of thanks to legislators at the end of the session. It seemed to him that they should make a very special effort to recognize the outstanding work of the Delegation and to note that Montgomery County did better than they thought they would.

9. Mrs. Brenneman said she was receiving calls about the Highland View issue. She understood where Highland View was and where the Julius West piece fit in, but she was wondering if they could relook at their policy and have a division of their ranking system for elementary schools and for secondary schools. She requested a response from the superintendent.

Re: LEGISLATIVE UPDATE

Mrs. Hobbs stated that on behalf of the Board she would like to acknowledge the collective efforts of MCPS staff and especially the efforts of Mrs. Lois Stoner, legislative aide, in meeting the needs of education. The Board also wanted to acknowledge the yeoman efforts of the Montgomery County Delegation.

Mrs. Stoner commented that they could not have done this without the support of staff members such as Larry Bowers, Melissa Bahr, Dr. Rohr, and Stan Sirotkin. She reported that today there had been a press conference at the county executive's office with the legislators about the money the county would receive.

Mrs. Stoner said they would get the APEX aid at the \$8.2 million level, but there was a suspension of the maintenance of effort so that the county would not be required to meet that. They did have a loss of \$5.9 million in transportation aid. On the nonpublic, they got back \$1.5 million of an expected \$2.5 million loss. This was one of their biggest legislative successes. Schools for Success had been modified to support challenge grants, and they understood MCPS would receive \$2.25 million of that. She pointed out that there were specific words in that bill that came directly from Dr. Vance. The wording was that "selection of school administrative leadership shall be a decision by the local school superintendent with the concurrence of the state superintendent." She acknowledged the efforts of Dr. Vance in legislative issues.

Mrs. Stoner said she had been assured that the Board of Public Works would award MCPS \$18 million in school construction funds, including the \$4.5 million that had already been allocated. On the current fiscal year, she had been assured that the lowest fiscal alternative would be \$8.7 million for Montgomery County. The taxes going into effect on May 1 would provide \$23.3 million from the cigarette tax in May and June and \$10.8 from the sales and use tax. Finally, the bill introduced by Delegate Counihan to extend the life of school buses was incorporated into a comprehensive transportation bill after it received an unfavorable report. The local bills on the student Board member vacancy and the local revenue authority were both adopted.

Dr. Vance remarked that given the increasing importance of the delegation and legislators in Annapolis, he thought it might be

fitting if the Board officers and superintendent were to meet with the leadership of the Delegation with the idea of setting up a meeting with Board and Delegation members for a debriefing.

RESOLUTION NO. 294-92 Re: EXECUTIVE SESSION - APRIL 27, 1992

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

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education of Montgomery County hereby conduct its meeting in executive closed session beginning on April 27, 1992, 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. 295-92 Re: MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 26, 1992

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

Resolved, That the minutes of February 26, 1992, be approved.

RESOLUTION NO. 296-92 Re: MINUTES OF MARCH 16, 1992

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

Resolved, That the minutes of March 16, 1992, be approved.

RESOLUTION NO. 297-92 Re: BOE APPEAL NO. 1992-2

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education dismiss BOE Appeal No. 1992-02 (student expulsion) at the request of the appellant.

RESOLUTION NO. 297-92 Re: BOE APPEAL NO. 1991-115

On motion of Dr. Cheung seconded by Mrs. DiFonzo, the following resolution was adopted with Mrs. Brenneman, Dr. Cheung, Mrs. DiFonzo, Mr. Ewing, Mrs. Fanconi, and Mrs. Hobbs voting in the affirmative; Ms. Gutierrez abstaining because she was not present when the appeal was discussed:

Resolved, That the Board of Education adopt its Decision and Order in BOE Appeal No. 1991-115, a student grade matter.

Re: NEW BUSINESS

1. Mr. Ewing moved and Mrs. Brenneman seconded the following:

Resolved, That the Board of Education reconsider the following action that was adopted by the Board of Education on March 10, 1992:

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.

2. Mr. Ewing moved and Ms. Gutierrez seconded the following:

Resolved, That the Board of Education discuss the following proposed resolution on grant applications:

Resolved, That the grant applications that come to the Board for approval should (1) show or list grant requirements or criteria for awards, (2) show the relationship to MCPS and Board of Education goals, priorities, and major objectives and indicate the degree of priority of this grant for which application is to be made, (3) show all the MCPS resources that will be used and/or may be required to carry out the grant, and (4) show the specific outcomes expected to be achieved through the use of grant funds.

3. Mr. Ewing moved and Ms. Gutierrez seconded the following:

Resolved, That the Board of Education schedule time to discuss a proposal contained in Mr. Ewing's memorandum (attached) to the Board of Education dated March 30, 1992, on long-range planning for the county's educational investment including a proposal for some concepts that would guide long-range planning and a task force to assist the Board in doing that.

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education schedule time to consider recommendations in Mr. Ewing's memorandum (attached) dated March 30, 1992, entitled "Task Force on Resource Allocation and Service Delivery Options."

5. Mrs. DiFonzo said that she would like to discuss the white cover sheets on Board materials. Mrs. Brenneman commented that she had raised this issue, and staff would be seeking comments from Board members on the usefulness of these sheets.

6. Mrs. Brenneman said that in the Family Life report there was a recommendation on membership, and she would like to have a discussion on the selection criteria for committee members. Ms. Melissa Bahr, staff assistant, indicated that Mrs. Fanconi had raised this issue previously and it was scheduled for Board discussion.

Dr. Cheung assumed the chair.

7. Mrs. Hobbs moved and Ms. Gutierrez seconded the following:

Resolved, That the Board of Education support the State Board of Education's action in support of a tobacco-free environment; and be it further

Resolved, That the superintendent of schools communicate the Board's position to the Maryland State Board of Education.

Mrs. Hobbs assumed the chair.

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education review the ESOL/bilingual program including current program organization and content, evaluation of its outcomes and goals, and any new trends and directions in educating this sector of their population.

Re: ITEMS OF INFORMATION

Board members received the following items of information:

1. Items in Process
2. Staff Response to Family Life Report
3. Staff Response to Counseling Report
4. Construction Progress Report
5. Change Order Quarterly Report
6. Approval of High School Fire Service Cadet Program  
Revisions (for future consideration)

Re: ADJOURNMENT

The president adjourned the meeting at 6:35 p.m.

---

PRESIDENT

---

SECRETARY

PLV:mlw