

Re: ANNOUNCEMENTS

Dr. Cheung reported that Mr. Abrams had an emergency situation at work. Ms. Gutierrez would rejoin the meeting later, and Mr. Sims was expected to join the meeting at noon.

RESOLUTION NO. 429-93 Re: BOARD AGENDA - JUNE 10, 1993

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education approve its agenda for June 10, 1993.

Re: SUCCESS FOR EVERY STUDENT PLAN
UPDATE - AVERAGE AND ABOVE AVERAGE
STUDENTS AND SPECIAL EDUCATION
ISSUES

Mrs. Gemberling reported that the Board had been provided with the latest version of their ongoing management plan process. This morning they would do a three-part presentation, and the next update to the Board would be a review of data. The first part would focus on how Success for Every Student served a variety of students including average and above-average students, the second part would speak to adapting strategies and addressing outcomes for special education students, and the third part would be the monitoring process and how it was applied in the school improvement plans.

Dr. Joseph Villani, associate superintendent, introduced Dr. Cindy Sullivan, director of academic programs, and Dr. Waveline Starnes, coordinator of enriched and innovative instruction. He indicated that the average high school student in MCPS took algebra, geometry, narrative drama, literature, essay and lyric poetry, United States history and government, modern world history, fine arts, two years of a foreign language, biology, chemistry, and a wide variety of other courses. Five years ago 38 percent of the students were enrolled in at least one honors course. Two years ago the figure was 46 percent, and this year it was 49 percent. Eighty-five percent of MCPS students taking the advance placement exam achieved a score of three or better, and 73 percent of their seniors took the SAT last year and achieved an average score 94 points above the national average. He reported that 75 percent of their graduates went on to college.

Dr. Villani said they were achieving spectacular results because of the program and the instructional practices used in classrooms from kindergarten through twelfth grade on a day-to-day basis

that promoted high levels of achievement and expectations of success for every student. He said there were four elements essential to gifted and talented programs. These included higher level thinking, interdisciplinary connections, options and choices, and skills for research. Through the Success for Every Student Plan, these had become the model for instruction for all students. The most powerful tool to help average and above-average students was the classroom that demanded higher level thinking and problem solving, that integrated learning, that provided options and choices to pursue learning and interests, and that built in skills to do research and construct knowledge for sharing with others. Through training and program design, they were making this classroom a reality in MCPS.

Dr. Starnes commented that in implementing this G&T model for all students schools were expected to use flexible grouping practices, and they had provided the Board with two articles on grouping practices. Their organizational model used grouping without tracking in order to make all students educational winners. To enable schools to implement this model, they were training teachers in the Dimensions of Learning framework for planning instruction. Teachers were concerned not only with the acquisition of knowledge but with its extension, integration, refinement, and meaningful use. Teachers wanted to develop critical, creative, and reflective thinkers. The training was integrated with training on strategy-based instruction, interdisciplinary instruction including the math content connections, cooperative learning, and other grouping practices. During this past year her unit had trained 50 middle school and 50 elementary school teachers in the extension enrichment model. The Board had been provided with written materials on this training. This year they had trained 89 K-2 teachers in multiple intelligences to recognize the many ways in which children could be gifted and to provide appropriate programming for those children. She indicated that 50 counselors and teachers from 18 middle schools were trained in the use of interdisciplinary curricular connections for conflict resolution. Over 100 PADI teachers received intensive training in their first year and continued training as these teachers worked with potentially gifted students. Next year they would have one SES special project teacher working full time to develop models for middle school gifted and talented program, a handbook, and training plan for middle school staff which would help to assure consistent implementation of programs for gifted students at the middle school level.

Dr. Sullivan stated that they were promoting high levels of achievement for average, above, and gifted students through a variety of program enhancements. These were in the form of cooperative field experience programs to give students an opportunity to extend their classroom learning and pursue their interests particularly in science and technology. Others were

the event-based science curriculum and the exploring technological concepts program. These provided students with an opportunity to exercise their thinking skills and creativity. At the elementary level, their reading/language arts program focused on developing the skills and strategies to acquire meaning from whole text, interpret different levels of meaning, critically analyze the content, and communicate the interpretation to others. The revised elementary science curriculum emphasized experimentation, discovery, and exploration, instead of recall. The math program was shifting its focus to math skills to solve meaningful problems. The secondary math program had been restructured to move higher level math concepts into earlier courses. They were embedding SAT preparation material into algebra, geometry, and ninth and tenth grade English courses. Telecommunications as a research tool was becoming standard in the schools with this capacity. Multimedia materials had been integrated into reading, science, and social studies curricula. Their fourth grade study of Maryland was on a laser disk which was now for sale to other school systems. All these program enhancements were designed to let all students use higher level thinking, make interdisciplinary connections, have options and choices, and develop skills for research, which were the four components of G&T instruction.

Dr. Hiawatha Fountain, associate superintendent, reported that several goals in the Success for Every Student plan addressed the overrepresentation of African-American students in special education. Special education students were included throughout the SES plan in outcomes, goals, strategies, and tasks that targeted performance on MSPAP. The special schools had a school improvement plan to address areas of identified need. More than 80 percent of students with disabilities attended general education schools, were instructed in the Program of Studies, and participated in standardized testing. Intensity 1 through 3 students, 60 percent of their students, had their test results included in individual school summary scores. Many Intensity 4 and 5 students also took standardized tests. Therefore, the SES outcomes included the vast majority of students with disabilities. He introduced Ms. Sandra Lebowitz, acting director of the Department of Special Education and Related Services; Mrs. Sharon Healy, acting supervisor of special education instruction, and Ms. Verna Chiarello, coordinator of transition services.

Ms. Lebowitz stated that two tasks in the Success plan addressed tasks which caused students to enter or leave special education. Strategy 1.4 spoke to student and school characteristics most likely to result in inappropriate referrals to special. The SED data base was a prototype to identify elements which caused a student to be referred to special education and what program supports were effective in meeting a student's needs at lower intensities of special education support. Data were being reviewed to identify schools with low percentages of students

identified as disabled and schools maintaining the greatest percentage of their students at the lowest intensities of support. A work group was identifying the data elements that would allow them to replicate the preferred successful intervention strategies that these schools were using in other settings. Strategy 1.5 targeted the overrepresentation of African-American students in special education programs. Task 1.5.1 proposed the development of a profile for a return to regular education particularly for students who were seriously emotional disturbed or learning disabled. In reviewing the literature, it was clear that no single policy or practice ensured success for a student with or without disabilities. Success occurred when there was a concerted collaboration by student, teacher, parent, and administrator to support student needs.

Ms. Lebowitz said the profiles included in the Board packet did not include a list of skills to be mastered or skills for entry or exit criteria. The profiles identified competencies for success in general education. She commented that to assure success they had to focus on the learner, the setting, the teacher, and the task. They had to incorporate competencies discussed in the literature and the Program of Studies. The teacher and the task were addressed in training and through the curriculum. In the profiles, both students' strengths and needs were a focus. The profiles would be used as year-long tools to identify supports for individual students, to develop specific instructional plans and student objectives, to provide on-going diagnostic information, and to identify needs for in-service training. The next steps included a review and field test in selected schools to see if the profiles were helpful tools.

Ms. Lebowitz explained that as a result of this work they were proposing a rewording of the MCPS Task 1.5.1 to read, "the coordinators of programs for students with SED and LD will develop profiles outlining competencies for success in general education." The related tasks, 1.5.2 and 1.5.3, would also be reworded to reflect this change in language and content.

Mrs. Healy reported that SES tasks and strategies clearly promoted instructional practices supporting the learning needs of students with disabilities. The Special Education Instruction Unit supported the development and implementation of curriculum through collaboration with other curriculum coordinators in the Department of Academic Programs to enable students with disabilities to meet outcomes. The vast majority of students with disabilities participated in the MCPS Program of Studies and attained the same outcomes as their peers. For these students, special education services were provided in the general education setting in collaboration with the classroom teacher. The Program of Studies and SES Strategy 2.7 expected teachers to adjust their instruction to address the variety of learning styles and needs

of students. Students with disabilities needed instructional adaptations to structure the learning task as well as modifications to circumvent their disabilities. The instructional practices described by Dr. Villani helped students with disabilities. Methods for adapting the curriculum included accommodation, adaptation, and parallel and overlapping instruction.

Mrs. Healy indicated that this year they were working on the math curriculum, and this summer special education and math teachers would develop instructional units to prepare students to meet the new graduation requirements in algebra as well as units to teach functional math to students with learning disabilities. They had also worked on social skills units for elementary and middle school students. A Success for Every Student checklist described teacher behaviors that contributed to good teaching and successful learning regardless of the diversity of students' needs. Training programs developed by the Unit supported special and general educators in implementing the curriculum so that the learning needs of students would be addressed as required in SES 1.2. They had a workshop on teaching students with disabilities in the least restrictive environment which was for special and general educators. They had training for special education instructional assistants, a math content connection training series for special educators focused on technology, and learning strategies training for special educators. They were working with local universities to develop graduate training programs for special and general educators. Students who could not attain the outcomes of the Program of Studies would use the fundamental life skills curriculum for students K-12, ranging in age from 5 to 21. It included basic skills including language arts and math, survival, work, leisure, and citizenship. This curriculum helped students make the transition from school to work and subsequently to an independent and productive adult life.

Ms. Chiarello stated that MCPS provided comprehensive transition programs to assist students with disabilities as they moved from school to successful participation as adults in the community. Transition plans were developed in ninth grade and were reviewed at least annually. The Unit worked with state and local, public and private agencies as well as employers, families, and schools to provide a continuum of experiences for each student. In the transition process, interagency collaboration was essential. They had provided the Board with a summary of transition partnerships, and each year they had 550 students with disabilities participating in paid and unpaid internships through these programs. Through grants they had disability awareness training for secondary schools, assistive technology and equipment for students, connections to ancillary services, and training for employers working with students. They had also provided the Board with a chart on their graduates. She pointed out that a majority of their students received a diploma, and

most graduates continued their education, were employed, or connected to appropriate services six months after graduation. She believed that MCPS programming and transition planning were leading to successful outcomes for youth with disabilities as they moved to adult life.

Dr. Phinnize Fisher, associate superintendent, said they would describe the use of the school improvement management plan. She introduced Mrs. Diane Ippolito and Dr. William Wilhoyte, directors of school administration. The school improvement management plan was a requirement by the State of Maryland which had been developed under the Maryland State School Performance Plan. MCPS was the forerunner in the development of the management plan, and Mrs. Ippolito had been a member of the state team to work on the school improvement plan. The Maryland State Department of Education had used the MCPS school improvement management plan as the model for their mandate.

Mrs. Ippolito reported that the Office of School Administration (OSA) worked directly with principals as they implemented their school improvement management plan. Their goal was to insure that the schools were reaching all children in an effective and meaningful way. The major role of OSA was to monitor that each plan was based on data that had been analyzed in a meaningful way. The plan had to have prioritized objectives geared towards improving student academic success, and the plan had to be implemented so that instruction was improving and students were making progress. She cautioned that there was no simple and easy fix to making this improvement. It would take time, commitment, and an effective use of resources, and it would take a lot of hard work on the part of teachers, principals, parents, and students.

Mrs. Ippolito commented that this year the directors had spent time trying to learn their schools. They studied data, looked at trends, and tried to identify not only the successes but also the weaknesses in order to develop a profile of schools. This would help principals develop an effective, school-wide implementation plan. They had looked at data on achievement on CRTs, the ISM profiles, the suspension rates, absenteeism, dropouts, promotion rates, loss of credit, identification of gifted and talented and special education students, course enrollment, grade distribution, Maryland functional test data, and college placement results. Even after that, they worked with principals to give them specific feedback on what the directors saw happening in the schools. The directors observed in individual schools and in classrooms. They were looking for differentiation, integration, flexible grouping, implementation of curriculum, student assignments, research projects, and the actual student products. They looked for balance between individual student learning and cooperative learning. They looked for programs to support the below-average student and to

nurture student growth and provide opportunities for average and above-average students. In EMT and SARD observations they questioned whether the focus was on the total child, whether there were multiple assessments, and whether the parent was a part of that process. They wanted to know if other avenues had been explored before a child was considered for special education.

Mrs. Ippolito remarked that when they talked with principals they looked to see if principals were planning cooperatively across schools within a cluster to improve academic performance. In regard to the teacher evaluation system, they asked if the principal's observations of the classroom teacher reflected a focus on instructional strategies that had been highlighted in the school improvement plan. They wanted to know whether the feedback to the teacher was specific regarding improvements and whether teachers were encouraged to participate in training programs. They also asked whether principals had the training opportunities they needed. OSA worked cooperatively with the Office of Instruction and Program Development and Personnel Services to provide a training program for principals on differentiation of instruction, Dimensions of Learning, and the math content connections. OSA was now completing its first year, and principals were now evaluating their successes and their failures and making new plans for next year.

Dr. Wilhoyte stated that as principals were working with their staffs and communities to determine how well the process was going this year, OSA was interested in what its role had been and how it was perceived by the principals. OSA had conducted an end-of-year review in their office in cooperation with OIPD and had met with principals. The packet included changes as a result of feedback they had obtained from those evaluations. Principals were in the process of reviewing their current plans and were being asked to review any new data they might have. As a part of that, they should include individual school data, cluster information, and system mandates. Principals should involve staffs and communities in the development of their plans, and they needed to have time to work together with OSA to look at the decisions of the school management team in light of the data available for each school. This year OSA wanted to make sure that the connection with OIPD was very clear and that they had identified the staff development needs for each school, each cluster, and the system. In August they would have a tentative completion of the management plan so that OSA could summarize patterns across individual schools and cluster staff development needs. Communities needed to be involved all the way along in the process. Finally the plan had to include and specifically address the needs of all students. He shared one school's plan with the Board.

Dr. Vance thanked staff for their presentation and asked Board members if they had questions.

Mrs. Brenneman thought it was a great presentation. However, she had a problem because she was hearing what the community was saying about the average and above-average student. She did not know whether there was a communication problem or not. Some of it went back to the title, Success for Every Student. The sidebar stated that it was a plan to improve the achievement of low to average achieving students. The plan came from the Gordon report and was an excellent system management plan with a budget wrapped around it. People looked at the budget and wondered how their children fit into the plan. She thought it might be time to look at the Success for Every Student document to retool some of it to make it success for every student if they were going to use it as a management plan.

Mrs. Brenneman pointed out that they talked about improving student scores but it was in the aggregate. What about the above average student and improvements there? She heard what the staff was saying, but when they got to the individual student, parents did not see the growth measure for their child. Perhaps they had to look at that sidebar and decide whether this was a plan for improving low to average achieving students or whether to make modifications to encompass above average students. She did not see the challenge in the plan when the student was already successful.

Mrs. Brenneman noted that they had changed the way they did staff development. At some point she would like to know how the money had been spent school by school and what the focuses had been. For example, did schools look toward differentiation, computers, or special education? Dr. Vance agreed that one of the most vexatious aspects of the creation and implementation of the school system's leadership plan had been the perception of varying constituent groups from parents of above average students to parents of special needs students. He suggested this could be a public discussion next fall. In regard to staff development, the executive staff had discussed the new model and how the funds had been expended. He hoped to pull these data together, share it with the Board, and have a discussion.

Mrs. Brenneman said the Board had received information on the dissemination of successful practices. She felt that they had to let the greater community know what was happening. For example, one of the principals was replicating a magnet program in a middle school, but the PTA did not know this. Dr. Vance commented that yesterday he had met with the several members of the corporate partnership. They had discussed the issue of external and internal communications, and Dr. Vance acknowledged that they were push to the maximum in getting information out.

He hoped that the group would have recommendations and suggestions to do this more effectively.

Mr. Ewing said that with respect to the inclusion of activities bearing on the education of all students in school management improvement plans, he knew some schools were doing an excellent job and some did not. He did not find anywhere what happened with school developed management improvement plans. He asked whether there was a formal approval process, and he noted that he did not see a set of substantive guidelines for those plans. For example, he did not see a list of minimal requirements for every plan such as the requirement for the education of the gifted and talented in every school. He stated that the Board's primary function was to set policy, and he did not see the school management plans as designed to take account of Board policies and priorities. He did not see very many of the plans addressing the education of students with disabilities, and he was troubled by that. This might be a function of their ability to assess because Dr. Fisher had such a small staff. He thought they were trying to have it both ways. They were trying to encourage individual schools to assess what they wanted to do with their resources, and the Board also had the expectation that their policies were going to be reflected in what schools did. He was not saying this was not happening, but he was saying this was not evident in the plans. He was not sure they could leave the schools to make their own plans, set policy at the Board table, and expect those things to connect solely through the instrument of a small Office of School Administration staff.

Dr. Fisher replied that Mr. Ewing was correct about the school improvement plans for this year. OSA had started on August 20, and by this time schools had already established their plan. Some of the plans were based on models from the past. In some cases critical changes were made, but for the most part the plans were not changed. OSA had revised the instructions to include priorities including the identification of and instructional differentiation for gifted and talented students. This year they had met with principals, cluster by cluster, to review recent mandates and policies. She pointed out that everything in a school need not be in a plan, but they were asking schools to look at priority needs. OSA was developing school profiles, and the directors would use these profiles to review the school improvement plans. The directors were not actually approving the plans, but they were determining whether or not the objectives were appropriate. In August and October, they would be receiving, reviewing, and discussing these plans with principals. They had also included parental involvement and dissemination of the plans.

*Ms. Gutierrez rejoined the meeting at this point.

Mr. Ewing commented that they had this dilemma of whether to speak in a single document simultaneously to the needs of those in need of special help, to the needs of racial and ethnic groups, and to the needs of all other students. It seemed to him they had chosen to march down the road of speaking to the needs of all students while also speaking to the needs of special groups of students. He thought that was fine, but they continued to have difficulty in communicating that. Some people read Success for Every Student as nothing but a plan for students with special needs or for ethnic and racial groupings. As they looked at the plan, they might want to be very explicit about what it was they were doing. This was a plan for all students, but all students were not identical and some had needs that required special attention. They had to make clear what choice they had made about SES; therefore, they also needed to say much more than they had said about students with disabilities. He thought they should consider the suggestions made by Mrs. Karasik for changes in the plan. He would like staff reaction to the proposition of being more specific about students with disabilities.

Dr. Vance replied that staff had had similar discussions on the extent to which SES sufficiently addressed students with disabilities. Mrs. Gemberling noted that Mrs. Brenneman had pointed out the original reason for developing this plan. The superintendent wanted to move from minority/majority into broader categories. They wanted everyone to buy into the plan, and it was important that each group find themselves very clearly identified within the plan. She felt it was time to think about revising Success for Every Student to make sure it was saying what they intended. While they were not in total agreement with Mrs. Karasik's suggestions, the suggestions did merit consideration. At this point they needed the sense of the Board in order to bring back revisions and suggestions to make sure the plan was sufficiently explicit to be the driving force in the school system.

Mrs. Fanconi thought the presentation was well done, and she suggested that they publish some of the information on the average student because it was something they needed to continue to communicate to the community. She asked that the Board be provided with hard copies of the materials shown on the overhead. Because they did not have time to go into special education, she felt they needed a continuation of this discussion, perhaps when they talked about the reorganization of OSAE. She did support the recommendations made on changes in the document. She did have questions about the profile of competencies and the use of this document. Mrs. Gemberling replied that she would not like to see the organization of OSAE tied into a discussion of SES. She would hope that the SES discussion would be separate.

Mrs. Gordon stated that this was an excellent presentation, and she especially enjoyed the technology piece to make the

presentation. She had not been on the Board when the original plan was adopted and would welcome the opportunity to have input into any revisions to the plan. She would like them to look at the total SES document rather than pulling out each piece. She would like to see a discussion on what they had been successful in doing and what kinds of things they needed to change. Mrs. Brenneman agreed with Mrs. Gordon, and she would have a proposal to make during new business.

Dr. Cheung, too, liked the high tech aspects of the presentation and thought they needed to do more of this for the Board and for the classroom. He pointed out that there were no dates on some of the backup papers provided the Board. It seemed to Dr. Cheung that the SES plan was really a continuum. They tried to have high expectations to meet the needs of individual students. The system assumed that most students met those high expectations, but there were students who had not reached this level. All school systems had a core capability to meet the needs of students, but MCPS was now talking about critical capabilities which meant this lighthouse school system would do better than other systems. These capabilities should be identified, and they should discuss how this related to average and above-average students. Then they needed to talk about the cutting-edge capability which meant preparing students for the 21st century. He thought Mr. Ewing had a very important point because the Board spent many hours trying to develop good policies. It was important for the Board to know whether those policies were being implemented and whether the policies worked or not. They needed more feedback, not just a policy review every three years. He said this was important in terms of the school improvement management plan. He liked the way staff talked about using the school profile to assist the school-based management team, but he wondered how teachers would be involved. The teachers were the front-line, and he wanted to know what kinds of profiles would help them to look at meeting the needs of individual students.

Ms. Gutierrez expressed her regret at missing the presentation because of a business commitment. She hoped that they would not bogged down in rewriting the plan. It seemed to her they should focus on implementation. She thought that in the plan they had captured the fundamental elements to make Success for Every Student work. They had clear goals and strategies as well as the mechanism by which they could implement the program. The key to her was the way they would be using the improvement plans. She would like to discuss how the improvement plans were going to be used and what they contained to provide feedback. The improvement plan was not only for the schools but for all the divisions in the programs. If the Board established the goals, she thought that everyone in the system should be aligning their activities in support of the goals. If they aligned under that constancy of purpose established by the goals, they would go well beyond anything they could ever capture in a plan. If they said

the plan established the goals, they could expect that every individual in the school system would be working to support that goal. If they had a mechanism which was an observable, accountable activity, they would have an incredible dynamic process in place. Everyone would be empowered to work towards those goals. The Board should discuss the mechanism it would like to have a visibility into that process.

Dr. Cheung and Dr. Vance thanked staff for their presentation.

Dr. Cheung temporarily left the meeting at this point, and Mrs. Fanconi assumed the chair.

Re: RESOLUTIONS PROPOSED BY THE GIFTED
AND TALENTED ASSOCIATION

Dr. Vance asked Dr. Villani to come to the table to address this issue. Mrs. Gemberling noted that Board members had received a memo and staff reaction to the resolution. In addition, they had staff who worked with ISM and the reporting process. She introduced Ms. Betty Collins, principal of South Lake ES, who was a former elementary school math specialist; Mrs. Norma Mellott, the acting elementary math coordinator; and Ms. Pam Collins who was a math specialist.

Dr. Villani introduced Ms. Estelle Moore, a third grade teacher at Brooke Grove ES, and a nominee for the Maryland Teacher of the Year Program. He explained that the costs of implementing the proposals were included in the Board paper. One proposal had to do with providing parents with useful information about their children's ISM program. Several weeks ago the Board had received a presentation on the CRT process and reporting progress of students. Their plan was to use a report form to parents each year on ISM so that parents would have a sense of where their child was, what the standard was for that grade level, and how much progress their child had made since last year. To do the kind of printout requested in the proposed resolutions each marking period would have fairly large implications for staff time and costs in terms of programming. The second component of that proposal was to provide parents with information regarding what objectives students would be working on next marking period. The difficulty with that was their program was not linear. If a student accomplished a certain objective in one marking period, the student did not automatically go to the next objective in that sequence in the next marking period. In fact, that process would run contrary to the model of their gifted and talented program of making interdisciplinary connections and options and choices. A "lock step" to achieve the goals of the recommendation would have an impact on the total MCPS program delivery model.

Dr. Villani reported that many schools provided parents with a handout every year of what all the objectives were in mathematics for the grade level. He provided Board members with copies of samples of the ISM objective handouts that were provided to schools. He also provided a number of printouts from ISM as they currently came from the computer. The printouts would not be useful to parents, but parents could obtain this material upon request. He believed that providing information through the CRT process would give parents a better picture of how their children were doing.

Dr. Villani indicated that the other ISM resolution had to with percentage of expected progress. That, too, was somewhat problematic because of the structure and nature of the MCPS program. They did have information on expected rate of progress, but they had arrived at that number by taking the total number of objectives they expected the student to master during the grade and dividing it up by marking periods. This gave a teacher or principal a benchmark. If the particular rate of progress were seven objectives and a student had only mastered two, this was something for the teacher and principal to look at. It might be appropriate if the student only mastered two because not all of the MCPS were of equal difficulty nor did they demand equal time in the classroom. It would be misleading to tell parents what the typical rate of progress was versus the number of objectives mastered by their child. This did not give the parent all the information he or she needed to know. The request to send the information to the Department of Educational Accountability was not a very useful request because MCPS was working on a process to download ISM data into the SIMS system which would give them the ability to monitor and provide information to OSA on progress made at an individual school compared to progress made across the county. However, information on progress made was only useful if one knew what progress was made in that classroom during that marking period.

Mrs. Fanconi asked if there were Board questions.

Mrs. Gordon commented that she had been a parent of a student in a school where ISM printouts were regularly distributed to parents with report cards. She reviewed her daughter's printout and indicated that the notations on the printout meant very little to her as a parent. The printout stated that her daughter was working on grade level, but her report card indicated that her daughter was above grade level. She believed that the teacher had better information about a student's working level than a printout. She commented that they should be somewhat cautious in using the printout as the ultimate reflection of a student's progress. They did need to get information to parents so they understood where their children were, and they needed to provide information to support students at home. She noted that the PIBS program provided information to parents which

corresponds to objectives being taught. The ISM system was a good one and provided information to the professionals, and she wondered if it could be translated for parents. However, she felt it had to be done as part of an overall picture. The use of the CRTs was a more valid picture of a student's progress and performance. She said that parents could receive information about objectives, but she did not want to make that the only determination of a student's performance or the work a particular teacher or school was doing. She cautioned the Board to look at the purpose of the information, examine the information, and listen to what staff was saying they could do.

Mr. Ewing suggested that they think about what they were trying to accomplish. He agreed that the memo before the Board captured the need to provide parents with a report of student progress. He thought that the issue was the frequency of that report, the utility of the report, and the value of allowing parents to understand what their children had mastered or had not. In the memo there was a sentence that said, "it is more meaningful to look at a student's progress over an entire year, not just an individual quarter." He questioned to whom it was more meaningful. To a parent concerned about the child's progress, it was meaningful to have that information more frequently. After that, the memo indicated that criterion-referenced test reporting process reflected instruction which focused greater attention on National Council of Teacher of Mathematics standards -- problem solving, reasoning, communicating, and making connections -- and less time on mastery of discrete skills. Mr. Ewing said he was in favor of those standards set by NCTM, but he was also in favor of students mastering discrete skills if they meant add, subtract, divide, etc. He felt that at least in the elementary school the calculator would not replace human learning of an ordinary kind immediately. Parents thought it was important for students to learn how to do these things, and if MCPS did not think this was important they would have to convince 95 percent of the parents. He remarked that the NCTM statement was a red flag to him, and he was concerned about that.

Mr. Ewing thought that parents had a right to have information frequently about how well their children were mastering discrete mathematical skills having to do with ordinary calculations and computations. This was not a replacement for problem solving, reasoning, etc. because those were extremely important. He wondered how students could solve problems if they hadn't mastered the basic skills. Dr. Villani assured Mr. Ewing that in order to master problem solving students did have to have discrete skills. Parents did get information at least every nine weeks from teachers about how well students were doing in mathematics.

*Mr. Sims joined the meeting at this point.

Mrs. Mellott commented that they really did want students to learn basic math; however, the amount of time spent drilling on basic math had changed over the years. When she had attended school, a tremendous amount of time was spent on arithmetic and now students were exposed to geometry and statistics at an earlier time. They did want students to know how to add, subtract, multiply, and divide. They tried hard to help teachers to be better able to teach those basic facts, not by just memorizing them, but by connecting these facts.

Ms. Gutierrez thanked staff for the handouts. They told her that MCPS had a system already in place that was down to the individual student profile. Although it was hard to understand and read, it reflect what was being taught. She thought this was a wonderful basis to achieve what was being requested by parents. She suggested that before they moved forward with making the report easier to read that they ask teachers to give their input on what they would like to see summarized. She commented that ISM had the potential to look at information that was not only student based but teacher based. It could tell them more about how MCPS was doing in delivering a particular set of instruction. If they found a large number of students were having difficulty, it would point out where improvements needed to be made. She did not think it would be difficult to make this information understandable to parents.

Ms. Moore reported that she had parent conferences on a regular basis. She talked with parents at least once every month, and she was not an exception to the rule. She went over the child's report so that parents would know where their child stood for that month. They were also given an opportunity to come in and help in the classroom. She was constantly giving feedback to parents. She explained that math was not a separate piece because it was integrated with science and social studies. She taught third grade and had children on a 1-2 and other children at the sixth grade level in math. When parents met with her, she talked about their child. When parents received the report card, there was no surprise. She felt that the printout was not good for the parent, but it did give her a chance to know that child. Without the printout, she had to do diagnostic testing. She pointed out that she was the one with that child every day for five and an half to six hours.

Ms. Moore explained that she got to school at 7:45 a.m. and left at 7:45 p.m. This was her choice. If teachers were to do all of that and convey information to parents, it was difficult to do if the teacher did not stay in school after 4 p.m. She knew that teachers cared about every child and did communicate the individual needs of that child.

Mrs. Brenneman remarked that she now knew why Ms. Moore had been nominated for teacher of the year. She said that a lot of

teachers did not do this. She had never received a printout. She had gone in for her yearly conference and had received a report card that did not give her information on where her child was. She pointed out that working parents could not take time to go in to meet with teachers. She thought that parents did need more information than what they were receiving right now, and she believed they could take this information and make it more readable for parents.

It seemed to Mrs. Fanconi that the Board was interested in looking at ways of improving communications with parents that did not overburden staff. She thanked the staff for the presentation and indicated that the Board would continue to discuss this topic.

*Dr. Cheung rejoined the meeting during closed session and assumed the chair.

Re: PUBLIC COMMENTS

The following individuals appeared before the Board:

1. Laura Steinberg, Blair Cluster
2. Sue Manos
3. Diana Kahn, Takoma Park ES PTA
4. Sharon Ellis read a statement form Councilman Greg Hamilton of Takoma Park
5. Tony Fisher, Police Chief, Takoma Park
6. Marcia Ventura
7. Sarah Peller
8. Gary Peller

Re: PROCUREMENT CONTRACTS MORE THAN
\$25,000

Mrs. Fanconi requested that a separate vote be taken on Bid 95-92, Conference Facilities.

RESOLUTION NO. 430-93 Re: PROCUREMENT CONTRACTS MORE THAN
\$25,000

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

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

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

92-15	Employee Benefit Program Consultant - Extension <u>Awardee</u> Alexander and Alexander Consulting Group	\$ 35,475
427-3	Freon <u>Awardee</u> H. M. Sweeny Company	\$ 83,406
91-92	Guard Service for Bus Lots - Extension <u>Awardee</u> Abacus Corporation	\$ 99,144
106-92	Piano Tuning and Maintenance - Extension <u>Awardees</u> AAA Piano Tuning Rick Amelang Piano Service Clark Piano Tuning Winzer Piano Service Total	\$ 7,656* 12,420 9,280* 12,580 \$ 41,936
40-93	Office Papers <u>Awardees</u> Alling and Cory Butler Paper Company Diamond Paper Corporation Garrett-Buchanan Nationwide Papers OEI Business Forms Frank Parsons Paper Company, Inc. Stanford Paper Company Toucan Business Forms R. S. Willard Company, Inc. Total	\$ 96,594 13,219 147,672* 114,831 1,495 770 49,598 11,478 5,977* 4,192 \$ 445,826
86-93	Musical Instruments <u>Awardees</u> Cornet Music Drums Unlimited, Inc. Ideal Music Company Music and Arts Center, Inc. Musication, Inc. National Education Music Company, Ltd. Northeast Music, Inc. Washington Music Sales Center, Inc. Steve Weiss Music Wenger Corporation Wright's Music Shed Total	\$ 3,684 1,677 3,298 115 2,145* 2,830 10,466 42,533 18,952 2,937 9,626 \$ 98,263
90-93	Printing Supplies <u>Awardees</u> AM Multigraphics	\$ 6,372

	American Printing Equipment and Supplies	3,043
	Arcal Chemicals, Inc.	2,822*
	Chaselle, Inc.	3,331
	A. B. Dick Company	233
	National A & E Supply Company	293
	Patton Printing Supplies, Inc.	3,471
	Pitman Company, Inc.	4,157
	Printers Ink and Supply Company, Inc.	733
	Washington Printing Supplies	9,311
	E. H. Walker Supply Company, Inc.	39,977
	Total	\$ 73,743
104-93	Music Furniture for New and Existing Schools	
	<u>Awardees</u>	
	Lyons Music Product	\$ 272
	S and H Manufacturing Company	260
	Wenger Corporation	32,046
	Total	\$ 32,578
106-93	Interactive Communication System for Poolesville Middle/Senior High School	
	<u>Awardee</u>	
	Ideas, Inc. (Commercial Systems Division)	\$ 64,950
107-93	Cafeteria Disposables	
	<u>Awardees</u>	
	Acme Paper and Supply Company, Inc.	\$ 54,025
	Calico Industries, Inc.	662
	Carroll County Foods	7,701
	S. Freedman and Sons, Inc.	9,301
	Kahn Paper Company, Inc.	155,147
	Marstan Industries, Inc.	62,536
	Monumental Paper Company	1,789
	Total	\$ 291,161
113-93	Drafting/Computer Aided Drafting (CAD) for Edison Center	
	<u>Awardees</u>	
	Baltimore Stationery Company	\$ 193
	Diversified Educational System	39,877
	Douron, Inc.	4,683
	Total	\$ 44,753
114-93	Modulators and Processors for Cable TV/ Telecommunication Network Installations	
	<u>Awardee</u>	
	Anixter Brothers, Inc.	\$ 124,986
117-93	Poultry Products Frozen and Processed	
	<u>Awardees</u>	
	Chaimson Brokerage Company, Inc.	\$ 6,400
	Mazo-Lerch Company, Inc.	26,600

Shane Meat Company	36,922
Smelkinson/Sysco	<u>66,000</u>
Total	\$ 136,922
 TOTAL MORE THAN \$25,000	 \$1,573,143

* Denotes MFD vendors

Re: A MOTION BY MR. EWING TO ACCEPT BID
95-92, CONFERENCE FACILITIES -
EXTENSION (FAILED)

A motion by Mr. Ewing to accept Bid No. 95-92, Conference Facilities - Extension failed with Dr. Cheung, Mr. Ewing, Mrs. Gordon, and (Mr. Sims) voting in the affirmative; Ms. Gutierrez voting in the negative; Mrs. Brenneman and Mrs. Fanconi abstaining#.

RESOLUTION NO. 431-93 Re: ASBESTOS ABATEMENT FOR VARIOUS
SCHOOLS

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

WHEREAS, The following bids were received on May 14, 1993, for asbestos abatement work associated with Planned Life-cycle Asset Replacement (PLAR) and Asbestos Hazard Emergency Response Act (AHERA) requirements in various schools, in accordance with plans and specifications prepared by the Department of Facilities Management, with work to commence on or after July 1, 1993, and be completed on or before August 6, 1993:

Bel Pre, Cashell, and Fields Road Elementary Schools

Bidders

Asbestos Environmental Services, Inc.	\$ 13,221
Air Services, Inc.	18,314
Barco Enterprises, Inc.	21,000
Precon Corporation, Inc.	28,320

College Gardens, Maryvale, and Poolesville Elementary Schools

Bidders

Asbestos Environmental Services, Inc.	\$ 19,296
Air Services, Inc.	19,655
Barco Enterprises, Inc.	23,400
Precon Corporation, Inc.	51,450

Farmland and Watkins Mill Elementary Schools and Thomas S. Wootton High School

Bidders

Asbestos Environmental Services, Inc.	\$ 30,807
Air Services, Inc.	49,660
Barco Enterprises, Inc.	50,200
Precon Corporation, Inc.	58,455

Wheaton Woods Elementary SchoolBidders

Potomac Abatement, Inc.	\$ 91,200
Falcon Associates, Inc.	92,000
LVI Environmental Services, Inc.	104,352
Kleen All of America, Inc.	109,024
Precon Corporation	110,700
Asbestos Environmental Services, Inc.	159,843
Air Services, Inc.	185,439
Barco Enterprises, Inc.	190,600

and

WHEREAS, Asbestos Environmental Services, Inc., has completed similar projects successfully at various schools, including Brown Station and Cannon Road elementary schools and Bethesda-Chevy Chase and Damascus high schools, and Potomac Abatement, Inc., has completed similar projects successfully for other area school systems; and

WHEREAS, The low bids are below the staff estimate of \$160,000, and funds are available in the Asbestos Abatement Capital Project to award the contracts; now therefore be it

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

<u>Project</u>	<u>Amount</u>
Bel Pre, Cashell, and Fields Road Elementary Schools <u>Low Bidder</u> : Asbestos Environmental Services, Inc.	\$13,331
College Gardens, Maryvale, and Poolesville Elementary Schools <u>Low Bidder</u> : Asbestos Environmental Services, Inc.	19,296
Farmland and Watkins Mill Elementary Schools and Thomas S. Wootton High School <u>Low Bidder</u> : Asbestos Environmental Services, Inc.	30,807
Wheaton Woods Elementary School <u>Low Bidder</u> : Potomac Abatement, Inc.	91,200

RESOLUTION NO. 432-93 Re: REROOFING - WASHINGTON GROVE
ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

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

WHEREAS, The following sealed bids were received on May 20, 1993, for the reroofing at Washington Grove Elementary School which will begin on July 1, 1993, and be completed by September 1, 1993:

<u>Bidder</u>	<u>Amount</u>
1. J. E. Wood & Sons Co., Inc.	\$191,171
2. Korb Roofers, Inc.	192,494
3. Rayco Roof Service, Inc.	193,993

and

WHEREAS, The low bidder, J. E. Wood & Sons Co., Inc., has completed similar projects successfully at various schools, including Germantown and College Gardens elementary schools and Winston Churchill and Seneca Valley high schools; and

WHEREAS, The low bid is below the staff estimate of \$195,000, and sufficient funds are available in the Roof Replacement Capital Project to award this contract; and

WHEREAS, The State Interagency Committee for Public School Construction will fund 50 percent of the eligible work for Washington Grove Elementary School as part of the state systemic renovation program; now therefore be it

Resolved, That a \$191,171 contract be awarded to J. E. Wood & Sons Co., Inc., for reroofing Washington Grove Elementary School, in accordance with plans and specifications prepared by the Department of School Facilities.

RESOLUTION NO. 433-93 Re: ELEVATOR ADDITION - CARDEROCK
SPRINGS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

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

WHEREAS, The following sealed bids were received on May 25, 1993, for an elevator addition and accessibility modifications to Carderock Springs Elementary School, with work to begin immediately and to be completed by December 3, 1993:

<u>Bidder</u>	<u>Amount</u>
1. Keller Brothers, Inc.	\$197,065
2. Heritage Builders, Inc.	202,700
3. Meridian Construction Co., Inc.	210,000
4. Henley Construction Co., Inc.	213,350
5. C. M. Parker & Co., Inc.	224,780
6. H & H Contractors	234,990
7. Construction-Commercial, Inc.	236,400
8. Pavel Enterprises, Inc.	236,430
9. E. A. Baker Company, Inc.	256,607
10. Image One	257,680
11. R. J. Crowley, Inc.	264,000
12. Smith & Haines, Inc.	266,200
13. Donna J. Smith, Inc.	287,000

and

WHEREAS, The low bidder, Keller Brothers, Inc., has completed similar projects successfully for Montgomery County Public Schools, including the addition/modifications at Luxmanor Elementary School; and

WHEREAS, The low bid is below the staff estimate of \$210,000; now therefore be it

Resolved, That a \$197,065 contract be awarded to Keller Brothers, Inc. for the elevator addition and accessibility modifications to Carderock Springs Elementary School, in accordance with plans and specifications prepared by Murray & Associates, Architects.

RESOLUTION NO. 434-93 Re: AWARD OF CONTRACT FOR MAINTENANCE
PROJECT - RICHARD MONTGOMERY HIGH
SCHOOL

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

WHEREAS, The following sealed bids to replace the chillers and cooling towers at Richard Montgomery High School were received on May 21, 1993, funded from Planned Life-cycle Asset Replacement (PLAR) Capital Funds, with work to begin July 1, 1993, and be completed by September 1, 1993:

<u>Bidder</u>	<u>Amount</u>
1. EMD Mechanical Specialists	\$179,245
2. R. W. Warner, Inc.	182,000
3. Combustioneer Corporation	182,200
4. Noyes Air Conditioning Co.	184,679
5. M & M Welding & Fabricators	187,630

6. HPS Mechanical, Inc.	191,301
7. Mech-Air, Inc.	197,000
8. R. M. Thornton, Inc.	229,700

and

WHEREAS, EMD Mechanical Specialists has completed a similar project successfully at Montgomery Blair High School; and

WHEREAS, The low bid is below the budget estimate of \$185,000, and sufficient funds are available to award the contract; now therefore be it

Resolved, That a \$179,245 contract be awarded to EMD Mechanical Specialists to replace the chillers and cooling towers at Richard Montgomery High School.

Re: PLAN TO PLAN, EASTERN AREA

Dr. Vance explained that the paper before the Board included a proposed calendar and dates. They had made a list of what should be addressed in what they considered a timely fashion. He, Dr. Rohr, and Ms. Briggs had had a number of meetings in the community to allay concerns.

Ms. Ann Briggs, director of the Department of Educational Facilities Planning and Capital Programming, called attention to a more extended effort on the part of the system to respond to the issue of keeping everyone informed. They envisioned a monthly paper listing issues, meetings, and summaries of meetings.

Mrs. Fanconi asked why the B-CC cluster was not included as a part of the advisory committee. Ms. Briggs replied that the initial plan was the original Eastern Area involving nine clusters. B-CC had not been a part of the Eastern Area and was not a part of most of the various plans considered; however, B-CC had been mentioned in some of the options. The staff was planning an advisory committee with representatives of at least these clusters. Over the summer, the planning staff would be working on realistic and detailed options for the committee to react to and modify. If any other cluster came into one option, they would be contacted for representation on the committee.

Mrs. Fanconi commented that this community had gone through year after year of advisory committees, and she did not think there were any options out there that had not been studied. It seemed to her that MCPS should put out the best two options and have people react to these. She pointed out that if they took students from Blair into Einstein, there might be a need to move students to the next cluster which might be B-CC, and she thought B-CC should be involved from the beginning.

Ms. Briggs thought that whatever came forward in the fall would be some iteration of what they had previously examined. Staff wanted to focus on and bring forward the best plan or plans in detail so that an advisory committee could work on the plans. If the advisory committee agreed on a plan, it could go out as a recommendation to the superintendent. However, the reality was it would probably be February before the superintendent could bring in a recommendation. Dr. Vance said he would be interested in the Board's reaction to his bringing in one plan in September.

Mrs. Gordon said she was glad they were going to move relatively quickly to resolve the situation within the next school year. She noted that this would be a large advisory committee, and she asked whether they envisioned subcommittees working separately from the rest of the group. Ms. Briggs recalled that the subcommittee process had worked well in the western area, and she thought this might be possible for the eastern area. Mrs. Gordon hoped that as they looked toward setting assignments they would work with communities experiencing some concern about elementary boundaries that might be addressed through this process.

Mrs. Brenneman asked that the Board be on the mailing list for the newsletter. In regard to B-CC, she thought it would be better to invite them to sit in on the meetings just in case B-CC came up. She hoped that when they had public hearings they would schedule an adequate amount of time and give consideration to starting hearings in the late afternoon.

Mr. Ewing agreed with Mrs. Brenneman's suggestion about inviting B-CC to observe but not necessarily be part of the formal official process. He thought that Mrs. Steinberg's statement during Public Comments should be given consideration because he did not see in the plan to plan the mechanism for ensuring that educational program consideration had a very major role to play. There was nothing in the plan about the specific suggestions that the Kennedy and Einstein communities had made with respect to educational programs in addition to the consortium. He thought that the Kennedy proposal was a good idea, and he agreed with the Einstein proposal that visual arts students should be enrolled as full-time students in that school.

In regard to the size of Blair, Mr. Ewing said the Council had used the size of 2,400, but he did not think they should be locked into that number. He noted that they had \$24 million and could probably keep the auditorium and C building. The more of the building they could keep, the less money they had to spend on tearing down buildings. This would give them more money to increase the capacity. He recalled that the Board was not locked in at 2,400 because the Council did not put a cap on the enrollment.

WHEREAS, The Col. Zadok Magruder High School Facilities Advisory Committee has approved the proposed schematic design; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Board of Education approve the preliminary plan report for the addition to Col. Zadok Magruder High School developed by Bowie-Gridley Architects.

Mr. Ewing temporarily left the meeting at this point.

RESOLUTION NO. 436-93 Re: PERSONNEL MONTHLY REPORT

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

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. 437-93 Re: EXTENSION OF SICK LEAVE

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

WHEREAS, The employees listed below have suffered serious illness; and

WHEREAS, Due to the prolonged illness, the employees' accumulated sick leave has expired; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Board of Education grant an extension of sick leave with three-fourths pay covering the number of days indicated:

<u>Name</u>	<u>Position and Location</u>	<u>No. of Days</u>
Dennis Dorsey	Building Service Worker Watkins Mill High School	7
Sheena Wright	Instructional Assistant Quince Orchard High School	20

RESOLUTION NO. 438-93 Re: DEATH OF GEORGE S. GIFFIN,
AUTOMOTIVE SERVICE WORKER IN
DIVISION OF TRANSPORTATION

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

RESOLUTION NO. 440-93 Re: PERSONNEL APPOINTMENTS AND
TRANSFERS

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Mrs. Gordon seconded by Mr. Sims, the following resolution was adopted unanimously by members present:

Resolved, That the following personnel appointments and transfers be approved:

<u>Appointment</u>	<u>Present Position</u>	<u>As</u>
Edward W. Shirley	Director of School Administration Office of School Administration	Principal Rockville HS Effective: 7-1-93
Darlene A. Simmons	Asst. Principal Watkins Mill HS	Principal Montg. Village MS Effective: 7-1-93
Tille C. Garfinkel	Acting Asst. Principal Stedwick ES	Principal Fairland ES Effective: 7-1-93
<u>Transfer</u>	<u>From</u>	<u>To</u>
Brenda J. Lee	Principal Glenallan ES	Principal Greencastle ES Effective: 7-1-93
Thelma Monk	Principal Pooleville ES	Principal Stonegate ES Effective: 7-1-93
Mary K. O'Connell	Principal Cedar Grove ES	Principal Burnt Mills ES Effective: 7-1-93

RESOLUTION NO. 441-93 Re: PERSONNEL APPOINTMENTS

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Mrs. Gordon seconded by Mr. Sims, the following resolution was adopted with Mrs. Brenneman, Dr. Cheung, Mr. Ewing, Mrs. Gordon, Ms. Gutierrez, and Mr. Sims voting in the affirmative; Mrs. Fanconi being temporarily absent:

Resolved, That the following personnel appointments be approved:

<u>Appointment</u>	<u>Present Position</u>	<u>As</u>
Sharon H. Healy	Acting Supervisor Special Education Instruction	Coordinator, Special Education Instruc. Dept. of Academic Programs Grade N Effective: 7-1-93
Lynn Brown	Supervisor of Special Education Charles Co. BOE La Plata, MD	Personnel Specialist Dept. of Staffing Grade M Effective: 7-1-93
Sheri J. Lowe	Acting Personnel Specialist Dept. of Staffing	Personnel Specialist Dept. of Staffing Grade M Effective: 7-1-93
Richard Tyler	Instructional Support Teacher Laytonsville ES & McAuliffe ES	Personnel Specialist Dept. of Staffing Grade M Effective: 7-1-93

Re: MONTHLY FINANCIAL REPORT

Mr. Larry Bowers, budget director, reported that they expected to generate the level of savings requested by the County Council because the spring had been cool and utilities were down. They were experiencing some higher claims in Category 10 which was worse than the last time.

Mr. Ewing understood they had to generate savings totally \$8.5 million with another \$500,000 for losses in the enterprise fund. They were now projecting a year-end balance of \$7.6 million plus revenue surplus and additional revenue from the state. Mr. Bowers explained that there was an offset to some of the additional revenue from the state which was lower than anticipated federal impact aid money. The other piece was \$600,000 of current receipts funding from the capital budget which took it over \$9 million.

RESOLUTION NO. 442-93 Re: FISCAL 1994 OPERATING BUDGET
FOLLOWING COUNTY COUNCIL ACTION

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

WHEREAS, The Board of Education adopted a Fiscal Year 1994 Operating Budget of \$791,284,973 on March 22, 1993; and

WHEREAS, The County Council made reductions of \$1,122,131 from the various state budget categories, as shown in the following schedule, in appropriating \$79,162,842 for the Board of Education's Fiscal Year 1994 Operating Budget:

<u>Category</u>	<u>BOE Approved as of 3/23/83</u>	<u>Council Reduction</u>	<u>Council Approved on 5/25/93</u>
01 Systemwide Sup.	\$ 27,623,574	\$ 170,413	\$ 27,453,161
02 Inst. Salaries	396,456,922	181,818	396,275,104
03 Oth. Ins. Costs	20,296,342		20,296,342
04 Spec. Ed.	86,111,131		86,111,131
05 Student Pers.	2,101,981		2,101,981
06 Health Svs.	21,952		21,952
07 Student Trans.	36,563,653	398,777	36,264,876
08 Op. of Plant	51,284,834	207,662	51,077,172
09 Maint. of Plant	17,309,229		17,309,229
10 Fixed Charges	127,546,814	105,150	127,441,664
11 Food Services	68,318		68,318
14 Comm. Services	609,156	58,311	550,845
41 Ad.Ed/Sum.Sch.	2,826,304		2,826,304
51 Real Estate	652,402		652,402
71 Field Trip Fund	500,000		500,000
Total	\$791,284,973	\$1,122,131	\$790,162,842

now therefore be it

Resolved, That, based on an appropriation of \$790,162,842 approved by the County Council on May 25, 1993, the Board of Education adopts its Fiscal 1994 Operating Budget reflecting the changes shown in Schedule A; and be it further

Resolved, That the county executive and County Council be informed of this action.

For the record, Mr. Ewing made the following statement:

"My vote for the budget is for the dollars for employee compensation and, on the other hand, should not be construed as a vote to endorse the Board's position on the economic package for teachers. That is to say, on the way in which that package would be implemented. I believe very strongly that we ought to use those dollars for a cost of living adjustment next spring rather than a bonus. I believe, of course, that could be done at any time under this budget if the Board chose to change its position on that issue. My reservation about this is very strong. I think the Board is travelling down the wrong path, a path that is dangerous in the extreme. Their refusal to negotiate is unprecedented, rigid, and inflexible. A refusal to consider a COLA is unnecessary given that the dollars are available for one.

"I have one other comment to make, and that is respectfully I disagree with the superintendent in his initial comments with respect to the degree of satisfaction he expressed about achieving funding from the Council at a 99 plus percent rate. We've got a budget that I am not very happy with quite apart from the issue of teacher salaries. I think we ended up asking, I know, we ended up asking for far less than we needed. I recognize we did that in part because of the economic situation, the production of revenues at the county level, but it is one thing to recognize that we were, as Dr. Vance has said, fiscally conservation and presumably responsible, and quite another to feel any degree of satisfaction that this budget is going to meet real needs. In fact, it reflects the loss of a good many programs, the failure to offer employees anything like the appropriate and proper increases in cost of living adjustments, and leaves us without anything like what we ought to have in the way of an all-day kindergarten program. It leaves us without all sorts of program needs that ought to be met and aren't being met.

"So my view of the budget is that while we can say we escaped the worst, I am not sure we should feel terribly good about the outcome. I don't. The Council's role in this is to congratulate itself for having given us 99 percent and to say in writing that this is a reflection of the Council's high priority for education - that is nonsense. What the Council did was to set spending affordability guidelines last fall that were set before there was any indication of what the real needs of the school system were. But they knew then that the number they set was certainly not going to meet the needs of the school system. So having artificially depressed the availability of funds and then funded the resulting amount hardly seems to me that they ought to congratulate themselves for having done a wonderful thing. They haven't. I think the school system will find it very difficult to meet children's needs, more difficult next year than this year, and this year has been very difficult. So with those sorts of reservations, I am prepared to vote for the budget, but I surely do want to make it very clear that I do not think it is a good budget, and I don't like the employee compensation package at all, and I want that to be in the record."

Ms. Gutierrez made the following statement for the record:

"I want the record to reflect that I do not support the economic package that is implicitly represented when we approve this budget as Category 2, Instructional Salaries. I believe that the Board initially should have taken into consideration the proposal of an improved economic package for our employees, all of our employees, from the start. Unfortunately we did not. We do have the dollars approved in this budget for us to be able to reconfigure and begin to address what I think has been now an accumulation of negative actions that this Board has taken with regard to our employee contracts.

2. Mr. Ewing commended the Maryland National Capital Park and Planning Commission for its excellent publication on population diversity in the county.

3. Mr. Ewing reported that they had heard testimony from people in the Takoma Park community about daycare options. There were literally 100 to 150 children gathering in front of Takoma Park and Piney Branch elementary schools for upwards of an hour without supervision now when school started at 9 a.m. With the change in starting hours, the expectation was that number would increase greatly. Parents in that area could not afford daycare, even if daycare were available. He believed MCPS had a genuine responsibility to help find a solution.

4. Mr. Ewing stated that the superintendent had provided a memo from Art Nimitz about Mrs. Barry and Mrs. Pumphrey who had worked to provide tutoring and other assistance to homeless students. They had also received letters from parents about how very important this had been to those students and their parents. These teachers and others had clearly given of themselves far beyond what was expected of them in this program.

5. Mrs. Fanconi acknowledged that Dr. Vance did, in fact, go to Lakeforest and visit the program the students in the Gaithersburg cluster had put together. She had seen his signature in the book at the mall. She added her compliments to Mr. Ewing's remarks about the teachers taking part in the homeless project.

6. Mr. Sims thanked Dr. Vance for attending the Student Member on the Board Advisory Committee meeting on Monday.

7. Mr. Sims reported that he had just graduated from high school and wanted to commend his teachers, Dr. Thomas Quelet, and the staff at Richard Montgomery High School. He had had four wonderful years at Richard Montgomery and was proud to say that he had attended that school.

RESOLUTION NO. 444-93 Re: CLOSED SESSION RESOLUTION - JUNE 15
AND 21, 1993

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

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education of Montgomery County hereby conduct a portion of its meeting in closed session beginning on

June 15, 1993, at 7 p.m. in Room 120 of the Carver Educational Services Center, Rockville, Maryland, to consult with counsel to obtain legal advice as permitted under Section 4-106, Education Article of the Annotated Code of Maryland and State Government Article 10-501; and be it further

Resolved, That the Board of Education of Montgomery County hereby conduct a portion of its meeting in closed session beginning on June 21, 1993, at 7 p.m. in Room 120 of the Carver Educational Services Center, Rockville, Maryland to discuss personnel matters, pending litigation, matters protected from public disclosure by law, and other issues including consultation with counsel to obtain legal advice as permitted under Section 4-106, Education Article of the Annotated Code of Maryland and State Government Article 10-501; and be it further

Resolved, That such portion of these meetings shall continue in closed session until the completion of business.

RESOLUTION NO. 445-93 Re: MINUTES OF APRIL 26, 1993

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

Resolved, That the minutes of April 26, 1993, be approved.

RESOLUTION NO. 446-93 Re: MINUTES OF MAY 11, 1993

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

Resolved, That the minutes of May 11, 1993, be approved.

Re: REPORT ON CLOSED SESSIONS - MAY 24
AND 26, 1993

On May 11, 1993, by the unanimous vote of members present, the Board voted to conduct a closed session on May 24, 1993, as permitted under Section 4-106, Education Article of the Annotated Code of Maryland and State Government Article 10-501.

The Montgomery County Board of Education met in closed session on Monday, May 24, 1993, from 7:05 p.m. to 7:50 p.m. and from 9:35 p.m. to 10:35 p.m. The meetings took place in Room 120 of the Carver Educational Services Center, Rockville, Maryland.

The Board met to discuss the monthly personnel report, the naming of Quince Orchard Elementary School #7, and negotiations. Actions taken in closed session were confirmed in open session.

Resolved, That the following students be appointed to serve through June 30, 1994:

Carissa Brooks	Jessie Hempstead
Ryan Katz	Andrew Pergam
Anice Schervish	Derrick Smith

RESOLUTION NO. 448-93 Re: APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO THE
 ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR FAMILY LIFE
 AND HUMAN DEVELOPMENT

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

WHEREAS, COMAR 13A.04.01 requires that each local education agency have a Citizens Advisory Committee for Family Life and Human Development; and

WHEREAS, Montgomery County has had such a committee since 1970, consisting of representatives of various civic associations and religious groups, community members at large, and student representatives; and

WHEREAS, Membership on the committee is for a two-year term; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the following individuals be appointed to serve a two-year term, effective July 1, 1993, and terminating June 30, 1995:

Raymond Gates	Kate Davis
Deborah Linzer	Courtney Gallop-Johnson
Mary Garrison	Clair Cripe
Jean Cross	Tina Clark
Fulton Earl Marshall	Maj-Britt Dohlie
Theresa K. Sunderland	Pilar Torres

and be it further

Resolved, That the following students be appointed to serve through June 30, 1994:

Kelli Palmer	Amy Smith
Wendy Converse	Norah Jackimowicz

RESOLUTION NO. 449-93 Re: APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO THE
MEDICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE TO THE
BOARD OF EDUCATION

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

WHEREAS, The Medical Advisory Committee to the Montgomery County Board of Education has been active since it was reconstituted by the Board in 1972; and

WHEREAS, Membership on the committee is composed of representatives of organizations and associations named in the "Statement of Purpose" of the committee; and

WHEREAS, Members of the committee are appointed by the Board of Education; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Board of Education appoint the following individuals to serve a two-year term ending June 30, 1995:

Russell Henke

Daniel Lulchuk

RESOLUTION NO. 450-93 Re: APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO THE
MENTAL HEALTH ADVISORY COMMITTEE

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

WHEREAS, On June 13, 1989, the Mental Health Advisory Committee was established by the Board of Education; and

WHEREAS, The members of the Mental Health Advisory Committee are appointed by the Board of Education; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the following persons be appointed to the Mental Health Advisory Committee to serve through June 30, 1995:

Harry Mass

Stuart L. Graff

RESOLUTION NO. 451-93 Re: APPOINTMENTS TO THE ADVISORY
COMMITTEE ON MINORITY STUDENT
EDUCATION

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

WHEREAS, On May 14, 1991, the Board of Education revised the composition of the Advisory Committee on Minority Student Education; and

WHEREAS, The members are appointed by the Board of Education; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the following persons be appointed to serve through June, 1995:

Elida Vargas
Joy Barrow

Vaughn U. Arkie

and be it further

Resolved, That the following students be appointed to serve for a one-year term ending June 30, 1994:

Tosin Aje
Aisha Dudley

Alshadye Yemane

RESOLUTION NO. 452-93 Re: APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO THE TITLE
IX GENDER EQUITY ADVISORY COMMITTEE

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

WHEREAS, On July 19, 1977, the Board established the Title IX Gender Equity Advisory Committee; and

WHEREAS, The members of the Advisory Committee are appointed by the Board; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the following individuals be appointed to serve a two-year term through June 30, 1995:

Janet Crampton
Betty Montgomery

Amanda M. Bullard

and be it further

Resolved, That the following students be appointed to serve a one-year term through June 30, 1994:

Eve Ferruggiaro
Christine Pride

Angela Fong

RESOLUTION NO. 453-93 Re: APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO THE
MONTGOMERY COUNTY ADVISORY COUNCIL
ON VOCATIONAL-TECHNICAL EDUCATION

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

WHEREAS, On September 26, 1977, the Local Advisory Council on Vocational-Technical Education was established by the Board of Education; and

WHEREAS, The members of the Montgomery County Advisory Council on Vocational-Technical Education are appointed by the Board; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the following persons be appointed to serve a three-year term beginning July 1, 1993, and ending June 30, 1996:

Dr. Harold Blank	Mr. Gordon Hawkins
Mr. Bernard Michael	Dr. Christopher Shinkman
Dr. Stuart Weinstein	

and be it further

Resolved, That the following student be appointed to serve a one-year term through June 30, 1994:

Kristi Musgrove

RESOLUTION NO. 454-93 Re: ABILITY GROUPING

On motion of Mrs. Brenneman seconded by Mr. Abrams (on May 24, 1993, the following resolution was adopted with Mrs. Brenneman, Dr. Cheung, Mr. Ewing, Ms. Gutierrez, and Mr. Sims voting in the affirmative; Mrs. Fanconi and Mrs. Gordon voting in the negative:

Resolved, That the Board of Education discuss ability grouping including heterogenous and homogenous grouping, differentiation, and their effects on all children.

RESOLUTION NO. 455-93 Re: BOE APPEAL NO. 1993-8

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education adopt its Decision and Order in BOE Appeal No. 1993-8, a student disciplinary matter.

RESOLUTION NO. 456-93 Re: BOE APPEAL NO. 1993-11

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education adopt its Decision and Order in BOE Appeal No. 1993-11, a student disciplinary matter.

Re: NEW BUSINESS

1. Mrs. Brenneman moved and Mrs. Gordon seconded the following:

WHEREAS, Success for Every Student was adopted by the Board of Education on January 6, 1992, as a plan to achieve the vision and goals of the Montgomery County Public Schools; and

WHEREAS, Many highly effective strategies and tasks were defined to implement the plan; and

WHEREAS, This plan was intended to be flexible and dynamic; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the superintendent and staff review and update strategies and tasks in the Success for Every Student plan to reflect the full range of the Board's initiatives and the programs, and activities, carried out in schools in order to accomplish the goals of the plan and achieve its vision; and be it further

Resolved, That this updated plan should be reviewed by the Board of Education prior to budget discussions for FY 95.

RESOLUTION NO. 457-93 Re: COMMENDATION OF DR. EILEEN C. LEVI AND DR. NAOMI PLUMER

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

WHEREAS, The Board of Education recently adopted its Policy on Early Childhood Education, which establishes a framework and structure to meet the unique educational and developmental needs of young children; and

WHEREAS, Early childhood education is one of the Board of Education's high priority Action Areas; and

WHEREAS, Two staff members who have had major responsibilities for guiding early childhood education efforts in the Montgomery County Public Schools are retiring after many years of dedicated service to the children of Montgomery County; and

WHEREAS, Dr. Eileen C. Levi, director of the Division of Head Start, and Dr. Naomi Plumer, coordinator of early childhood education, will be retiring in June; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the members of the Board of Education express their appreciation to Dr. Eileen C. Levi and Dr. Naomi Plumer for their outstanding efforts in promoting the establishment of an educational climate in which young children can be stimulated and encouraged to learn; and be it further

Resolved, That on behalf of graduates, current students, and future students, the members of the Board of Education commend Dr. Eileen C. Levi and Dr. Naomi Plumer for the significant, profound differences they have made in the lives of students through their sponsorship of and support for early childhood education.

Re: NEW BUSINESS (CONTINUED)

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

Resolved, That the superintendent be requested to develop a proposed policy on site size for elementary, middle, and high schools to be brought to the Board for its consideration perhaps, but not necessarily, as an amendment to the long-range facilities plan.

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

Resolved, That when the Board acts on and schedules time for discussion of the motion on Success for Every Student that the Board also consider the recommendations contained in the letter from Mrs. Joan Karasik dated May 24, 1993, containing suggestions for changes in the SES plan to incorporate meeting of needs of students with disabilities.

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education schedule time to discuss potential amendments to the discipline policy for very young children.

5. Ms. Gutierrez moved and Mr. Sims seconded the following:

Resolved, That the Board of Education schedule a discussion on dropouts in the Montgomery County Public Schools including retention and prevention efforts, the method of determining dropouts, the tracking they had of dropouts, the policies impacting potential dropouts (attendance, suspension, and withdrawal), alternative programs including GED, and consideration of establishing specific goals for MCPS beyond the MSPP goals. (See also Board Items 92-51 and 93-42).

the revised composition at the Board's all-day meeting in December of 1993; and be it further

Resolved, That the liaison designed to support the committee be amended effective July 1, 1993, as follows:

Coordinator, Program for Students with Serious
Emotional Disturbance (SED)

Re: ITEMS OF INFORMATION

Board members received the following items of information:

1. Items in Process
2. Construction Progress Report

RESOLUTION NO. 459-93 Re: ADJOURNMENT

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education adjourn its meeting at 5:35 p.m. to a closed session.

PRESIDENT

SECRETARY

PLV:mlw