

January 10, 1995

APPROVED
2-1995Rockville, Maryland
January 10, 1995

The Board of Education of Montgomery County met in regular session at the Carver Educational Services Center, Rockville, Maryland, on Tuesday, January 10, 1995, at 10:05 a.m.

ROLL CALL Present: Mrs. Beatrice B. Gordon, President
in the Chair
Dr. Alan Cheung
Ms. Wendy Converse
Mr. Blair G. Ewing
Mr. Reginald Felton
Ms. Ana Sol Gutierrez
Mrs. Nancy King

Absent: Mr. Stephen Abrams

Others Present: Dr. Paul L. Vance, Superintendent
Mrs. Katheryn W. Gemberling, Deputy
Mr. Larry A. Bowers, Acting Deputy
Mr. Thomas S. Fess, Parliamentarian

RESOLUTION NO. 1-95 Re: BOARD AGENDA - JANUARY 10, 1995

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education approve its agenda for January 10, 1995.

Re: ANNOUNCEMENT

Mrs. Gordon announced that Mr. Abrams would not be attending the meeting today.

Re: LINKAGES TO LEARNING AWARD

Ms. Ann Bishop, director of the Montgomery County Department of Social Services, presented the Board and superintendent with the 1994 National Association of Counties award for Linkages to Learning. She praised the efforts of the school system in working in cooperation with the county government on this important program.

Re: SAFETY AND SECURITY PLAN UPDATE

Dr. Vance introduced Mr. William Wilder, director of the Department of Facilities Management; Mr. Michael Gough, director of the Division of School Security; Mr. Donald Kress, principal of Springbrook High School and president of the Secondary School Administrators Association, and Austin L. Patterson, security team leader at Springbrook High School. He announced that Mr. Patterson was starting his 33rd year with MCPS.

Dr. Vance recalled that in early 1992 the Board approved a three-year plan to improve safety and security within MCPS. Today they would share a progress report on how they had implemented this initiative. Almost \$2 million had been appropriated for this initiative, and currently they had 21 team leader positions and 59 security assistants at their high schools. All middle schools had one security staff member and eight had two security assistants. Dr. Vance stated that he was recommending a continuation of the security plan. Preliminary estimates were that an enhanced five-year plan would require almost \$900,000. In his FY 1996 operating budget, he had included \$104,000 to provide the necessary assistance to elementary schools and to respond to emergency situations.

Yesterday he had received a request from Mr. Ewing to share an assessment of the effectiveness of what had been done in making schools safer. Mr. Ewing asked about the trend in major incidents by type. Dr. Vance believed that the safety and security initiative had had a positive and tangible effect on making schools less threatened by violence and disruption. However, the component to develop an incident profiling system to collect information summaries and display patterns of activity still remained unfilled. This component was under active planning at this time. Staff was currently reviewing the potential for incorporating the serious incident reporting system into SIMS 2.0. This lack of hard data hindered his ability to provide the Board with concrete trend analysis and specific data about types of incidents. However, he had kept a careful watch on the presence of firearms. This had dropped off markedly from 15 reported incidents two years ago to just six last year to only one incident reported thus far this year. That one incident involved a gun found in the trunk of a car.

Dr. Vance commented that a hand count of serious incidents for the first month of school compared to the first month last year revealed a noticeable decline overall. They were grateful for that. They did know through anecdotal reports from students, teachers, principals, staffs, and parents that there was a heightened sense of security in and around schools from the presence of trained and responsive security assistants. They also knew that community leaders, business leaders, and elected officials felt a heightened sense of security was noticeable in their visits to schools.

However, Dr. Vance said they also continued to hear from employees about continuing concerns about violent incidents. This reality was based on news reports of incidents elsewhere in the Washington area and nationally about violence and weapons in schools. This was another indication that they must continue to remain vigilant against this very serious threat. The need for hard data would become increasing important as they faced issues of confidence and perception about the progress they had made. He intended to fulfill that part of the initiative as quickly as possible.

Dr. Vance said that Mr. Ewing had asked about additional safety and security systems which might be needed beyond those contained in the recommended budget for FY 1996. There were specific elements of the long-range plan that would contribute to improved protection of students and staff. However, the basic goal of safety and security could never be realized until society itself came to grips with what people did to one another, especially what teenagers did to themselves and to each other. Their five-year plan included employee and student photo identification, a systemwide safe schools hotline, enhanced keyless access at schools, and the full implementation of the rapid response security system. Next year MCPS would have 120,000 youngsters spread over an area of 500 square miles in 179 schools.

Dr. Vance observed that technology alone would not ensure their schools were truly safe. Such assurance would come when communities and community leaders, particularly leaders of the faith community, understood and accepted the need to involve more parents and public in teaching children and young people about non-violent responses to conflict. There were some successful initiatives in the county such as conflict resolution, Voices vs. Violence, and Mrs. Julie Elseroad's campaign against guns. They must continue with these and other programs to help protect schools and reverse the cycle of violence occurring in homes and the community. He intended to ensure that the peer mediation process was used effectively in all schools. They must continue to infuse conflict resolution into the entire curriculum. Finally, given the start of the General Assembly, they must not give up on legislative initiatives to restrict dangerous weapons on and around school property, to gain access to information about juvenile offenders, and to remove handguns from the community.

Dr. Vance was dismayed to read about the death of a student in a nearby high school and about statements made by the mayor and superintendent that they did not know what to do because they had tried everything. He believed that democracy was in serious trouble if they could not control violence in and around public schools. He was convinced that this would not happen in their community, and he intended to do everything he could to ensure that their safety and security initiatives fulfilled the promise he and the Board made to students, parents, and employees. They would continue to have safe schools, and they would continue to provide the leadership to help move the community toward the day when such issues were no longer relevant.

Mr. Wilder introduced Major Carol Mehrling, acting chief of police, and Mr. Al Augustine, Mr. Hoyt Gamble, and Ms. Ellen Carroll, field security coordinators for MCPS. This morning they would review the history of the development of the security initiative, highlight status of pertinent recommendations in the advisory committee report, and outline plans for the future. They would discuss training needs, legislation, and progress in upgrading electronic detection systems, exterior lighting, and interior security gates.

Mr. Gough reported that their last formal presentation to the Board occurred in May, 1993. In the fall of 1991, Dr. Vance decided to have the MCPS security program evaluated. He brought in the National Alliance for Safe Schools and established a committee of school-based people to review their report and make recommendations. In February 1992, the Board adopted a three-year security plan. Staff members were in place by September 1992, and he had been hired in October 1992 to head up the program.

During the first year they had developed a comprehensive training program. They trained security staffs and school administrators with the assistance of the Police Department. They trained in areas covering school security policy, graffiti recognition, drug activity and identification, conflict resolution, cultural diversity, evidence handling, weapons identification, and non-violent crisis intervention. Two-way radios were purchased and soft uniform jackets and caps were provided to all security personnel.

In the spring of 1993, three field security coordinators were hired from existing ranks of the security team leaders. In September 1993, they hired an additional 26 security assistants. This provided security to all high schools and some middle schools. They continued training and added programs to understand the physiological effects of drugs, blood pathogens, and sexual harassment. In December 1993, the unit was

given the additional responsibility of coordinating upgrades in the security alarm systems, exterior lighting, and interior security gates.

In this fiscal year, Mr. Gough reported they had added 29 security assistants to school-based staff. His staff had worked to achieve gender and racial balance in staffing and to find bi-lingual candidates. This year they had staff in all 21 high schools and all 27 middle schools. They began the 1994 school year with training in problem oriented policing concepts, cultural diversity, understanding middle school student behavior, legal issues, police critical incident response, graffiti recognition and interpretation, risk management issues, special education and alternative schools, drug-free schools programs, and understanding addictive behavior. Later this month they would have a training session on violence in the work place for security staff, school administrators, other school system representatives, and law enforcement officials.

Mr. Gough indicated that there had been two attempts to get legislation on the sharing of confidential information with criminal justice agencies and on strengthening penalties for the possession of dangerous weapons on school property. Neither piece of legislation was adopted. It was his understanding that both pieces of legislation would be reintroduced this year. He also reported that by the end of FY 1995 they would complete an additional 37 lighting upgrade projects and 27 alarm system upgrades. They expected to complete the lighting project by FY 1996. They would schedule 53 schools for alarm system upgrades for completion in FY 1996. They continued to review the need for interior security gates, and they had installed six since the beginning of the upgrade program.

Mr. Gough reported that at the end of this school year they would complete the safety and security recommendations and set the stage for the new phase. Dr. Vance was recommending that the security plan be expanded and was requesting \$900,000 for an enhanced five-year security plan. They would like to see a systemwide school hotline to obtain anonymous and confidential information from students, staff, parents, and community members about guns, drugs, and violence in the schools. There was a provision to add three security assistants in FY 1996 to provide assistance to elementary schools and to respond to emergency situations throughout the school system. They would provide assistance to summer school programs and construction sites in the summer. With the assistance of the Police Department, they would develop training courses in critical incident response, mediated conflict, cultural diversity, understanding and dealing effectively with the behavior of elementary school children, managing large groups, behavior management, and physical plant security. The plan included employee/student photo identification, upgrading patrols, upgrading alarm systems, and enhanced keyless access to schools.

Mr. Gough acknowledged the support of the acting chief of the police, deputy chief, executive staff, division commanders, and all the police officers of the Police Department. He also acknowledge the support of the police chiefs in Takoma Park, Rockville, and Gaithersburg for similar support and encouragement. Mr. Gough said that his staff could not be as successful without the devotion to duty of security staff and the cooperation of parents and school-based staff.

Mr. Kress commented that all principals felt very strongly that Dr. Vance had been very responsive to their concerns about school security and had translated those concerns into budget initiatives. He had words of praise for the relationships that schools had

with the Department of Police. The police were there to assist schools, and principals had been able to develop good rapport with precinct commanders.

Dr. Vance thanked Mr. Kress for his comments, but the superintendent only made recommendations. It took an action of the Board to adopt a plan. This was the Board's policy, and it was the strong desire to ensure the safety of all students.

Mr. Patterson thanked the superintendent and the Board for finding them a good leader for the security department to get them where they were today. Mr. Gough had been able to get things done so they were more effective and efficient.

Mrs. King stated that as the parent of a seventh grader and twelfth grader, she saw first hand how the security worked in her local schools. Both of her children went to school everyday feeling secure knowing that the safety and security people were in the schools. She asked whether the new hotline would replace the "I-care" hotline. Mr. Gough replied that this was a different program. That hotline made referrals to social agencies within the county. This was an 800 number located in Texas, and if a student called with a problem, he or she was referred to a Montgomery County agency.

Ms. Converse asked what an electronic detector leader position was. Mr. Gough explained that this person supervised 10 employees. Those employees monitored and patrolled all school facilities in the evenings and on weekends. The alarms in the 206 school system buildings were fed into a central monitoring station with radio communication with staff in the field.

Ms. Converse inquired about the future issue of metal detection capability. She asked whether this would be upgrading current equipment or increasing the equipment in schools. Mr. Gough replied that they were considering using portable metal detectors that could be used at facilities on an as-needed basis. This would be considered for future budgets.

It seemed to Ms. Converse that middle schools were a second priority. For example, they were receiving hand-me-down two-way radios. She felt that middle schools were becoming more of a priority, and she wanted to express her concern about the number of incidents she heard from students. She thought that middle schools needed to be a first priority especially with the inclusion now of the sixth grade.

Dr. Vance thanked Ms. Converse for her questions. School safety and security was more than just guarding and protecting school premises during operating hours. It was a 24-hour initiative. It would be impossible to carry out this responsibility without the cooperation and support of Chief Mehrling and an outstanding police department.

Mr. Felton commended staff for their efforts to date. They had learned in recent years that any successful program involved more than just a security force. The community at large had to accept more and more responsibility. A section of the report talked about meeting with the community so that they would begin to understand what was needed. He wondered if their plan included the involvement of parents or other volunteers, especially having a greater role in monitoring afterschool.

Mr. Kress replied that they had attempted to foster very good relationships with the community. At Springbrook they were able to solve a situation very quickly last Friday because of a call from a community person alerting them to a situation that was

developing. Principals planned to discuss with Mrs. Gemberling the issue of community groups that were seeking to come on school property to assist in patrolling the property or the building. They wanted to discuss what kind of help those groups could be, what kind of liability issues that might exist, and what kind of problems might exist. He suspected that they would see more community involvement. From the point of view of a principal, community involvement was key. Parents would ask him if his school had a drug or violence problem, and he responded that no they did not because the school did not supply drugs; however, they might have a drug problem in the community. Schools were not going to solve security problems. It would take schools and communities working together to solve these societal problems.

Mr. Felton asked if they were exploring the greater use of communities. Mr. Gough replied that the Police Department and MCPS were considering setting up a program around the perimeter of schools similar to a neighborhood watch program. Mr. Wilder added that the Interagency Coordinating Board was also committed to some initiatives to be alert to activities occurring during evening hours and on weekends. Dr. Ayers, the executive director of the ICB, was also working with the Police Department, MCPS security staff, and principals to shore up that piece as well.

Ms. Gutierrez asked whether a decision had been made on a photo identification program. Ms. Converse replied that it was in place at Richard Montgomery High School where staff members wore photo identification cards. Mr. Gough commented that this would be a future budget consideration; however, there was some difficulty in having students wear identification. They would have to evaluate this before making a recommendation. Dr. Vance said it would not be their intention to have students wear badges, but in the case of Richard Montgomery High School this was a collective decision that staff would wear them because of their concerns about adult intruders coming on school grounds.

Ms. Gutierrez remarked that the photo identification program had not been part of the original recommendations, and before the Board adopted this, they would want to have a lot more information on this including the costs and how the identification would be used.

Ms. Gutierrez asked if they had an update on the alternative program. They had mentioned the Choice staff members had been hired and meetings had been held. Dr. Vance replied that MCPS was ready to move on this program. Board members would recall that this had been an 18-month interagency initiative. They had communicated with the county executive's office and their interagency partners; however, plans to place the program in the Watkins Mill community ran into a storm of protest. The placement of the program there had been slowed down. He emphasized that in terms of commitment he was still pressing ahead with their effort to establish the center.

In regard to data, Ms. Gutierrez agreed they needed better and more consistent data. The Board received reports of serious incidents, and she thought they were looking at upgrading this and making it more automated. She wondered if they were doing anything now with the data they had been collecting because they had it by type, school, and incident. She asked whether the security team wrote incident reports or if only the schools did this. Mr. Kress replied that at the school level he wrote up the serious incident report, and depending on the incident, he would sometimes ask for written reports from security staff. Ms. Gutierrez suggested that this might be a good source of getting better data about what was happening and where they might need to

deploy certain types of supports. Mr. Patterson added that he did keep data on trespassers. He took pictures of them, and usually they did not return when their picture had been taken. He also worked with the police department when graffiti was found. Ms. Gutierrez pointed out that security staffs knew their schools and could provide valuable information. She thought that in addition to SIMS they needed systemwide data so that they could understand what was happening.

It seemed to Ms. Gutierrez there was a strong intervention focus especially with the SWAT team capability. She would like to see them also focus on strengthening prevention, and the report did not have a lot of emphasis on what they were doing in the prevention area. She would like to see more conflict resolution and peer mediation, and she suggested expanding this to involve community groups. She also asked about what kind of training they had in the area of legal issues such as unlawful searches.

Dr. Vance invited Chief Mehrling to the table. Chief Mehrling stated that she had enjoyed the presentation, and she was not surprised at the quality because she had worked with Mr. Gough and his staff for several years. She thought they had the strongest partnership in the county between the schools and the police. They had taken the time to look at the issues, to share resources, to recognize common problems, and to resolve these problems together. They continuously contacted one another when information came up. She said the police would continue their commitment to this program because they, too, were concerned about the youth in the county. She agreed with Dr. Vance that democracy could be in trouble if people just threw up their hands and said they could not do anything. They had to adjust and be flexible to meet the problems of today, not using yesterday's solutions. Once they became more creative in their thinking and more directed in their focus, she thought they would see a change. Mr. Gough's vision for the future with his five-year plan was very refreshing and gave her a lot of confidence that they were going in the right direction.

It seemed to Mr. Ewing that the safety of schools was a threshold issue for the school system. If schools are not a safe place for staff and students to be, the level of confidence on the part of the community will drop abruptly. The evidence was there from large urban school systems, that this had been a major source of their decline. The other obvious concern that people had was the quality of instruction. MCPS had maintained and improved the quality of instruction, and he thought they were well on their way to getting the message across effectively that they were addressing safety issues.

Mr. Ewing recalled that 20 years ago there were virtually no safety and security people in the schools because it was not necessary. Five years ago as chair of the Metropolitan Area Boards of Education, he had called a conference on school safety for the whole metropolitan area. The person they turned to was the Prince George's county director of public safety for schools. Today, if they were to have such a conference, they would turn to Mr. Gough who was a highly effective leader and one who had done an outstanding job of putting the plan in place and making it work. Mr. Ewing thought that Mr. Gough and the Police Department deserved their thanks.

Mr. Ewing thought it was important for them to continue to focus on preventive measures and community involvement, and he suggested they needed to expand their efforts in that regard. At the same time, they could not lose sight of the fact that they had to have people in the schools whose job it was to make sure that things were safe.

They were critical to this effort, and he thought they had to recognize that in all likelihood they would need to expand that effort in the middle schools and in the elementary schools. He was prepared to support the superintendent's budget, and he would hope that the superintendent would continue to reflect on what was needed.

Mr. Ewing agreed that they needed to get the system on serious incident reporting in place as quickly as possible. This helped them at the Board table to assess what made the most sense in terms on where they put resources to support this effort. As time passed, the public and the Council were going to want to know the extent to which they were effective in dealing with safety issues. He asked whether they had the resources available at the moment to put that system in place.

Dr. Cheung stated that safety and security was a national priority issue. He agreed with Mr. Ewing that people had to feel safe in schools because in Montgomery County the public schools were the most important treasure. Montgomery County had a reputation for quality education, and they had to assure the continued excellence of the public schools. He understood the three-year initiatives, but he had read about a six-year plan and a five-year budget. He asked for some explanation. He had added up the staff and they now had 119, about 10 percent of the personnel in the Police Department. He inquired about future staff requirements to meet their goals.

Mr. Gough replied that principals would reply that they did need more security staff. They now had 115 security people in secondary schools dealing with 55,000 students each day. They had new schools opening, and they had plans to staff those. There wasn't a set formula on staffing each school. The plan called for staffing middle schools and high schools, and they had done that. Now they were evaluating the success of the three-year initiative. He agreed they did not have enough data to do trend analyses, but they had paper data which was difficult to put together. Once those things were in place, they would be able to develop a plan on future staffing needed. The five-year plan referred to the operating budget projections. Mr. Bowers explained that the six-year reference was to the capital budget which included lighting and detection systems.

In regard to the computer system, Dr. Vance replied that they did have sufficient resources to complete this task.

On behalf of the Board, Mrs. Gordon thanked all of them and asked them to pass that appreciation on to members of the Police Department and the members of the MCPS security team in the schools. As the parent of a high school student, she was in the building occasionally and knew the relationships were very positive. Students felt comfortable meeting and talking to the security people in the building.

On the serious incident reports, Mrs. Gordon agreed with Mr. Ewing that this information should be compiled and made available. In addition, they should let people know that not all serious incidents were the result of illegal activities. If a student fell off the jungle gym or a teacher fainted, these would be serious incidents. They needed to be very clear about what kinds of things principals were required to report.

Mrs. Gordon said she had a copy of a fact sheet from the U.S. Department of Justice, the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994. She knew that security people were discussing legislative issues and federal law provisions, and she wondered whether MCPS was in compliance with the law and were training their people

about the law. Mr. Gough replied that the act was effective on January 1, 1995, and placed a burden on school systems receiving federal funding. Any student found in possession of a firearm must be suspended for one year. Superintendents could offer, on a case by case basis, alternative education. There had been legislation introduced by the state superintendent to provide for those exceptions and to enact state policy to guide systems. Mrs. Gordon recalled that there was something in the federal act about adult prosecution for those over 13 and a tripling of the maximum penalties for using students for the distribution of drugs. Mr. Gough replied that he had not seen this portion.

Mrs. Gordon acknowledged the cooperation of the Police Department and the schools in Project DARE. This was an outstanding program. A few meetings ago, she had asked about the SMART training which was a drug resistance program for sixth graders. She thought the program was in the elementary schools with sixth grade, but she believed that only two middle schools were using that. She would encourage staff to get schools to follow through on that. The last time the Board met with students, the students at the mid level really felt they were not getting sufficient training on drug and alcohol abuse.

Mr. Ewing asked Mr. Kress to let the Board know what secondary principals thought might be needed in the future to ensure a continuing effective program. This information would be very valuable to the Board. Dr. Vance thanked the team leaders and field coordinators for being present today. Mrs. Gordon added her thanks to them for being here especially the Police Department.

Re: CLOSED SESSION

The Board of Education adjourned for lunch and met in closed session from 11:20 a.m. to 1:30 p.m. to discuss legal issues.

Re: PUBLIC COMMENTS

The following individuals appeared before the Board:

1. Steve Horn, Whitman Cluster United
2. Hall Sisson, Whitman Cluster United
3. Susan Labin, Whitman
4. Lisa Baach
5. Phyllis Lickenbaugh, Whitman
6. Debbie Cohn, Whitman
7. Dale Morrison, Sumner Citizens Association
8. Linda Madden, Whitman

RESOLUTION NO. 2-95

Re: PROCUREMENT CONTRACTS MORE THAN
\$25,000

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Ms. Gutierrez seconded by Mr. Felton, 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 bidder meeting specifications as shown for the bids as follows:

COG		
94-044	Tires and Tubes - Extension	
	<u>Awardees</u>	
	Friend's Tire and Fleet Service	\$ 3,072
	Goodyear commercial Tire	242,539
	Merchants Truck and Auto	<u>8,097</u> *
	TOTAL	\$ 253,708
94-08	Speech Therapy Services - Extension	
	<u>Awardees</u>	
	Berman, Peverly and Associates	\$ 113,000 *
	Polcari Therapy Services, Inc.	<u>112,000</u> *
	TOTAL	\$ 225,000
32-94	Electrical Supplies & Equipment - Extension	
	<u>Awardees</u>	
	Advent Electric, Inc.	\$ 980
	Allegheny Electronics, Inc.	1,029
	Allied Sales Corporation	4,490
	Boddicker Electric Supply, Inc.	17,024
	Branch Electric Supply Company	120,413
	Davis Instruments	1,150
	Del Electric Supply	14,352 *
	Grainger	19,126
	Ideal Electrical Supply Corporation	17,943 *
	Mark Electronics Supply, Inc.	1,700
	Maurice Electrical Supply Company, Inc.	25,670
	C. N. Robinson	22,796
	Tri-County Electrical Supply Company, Inc.	<u>353,228</u>
	TOTAL	\$ 599,901
56-94	Voice Mail Processing System - Extension	
	<u>Awardee</u>	
	Microlog Corporation	\$ 59,831
66-94	Office Furniture - Extension	
	<u>Awardee</u>	
	Douron, Inc.	\$ 500,000 *
22-95	Bread and Rolls	
	<u>Awardee</u>	
	H & S Bakery, Inc.	\$ 295,200
4-95	Physical Education Supplies and Equipment	
	<u>Awardees</u>	
	Aluminum Athletic Equipment Company	\$ 17,655
	Artistic Typing Headquarters, Inc.	353 *
	ATS/Total Sports	270

January 10, 1995

	Bacharach Tasin Company	795
	Cannon Sports, Inc.	20,152
	Dita USA, Inc.	120 *
	DTI Soccer, Inc.	1,263
	DVF Sporting Goods Company	1,399
	Flaghouse, Inc.	7,097
	Bill Fritz Sporting Corporation	26,782
	Georgi-Sports	22,444 *
	Gill Sports Equipment	374
	Gopher Sport	2,029
	Lax World	3,620
	Longstreth Sporting Goods	6,832 *
	M-F Athletic Company	15,595
	Marlow Sports, Inc.	3,755 *
	Morley Athletic Supply	36,585
	Passon's Sports	34,912
	Penn Monto, Inc.	6,480 *
	Sportime	6,652
	Sportmaster	6,875
	Wittek Golf Supply Company, Inc.	109
	Yorktown Sports Shop II	15,587
	TOTAL	\$ 237,735
113-95	HVAC Service	
	<u>Awardees</u>	
	Boland Trane Services	\$ 70,050
	Carrier Building Systems & Service	41,865
	AAF-McQuay Inc., dba McQuay Service	8,263
	TOTAL	\$ 120,178
117-95	Industrial & Technology Education Hand Tools	
	<u>Awardees</u>	
	B&W Equipment and Supply Corporation	\$ 4,664
	L. A. Benson	2,056
	Brodhead-Garrett Company	3,537
	Carey Machinery and Supply Company, Inc.	6,960
	Columbia Industrial Hardware	7,136
	Diamond Tool Company	20,203 *
	Frederick Trading Company	236 *
	Grainger	5,662
	K. Layne, Inc.	3,702
	Ladysmith, Inc.	278 *
	Midwest Tech Products and Service	4,640 *
	Mouser Electronics	2,944
	Noland Company	6,815
	Norman Machine Tool, Inc.	91
	Omnitron Electronics	955
	Print Products International	3,995
	Rutland Tool and Supply Company	5,290
	Satco, Inc.	628
	Sears Industrial Sales	2,755
	Snap-On-Tools Corporation	5,055
	Thompson and Cooke, Inc.	6,560 *
	Wharton Supply Inc. of Virginia	12,261
	Woodworkers World	1,500

January 10, 1995

	TOTAL	\$ 107,923
118-95	Door Hardware, Closures and Exit Devices <u>Awardees</u>	
	American Lock and Supply	\$ 2,032
	Blaydes Lock Company	15,550
	Precision Doors and Hardware, Inc.	1,480
	Taylor Security & Lock Company, Inc.	<u>125,340</u>
	TOTAL	\$ 144,402
121-95	Chemicals and Test Equipment for the Division of Maintenance <u>Awardees</u>	
	Recreonics, Inc.	\$ 398
	Tasco Water Works, Inc.	6,215 *
	Tilley Chemical Company, Inc.	<u>21,899</u>
	TOTAL	\$ 28,512
226-95	Media Center Supplies <u>Awardees</u>	
	Brodart Company	\$ 11,877
	Demco, Inc.	3,206
	Interstate Office Supply Company	49,843 *
	Kunz, Inc.	5,513
	University Products, Inc.	1,755
	Vernon Library Supplies, Inc.	4,602
	Nelson C. White Company, Inc.	4,880
	Paul B. Williams, Inc.	880
	Winnebago Software Company	<u>1,249</u>
	TOTAL	\$ 83,805
	MORE THAN \$25,000	\$2,656,195

*Denotes MFD vendors

RESOLUTION NO. 3-95

Re: BID NO. 18-95, PURCHASE OF SCHOOL BUSES, BID NOS. 47-92 AND 51-93, PURCHASE OF SCHOOL BUSES, EXTENSION

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

WHEREAS, In order to receive the 93 buses before the opening of school next fall, it is necessary at this time, as has been the practice in prior years, for the Board to authorize the acquisition of 93 buses included in the superintendent's recommended FY 1996 operating budget; and

WHEREAS, It is necessary to purchase 93 school buses to replace buses that have reached the maximum age guideline and to accommodate increased enrollment; and

WHEREAS, It has been determined that extension of Bid Nos. 47-92 and 51-93 is cost effective, authorized by the terms of the bid, and in the best interest of MCPS; and

WHEREAS, Patco Distributors, Inc., has agreed to extend the contract with a 5 percent increase permitted under the terms and conditions of Bid No. 47-93 for the purchase of 9 replacement and 11 additional 36-passenger school buses; and

WHEREAS, The Board of Education advertised Bid No. 18-95, Purchase of School Buses, for the purchase of five replacement 48-passenger school buses; and

WHEREAS, Wantz Bus and Body Sales is the lowest responsible bidder meeting specifications under Bid No. 18-95 to provide the five 48-passenger buses; and

WHEREAS, If a cooperative master lease/purchase agreement with the Montgomery County Government is not finalized and approved by the Board by March 1995, MCPS shall issue an invitation to bid to acquire preferred municipal financing from qualified financial institutions to fund the lease/purchase of 93 school buses; now therefore be it

Resolved, That contingent on the approval of adequate funding in its FY 1996 operating budget, the Board of Education extend the contract awarded under Bid No. 47-92, Purchase of School Buses, to Patco Distributors, Inc., for 57 replacement and 11 additional 69-passenger school buses costing \$4,672,824; and be it further

Resolved, That contingent on the approval of adequate funding in its FY 1996 operating budget, the Board of Education extend the contract awarded under Bid No. 51-93, Purchase of School Buses, to District International Trucks, Inc., for 9 replacement and 11 additional 36-passenger school buses costing \$958,900; and be it further

Resolved, That contingent on the approval of adequate funding in its FY 1996 operating budget, the Board of Education award Bid No. 18-95, Purchase of School Buses, to Wantz Bus and Body Sales for five replacement 48-passenger school buses costing \$234,147; and be it further

Resolved, That financing for acquisition of the 93 buses be presented to the Board of Education for approval at a later date.

RESOLUTION NO. 4-95 Re: BID NO. 36-95, INSTALLATION OF
COMPUTER AND TV CABLE

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

WHEREAS, It is necessary to purchase and install computer and TV cable at Winston Churchill High School to accomplish Global Access objectives; and

WHEREAS, Funds for acquisition and installation of computer and TV cable are included in the FY 1995 approved capital budget; and

WHEREAS, The Board of Education advertised and received Bid No. 36-95, Installation of Computer and TV Cable, for Winston Churchill High School; and

WHEREAS, Netcome Technologies, Inc. is the lowest responsible bidder meeting specifications to provide and install the computer and TV cable; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Board of Education award Bid No. 36-95, Purchase and Installation of Computer and RV Cable, at Winston Churchill High School to Netcome Technologies, Inc. totaling \$334,285.

RESOLUTION NO. 5-95 Re: ARCHITECTURAL ADJUSTMENT - ALBERT
EINSTEIN HIGH SCHOOL

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

WHEREAS, The final plans for the Albert Einstein High School modernization project have been approved and included in the FY 1996-2001 Capital Improvements Program; and

WHEREAS, The architectural services fee requires adjustment to reflect the final construction budget's scope of work; and

WHEREAS, Staff has reviewed the adjustment and feels it is consistent with fees for similar MCPS and other school projects within the Washington metropolitan area; and

WHEREAS, Funds for the architectural fee are programmed in the capital budget for Albert Einstein High School's modernization; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the fee approved by the Board of Education for the firm of Grimm & Parker, Architects, to provide architectural services for the Albert Einstein High School modernization project be increased from \$890,000 to \$1,300,000, which is 5.8 percent of the estimated construction budget.

RESOLUTION NO. 6-95 Re: ENERGY MANAGEMENT SYSTEM
INSTALLATIONS AT VARIOUS SCHOOLS

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

WHEREAS, Bids were received on November 17, 1994, for energy management system installations at Georgian Forest and Rosemont elementary schools; and

WHEREAS, The low bids are below staff estimates, and the recommended contractors have completed 21 similar projects successfully for Montgomery County Public Schools; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Board of Education approve the following contracts for energy management system installations and assign them to the general contractors for implementation and supervision:

Georgia Forest Elementary School
Contractor: Hess Construction, Inc.
Subcontractor: Engineered Services, Inc.
Amount: \$77,830

Rosemont Elementary School
Contractor: Hess Construction, Inc.
Subcontractor: Barber-Colman Pritchett
Amount: \$70,489

Re: SCHOOL INSPECTIONS

Ms. Gutierrez agreed to do the Highland View Elementary School inspection at a time to be determined. Mrs. King agreed to do the Dr. Sally K. Ride inspection on Tuesday, January 17, at 1:30 p.m. Mrs. Gordon agreed to do the Meadow Hall Elementary School inspection at a time to be determined.

RESOLUTION NO. 7-95 Re: MONTHLY PERSONNEL REPORT

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Mr. Felton seconded by Mrs. King, 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. 8-95 Re: EXTENSION OF SICK LEAVE

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

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

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

Resolved, That the members of 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>
Brown, Tricia	Special Ed. Instruct. Asst. Viers Mill ES	20
Musgrove, Harry	Media Services Technician Sherwood HS	30
Wood, Richard	Special Ed. Instruc. Asst. Long-term Leave from Bridge School	10

RESOLUTION NO. 9-95 Re: PERSONNEL APPOINTMENT

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 following personnel appointment be approved:

<u>Appointment</u>	<u>Present Position</u>	<u>As</u>
William N. McDonald	Acting Coordinator	Coordinator, Elem.

Elem. Science

Science
Dept. of Academic
Programs
Grade N
Effective: 1-1-95Re: RACIAL/ETHNIC GROUPS IN SPECIAL
EDUCATION - OUTCOME J OF THE
SUCCESS FOR EVERY STUDENT PLAN

Dr. Vance introduced Dr. Hiawatha Fountain, associate superintendent; Dr. Raymond Bryant, director of the Department of Special Education and Related Services; Dr. Frieda Lacey, equity assurance officer; and Mr. Tony Paul, coordinator of the Program for Students with Serious Emotional Disturbance (SED). The paper before the Board addressed the outcomes included in the Success for Every Student plan. Outcome J assured that the disparities in achievement among students from various ethnic and racial groups were targeted for systemwide attention and commitment to corrective action. The Board would recall that the intent of that outcome was to eliminate disproportionate representation of African-American students within special education programs, particularly in the categories of the serious emotional disturbances and learning disabilities.

Mrs. Gemberling pointed out that this was the first in-depth discussion they had had on Outcome J. They wanted to look at data, talk about the plans that had been put in place, and hear from the equity assurance officer. They also decided to bring in the SES update at this time because it was their first area of the over-representation in special education that was going to be the focus for some of the changes in this spring's review process.

Dr. Fountain stated that this was a very complex issue which was the disproportionate representation of African-American students in special education. As a school system administrator and an African-American, he was deeply concerned personally about this matter. For a number of years they had tried to get a handle on this issue, but they believed with the onset of Success for Every Student they had the right mechanism to make a difference in this area. This was a challenging problem for school systems across the country. The U.S. Department of Education highlighted the complexity of this issue in their report to Congress. This report indicated that African-American students represented 16 percent of the public school enrollment in the country but nearly 25 percent were identified as SED. In MCPS Outcome J focused on this issue and illustrated their commitment to the systemwide actions necessary to make progress on these issues.

Dr. Fountain felt that the results of their initiatives were most encouraging. The data reflected the beginnings of a downturn in disproportionate representation. Although there was no quick fix, they believed that MCPS was on the right path in terms of specific actions that were in place now as well as the long-term perspectives for the future. The students of MCPS had his personal commitment to continue the positive direction they were taking now. In addition, he was making a commitment to the members of this Board to keep them fully informed.

Dr. Lacey reported that she had assumed her position one year ago. She knew that a plan was essential. When she started her job, she started asking herself some

questions. The first question was what was disproportionality and how was it defined. Dr. Harry at the University defined it as "the percentage of minority students in the program is larger than the percentage of that group in the educational system as a whole."

Next Dr. Lacey looked at what the historical data on African-American students placed in special education revealed. The data revealed there was disproportionality in mental retardation, SED, and specific learning disabilities. Of particular concern was the increase in SED and MR. Looking at other students, white students comprised 57.7 percent of the MCPS enrollment, and 53.9 percent of the students identified as mentally retarded were white, 55.5 percent of the students identified as SED were white, and 60 percent of the students identified as SLD were white. This was proportionate. When they looked at Hispanic students, they comprised 10.8 percent of the MCPS enrollment, and 9.7 percent were identified as MR, 5.4 percent as SED, and 11 percent as SLD. Asian students comprised 12.5 percent of the MCPS enrollment and were under-represented in the three categories.

Dr. Lacey stated that the data on African-American students was most alarming. For example, their figures for SED were 35.5 percent when they represented 18.6 percent of the MCPS student body. In the mentally retarded program it was 28.5 percent, and in LD it was 26.4 percent. This was disproportionality, and it was extreme. Dr. Harry would be working with her, Mrs. Gemberling, and DEA to further define disproportionality and to find some way of displaying the data in a consistent manner.

Dr. Lacey said that her next question was to determine what were the critical issues. In other words, why did they have this problem. The document before the Board spoke to these critical issues and provided research related to those issues. Her next question was what to do about those issues. They had to have a plan incorporating the Success for Every Student plan, and it also had to delineate further tasks in some logical fashion. She had organized these tasks according to the referral process. She said they first needed to raise the awareness level of all MCPS staff related to this issue. In one year, in-service training had been provided to all special education staff, all principal trainees, and acting assistant principals. This would be the focus of the January OSA principals meeting. They needed to target SED as a priority followed by the category of mental retardation. They had established two work groups for those issues.

Dr. Lacey called attention to the attachments to the paper before the Board. She strongly supported Attachment C because this had been a long-standing issue. They needed to put the brakes on the process. Before they assigned a stigmatizing category to any youngster, they had to look at what they were doing. Additionally they needed guidelines for assessing and identifying students as SED. Third, they needed to target systemwide pre-referral intervention strategies to assist teachers in meeting the diverse needs of all students. Mr. Paul was working on that, and they were currently piloting eight software programs in schools related to pre-referral strategies. They needed to monitor the pre-referral EMT and ARD processes, and they had established a comprehensive data base to do that and pilot it in eight schools. Finally, they needed to increase outreach to the African-American community.

Mr. Paul reported that this was the fifth update on the SED comprehensive plan. Within the comprehensive plan, it was important to look at it broadly and then focus on the pieces that related directly to what Dr. Lacey was talking about. Within the plan were

several models and pilots that delivered better services to SED students. At the heart of the plan was a focus on creating growth-oriented learning environments for all students. Research and experience showed them that to be successful with SED students they must concentrate on providing students with an array of educational opportunities within the least restrictive environment.

Mr. Paul said that as they looked at disproportionality they had to ask themselves how and where these children were being served. Were children disproportionately disturbed or was their behavior disproportionately disturbing? They had developed a comprehensive plan for all students which tried to address the needs of students, families, and staff. They had a comprehensive intervention program, and he called attention to the mental hygiene training school climate best practices piece. Within each school they were trying to do preventive proactive best practices. The idea was to train all school system including administrators, building services, cafeteria workers, and everyone in the building. They would increase their repertoire of skills when dealing with behavior that had changed significantly and had become intense and complex over the years.

Mr. Paul recognized that he and his staff could not do it all themselves. They needed the interagency piece. They needed to develop more programs in cooperation with family services, juvenile services, social services, mental health, housing, and so forth. If they recognized that the intensity and complexity of students within MCPS was changing and they took this approach to provide this intensive training in early intervention and prevention, they hoped this would have a direct relationship to pre-referral. That pre-referral piece would have a direct relationship to the disproportionality issue.

Mr. Paul explained that in the process of this they had to focus on behavior. The behavior they were dealing with in the schools was real, and these programs were real. They were not going to go away overnight.

Mr. Paul believed that they were making an impact. A cluster program consisted of two classes in a general education schools for SED students. Those were the most intense offerings. Everyone was trained in these buildings, and they wanted to see if over a one-year basis that they made an impact on the numbers of youngsters being coded. Next year they planned to eliminate the singleton SED classes. Some schools without programs had had three or more trainings. Then they had schools with no training or consultation. The figures went from two youngsters being coded to 24 youngsters being coded. They then looked specifically at African-American males, and over a one-year period the coding ranged from zero in the cluster models and zero in the singleton schools to 16 in schools with no training. This was a very powerful statistic.

Mr. Paul felt that the pilot models in best practices benefitted all children. However, they had to provide early interventions and work together to assure they had ARD procedures. They had to promote parent participation and partnership. They believed that these increased efforts combined with outstanding models and pilots should continue to make an impact. He introduced Mr. Jeff Martinez, principal of Rosemary Hills Elementary School; Ms. Dorinda Yates, principal of White Oak Middle Schools; Dr. Judy Docca, principal of Argyle Middle School; and Dr. Rebecca Newman, principal of Paint Branch High School.

Mr. Martinez said this school had gotten involved in the training because they had several students with different issues they were not used to dealing with. They were

looking at the whole special education process and at how they were viewing children. They found they were very limited in the tools they had, and Mr. Paul's office helped them through the process to look at the behaviors they were seeing. The point was whether they were looking at emotional behaviors or behaviors that were inappropriate. Sometimes these were not clear when they were working with a child. One of the benefits of the pre-referral process was SED staff did observations of students and talked to the staff about the different behaviors. As a staff, his school had gone through the full training from the management techniques all the way through the restraint techniques. This gave them an opportunity to look at what they did, how they did it, and to break down the process of looking at students with emotional issues. This gave them the confidence to be able to deal with whatever was going on. If they did have to go to a higher level of referral, they felt confident they had done all the things they could do. In terms of the school and overall climate, people felt more supportive. When they had knowledge and skills and practiced them, they felt more confident they were not alone in their classrooms. This generated discussions among the staff, and they worked as a team. They felt they had a safe environment for children and also for staff. If a crisis did come about, they did not have to wait for the principal to deal with it. One of the key elements in the process was to take away the idea of differences in levels of power within the building. Just because he was the principal didn't mean he was the one who could solve all the problems.

Ms. Yates commented that she and her school had had much of the same experience. They got into this not only for coding students but to look at the climate of the school. They wanted to empower teachers. They felt they wanted to go into inclusion, and they wanted staff to feel very confident and very comfortable as to what they were able to do in working with a variety of students. In order to do that, there had to be a change. They had to let staff know they had skills they had not utilized before. They needed training in terms of communication in order to be able to make a change in their classrooms to enable a variety of students to be successful. They had the surface management and physical restraint training, and they included their entire staff in that. One of their goals was to be one staff with no divisions. They wanted to empower their building service workers, their secretarial staff, their instructional assistants, etc. so if they saw something inappropriate they would confront that situation and know that they would be supported in that. Staff had the skills and comfort level, and students were trained to respond to them as they would to any professional staff member.

Ms. Yates stated that these efforts had been supported by Mr. Paul's office. They had been in every classroom to present a schoolwide problem-solving model. They had students who had been trained in terms of how to solve their problems. For crisis intervention, they had created teams so that if there were a major crisis intervention the whole building was networked and everyone knew what their responsibilities were. This had established open communication with instructors, and if something was not going well they could talk about strategies. They were holding parent education seminars once a marking period in the evening. They hoped that they had students, staff, and community working on the same focus. By having this, they had been able to increase their number of inclusion classes for students in the Intensity 4 program. They were much more able to provide a positive transition for students coming back from Level 5 programs. Overall, it had improved the serious incidents and had reduced the numbers of students coded for special services.

Dr. Newman reported that at the high school level, students saw teachers for 45 minutes a day which could be a depersonalized experience. They had done some staff

and student surveys and had received community input in terms of what were seen as pressing issues for Paint Branch High School. As the data came back, it became very apparent that one of the issues was climate and some issues of safety. Staff asked for some training, and students also asked for some training. They hoped that Mr. Paul's unit would be able to provide training for students. Part of the training was on school climate and how to improve it. This was primarily on prevention. They had some excellent special education programs, and one addressed the emotional needs of students coded as SED. They felt they were seeing a number of youngsters who were very visible in the school but who were not coded. They did not want these students to be coded; therefore, they looked at prevention and what the staff could do to change their behavior to make this more of a climate conducive to students doing better in school. Their training was successful, and she felt that training should be done on an on-going basis.

Dr. Newman said that as an outgrowth of that schoolwide training, they trained a small number of staff in specific crisis intervention. This involved guidance counselors, some resource teachers, the administration, and the security staff. The end result of that training was physical restraint, but probably the best thing coming out of that training was a change in attitude of the group. Staff had an increased confidence level in their ability to handle difficult situations. They wanted to de-escalate the situation and not put their hands on a youngster even in a very volatile, physical situation. The need for physical intervention had been reduced drastically in her building.

Dr. Newman indicated that they were the pilot for the comprehensive data base at the high school level. They were approached by the SED unit to be involved because they had already done a mini database themselves to track what they were doing with youngsters. There were 1500 students at Paint Branch, and 400 of these were identified as being at risk. The vast majority, 90 percent of those, were non-coded youngsters. These students were identified through the guidance counselor, and once these youngsters were identified the school tried to provide services and strategies. This information was on the database and at the end of each semester they compared their grade point average, their attendance, and the behavior with the intervention strategies used with them. They felt that a number of students were doing significantly better, and they had increased grade point averages in the first nine weeks. Perhaps the most gratifying result was they had persuaded these students to help other students at risk.

Dr. Docca reported that they were working with the SED unit because they needed some training. Their concerns were how to deal with students who were showing some dysfunctional behaviors but not necessarily needing special education services. They wanted their staff to be like the staff at White Oak. Mr. Paul's staff had met with her instructional team this summer to find out their concerns. Last month, the staff was taught how to de-escalate situations. Mr. Paul's staff confirmed that the Argyle staff had been doing the right things. Mr. Paul's staff would be back again to help her school throughout the year. In addition, his staff had interviewed and observed students to give her staff time to discuss how to work better with students. She felt that this had all been very reassuring and very helpful.

Dr. Bryant hoped that the Board felt the real enthusiasm and excitement. They had embraced the Board's leadership because it was Success for Every Student that identified Outcome J. He wanted to clear up the idea of "plan." This was not a plan. What they had been describing were action steps. These were things that were

actually going on every day in MCPS. They believed they were accepting the mandate as outlined in Success for Every Student. They recognized that this issue did not begin overnight and would not go away overnight. However, they thought they were on the road to making a major difference in Montgomery County.

Dr. Bryant also thought that what they had heard today addressed not just special education issues, but their plan addressed good educational practices within MCPS. It had to start with good education, and from that, special education came as necessary. They were beginning their actions with prevention through increased education and awareness across the system as described by Mr. Paul. To date, this training had occurred in 70 schools. They believed the training needed to continue on a systemwide basis. Dr. Lacey's training and input across the system had increased awareness of this issue. Following the principals meeting on January 19, they would have hit every base in MCPS.

Dr. Bryant noted that Attachments C and D were significant as they looked at the assessment of students. Research was significant for assessing the psychological and educational needs of culturally and ethnically different students. Given the complex education and social/cultural context of the child's behavior, assessment cannot be conducted in a mechanical fashion insensitive to differences in language, values, behavioral norms, and idiomatic expressions of distress. Great skill must be exercised in sifting through all the available information and formulating the diagnosis for all students, especially African-American males. Accurate diagnosis of serious emotional disability was a complex process that was even more challenging when ethnic and cultural differences exist between school personnel and student. Valid diagnosis of serious emotional disability must be based upon normative standards within the context of family, culture, and community. Within MCPS, assessment of serious emotional disability considered these normative standards through the use of comprehensive, culturally sensitive assessments, assessments that were multi-setting, multi-method, and multi-informant reflective of this orientation. Identification of serious emotional disability should be based upon a broad analysis and synthesis of data from multiple methods, informants, and across multiple settings.

Dr. Bryant said that the work that Dr. Lacey had done in terms of the EMT process, looking at prevention, building good instructional practices, and building on the work that Mr. Paul's unit was doing was a significant way of trying to prevent referral and coding. The reorganization of the Department of Special Education Programs and Services had enabled them to do individual case reviews of all students coming forward for an Intensity 4 or 5 request. The review looked at the continued placement of that student and the continued coding of that student. In addition, they were in the process of conducting a case-by-case review of all students within MCPS who were in programs for students considered to have mild mental retardation.

Dr. Bryant said they had talked about increased opportunities for parents to receive support. They had the parent information resource center and advocacy support for parents of Afro-American students so that during the ARD or CARD process a parent could bring an advocate along. They were tying this into the database that existed so that schools through SIMS could begin to collect and look at data. The school system was not an end-all. For this reason they had reached out to parents and were supporting Parents Supporting Parents and doing coping skills classes for other parents at Eastern Middle School. Through Mark Twain in collaboration with many community agencies, they had written a grant that had been funded to begin looking at how they could enhance community services at Mark Twain.

Dr. Bryant believed these actions were making a difference and would continue to make a difference. He asked for Board questions and comments.

Mr. Felton stated that he was pleased with the effort taken by the group. Given the recognition that the assessment had to be changed, he asked what they did with students who had previously been coded. Mr. Paul replied that if there were youngsters who had been coded and had been receiving services in self-contained classrooms, they had a marked increase in the numbers of youngsters leaving that self-contained setting and being educated more and more in the general population. To sustain that over time meant success. That success manifested itself in better grades, no significant behavioral problems, and better attendance. On the other side of the coin, those very same kinds of practices allowed them to move the youngster in the mainstream prior to going into that self-contained class or they might be able to use that self-contained class as a place for a class or two a day.

Mr. Ewing said he would like to focus on the assessment considerations as discussed at the end of the presentation. He could not agree more that it was extremely important for them to be sensitive to differences in language, values, behavioral norms, and idiomatic expressions of distress. At the same time it was important to recognize that none of this as yet defined very well what the limits were in terms of behaviors which were acceptable in the classroom and those that were not. It seemed to him that this needed to be addressed. Without that, their sensitivity might be high to student behaviors that were not usually within norms, and parents might be concerned because they heard about behaviors in the classroom that seemed to them to be well beyond the norms. That might be so for staff as well. They had the ability to influence staff perceptions through training, but parent perceptions were another matter. Parents were going to be very concerned about behaviors they regarded as disruptive. He did not know how they dealt with that in this context.

Dr. Bryant replied that in their discussions of behavior around a topic of serious emotional disability they needed to be real careful that behavior did not always mean serious emotional disability. They were acknowledging that behavior existed and might be different than a norm, but it did not necessarily mean SED. They were trying to look across the school at setting a school climate, understanding behavior in the context of that school climate, and being able to deal with this. This was the plan they were trying to implement through that training.

Mr. Paul thought that if they looked at behavior on a continuum from where they were 10 or 15 years ago to what was unacceptable today, there were certainly lots of behaviors that were unacceptable. There were lots of behaviors in schools, while inappropriate for a cultural norm of the school, that could be modified and dealt with by establishing that climate and that preventative, pro-active mode. Those differences scared parents and staff; however, what they could do was work together to set up a mutuality of respect between youngsters and staff. They could deal with those behaviors and help those youngsters succeed.

Dr. Lacey said that she thought about instruction and what was happening in that classroom. No child in any school should be disruptive to the point where that behavior interfered with the education of other students. The literature said they should start at the pre-referral level and what was happening in that classroom. They had to provide support to that teacher. They must identify the resources and the training to help assist teachers to meet the needs of all students. Teachers had to have strategies to help a

youngster having difficulty. They had to look at the interactions between teacher and child, between principal and child, and between parent and school. They could not accept inappropriate behavior, but they must provide support to their employees.

Dr. Fountain thought they were well on their way with the training. He was thinking about the instruments used to select students for special education and whether or not those instruments were really fair. For the past 18 months, they tried to look at cultural issues. He asked Mr. Brian Bartels, psychologist, to speak to the instruments.

Mr. Bartels stated that in the past a part of the SED assessment had included a personality assessment. The validity of this was equivocal. Now they were placed more emphasis on obtaining behavior rating data from teachers and parents. Teachers might identify a significant problem, but the parents might describe normal behavior outside of the school. Central to the concept of any disability was if there were a disability it should be pervasive across settings. Requiring the behavior rating measures and using culturally fair measures and requiring input from parents should level the playing field. In addition, they had several new instruments that produced a fair evaluation when they looked at cross-cultural studies. There was an equal emphasis that needed to be placed on the whole pre-referral activities. The children going through the assessment were a small number of the students who might have issues. The behavior might be real, and they needed to deal with it. The only way to deal with that was to make a concerted effort to do pre-referral interventions through the EMT committee.

Ms. Gutierrez commented that this was an excellent presentation. It was evident they had made enormous strides. As a Board member, she felt they needed to set a target of what they were expecting to see. She asked if they were going to go back and take another look at students who had been coded to see if they could come out of special education. Dr. Fountain replied that they were looking at all students in the mentally retarded program. The other part was what they did with the student who was manifesting certain kinds of behavior. They had to consider how to transition that student back into the mainstream which was also a challenge. He reported that he had submitted a plan-to-plan which was a five-year plan for special education. Ms. Gutierrez asked whether this would include goals, and Dr. Fountain assured her that it would. Dr. Lacey added that she also monitored the data on a monthly basis. In this report they showed that 35.5 of SED students were African American, but by December, 1994, it was 34.6 percent. This was a start.

Dr. Cheung thought that the presentation of material was very, very good. As they all knew, in order to provide good services they had to have good data and information. He hoped that the information Mr. Paul presented was on real students rather than a survey or review. He asked how this microcomputer database system fit in with SIMS 2.0. Dr. Newman replied that they had struggled with their system and were still struggling with it. However, they had not lost sight of each individual student they were working with. If she had her choice, she would bring these youngsters to the Board and let them tell the Board where their lives had gone.

*Ms. Gutierrez left the meeting at this point.

Dr. Cheung imagined that the individual student profile was longitudinal and not frozen at one moment. Dr. Newman agreed and indicated that they had built into their database a measure by which youngsters considered to be successful were pulled off

into another database. They continued to feed in grade point average and attendance, and they hoped to fill in some information after the student had graduated. Dr. Cheung was pleased to learn that they were collecting good information which would help them improve and provide good services to students.

Dr. Vance stated that he did not think there was a single issue which was more important or significant for the future of the school system. There was a controversy raging now regarding the bell curve, and for all the statements made no one had come out with a fact-finding, definitive, non-emotional response to what the behaviorists were saying. What MCPS staff was saying was that they must resolve the disproportionality issue. While they had responded to Mr. Ewing's question, the question was there with the majority of their parents in terms of the impact of these youngsters. As the diversity population grew and expanded in Montgomery County, this was increasingly going to be an issue which would impact the continued confidence citizens had in the school system. He thanked staff for the presentation.

On behalf of the Board, Mrs. Gordon thanked staff for the excellent presentation which was very helpful to the Board. As usual, Mr. Paul had made an outstanding presentation. She had some questions about assessments, mental retardation, and learning disabilities, but she would forward these to Dr. Fountain.

Re: GLOBAL ACCESS UPDATE

Dr. Vance introduced Dr. Joseph Villani, associate superintendent; Ms. Lani Seikaly, director of the Department of Media and Technology; Ms. Kitty Blumsack, coordinator of the School Improvement Training Unit; and Mr. Jeffrey Levin, BDM Federal Incorporated, project manager for Global Access.

Dr. Villani reported that they did have a large number of staff, students, and parents in the audience today. Today, they would give the Board an update on the activities of BDM and to present a training model they had been using to assist staff in prototype schools to restructure classrooms and provide models of instruction to take advantage of the technology.

The global access plan was adopted by the Board of Education nine months ago. Global access meant equipping and connecting of every classroom, media center, and office in the school system so that people could communicate with each other, access information, and share data and information. This also meant that outside resources could be brought into the classroom. In classrooms, the machinery could be used to present lessons in various ways. The second component was the training they were providing. Global access was the reform initiative for Montgomery County Public Schools because they were using this as a transition mode to transform instruction. They had to provide a very large amount of training to staff as well as on-going support. The third dimension of the plan was to plan an implementation of technology so that there would be a seamless merger between administration and instruction. The connectivity and machinery in place for purposes of instruction needed to be useful for purposes of school management.

Dr. Villani commented that the implementation plan they had been using so far had focused on the planning necessary to create the connectivity and in developing in teachers the competencies and the vision necessary for full utilization of the technological tools. They were doing program development from the inside out. They were trying to generate in teachers a vision of what was possible so that teachers could look at their own classroom settings and devise and create new ways to deliver services. In addition, all coordinators as they worked on programs were developing ways and tools for teachers to integrate into the instructional program. If reform efforts were to take root, they must have a partnership among teachers, staff, parents, and students. They had involved parents in program development and implementation, and they were very proud of this. They believed if efforts were to persist, they needed to be developed in partnership with all of the major players.

Mr. Levin reported that they were working on getting schools wired to allow communication within the school, getting equipment installed along with software, and connecting schools together. This was the infrastructure of global access. The training component and changes in the curriculum were their other large challenges. Of the seven pilot schools, two came into the program with a physical infrastructure in place, one just received contract approval for wiring, and the remaining four would be before the Board in the near future. They now had a bulletin board system in place. This was called First Class and allowed teachers and administrators to get an appreciation for how the information exchange would facilitate what global access was trying to do. First Class appeared to be quite successful and was really taking off.

Mr. Levin indicated that in the course of a wide-area network committee, they had an offer from the National Institutes of Health to provide Internet connectivity to MCPS for at least two years. From a technical perspective, he thought this would be a very high quality connection and would save MCPS a considerable amount of money. In November they presented this committee with an engineering model for the wide-area network which had been accepted by the committee. That would serve to tie together the pilot schools and would be the framework for future expansion of the global access program. This model incorporated existing networking resources that MCPS had already put in place.

In regard to procurement, Mr. Levin explained that they had made several recommendations on ways to streamline and improve the procurement process. They were suggesting contracting mechanisms and putting more burdens and responsibility on individual contractors. They were suggesting more accountability for testing of systems and wiring so MCPS could concern themselves with higher issues of actually supporting the system. The final topic was the standards process. He believed that the standards institutionalized in global access were the glue that would hold the whole process together. They had standards for wiring, equipment, network interfaces, software, etc. These were crucial to make sure that global access continued over the next years in a smooth process.

Ms. Blumsack stated that she wanted to highlight several things about the training. They were changing the paradigm they had about training. It used to be that if people said they wanted technology training, they would give them Windows and everyone would learn about Windows by a certain date. That was not happening because no everyone needed to know Windows and not everyone had a DOS machine. They were looking at training as needed, when it was needed, how it was needed, and who needed it the most. The second major component was coaching. It was coaching by their own staff, by people in the community, by parents, and students. The third was the teacher as a researcher studying best practices. The last piece was the direct relationship to what actually happened in the classroom. Her clients used to be the teachers, and today at the Board table they would see students because they were the clients. She showed the Board a video highlighting this training.

Ms. Nancy Carey, science teacher at Lee Middle School, remarked that she taught eighth grade science and an elective on the Chesapeake Bay for students in the seventh and eighth grade. The Chesapeake Bay Streams Studies class was selected by her principal to be one of the county's global access research and experimentation projects. The training she had received was unique. They were trained in applications that were directly related to what they were currently working on in the classroom. For example, at the last session she learned how to import video footage from a Smith Island field trip into Persuasion. One of her students had been working on importing sound which helped them with one of their multimedia presentations.

Ms. Carey reported that technology in her classroom had helped to remove some student barriers by serving the multiple learning styles of students. One of her students, Musa Kamara, came to Montgomery County in January, 1992 and entered into the METS program. He came to Lee with very little reading. Next semester he would be one of her student technology aides along with John Sustar working on hypercards and spreadsheets. Dominique Trinh had opened up communications with an astro-physicist at the National Air and Space Museum, and next semester he would be her communications expert. Ms. Carey believed that global access had made a

dramatic impact on the students and herself. She had always preferred student-centered learning, and since global access she had become even more of a facilitator in her classroom with the students as the directors. They always had a goal in mind, but the path taken by students was one of their own choosing. The Chesapeake Bay class was a meshing of technology, students, parents, the community, and professionals learning together.

Mr. Sustar remarked that he was the software specialist for the Persuasion program. He said the great thing about the Chesapeake Bay program was that they never knew what they were going to learn the next day. Working in this class helped him break through new boundaries. His last school did not emphasize this technology, and he felt very fortunate to have learned so much in only one semester. Ms. Carey encouraged students to experiment which gave them more freedom to learn. The Persuasion program dealt with how to make presentations, and he was now trying to import sound and music into his presentation. His future would involve technology, and he felt it was very important for him to understand it.

Mr. Kamara stated that his science class was different because of technology and the computers. In class they studied the environment, and they did many experiments. One project was looking at how Americans disposed of trash. They had picked up trash along the Potomac and had sorted it by type. He entered the data into the computer and had sent a graph to other schools. He planned to put the graph on internet with a letter. He said that the environment was going to waste, and they had to stop it. His class was also doing river studies, and they looked for information using the computer, encyclopedias, and books. They also wrote to agencies in different states to ask for information. From what he had learned in his class, he wrote about the fish of the Chesapeake Bay. He thought that people were destroying the Bay, and he planned to read the book to elementary school students and to patients in the Children's Hospital.

Mr. Trinh said that he, too, was an eighth grader at Lee Middle School. He was the internet specialist there. He was working on a project about the Chesapeake Bay. His class was one of a kind because they had the equipment to access information. They analyzed the information they had gathered in order to make a presentation. They learned from each other, and they took many field trips via internet to places like Japan and Oregon to learn from other students and share information about the Chesapeake Bay. He had learned to access the information highway. He had learned how to teach students, and he learned how to work in partnership with other students. Students who were not very enthusiastic about learning before were motivated to express their own creativity. The Global Access program taught them in a way they had never been taught before. It encouraged students to learn independently and to work with everyone.

Mrs. Carol Hyatt explained that she was here as an individual parent with a strong interest in what technology could do to facilitate communication and learning. She was excited by what was happening in Montgomery County because they were making great strides. However, this was a challenge. The challenge was greatest when it came to training. Training could not be accomplished in one sitting. She had seen increased collaboration and communication among staff, parents, and students.

Mrs. Hyatt was pleased to have been able to take part in the training provided for middle school prototype staff. This gave her a sense of where she would like to see them, and she wished they had the staff to do more of that kind of training sooner. Mrs. Hyatt stated that one of the problems was that they were asking people to plunge in before they really had a sense of what their vision was. In that training, teachers became aware of what they could do for students. She wished that the Board members could participate in that training. They were talking not about technology but about reforming how learning occurred in classrooms. They were not yet equipped to deliver the training they needed. They needed more staff, and they needed at least one site for hands-on training during the school day. They needed release time for teachers. She commended MCPS staff for their efforts to make training happen and for their efforts to take advantage of the community and parents who were willing and eager to help.

Mrs. King stated that this was all very exciting. It was particularly good to listen to the enthusiasm of the students. The more students spread their enthusiasm and knowledge, the more excited other people got about getting on a computer. She urged the students to keep spreading their enthusiasm. She agreed with the importance of teacher training. She had toured Damascus High School and had seen their technology lab. Without the experience, enthusiasm, and technical knowledge of the teacher, the lab was just a place to house computers.

Dr. Cheung commented that it was a fantastic presentation, especially from the students. He remarked that when you taught, you learned more. They were witnessing the beginning of learning for the 21st century information and technological society. Current teaching methods had to be changed because students were learning more from these projects. This would create greater demands for teachers to be facilitators. He was sure that with technology that students would learn faster than the teachers which made some adults uncomfortable. It was important for them to look at how to use information once they got all this information. Learning for learning's sake without objectives and directions was not too effective. He would like to see each student and teacher with a personal computer that they could take home and work with it. Unfortunately this required resources. He hated to see computers locked up in a lab on the weekends or in the evening.

Mr. Felton thanked them for their presentation. He asked whether they had examples of how they had been able to get their fellow students more involved because of this type of environment. Mr. Sustar replied that he had introduced Dominique to Persuasion, and he had introduced a lot of other students to Persuasion. Students wanted to get into it because they wanted to do what he could do with computers. Mr. Trinh said that when he saw John working with the computers, he wanted to create something like that. He, too, came in early in the morning to work and ask questions. He was now able to use the internet to get information and to talk to people.

Mr. Ewing remarked that every time Ms. Blumsack came before the Board she managed to engender immense enthusiasm for training. However, there was a curious dichotomy in which everyone in MCPS believed that they had an enormous training job to do in a whole range of areas, but the County Council seemed to lack enthusiasm for this. When the Board went to the Council for funding, training was not high on the Council's priority list. He hoped that they could find a way to have Ms. Blumsack, teachers, and students make a presentation to the Council to generate some enthusiasm for the training funds that were needed. He was not satisfied that they had

adequate funding for training in the superintendent's proposed budget. He would be interested in knowing what increments of additional funding might make sense for global access and for other kinds of training beyond what was in the superintendent's budget now.

Mrs. Gordon thanked staff and students for the presentation. She said it was always nice to see students take the things they learned in school and put them into real life. The County Council had asked questions about global access and how this fit into the real world. These were the kinds of things the Board and Council needed to know.

RESOLUTION NO. 10-95 Re: SCHOOL CALENDAR FOR 1995-96

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

WHEREAS, The establishment of school terms by the County Board of Education is required by state law; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the school calendar for 1995-96 as reflected in the alternative be adopted.

Re: BOARD/SUPERINTENDENT COMMENTS

1. Mr. Ewing recalled that about three and a half years ago the Board had a reunion of former and present Board members. He had suggested to the Board that he wanted to do this again this spring. Last time they got some help from former Board members who attended the meeting and spoke to other political leaders on behalf of the Board in terms of funding. This was not the purpose of the reunion, but it was a wonderful benefit.

2. Mr. Ewing made the following statement:

"All of us have heard both today and in other ways, in fact, in every possible way from people in the Whitman community about the issue of how we deal with the Whitman population problem. They couch it in terms of 'don't change the boundaries.' Obviously boundary changes are theoretically a possible way of dealing with the problem. I can't speak for other Board members, but for myself that's not the way I think we ought to solve this. I would hope that the community would be a little patient until we receive the recommendations and deal with them. I want to say that as far as I know there are no active or inactive conspiracies, past promises, and political influence, past pressures on the Board or anybody else that weigh in on this. I have heard lots of speculation about that sort of thing. I suppose that is inevitable, but in fact as far as I can tell the Board simply wanted the superintendent to look at some other options and bring the Board his recommendations. It is as simple as that. Among the targets of the conspiracy theories is the Bethesda Academy of Performing Arts. They are not, I think, the villain in the piece. I don't know that there is a villain at all, but they don't want to move if they can help it. That is obvious and natural, but I don't see that they are engaged in any kind of political games at all. I hope that people in the community will not see them in that light and will not attempt to punish them for a situation that is the product of simple population growth and perhaps a decision some years ago not to add those extra classrooms onto Whitman. I am hopeful that we can get through this process fairly soon and that when we do we will have come up with a

reasonable and sensible solution to the problem that doesn't cause anybody any longer to think there are villains and victims and so forth. I hope the superintendent will let us know as soon as he can what he is going to do in the way of recommendations."

3. Mr. Felton stated that he would like to have placed on the agenda a review of the procurement process and participation by minority contractors. Mrs. Gordon replied that this was an item to be scheduled, and she believed the staff had prepared a presentation which had been postponed because one of the participants was unable to attend. The Board officers would schedule this as soon as possible

RESOLUTION NO. 11-95 Re: CLOSED MEETINGS - JANUARY 12 AND 23, 1995

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Mrs. King seconded by Mr. Ewing, 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 January 12, 1995, at 9 p.m. in closed session to discuss contract negotiations; and be it further

Resolved, That the Board of Education of Montgomery County hereby conduct a portion of its meeting on January 23, 1995, at 7:30 p.m. in closed session to discuss personnel matters, matters protected from public disclosure by law, and other issues including consultation with counsel to obtain legal advice; and be it further

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

RESOLUTION NO. 12-95 Re: MINUTES OF OCTOBER 24, 1994

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

Resolved, That the minutes of October 24, 1994, be approved.

RESOLUTION NO. 13-95 Re: MINUTES OF NOVEMBER 9, 1994

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

Resolved, That the minutes of November 9, 1994, be approved.

RESOLUTION NO. 14-95 Re: MINUTES OF NOVEMBER 21, 1994

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

Resolved, That the minutes of November 21, 1994, be approved.

RESOLUTION NO. 15-95 Re: MINUTES OF NOVEMBER 22, 1994

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

Resolved, That the minutes of November 22, 1994, be approved.

Re: REPORT ON CLOSED SESSION -
DECEMBER 13, 1994

On November 21, by the unanimous vote of members present, the Board of Education voted to conduct a closed session on Tuesday, December 13, 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 Tuesday, December 13, 1994, from 9 a.m. to 10:10 a.m. and from 12:45 to 2:25 p.m. The meetings took place in the Room 120 of the Carver Educational Services Center, Rockville, Maryland.

The Board met to discuss the monthly personnel report and the appointments of the principals of Gaithersburg MS #2 and Damascus MS #2. Votes taken in closed session were confirmed in open session. The Board authorized further negotiations for the purchase of the Northeast areas high school site. The Board also discussed another site. The members of the Board received an update on the transfer process from its attorney. Board members also discussed the timing of transfer appeals and the impact of the transfer process on special programs.

At noon the Board consulted with its attorney on the implications of the Ruesch decision. Board members also discussed implications of the Baltimore ACLU lawsuit with their attorney. The Board then reviewed and adjudicated the following appeals: No. 1994-18, 1994-21, 1994-27, and T-1994-47. Board members selected members for Board of Education advisory committees and Board of Education subcommittees.

In attendance at the closed session were Steve Abrams, Judy Bresler, Ray Bryant, Alan Cheung, Wendy Converse, Blair Ewing, Reggie Felton, Tom Fess, David Fischer, Phinnize Fisher, Hiawatha Fountain, Kathy Gemberling, Bea Gordon, Zvi Greismann, Ana Sol Gutierrez, Marie Heck, Nancy King, John Larson, Elfreda Massie, Brian Porter, Phil Rohr, Roger Titus, Janice Turpin, Paul Vance, Bill Wilder, Mary Lou Wood, and Melissa Woods.

Re: APPEALS

Mr. Fess announced that Ms. Gutierrez had signed the appeals prior to leaving the meeting, and Mr. Abrams would also sign the appeals.

RESOLUTION NO. 16-95 Re: BOE APPEAL NO. T-1994-47

On motion of Mrs. King seconded by Mr. Felton, the following resolution was adopted with Dr. Cheung, Ms. Converse, Mr. Ewing, Mr. Felton, Mrs. Gordon, Ms. Gutierrez, and Mrs. King voting in the affirmative; Mr. Abrams voting in the negative:

Resolved, That the Board of Education adopt its Decision and Order in BOE Appeal No. T-1994-17.

RESOLUTION NO. 17-95 Re: BOE APPEAL NO. 1994-29

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education adopt its Decision and Order in BOE Appeal No. 1994-29, a tuition matter.

RESOLUTION NO. 18-95 Re: BOE APPEAL NO. 1994-24

On motion of Mrs. King seconded by Dr. Cheung, the following resolution was adopted with Dr. Cheung, Ms. Converse, Mr. Ewing, Mr. Felton, Mrs. Gordon, Ms. Gutierrez, and Mrs. King voting in the affirmative; Mr. Abrams not participating:

Resolved, That the Board of Education adopt its Decision and Order in BOE Appeal No. 1994-24, a tuition matter.

Re: NEW BUSINESS

It seemed to Mr. Ewing that they should start scheduling the monthly financial report for Board discussion because they now had a partial freeze because of financial conditions.

Re: ITEMS OF INFORMATION

Board members received the following items of information:

1. Items in Process
2. Staff Response to Career/Technology Education Committee
3. Construction Progress Report
4. Monthly Financial Report

RESOLUTION NO. 19-95 Re: ADJOURNMENT

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education adjourn its meeting at 4:45 p.m.

PRESIDENT

SECRETARY

PLV:mlw