

APPROVED
19-1994

Rockville, Maryland
April 14, 1994

The Board of Education of Montgomery County met in regular session at the Carver Educational Services Center, Rockville, Maryland, on Thursday, April 14, 1994, at 10:05 a.m.

ROLL CALL Present: Mrs. Carol Fanconi, President
 in the Chair
 Mr. Stephen Abrams
 Ms. Carrie Baker
 Mrs. Frances Brenneman
 Dr. Alan Cheung
 Mr. Blair G. Ewing
 Mrs. Beatrice Gordon

 Absent: Ms. Ana Sol Gutierrez

 Others Present: Dr. Paul L. Vance, Superintendent
 Mrs. Katheryn W. Gemberling, Deputy
 Dr. H. Philip Rohr, Deputy
 Mr. Thomas S. Fess, Parliamentarian

RESOLUTION NO. 256-94 Re: BOARD AGENDA - APRIL 14, 1994

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education approve its agenda for April 14, 1994.

RESOLUTION NO. 257-94 Re: NATIONAL PROFESSIONAL SECRETARIES'
 WEEK

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

WHEREAS, Professional Secretaries' Week will be celebrated nationally the week of April 24-30, 1994; 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 the Montgomery County Public Schools; 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 be observed by the school system during the week of April 24 through April 30, 1994; and be it further

Resolved, That Wednesday, April 27, 1994, be designated as Professional Secretaries' Day for the Montgomery County Public Schools.

RESOLUTION NO. 258-94 Re: NATIONAL VOLUNTEER WEEK, APRIL 17-23

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

WHEREAS, A goal of Success for Every Student is to secure the commitment of the entire community to maintain quality education in Montgomery County by building partnerships that promote and support initiatives to help all children succeed; and

WHEREAS, Every school in Montgomery County relies on volunteers to supplement and enrich programs for students; and

WHEREAS, Schools rely on both paid and volunteer staff to provide coordinated efforts to develop and manage school volunteer and partnership programs that serve staff and student needs; and

WHEREAS, This year, 103 schools have met the criteria and earned a citation of merit from the Maryland State Department of Education for an outstanding school volunteer program; and

WHEREAS, During the last school year more than 44,300 volunteers gave 2.5 million hours of service to staff and students and provided the equivalent hours of 1,200 full-time, 12-month staff people; and

WHEREAS, If a dollar value were attached to the hours of service volunteers provided, the sum would be more than \$24.5 million; and

WHEREAS, As volunteers share their time, energy and experience in schools, they inspire the school and the community to renew our commitment to success for every student; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Montgomery County Board of Education express its appreciation to all volunteers and volunteer coordinators for their assistance, generosity of spirit, and commitment to our schools and our young people and join in supporting the "Catch the Wave Blue Ribbon Campaign" to honor the contributions of volunteers to the Montgomery County community.

RESOLUTION NO. 259-94 Re: MCCPTA'S 50TH ANNIVERSARY

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

WHEREAS, The education of children and youth is a shared responsibility of the home and the school; and

WHEREAS, The mission of the PTA is:

to support and speak on behalf of children and youth in the schools, in the community, and before governmental agencies and other organizations that make decisions affecting children;

to assist parents in developing the skills they need to raise and protect their children; and

to encourage parent and public involvement in the public schools of this nation; and

WHEREAS, The Montgomery County Council of PTAs is a federation of the PTAs in Montgomery County working to fulfill this mission as well as:

to strengthen the work of each local unit;

to lead PTA membership throughout the county on county, state, and national issues affecting the welfare of children and youth; and

to provide training and assistance to parents and local PTAs; and

WHEREAS, The Montgomery County Council of PTAs since it was founded on April 17, 1944:

has grown from 15 to over 170 PTAs;

has worked annually to support school budgets that meet the needs of children and youth;

has worked to secure for the county a junior college, home rule, and an elected school board;

has worked on improvement in reading, education for the gifted and talented, cultural opportunities in the schools, special education, counseling, early childhood

education, human relations, site-based participatory management, and parent involvement;

has held forums and presented workshops on topics of concern to parents and PTAs;

has worked with MCPS to provide interested and qualified representatives to serve on task forces and work groups, to disseminate information about changes in the school system and the impact of school board policies, and to help parents and PTAs understand and access the school system and be involved in meaningful ways in the education of their children; and

has cooperated with the County Council, the county agencies, and county organizations on matters affecting children and youth; now therefore be it

Resolved, That on behalf of the superintendent of schools, staff, and students, the members of the Board of Education thank MCCPTA for its dedication, hard work, and accomplishments for children and families; and be it further

Resolved, That the members of the Board of Education do hereby proclaim Sunday, April 17, 1994, as MCCPTA Day and urge all Montgomery County Public Schools staff and students to join with the Board of Education in wishing MCCPTA well in its present and future endeavors.

RESOLUTION NO. 259-94 Re: MCCPTA'S 50TH ANNIVERSARY

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

Re: DISCUSSION OF ASSESSMENT OF POLICY
IMPLEMENTATION

Dr. Vance commented that in his nearly two decades of work in Montgomery County he had had the pleasure of witnessing the development and implementation of major policies by several Boards of Education. One of the distinct achievements of this Board of Education was deliberate attention to policies that had had a very significant impact on the continued pursuit of educational excellence in MCPS. In the last two years the Board had worked on grading and reporting, quality integrated education, site-based participatory management, sex harassment, class rank, early childhood education, students with

disabilities, long-range facilities, and educational technology.

Overlaying the policies were the Board's vision and goals statements approved in 1991 and the Success for Every Student plan. He believed that Board members should be proud of their accomplishments in the area of policy development.

Today's discussion was on the assessment of policy implementation. He believed that the success of the Board in initiating and developing policies was due in some large measure to the ability of employees and managers to implement those policies quickly, skillfully, and comprehensively. The administration of public policy required attention to the overall intent and purpose behind the policy. Principals, administrators, and members of the executive staff invested a great deal of personal and professional expertise to ensure that the objectives and intended results of policies were truly reflected in the manner in which quality education was provided to every student in MCPS.

Mrs. Gemberling stated that as staff looked at this topic, they tried to point out in the paper for the Board some of the on-going processes that they used. There was no one single way of responding to policy, especially when they looked at the two volumes of policies and regulations. They maintained well-established, in place, and on-going policies and regulations, and they also considered revisions as well as new policies. These documents were used in every school and office in MCPS. If people had a question about a policy or regulation, there was a ready reference to the office responsible for the policy or regulation.

Today they would be talking about how the responsible offices did monitor and implement policies and procedures. There were mechanisms that kicked into place automatically when established policies needed to be revisited, but sometimes changing an existing policies was more challenging than implementing a new policy. Offices brought recommendations for policy revision to the executive staff, and from there the recommendations went to the superintendent who brought the recommendations to the Board.

These could result from restructuring of the school system, legal advice, and legal mandates. Staff built in due process and rights of appeal. Policies were built into management plans and budget initiatives. Mrs. Gemberling pointed out that if one major policy changed it often triggered a change in another policy.

Mrs. Gemberling said the most important things about new and revised policies were communication and training. She felt they needed to be more concerned about timeframes for implementation.

They also had to talk more about budget implications of policies. A good example of this was the new policy on educational technology. The Board's new policy on policies

contained a reporting structure that allowed the Board to determine what kind of reporting process they wanted. In terms of communication, she explained that they began with general A&S meetings and then went to the office that would be implementing the policy.

Dr. Phinnize Fisher, associate superintendent, reported that the Office of School Administration looked at how they could operationalize policies. Certain policies such as grading and reporting and homework were part of daily living in the schools.

Once policies were presented at the A&S meeting, OSA met with principals to review new policies or changes in policies. Every August, they had meetings with principals and at that time they reviewed frequently used policies and new policies. They looked at the daily-use policies and the events-based policies such as child abuse or sexual harassment. They suggested to principals that they make copies of certain policies for ready reference.

Dr. Fisher indicated that when she and her staff entered a building they checked to make sure policies were included in daily activities. For example, they looked for committees and the involvement of parents in the schools. When her office received calls on interpretation of policies such as political materials and schools and fund raising, they take another look at those policies. Some policies required lots of time. Policies such as sexual harassment required more time for monitoring and training. Through the training of principals, they moved a policy from a piece of paper in a book to an active policy.

Dr. Hiawatha Fountain, associate superintendent, commented that in 1975 P.L. 94-142 got the federal government involved in civil rights legislation regarding the education of children. The law and federal regulations were very prescriptive. States developed their own bylaws, and then local school systems developed their policies. The Board's policy was also very prescriptive. When parents came to OSAE from out of state or out of the county, they received a copy of their due process rights and a copy of the Board's policy. A couple of years ago the law was updated and categories were added such as autism, and there was an amendment for legal fees. All of these impacted on how MCPS must implement the Board's policy. In addition, there were parent groups in the county who could recite the law, policy, and regulation. Therefore, OSAE had to do a lot of training of staff around the implementation of Board policy.

In recent months, the Board had adopted a revised policy. OSAE staff was now concentrating on the least restrictive environment where instruction was taking place. Federal laws, state regulations, and COMAR put parameters around the Board's policy, and there were other policies impinging on this including ADA and 504.

Dr. Elfreda Massie, associate superintendent, stated that every policy had dissemination features which told them persons to whom the policy was to be disseminated. They had also built in a procedure for redress. Besides people within the system, policies were communicated to special interest groups, persons in the community, news media, and anyone requesting copies of policies. Policies could be appealed through the appeals process within the policy or through the citizens complaint procedure or grievance procedures.

Dr. Massie said they knew whether policies were or were not working because of formal appeals or informal discussions. They heard from the staff responsible for implementation, and if they found a policy was difficult to implement, they would review or fine tune the implementation. For example, Personnel had an investigative procedures which had been changed by the sexual harassment policy. Personnel looked at the way they conducted investigations which brought them to reviewing other procedures to enable them to conduct investigations in a more thorough way.

Many policies affected Personnel Services, and her leadership team had regular reviews of personnel policies and procedures. She reported that a number of personnel policies would be coming to the Board for revision.

Dr. Joseph Villani, associate superintendent, remarked that part of what they did through the management plans was to assess how effectively policies were being implemented. Each policy had a responsible office, and the associate superintendent and his/her staff had to take that policy, make sure it was implemented, develop a management plan, and assess how effectively it was being done. For example, several years ago the Board adopted a policy on middle schools, and various units in OIPD took on responsibility for making sure the policy was implemented. Through the management planning process, they took on the responsibility of assessing how well the policy was implemented.

In the past year they had had some concerns about how some components of that policy were being implemented; therefore, the Unit for Enriched and Innovative Instruction changed its management plan and devoted resources to implement gifted and talented programs in the middle school and devised a work plan for staff to assure that the policy was implemented.

Mr. Larry Bowers, chief financial officer, reported that Board policies were critical in the development and implementation of the operating budget. Policies were considered as managers developed their strategies to achieve the Success for Every Student Goals. Last year, those became an integral part of the budget development process and the program mission summaries. The strategies and tasks that were part of the annual management planning process were incorporated into the budgets and were part of the review process by the superintendent and the Board.

Because of the ongoing fiscal shortfalls, managers had been asked to consider changes in their budgets that were cost neutral but allowed them to implement their management plans and address the Board's priorities. A key example would be staff development activities. Two examples had been mentioned, and another example was the requirement for elementary teachers to have 12 credits in math and science. The Board had amended its budget to incorporate additional dollars to provide the opportunity for all teachers to meet that requirement by 1999. A number of departments had the responsibility for making sure that happened, and this would be included in their management plans.

Mr. Bowers pointed out that one of the most critical aspects of the implementation of the educational technology policy was going to be staff development. Funds for training in future years would have to address this. In the FY 1995 operating budget, several other areas of critical need including early childhood education and Q.I.E. were addressed. Although the county's fiscal situation had made it difficult to make strides in this area, they were asking for additional funds and had realigned some of their resources to address these needs.

Dr. Rohr explained that the Q.I.E. and long-range facilities policies illustrated the interrelationship between the support side and instructional side of the school system. The Board spent two years working on the Q.I.E. policy which was adopted in May and served as part of the basis for the revision of the long-range educational facilities planning policy adopted in November. The relationship of these policies pointed out that facilities and capital budget decisions were seldom a question of bricks and mortar, and demographics and programs were shaping facilities decisions more and more. The Board had approved innovative concepts in the new Q.I.E. policy that they were trying to reflect in all policies regarding educational load and diversity profiles. These were gaining acceptance in the community, and it was evident to Dr. Rohr that the community looked forward to application in the Success for Every Student plan. The facilities policy bridged many functional areas in the school system. The capital budget and the capital improvements plan were the documents that guided them for the next six years, and increasingly the program emphasis was becoming the driving force in facilities planning. The long-range planning policy had become a significant tool to advance community acceptance of their CIP planning, and they would be publishing this twice a year.

Dr. Pam Splaine, acting director of the Division of Administrative Analysis and Audits, explained that the assessment of policy implementation went on continuously. Page 8 outlined ways including monitoring federal and state mandates; Board identification of significant issues; national, state, and local initiatives such as the Success for Every Student plan; related

entries for policy revision; the review and reporting section in every policy; and three-year review of all policies. Over the last couple of years they had evolved an on-going process that prioritized the way they reported significant issues to the Board. Policies that were in conflict with law, Board-identified initiatives, and policies identified by the executive staff got the most immediate attention. Other policies needed to be changed because of position titles or office titles; however, this usually waited until they brought the policy up for a different reason.

Dr. Splaine noted that they were offering the Board four alternatives for consideration. The first alternative was the ongoing process, one-time review of all policies to bring every policy into the right format, and continue with three-year review cycle. The second alternative continued with the ongoing process, had a one-time review of all policies, and removed the three-year review requirement. The third alternative continued with the ongoing process and removed the three-year review cycle that was not working. The fourth alternative continued the ongoing process, removed the three-year review cycle, and used the reporting requirement in policies to provide the Board with information specific to each policy. The superintendent was recommending the fourth alternative because it would strengthen the reviewing and reporting process in policies.

Mr. Ewing agreed that the Board had done a reasonably good job in recent years at policy making, and a better job since they had adopted the new policy on policy-making which he thought had been extremely useful. The implementation strategies were of interest to the Board, but they were not the Board's job. The Board needed to focus on results, what was happening, and if there were further issues to consider which hindered successful implementation of a policy. The Board needed to know what had been accomplished to date, and here they were not as strong in terms of the efforts of the Board to define what they wanted to know and to give guidance about what was the highest priority. If they did not know whether the policies they had now were effective, they could not be effective as Board members. Mr. Ewing pointed out that the policy making was their basic job, and they needed to do a better job of it. He was glad to see the superintendent's recommendation. Over the years there had been a resistance to anything more than a three-year review. He knew that the recommendation meant more work by the staff.

As they looked at this, one of the issues was the question of uniform implementation. Mr. Ewing noted that no one had spoken to this. When a policy applied to all schools, they wanted to be sure it was uniformly implemented. There could be some variations in implementation at the school level, but there were policies that varied substantially at the school level. However, the Board had not done a very good job of identifying which was

which and under what circumstances exceptions would be made. They had a policy on site-based management which said that locally people would have a lot of responsibility, but they had not defined what that meant because they had not gotten very far with their experiments in site-based management. They needed to address the issue of local autonomy versus uniformity, and information about implementation efforts ought to include that and make the Board aware of what the issues are there.

Mr. Ewing said that as they looked at getting information about what had changed and how, they needed to be clearer in their policies about objectives. They had to state what they wanted to accomplish and by what timeline. Timelines were helpful because they affected budget, staff resource allocations, and a variety of other factors.

Mr. Ewing remarked that another issue was tying the Board's need for information to the agenda for research and evaluation in DEA. The committee on research and evaluation had been working on this but had not made a specific recommendation. They would address this next on June 20. Another issue was how they related subsequent actions to initial policy decisions. Not all subsequent actions were related in that fashion. The budget took account of the issues of policy in the narrative, but the Board itself did not pay much attention to that section of the budget when it reviewed the budget. Grants, budgets, other policies, and laws were also factors that were subsequent to the adoption of an initial policy and ought to be considered as they moved along.

Mr. Ewing commented that it was not right to say that one policy or one set of goals, if examined, would yield the right answer in terms of consistency. They might find that their goals and objectives in various policies were inconsistent. It might be difficult to know which set of goals should be applied to be sure they were moving in a reasonable direction. Not everything was Success for Every Student. There were other policies, and some of them were not covered by SES.

Mr. Ewing noted that they sometimes made decisions to either ignore or even override some policy issues through budget or in other ways, or they did not pay attention, or they lacked the resources. He cited the example of their policy on the education of gifted and talented students. The early childhood policy called for all-day kindergarten in every school, but they had not found the resources to do that. They had a policy on math and science education, but Board agenda items for math and science grants did not reflect this policy.

Mr. Ewing thought that the superintendent's recommendation was the appropriate one, but it did not go far enough. He would like it to attend to some of these other issues as well so that the

Board would not only get reports but would get the benefit of systematic analysis, where requested, of specific aspects of the results it seeks. Sometimes the Board received descriptions of the process of implementation, but it would be better to know what happened. For example, on math and science they needed to know how many teachers were, in fact, meeting the requirement and how they got there. In terms of curriculum, they needed to know what it was they were doing to ensure that the nature and purpose of math and science were being incorporated as part of instruction. The Board needed to know what the outcomes were of the policies adopted by the Board. The Board itself needed to pay much more attention to policy issues in the adoption of the budget.

Mrs. Brenneman agreed that the recommendation was a good one, but she was not sure it went far enough in terms of results and accountability. Checking off four-years of math and three years of science was easy, but the middle school policy and the gifted and talented policy were a different story. How did they assess the implementation of gifted and talented policy or the middle school policy? What were the results? She wrote memos on these policies, but much of the information she received that all was not going well came from the community. She wondered what happened in communities where parents did not bring up these concerns. She commented that they had adopted a number of policies since she had been on the Board; however, the staff had never come back with a note saying this policy was not working or this change needed to be made.

Dr. Cheung stated that policy formulation was the most important function of the Board. He looked at policy formulation, policy implementation, and feedback as a continuum. He thought that local government was different from state and national government because when Congress enacted legislation they tended to forget about it. Local government had a closer relationship between policy formulation and policy implementation. He assumed that if a school implemented all Board policy, it must be an outstanding school. He wondered how they measured whether or not all schools were implementing policy equally well or whether some policies were more critical than other policies.

Dr. Cheung thanked staff for their improved policy formulation and analyses which aided the Board in making decisions. He noted that hospitals had a voluntary certification process involving peer groups. He assumed that staff could build in a peer consultation team with objective guidelines to look at whether the Board's policies were being implemented. The team could look at efficiency, effectiveness, quality, and productivity of the school's operation as well as the instructional program. This would result in feedback about policies and regulations that needed to be changed.

Dr. Cheung agreed with Mrs. Brenneman that when they passed a policy they did not know how well it was being implemented. To assure they had a lighthouse school district they needed to have this kind of quality assurance and assessment program on a voluntary basis. This was not to penalize a school but to help a school. He, too, liked the superintendent's recommendation.

Mr. Abrams also supported the superintendent's recommendation, but he was curious as to how much it cost to put on the presentation this morning by administrative staff and how much cost went into the care and feeding of the Board. He agreed with the removal of the three-year review cycle, but he was curious as to whether the use of the reporting requirement would facilitate something like a policy audit team in terms of a mechanism of providing feedback. It seemed to him there was management by exception concept inherent in all of this. To review policy implementation, they had to break it down into a discrete unit to find out if policies were being implemented and how they were being interpreted from school to school. He did not see this built in to this process. He assumed that continuing with the ongoing process meant that Board items would take precedence. In looking at the two-volume policy book, he was curious about a grouping issue and looking at areas where policy decisions were controlled elsewhere and comment back on those. They might look at groups of policies as they related to a specific area. He was also curious about how useful these two volumes were to a principal and whether there might be some better ways of breaking it down in terms of relevant information.

Dr. Fisher replied that they did group policies in presentations to principals. Initially principals received a K-12 perspective, but principals had separate sheets of frequently used policies and those policies that were often questioned. She had asked the directors to visit middle schools first because of the new middle school policy, the gifted and talented policy, and grouping. In their meetings with Dr. Villani and his staff they had discussed this information. She indicated that her staff did isolate policies in terms of events, frequency of use, newness, and changes.

Mr. Abrams asked whether they had a checklist of policies that were going to require more monitoring, and Dr. Fisher replied that they did. These policies were monitored until they were institutionalized. Mr. Abrams asked how this mechanism related back to what they were proposing for the Board in terms of information. Dr. Fisher replied that the Board would receive an example of this when they reviewed the site-based policy because staff would be recommending changes because of implementation. Mr. Abrams asked if the list OSA was using would fit into an annual reporting requirement to the Board. Dr. Fisher replied that the Board's annual report was a result of daily monitoring because they had notebooks and information which they examined on

a weekly basis. The report presented to the Board was a result of their yearly review.

Dr. Splaine explained that on top of the reporting requirement they were talking about was the ongoing process. If the law changed or the responsible office thought there was a problem, they would not wait and would come to the Board with a recommendation. Mrs. Gemberling added that with new or revised policy, the Board determined what kind of reporting it wanted. She pointed out that sometimes they needed almost 18 months to be able to report on results and some policies did not have a reporting requirement such as the grading policy.

Mr. Abrams commented that reports did not get them back to the idea of a site-based policy audit in terms of how policy was being translated in individual schools and on a broader range of policies. He was trying to get at something that would tell the Board more from a management standpoint as to how well policy implementation was being translated from the Board and what the results were coming back up. Dr. Fisher replied that her office had to look at a policy in context in terms of the overall operations of the school, but if they tried to present that it would result in more paper; therefore, when they presented the information to the Board, they isolated information in terms of a particular policy. OSA looked at information in the context of everything else because they could not isolate that policy.

Mrs. Fanconi suggested that the Board resume this discussion in the afternoon.

Re: FOREIGN LANGUAGE CREDIT FOR SIGN
LANGUAGE

Dr. Vance recalled that last January the Board had asked the superintendent to comment on the efficacy of offering foreign language credit for American Sign Language and, if affirmative, take the necessary steps. The Board now had the superintendent's recommendation.

Ms. Baker thanked the staff and Dr. Vance for their help with this idea which grew out of the student Board member advisory committee. With the American Disabilities Act and the Board's policy on inclusion, this would help people become more aware and break some of the barriers between hearing people and those with disabilities. This would give them more opportunity to bring students into the least restrictive environment.

Mr. Abrams asked whether they currently offered the course for credit. Dr. Mimi Met, coordinator of foreign languages, replied that they did in four high schools. Mr. Abrams said he had difficulty in offering sign language for foreign language credit because students might think they were fulfilling a language

credit for colleges and find the colleges did not accept sign language. He did share Ms. Baker's concerns in terms of increasing the availability of sign language training in all schools. He asked what it would cost to offer this course countywide. Dr. Met replied that the cost would be minimal. They would need to develop course materials for every school which would be done through EYE days. Dr. Joseph Villani, associate superintendent, explained that the four schools were offering the course on their own, and if they wanted to offer the course countywide they would have to standardize the offering.

Mr. Abrams said the superintendent was proposing the development of a two-semester course that would be test piloted as an elective but not for foreign language credit. Dr. Villani replied that it would be for foreign language credit if the student had already earned two other foreign language credits and an elective if the student had not. He noted that most colleges asked for two years of a foreign language.

Mr. Abrams asked how the issue of foreign language credit had come about and why they should not consider this just as an elective. Ms. Baker replied that people studied foreign languages to gain the ability to communicate across cultures and develop an appreciation of other cultures. American Sign Language would be considered a foreign language and should be offered for foreign language credit.

Mr. Abrams presumed that they had offered foreign languages because colleges required languages for admission. He saw sign language as a test program that they were pre-conditioning it as a foreign language credit if students had the two additional credits. This seemed to him to be a way of avoiding the question. Dr. Villani replied that there was no practical consequence to offering sign language as a foreign language credit if it were a student's third foreign language credit, but there was an acknowledgement of the value of sign language as a way of communicating. Mr. Abrams said he could appreciate that characterization, but he believed that other people would have the same confusion he was having with this.

Mrs. Gordon thought the recommendation was an excellent one. She believed that having sign language as an academic credit rather than an elective credit would give more credibility and more encouragement for students to take the course. She liked the flexibility of taking the course for an elective credit or a foreign language credit. She also thought they might consider giving an English credit for it because it was a form of communication. She did not want students thinking that colleges would accept this, but she continued to believe that students should have the flexibility.

Mr. Ewing shared the concern raised by Mr. Abrams that some

students might think they would be meeting a college admission requirement for foreign languages by studying American Sign Language. He thought they had to be careful about that to make certain students understood this. Before the Board made a final decision, he would like to know why it was that colleges and universities did not accept this. He would like to know their definition of an appropriate foreign language. It was his view that MCPS should be reducing rather than expanding electives. However, he was satisfied to have the superintendent proceed as he had suggested, but he was concerned about that issue partly for cost reasons. He did not doubt the value of American Sign Language, but he did not know if enough students would be interested in studying this and what the trade-off might be in terms of student programs and offerings. He also pointed out that another reason for studying foreign languages was for the sheer pleasure and joy of it.

Mrs. Fanconi asked Ms. Sheila Doctors, supervisor of the Division of Auditory Programs, to come to the table. Mrs. Fanconi remarked that there was another real reason to offer sign language. With ADA, there was a great demand for translators, and more people needed to be trained for this career. She said that they should look to this not only because of ADA but because there was a need to eliminate barriers in public education.

Ms. Doctors thanked Ms. Baker for introducing this item. She had been supervising the staff providing the sign language classes in the four high schools. She believed they had an opportunity in Montgomery County that not everyone had. They had a diverse population of young people, and they had one of the largest populations of deaf and hard of hearing students and adults in the United States. They needed to be responsive to these students and their families. While this was a small population relative to other minority or cultural groups, their population was in the county and was increasing.

Ms. Doctors reported that offering this course for foreign language credit went to the heart of the identity of her students. The question was sign language just an elective or a bona fide linguistic system. Studies had shown that American Sign Language met all criteria to be a foreign language. To students this meant that their language was not a poorer version of English, but was a language. She thought the worst thing they could do would be to make sign language an English credit which would be equivalent to making Spanish a subset of English.

Mr. Abrams pointed out that they had gone through the elimination of class rank, but this caused a lot of confusion. It might well be that there were colleges that would identify sign language as sufficient to meet a foreign language requirement. Some students might take this for a community service requirement, and he did not want them applying to college and finding out it did not

fulfill the foreign language requirement. This was his concern.

Mrs. Fanconi stated that she would like to join in the advocacy for having colleges look at this as a foreign language. In addition, they needed to look at outcomes. They had a public responsibility to respond to the community and demands for service which included ADA. They also wanted to remove barriers for their own students. She noted that they had asked about cost, but staffing had not been mentioned. She pointed out that if they offered sign language, they would end up dropping another elective. New people would have to be hired to teach sign language for an elective, and they might not have enough students to fill these classes in every high school which created a staffing dilemma.

Dr. Vance explained they were recommending doing this on a pilot basis and preplan this for FY 1995 and 1996. If they had a pilot, they would have an opportunity to survey the interest level and to get a sense of the number of professionals available to teach this course. Mrs. Fanconi commented that there were other ways of providing these opportunities as well. They had Adult Education programs and connections with Montgomery College.

The issue raised by Ms. Baker was an important one, but she thought that perhaps offering it in every high school would not be as effective as working with the college to offer a course there. She was concerned about bringing a paper to the Board which was very well thought out, but when they got to the table it became clear that a tremendous amount of work and discussion had gone into this. She wished there was some way the Board could get the benefit of what staff had gone through and discarded. She recalled Dr. Pitt's paper on Blair on how he came to his recommendation which assisted her in her deliberations and give her an opportunity to acknowledge the amount of work that had gone into the recommendations.

Re: ANNOUNCEMENT

Mrs. Fanconi announced that the Board had been meeting in closed session on legal issues. Ms. Baker had left the meeting during closed session.

Re: PUBLIC COMMENTS

The following individuals appeared before the Board of Education:

1. Mary Yano, Drew Center for the Highly Gifted
2. Donna Mayo, Drew Center for the Highly Gifted

Re: DISCUSSION OF IMPLEMENTATION OF
POLICY ASSESSMENT (CONTINUED)

Mrs. Gordon remarked that she was not sure that the Board really

got the most honest evaluation through the reporting system that they currently had for implementation of their policies. At times staff was far too nice by not telling the Board there were problems with a policy. The Board adopted policies but they were not in the schools everyday to see the impact of these policies on individuals. They had heard this morning there were some feeling that some policies were not being implemented to their satisfaction, for example, the gifted and talented policy in elementary schools. She did not think their middle school policy had been implemented. She believed that the middle school policy ought to be implemented in all schools, even if they had only seventh and eighth grade. They had talked about site-based management, and there were varying reasons why those things had not been done.

Mrs. Gordon thought they needed to get clearer feedback on the policies. She knew it took a tremendous amount of staff time when they worked on a policy, whether it was preparing a policy, reviewing a policy, or implementing. However, she was not convinced that what they had been doing was working very well. She knew it would be a mammoth task to look at every single policy and bring it up to where it should be, but she thought they needed to do that. They might not be able to do this in one year, but they should start in this direction. She was not sure that the superintendent's recommendation for alternative D really addressed this. She understood they could not do a one-time review in one year. She did think they needed to be a little more up-front about what was really happening in the schools because Board members did hear from people in the schools and from parents.

Mrs. Fanconi commented when she came on the Board she was struck by the fact that things actually happened when they passed a policy. As new Board members, they probably needed more training on the implications of what they were doing. The Board really focused a lot of attention on policy because this was a way to convey the Board's vision; however, they were not always cognizant of the implications of each sentence. In order to do their job, staff needed to help the Board members do their job better.

Mrs. Fanconi noted that there were eight Board members who came from different backgrounds which was their strength and which meant it might be difficult to educate them on the issues. The Board might do something that the staff did not want, but the Board was the boss, and it was difficult to say to the Board that this would be hard. She believed that the superintendent was the one who had to speak to the Board about the impact of their actions. She also thought they needed to look at what was the best kind of format. She had been on the staff of an organization which held conventions with thousands of people voting on very specific policy issues. Policy papers were

presented with fervent arguments from both sides which set up a very neutral way to discuss policy because the extremes of both positions had been presented. Staff needed to think about how to do this, and perhaps this piece could come in the analysis. She thought the Board should allow time for a worksession on different options.

Mrs. Fanconi said the Board had been told they had 150 policies, and some were from the law, some were administrative, and some were global. In addition, the blue books contained regulations.

She asked whether staff had a good understanding of what was in the book and what needed to be taken out. She asked whether 150 was the right number and whether there was a need to review every single policy.

Mrs. Gemberling replied that there were all kinds of policies and some were known almost verbatim. There were some policies an administrator might never use, but that policy had to be there for the one time it was needed. There were some policies that needed some revisiting, and they did try to prioritize policies for revisiting. They had limited staff, and they really did not have a unit to focus on this. They did alter regulations on a much more regular basis. One test of a really good policy was time, and the policy did not require as much revisiting as the regulations. She pointed out that the basic premise of the QIE policy had lasted for almost 20 years. Dr. Splaine added that when topics came up they took this opportunity to look at related entries and bring to the attention of the Board those that needed to be rescinded. There had been seven or nine of these in the last two years.

Mr. Ewing thought that this superintendent and this executive staff had been more forthcoming and more willing to change and more responsive to Board request than had been typical in the past. He thought the issue was a different one. They were asking people to report on policy implementation where they were the people doing the implementation and reluctant to admit failure. However, the Board did have to rely on staff. The Board itself had to be specific about the objectives they were seeking and the results they wanted. The staff could then tell the Board about the results. The Board needed to work on being clear about what it was they thought was needed in the way of results and to reflect that in policy.

Dr. Cheung agreed with Mr. Ewing. When they looked at policy implementation, the community and school people had totally different perspectives about Board policies. This morning he had talked about the need to have a continuous assessment program with feedback in terms of what was going on. There was a difference in a principal managing a school and the superintendent managing the largest corporation in the county. The Board was supposed to be accountable to the public. Staff

contracts be awarded to the low bidders meeting specifications as shown for the bids as follows:

102-93	Art Tools - Extension <u>Awardee</u> Chaselle, Inc.	\$324,952	
42-94	Athletic, Cheerleader & Pom Pon Uniforms <u>Awardees</u> Athletic House Collegiate Sports House of Sports Marlow Sports, Inc. Team Distributors Varsity Spirit Fashions TOTAL	\$ 15,000 15,000 15,000 15,000 15,000 <u>15,000</u>	*
67-94	Floor Maintenance Supplies <u>Awardees</u> Consolidated Maintenance Supply, Inc. Monumental Paper Company TOTAL	\$ 17,456 <u>204,726</u> \$222,182	*
70-94	Processed Cheese <u>Awardee</u> Carroll County Foods, Inc.	\$ 56,125	
76-94	Hand Held Calculators <u>Awardees</u> D & H Distributing Davis Distributing Co., Inc. TOTAL	\$ 84,098 <u>3,952</u> \$ 88,050	
80-94	Ceiling Board and Grid System Material <u>Awardees</u> Campbell Building Supply Corp. Capitol Building Supply Clevenger Corporation Washington Gypsum Supply TOTAL	\$ 1,544 32,548 9,336 <u>2,350</u> \$ 45,778	*
MORE THAN	\$25,000	\$817,087	

* Denotes MFD vendors

RESOLUTION NO. 261-94 Re: AWARD OF CONTRACTS - DAMASCUS
MIDDLE SCHOOL #2

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Mrs.

Brenneman seconded by Dr. Cheung, the following resolution was adopted unanimously by members present:

WHEREAS, Sealed bids for various subcontracts for Damascus Middle School #2 were received on March 29 and April 5, 1994, in accordance with MCPS procurement practices, with work to begin in a sequence consistent with a predetermined critical path of key dates and be completed by August 1, 1995; and

WHEREAS, Details of the bid activity are available in the Department of Facilities Management; and

WHEREAS, The low bidders have completed similar projects successfully; and

WHEREAS, The low bids are within the budget estimates, and sufficient funds are available to award the contracts, now therefore be it

Resolved, That contracts be awarded to the following low bidders meeting specifications for the bids and amounts listed below:

<u>Low Bids</u>	<u>Amount</u>
<u>Construction Scheduling Consulting Services</u>	
Rodgers Construction Management Associates, Inc.	\$ 16,170
<u>Civil/Site Construction Surveying</u>	
Marcris, Hendricks, Glascock, P.A.	33,000
<u>Sitework</u>	
AccuBid Excavation, Inc.	837,000
<u>Site Utilities</u>	
Deneau Construction, Inc.	57,000
<u>Site Concrete</u>	
Hess Construction Co., Inc.	173,900
<u>Paving</u>	
Richard F. Kline, Inc.	261,128
<u>Tennis Courts</u>	
Craig Paving, Inc.	76,400
<u>Building Concrete Work</u>	
David Campbell Concrete Construction Co., Inc.	648,900

RESOLUTION NO. 263-94 Re: GRANT OF RIGHT-OF-WAY AGREEMENT TO
THE POTOMAC EDISON COMPANY AT DR.
SALLY K. RIDE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

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

WHEREAS, The Potomac Edison Company has requested a right-of-way to provide electrical services to Dr. Sally K. Ride Elementary School, located at 21301 Seneca Crossing Drive, Germantown, Maryland; and

WHEREAS, The proposed grant of right-of-way includes underground electrical facilities to be installed in a 10-foot-wide strip for a distance of approximately 430 feet from an existing pole to a proposed transformer; and

WHEREAS, This grant of right-of-way will benefit the school and surrounding community by providing the necessary electrical facilities to support the school; and

WHEREAS, The proposed right-of-way will not affect any land that could be used for school programming and recreational activities; and

WHEREAS, All construction and restoration is to be carried out as a part of the capital project at the school, with The Potomac Edison Company and its contractors assuming liability for all damages or injuries; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the president and secretary of the Board of Education be authorized to execute a Right-of-Way Agreement with The Potomac Edison Company for the right-of-way needed for the electrical facilities at Dr. Sally K. Ride Elementary School.

RESOLUTION NO. 264-94 Re: UTILIZATION OF FY 1994 FUTURE
SUPPORTED PROJECT FUNDS FOR THE
ELEMENTARY SCIENCE SUPPORT PROJECT

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

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

Resolved, That the superintendent of schools be authorized to receive and expend within the FY 1994 Provision for Future

Supported Projects a grant award of \$60,000 from the Howard Hughes Medical Institute, through the Montgomery County Public Schools Educational Foundation, Inc., for the Elementary Science Support Project, in the following category:

	<u>Category</u>	<u>Amount</u>
3	Other Instructional Costs	\$60,000

and be it further

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

RESOLUTION NO. 265-94 Re: RECOMMENDATION TO SUBMIT AN FY 1994
GRANT PROPOSAL FOR THE TIGER
COMMUNITY NETWORK PROJECT

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

Resolved, That the superintendent of schools be authorized to submit an FY 1994 grant proposal for \$2,354,337 to the National Science Foundation, under the Networking Infrastructure for Education program, for the Technology Initiatives for Generating Educational Resources (TIBER) Community Networking Project; and be it further

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

RESOLUTION NO. 266-94 Re: DEFERRAL OF NAMING OF SENECA VALLEY
MIDDLE SCHOOL #1

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

Resolved, That the naming of Seneca Valley Middle School #1 be deferred.

Re: REPORT FROM THE BLAIR-EINSTEIN-
KENNEDY-SPRINGBROOK CONSORTIUM

Dr. Vance hoped that at the conclusion of the discussion, the Board would have a clear understanding of what the consortium was all about and how they intended to proceed to do that. He introduced Dr. Marlene Hartzman. Dr. Hartzman introduced John Bond, a student at Kennedy High School; Mary Ellen Verona, computer science teacher at Montgomery Blair High School; Judy Treanor, Einstein parent and MCCPTA area vice president; and

Donald Kress, principal of Springbrook High School.

Dr. Hartzman felt that the consortium was a collaborative effort between schools with cooperation between instruction and facilities and between every division in the school system. She thought that the consortium would be a bridge for the future and for other collaborations. They had heard a lot about technology which was a part of the consortium, but the steering committee felt it was building a human network. The Board would hear about examples where technology did not work. They felt that the consortium's goal was to expand access to educational opportunities to all students. The staff at Kennedy made themselves available to the staff at Einstein, as Einstein was beginning to plan. The staff at Blair made themselves available to the staff at Kennedy as they started to build the internships and the community role for students in grades 11 and 12. The staff at Springbrook had been the pioneers in looking for training models for staff on the use of networks.

Dr. Hartzman reported that they were beginning the exciting part of having students working together. They found as they began planning and talking and raising issues that there were many things they could do that did not require revisions of policies or extra money. The principals agreed that bell schedules could be altered next year so that they could facilitate sharing of courses. The media specialists had been able to talk about how they wanted to order materials to share resources. The school leadership teams had been involved.

Mr. Bond reported that he was a member of the Leadership Training Institute at Kennedy and felt the BEKS was a collaborative effort with student involvement. In sports, students were competitive, and this would give students a chance to work together. For example, this morning Blair students had visited Kennedy HS to talk about new technology and the Internet. Each school had something to offer to students. Blair had the magnet and the CAP program, Einstein had an internship program and the arts program, Kennedy had the Leadership Training Institute, and Springbrook had their new pioneering. Students would be able to teach other students.

Ms. Verona commented that as a teacher she was excited about working with students in authentic problem-solving situations. This was an authentic problem. They had to get schools in a group working together. There were problems with policies and access to technology. Students and teachers were gaining experience and learning from mistakes. She saw people valuing the expertise of others, and there was lots of expertise within the BEKS consortium. She had stopped thinking about Blair HS and had started thinking about BEKS. With communication, the world was becoming a smaller place. A place to start was with schools working together. It was not just the technology networking, it

was the people networking. She said it was great for teachers to share their experiences and to start to build relationships with teachers in other schools. They were starting to get in touch through telecommunications and in person.

Mrs. Treanor thanked the Board for their support. Parents feared that this was just going to be interactive television and a ploy for having fewer teachers and saving money. There was a concern that there would be orphan schools in the consortium. There was concern about back-up plans for when the technology broke down. They thought there would not be enough money to really see this through. When things started to happen, there was a lot of excitement. Now parents thought there were real steps toward cooperation between the staffs in terms of scheduling and media specialists in terms of ordering equipment and materials. Parents now believed this was going to be something new and different, and it was going to work. She thought it addressed some important issues regarding equity among schools. There would be much more program choice involved which was really important to parents. There was a collaborative effort and not a top down project. It was students talking to students, staff talking to staff, and administrators talking to administrators. This was helping to break down the territorial attitudes that schools had towards each other.

Mr. Kress expressed his appreciation to the Board for their support. As one of the four principals involved, he was very excited about the possibilities that existed in the consortium at a time when the educational literature was speaking to restructuring and creating new visions of education. He was especially pleased with the degree of collaboration which the four principals had been able to attain in analyzing and exploring ways to achieve maximum utilization of their resources.

The consortium had enabled the four principals to become partners in education. Each school was very unique, but each school had specific needs and specific strengths. The consortium offered them the opportunity to address their needs by building on their combined strengths. BEKS turned competition to cooperation. Media specialists were meeting together to share ideas and avoid duplication in materials. The four scheduling coordinators were analyzing the course offerings that had been dropped because of insufficient enrollment. Faculties were coming together to discuss interschool and interdisciplinary instructional activities. To him, the most rewarding achievement was to see the Blair magnet students training students from the other schools in how to access the Blair Internet. These activities represented only a small beginning in exploring and implementing the possibilities that existed. He believed this expanded the educational opportunities for every student at the four schools through sharing resources and staff expertise.

Dr. Hartzman added her thanks. She noted that students were

initiating projects and the juniors and seniors would leave a legacy of cooperation. As next steps, it was important that the schools fold all of this planning into their regular planning process so that this would not be an add-on. They needed to plan long-range, perhaps three years at a time, and to make commitments to long-term change.

Mrs. Fanconi said it would be appropriate for staff to point out items that had budget implications or items to be considered if another consortium were formed. She would like to have some discussion of the training and how they used this opportunity to define training needs for other schools. She wanted to know about adequate funds to train.

Dr. Hartzman replied that funds had been added to the operating budget for the continued support of the development of the Kennedy program and the Einstein program. They also had additional funds for staff training. They felt they needed to develop the program and train at the same time. They were looking at ways of cooperating and reassessing how they currently trained. They had talked about a summer institute in Kentucky, the lead teacher concept from the West Coast, and the third model of action research. She thought the consortium might have application for other schools depending upon which model they selected. In the capital budget, funds had been designated for the learning hubs in each of the media centers. Next year they would have to look at the technical equipment at Einstein and Kennedy to make sure it was compatible. As they moved along this path, they would be able to see additional needs as they evolved.

Ms. Verona said the schools needed to continue to feel an ownership for this project. She saw a need for released time for teachers, and in the coaching models a teacher would be able to go into another classroom and work with that second teacher. She would like to see the training emphasis placed here rather than a one-shot deal for two hours of training.

Mr. Kress commented that the technology and the equipment had to be compatible, and this was addressed in the technology plan. He, too, would say that a key component of this was staff training. It would not be successful if staff were not trained in implementing it and working cooperatively with one another. They could do this through training in their own building and consortium-wide training. In terms of expandability, he did not know because the consortium was created by the Board as a possible way of addressing some issues in the eastern area. He believed that it was created with the hope that this model could be expanded to other areas of the county. He would ask the Board to be patient and give the schools the time to experiment and to make this thing work. After that, it would be the Board's decision as to how it could be expanded.

Mrs. Gordon was pleased to see that they had moved as far as they had. She was glad that they had pointed out the interrelations as a big piece of this because her initial reaction was that this was the technology plan. However, in discussion, they had brought out some of the other pieces that were very important. They were working with one another and building a sense of community beyond their own schools. With Springbrook as a member of the consortium, she thought this was looking towards the future of the new northeast high school and Springbrook and Paint Branch doing some other kind of spin off. She hoped that the current group would not break apart but that their experiences would be used as a model for other schools. She knew that training was a big piece of this, and it sounded as if they were looking at alternative models of training, and she was pleased about this. She complimented John Bond and the members of the Leadership Training Institute at Kennedy for the excellent program they put on last week.

Mr. Abrams, too, was encouraged by what he was hearing. He was pleased to see in the description of the Einstein program that some considerations were going into the design of the modernization. In regard to a shared curriculum, he asked whether they envisioned this as a physical movement of students or distance learning or an offering in something less than the traditional class size. Dr. Hartzman replied that each of those options had been discussed. There were courses in social studies that all of the schools were interested in. Springbrook had been able to offer a course in probability and statistics while the other schools had not and would like to do. It would not be all distance learning. They had talked about students moving and sharing. Mr. Kress added that the result might be all of the forms described by Mr. Abrams.

Mr. Abrams asked about when the technical capability would exist to facilitate a partial or complete distance program. Mr. Kress replied that Einstein had the capability, Kennedy was installing it, and Springbrook would have it with their furniture and equipment in the capital budget. Dr. Hartzman commented that they had had some technical problems, but staff was working on them. There were other ways of taking advantage of telecommunications. She cited the example of teacher training and demonstration teaching.

Mr. Abrams asked whether there was a relationship between the consortium and the controlled choice options. Mr. Kress replied that to date there had not been. Springbrook was the only school involved with both the consortium and controlled choice. Mr. Abrams thought that the consortium option might become a portion of the controlled choice as a gateway into some of the other areas as well.

Dr. Cheung stated that he was very excited about their progress.

He liked their use of the word, "partnership." He looked at this as the human network which was very important in relationships among and between students, teachers, and administrators. He thought this was going to change the way teachers taught because of the availability of technology. He believe the consortium was setting a trend for the future on how teachers taught and how students learned. He asked whether the high school principals were thinking about collaboration with the feeder schools. Mr. Kress replied that they had had some preliminary discussions, but most of the efforts had gone into the high school planning. However, they had discussed how these opportunities could be expanded cluster-wide.

Mr. Ewing commented that he was very impressed with the progress they had made. He paid tribute to the steering committee and to Dr. Hartzman who had given extraordinary leadership and support to this effort. Dr. Vance had given clear indication of his support by picking one of their most talented administrators to direct this. He was not concerned that all of the details had yet to be filled in. One of the virtues of this was the collaboration and the exploration of possibilities.

Mr. Ewing recalled that they started against a background of concern, even anxiety, over inequity among schools and the lack of resources at some schools and a perceived placement of extraordinary resources at others. The mode in which the group had worked had brought them to a conclusion that the sharing of resources would largely deal with that issue. They were genuinely committed to assuring that equal opportunities were available to all students, and he thought they were getting there. There had been doubt in many quarters that this would happen, and it was becoming real. He believed that in four years or so they were going to have new or completely renovated buildings in all four of these locations, and they would be designed to be compatible technologically.

Mr. Ewing remarked that there was nothing inevitable about this kind of trend in Montgomery County. In most school systems, the parts with the highest concentration of poverty and minorities were usually the parts most neglected. A lot of people in Montgomery County expected that this would be true with regard to this part of the county, but they had never allowed that to be true. They had made extraordinary efforts to make sure this did not come true. He thought that the consortium was the latest evidence of the commitment of the community, Board, staff, and students that this would not come true. This was truly remarkable. He was delighted to see what was happening, and he thought it would be even more impressive in the future.

Mrs. Fanconi commented that the coaching model had the potential to change the way they did things. She asked whether there was a need to do initial surveys of staffs and students to see if they

saw any difference. The coaching model could be something to look at when they got into total quality management. She asked whether it would be useful to do surveys and a follow up in a few years. Dr. Hartzman agreed. She pointed out that one of the nice things about working with such talented and strong people was that they would voice their concerns and preferences before any survey was put together.

Mrs. Fanconi thanked them for their report. She hoped that the superintendent would point out the budgetary issues raised by the consortium including the compatibility of equipment. They had not talked about the grant writer, but this would be a good time to take advantage of the opportunity to expand this by using the services of a grant writer.

RESOLUTION NO. -94 Re: SUCCESS FOR EVERY STUDENT PLAN

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

WHEREAS, The Success for Every Student Plan was originally adopted by the Board of Education on January 6, 1993, and the plan has been updated to reflect current outcomes, strategies and assessments; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Board of Education hereby adopt the updated Success for Every Student Plan as the strategic framework for the advancement of quality education within the Montgomery County Public Schools.

Board members made the following editorial changes in the document:

Page 19. Strategy 1.4 Determine **and utilize** the pre-referral and early intervention strategies that enable at-risk students to succeed in general education, with particular emphasis on African-American students.

Page 19. Tasks 1.4.2 The local school Admission, Review and Dismissal committee will collect relevant student/school data each time a student is screened for a suspected disability. Results will be compiled each year to determine referral patterns **of students, especially African-American students.**

Re: REPORT ON LEGISLATION

Mrs. Lois Stoner, legislative aide, reported that MCPS had done well in funding. They got ESOL permanently into the law and

targeted poverty for next year for all, not just Baltimore City.

There was a total of \$106 million for school construction which would be allocated next Wednesday. There was \$18 million in paygo, \$82 million in bonds, and \$6 million in recycled bonds.

The year-round school bill passed much amended, and the bill applied only to the six counties that had a grant. Those counties could implement year-round school after they did their study, and while other counties could undertake a study on their own, they could not do anything about the 180 days. Their biggest disappointment was the failure of the confidentiality bill, the student safety and security act, which failed by two votes in judiciary committee. The weapons free-zone bill had been very watered down before it died in the Senate. The technology for education bill was adopted, and Delegate Counihan said this made MCPS eligible for federal funds. The Takoma Park bill passed; however, the date was delayed to July 1, 1997. The two bills that removed state and local sanctions on South Africa were adopted.

Mrs. Stoner said that another disappointment was the adoption of the English as the Official Language bill. The bill had been amended, and there was an additional exemption which permitted the state to use a language other than English to help persons not proficient in English in the conduct of legitimate government affairs. Mr. Abrams asked about the implications of this bill for MCPS, and Mrs. Stoner explained that MCPS was exempt.

Mr. Ewing indicated that Delegate Franchot had informed the Board about funding for a cultural center in capital program. The city of Takoma Park had asked that it be built on the Takoma MS site.

He assumed there was nothing in the legislation that said it must be built on the Takoma Park MS site. Mrs. Stoner replied that the bill stated that it must be built in Takoma Park, but it did not say it had to be built on the school site. The funds had to be matched by the county by June 1, 1996. Staff was checking into this.

Mrs. Stoner noted that originally in the governor's budget there was \$2.2 million for disruptive schools. This was in as a contingency based on the cigarette tax; however, even though the cigarette tax failed, this item stayed in the budget. It was her understanding that Montgomery County would get some money from that \$2.2 million which would be for a day school rather than a residential school.

In regard to Takoma Park, it seemed to Dr. Vance that if the school system were to conclude that cultural center attached to the middle school was not feasible, the school system would have no further involvement. Mrs. Stoner replied that the bill itself did not mention the school system, only that the center must be built in Takoma Park.

Mrs. Fanconi thanked Mrs. Stoner for her work during the legislative session. She noted that delegates had a high regard for Mrs. Stoner. She also thanked the members of the Montgomery County Delegation for their hard work during this session.

Re: BOARD/SUPERINTENDENT COMMENTS

1. Dr. Vance reported that he had given the Board a memo on the FY 1995 spending affordability guidelines. The financial outlook for the county had improved significantly, and the revenue projections were well above the estimates used by the Council when it adopted the guidelines in October. The estimates for the current year had increased by more than \$40 million, and the FY 1995 estimates had increase by over \$50 million. These were the result of revised income tax projections and more revenue from the state in FY 1995. Even with all of this additional revenue, the Council must still reach a super majority of seven members to override the earlier spending affordability limit. It might happen that the Council would supply various committees with different guidelines on April 19. If this was not done, the only guidelines the committees might have would be the spending affordability guidelines adopted in October.

Mr. Larry Bowers, chief financial officer, said the Council had discussed putting in \$10 million into the "rainy day" fund for FY 1994. In addition, there was a recommendation to use some of the funds available to pay off the deficit in the risk management fund. Last year the Board had raised the issue because their contributions to the fund were going up partially because of the deficit; however, their request was turned down. There was a difference of opinion between the county executive and the County Council about the setting of the property tax rate. Mr. Potter recommended the charter limit; however, he also recommendation a reduction of \$11 million to reduce taxes for people with incomes below \$50,000, a homeowner's tax credit. Council members rejected both ideas. There might be a recommendation to reduce utility taxes and to eliminate the beverage container tax. The revenue from the income tax was much higher, and Montgomery County had done better in the Legislature this year. He noted that some of the income tax was one-time money, and they did not know how much this was.

Mr. Ewing stated that this showed that the spending affordability legislation did not serve them very well as a county. They were setting rigid limits in October for a fiscal year that began 11 months later. The limits were based on revenue estimates in a volatile economy which did not make much sense. He hoped that the Council would consider making some changes to that law to make it more flexible. For example, this year they could end up with more money than they knew what to do with when there were severe unmet needs in the school system and

in the county government. Mr. Abrams disagreed. They were following a discipline and now seeing some rational reflection on the more current estimates, and this was not necessarily an indictment of the whole approach to spending affordability. He thought that they needed this discipline.

2. Mrs. Gordon reported that yesterday she had had the opportunity to spend five or six hours on a school bus with Mrs. Jenine Herron. Mrs. Herron transported kindergarten students to the French Immersion program as well as other students in the Paint Branch cluster. Mrs. Gordon remarked that the people who supported the instructional program did a great deal, but she had been struck by the amount of effort that Mrs. Herron put forth in dealing with the students on her bus. She knew every student on the bus, and she knew the parents of the kindergarten students. At the beginning of the year she gave parents her home phone number in case there were concerns or issues. When they arrived at Maryvale, Mrs. Herron walked the students into the building and had a conversation with the teacher about what had happened on the bus and about what she needed to know to help the students. Mrs. Gordon did not think that Mrs. Herron was alone in doing that kind of commitment. She hoped that other Board members would take the opportunity to see the real contributions made by supporting services people.

3. Mr. Ewing indicated that on Sunday the Blair community had held a rally for a new Blair High School. It was a very positive event, and one in which there was every expectation of a favorable outcome. He and Mrs. Fanconi had spoken, and he had issued an invitation to everyone present to attend the dedication of the new Blair High School in 1998. The Board now had a copy of the Park and Planning staff report on the potential for Blair on the Sligo Creek site, and the report stated there were not any major constraints on that decision. He thought that outcome of the decision about where to locate the school was made easier by this report. He would expect that the community would show up in droves at the public hearing on April 19 to have a discussion with the Council about a new Blair High School.

4. Dr. Cheung reported that he, the superintendent, and other staff had participated in the Leadership Montgomery education session. He believed this was a success and provided a hands-on type of experience. Participants heard from MCCPTA and community leaders. They had an opportunity to visit the Edison Center. He had received comments that this was an outstanding learning experience. He commented that Dr. Vance was the star in this program because he addressed all the issues without a single prepared note. He congratulated Dr. Vance and all the staff who participated in the program.

5. Mrs. Fanconi said that last evening she had attended the Council hearing on the budget and a couple of the testimonies

dealt with maintenance. Some Council members commented that the Council had not made any cuts in maintenance; therefore, they did not understand why repairs were not being made. The Council did not realize that when \$145 million had been cut from the budgets that this affected services. She did not know how they could get this point across to the Council. MCPS was not ignoring problems, but this reflected three years of extremely tight budgets. It seemed to her that this was not a time to blame. The Board had been fiscally responsible in reacting to the fiscal constraints, but now was the time to support the needs of the school system because there was more money. She suggested that perhaps MCPS could take the initiative and send the Council a list of unmet needs.

6. Mr. Abrams reported that some Council members were visiting schools including Glen Haven ES which had generated some phone calls. He had spoken with Dr. Rohr about Glen Haven and what the current conditions were. He suggested it might be useful to get some information on Glen Haven and have it sent to Council members. He further suggested that someone contact Glen Haven to let them know what the process would be for them to be considered for any major renovation. Mrs. Fanconi suggested adding information about schools already on the list for renovation and how far behind they were as well as schools that might come forward with more funds were available. Dr. Vance commented that they did have a long-range strategic plan, and it was an orderly process. Unless he were directed to do otherwise, he had no intention of over-reacting to whatever was being said on these visits to these schools. He would continue to be responsive to calls from parents and school-based personnel. Mr. Abrams noted that the Board knew about the plan, but the parents in the schools might not know about the plan.

RESOLUTION NO. 268-94 Re: CLOSED SESSION - APRIL 25, 1994

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Mrs. Gordon seconded by Dr. Cheung, the following resolution was adopted unanimously 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 on April 25, 1994, at 7:30 p.m. to discuss personnel matters, matters protected from public disclosure by law, contract negotiations, and other issues including consultation with counsel to obtain legal advice; and be it further

Resolved, That this meeting be conducted in Room 120 of the Carver Educational Services Center, Rockville, Maryland, 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 meeting shall continue in closed session until the completion of business.

Re: REPORT ON CLOSED SESSIONS - MARCH
21 AND APRIL 5, 1994

On March 8, 1994, by the unanimous vote of members present, the Board of Education voted to conduct a closed session on March 21, 1994, 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, March 21, 1994, from 7:30 p.m. to 8:35 p.m. and from 11:25 p.m. to 11:35 p.m. The meetings took place in room 120 of the Carver Educational Services Center, Rockville, Maryland.

The Board met to discuss the appointment of a principal for the McKenney Hills Learning Center. The Board also discussed a modification to the early retirement incentive program. Votes taken in closed session were confirmed in open session. The Board consulted with its attorneys on the transfer process in relation to Supreme Court rulings. The Board met with its attorney to be briefed on a conflict of interest matter which the superintendent had under consideration.

In attendance at the closed sessions were Steve Abrams, Carrie Baker, Larry Bowers, Fran Brenneman, Judy Bresler, Carole Burger, Alan Cheung, Blair Ewing, Carol Fanconi, Tom Fess, David Fischer, Hiawatha Fountain, Kathy Gemberling, Wes Girling, Bea Gordon, Ana Sol Gutierrez, John Larson, Elfreda Massie, Brian Porter, Phil Rohr, David Tatel, Roger Titus, Paul Vance, Mary Lou Wood, and Melissa Woods.

The Montgomery County Board of Education met in closed session on Tuesday, April 5, 1994, from 7 p.m. to 8 p.m. The meeting took place in room 120 of the Carver Educational Services Center, Rockville, Maryland.

The Board met to receive the report of its consultant, Maureen Steinecke, on policies affecting students alleged to have committed criminal offenses off-campus and to decide on the process for releasing the report to the public. The Board also consulted with its attorney regarding legal requirements of reporting practices.

In attendance at the closed session were Steve Abrams, Carrie

Baker, Fran Brenneman, Judy Bresler, Alan Cheung, Blair Ewing, Carol Fanconi, Tom Fess, Bea Gordon, Ana Sol Gutierrez, Phil Rohr, Maureen Steinecke, Mary Lou Wood, and Melissa Woods.

Re: NEW BUSINESS

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education request that the superintendent of schools establish a working group to consider the consultant's recommendation and bring any suggested changes to the superintendent and Board.

RESOLUTION NO. 269-94 Re: AN AMENDMENT TO THE PROPOSED
RESOLUTION ON THE STEINECKE REPORT

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

Resolved, That Mrs. Gordon's proposed resolution on the Steinecke report be amended as follows:

 Add, "on parental notification" after consultant's recommendation

 Add "and be it further Resolved, That any of the recommendations from the final Potter Commission report dealing with MCPS policies, practices, and procedures be taken up and discussed at that point.

RESOLUTION NO. 270-94 Re: STEINECKE REPORT

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education request that the superintendent of schools establish a working group to consider the consultant's recommendation (Steinecke) on parental notification and bring any suggested changes to the superintendent and the Board; and be it further

Resolved, That any of the recommendations from the final Potter Commission report dealing with MCPS policies, practices, and procedures be taken up and discussed at that point.

Re: NEW BUSINESS (CONTINUED)

The following items of new business were introduced:

1. Mrs. Gordon moved and Dr. Cheung seconded the following:

Resolved, That the Board of Education have a discussion of the new state-mandated health curriculum and how current health-related curriculum will be adapted to meet the new state requirements, including but not limited to wellness prevention, family life, and first aid.

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education schedule a meeting to discuss with the Trades Foundations the issues of career and vocational education in relation to the School-to-Work Act adopted by Congress.

3. Mr. Ewing moved and Mr. Abrams seconded the following:

Resolved, That the Board of Education schedule action and discussion before the end of the school year this year aimed at authorizing the extension of the sixth grade program of the Center for the Highly Gifted at Charles Drew ES for a period until the Takoma and Eastern conversions to middle schools are completed.

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education schedule action and discussion on the proposed cultural center to be located in Takoma Park and proposed by the City of Takoma Park to be located on the Takoma Park MS site with a request to the superintendent that he complete an analysis of the issue before the discussion.

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education schedule time to review the present plans for the need for additional science equipment, materials, technology, and software at the high school level as well as the educational specifications for high school science classrooms.

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

Resolved, That the superintendent bring an information item to the Board on standards and expectations in mathematics, science, and reading/language arts for the upper elementary grades and middle schools so that the Board could decide whether to schedule discussion on those standards separately or as part of another policy discussion.

7. Mr. Ewing moved and Mr. Abrams seconded the following:

Resolved, That the Board of Education schedule time to discuss the SAFE materials including the recommendations of the OSAE advisory committee and the family life and human development

committee.

8. Mrs. Brenneman moved and Mr. Abrams seconded the following:

Resolved, That the Board of Education schedule a discussion of the implementation of the family life curriculum including an overview of the curriculum, the guidelines for communications used by schools with parents and students in offering the family life unit including alternative options, and data on numbers of students opting out and available alternatives at a selection of high schools and middle schools.

9. Mrs. Brenneman moved and Dr. Cheung seconded the following:

Resolved, That the Board of Education discuss the Goals 2000 as it relates to MCPS curriculum, including the arts curriculum.

Re: A MOTION BY DR. CHEUNG ON NEW
BUSINESS ITEMS (FAILED)

A motion by Dr. Cheung to give the Board officers the authority to schedule the nine items of new business on two separate meetings for further consideration failed for lack of a second.

Re: ITEMS OF INFORMATION

Board members received the following items of information:

1. Items in Process
2. Report from OSAE Advisory Committee on SAFE Materials
3. Construction Progress Report
4. Monthly Financial Report
5. Report to the Board of Education on Policies Affecting Students Alleged to Have Committed Criminal Offenses Off-campus

RESOLUTION NO. 271-94 Re: ADJOURNMENT

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education adjourn its meeting at 5:10 p.m.

PRESIDENT

SECRETARY