

RESOLUTION NO. 494-95 Re: PROCUREMENT CONTRACTS FOR MORE THAN
\$25,000

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

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

52-95 Frozen Foods, Fish and Eggs

Awardees

Carroll County Foods	\$	59,593	
John Sexton Company/dba Continental Foods		10,416	
Dori Foods, Inc.		18,514	
Markolf Enterprises, Inc.		302	
Sandler Foods - Contract Division		12,121	
Shane Meat Company		146	
Smelkinson/Sysco Foods Service Company		<u>6,020</u>	
Total	\$	107,112	

53-95 Processed Meats

Awardees

Carroll County Foods	\$	10,124	
John Sexton Company/dba Continental Foods		21,692	
Karetas Foods, Inc.		109	*
Shane Meat Company		<u>7,938</u>	
Total	\$	39,863	

54-95 Frozen Baked Pizza

Awardees

Better Baked Pizza	\$	166,165	
Nardone Brothers Baking Company		126,000	
Profera, Inc.		<u>500,490</u>	
Total	\$	792,655	

55-95 Ice Cream, Ice Milk and Novelties

Awardee

Briggs Ice Cream Company	\$	150,000	
--------------------------	----	---------	--

209-95 Novell Software Installation - Extension

Awardee

United Information Systems, Inc. \$ 25,000

249-95 Liquid Crystal Display Data Imaging System

Awardees

Kunz, Inc. \$ 9,159
 Nicholas P. Pipino Associates 65,340
 Total \$ 74,499

BCPS Lacrosse Equipment

3-309-95

Awardees (Please see note below)

Bacharach-Rasin Company
 Bill Fritz Sports
 Passon's Sports
 Shiflett and Horn Sporting Goods
 Simply Soccer
 Sports Stop, Inc.
 Tuskewe Krafts *
 Total \$ 60,000

MORE THAN \$25,000

\$1,249,129

Note: Contract amounts will be based on individual school requirements

* Denotes MFD vendors

RESOLUTION NO. 495-95 Re: ENGINEERING SERVICES - RANDOLPH AND
 BETHESDA MAINTENANCE/TRANSPORTATION
 DEPOTS

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

WHEREAS, It is necessary to appoint an engineering firm to provide professional and technical services for the industrial stormwater management improvements to the Randolph and Bethesda maintenance/transportation depots; and

WHEREAS, Funds for planning were appropriated as part of the FY 1996 Capital Budget; and

July 24, 1995

WHEREAS, An Engineering Selection Committee, in accordance with procedures adopted by the Board of Education on May 13, 1986, identified Harris, Smariga & Associates, Inc., as the most qualified firm to provide the necessary engineering services; and

WHEREAS, Staff has negotiated a fee for necessary engineering services; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Montgomery County Board of Education enter into a contractual agreement with the engineering firm of Harris, Smariga & Associates, Inc., to provide professional engineering services for the improvements to the Randolph and Bethesda maintenance/transportation depots for a fee of \$62,500, which is 8.25 percent of the construction budget.

RESOLUTION NO. 496-95 Re: AWARD OF CONTRACT FOR MAINTENANCE
PROJECT AT FALLSMEAD ELEMENTARY
SCHOOL

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

WHEREAS, The following sealed bids to replace the boiler and an air conditioning unit at Fallsmead Elementary School were received on July 7, 1995, in accordance with MCPS procurement practices, with work to begin August 25, 1995, and to be completed by October 2, 1995:

<u>Bidder</u>	<u>Amount</u>
1. Interstate Service Company, Inc.	\$ 69,824
2. EMD Mechanical Specialists	84,778
3. G.W. Mechanical Contractors, Inc.	96,000
4. E.J. Snyder, Inc.	99,500
5. Mech-Air Inc.	101,000
6. M & M Welding & Fabricators, Inc.	108,000
7. Edward Kocharian & Co., Inc.	109,915
8. American Combustion Industries, Inc.	120,228
9. Calvert Mechanical, Inc.	160,630

and

WHEREAS, The low bid is below the staff estimate of \$76,000, and funds are available to award the contract; and

WHEREAS, Interstate Service Company, Inc., has completed similar projects successfully for Montgomery County Public Schools; now therefore be it

July 24, 1995

RESOLUTION NO. 502-95 Re: PRICE INCREASE IN THE FOOD SERVICE PROGRAM

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Dr. Cheung seconded by Mrs. King, the following resolution was adopted unanimously (Mr. McCullough voting in the negative):

WHEREAS, FY 1996 supply and salary costs will have increased significantly since FY 1994, the last time prices were increased; and

WHEREAS, The cost to provide meals will increase due to changes in the federal program guidelines for meal proportions; and

WHEREAS, It is necessary to maintain a financially solvent food service enterprise fund; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the price of the elementary lunch be increased from \$1.40 to \$1.45, secondary lunch from \$1.50 to \$1.55, adult lunches from \$2.30 to \$2.40, and a la carte items by 5 per cent; and be it further

Resolved, That the price increases be effective September 5, 1995.

RESOLUTION NO. 503-95 Re: PERSONNEL APPOINTMENT

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

Resolved, That the following personnel appointment be approved:

<u>Appointment</u>	<u>Present Position</u>	<u>As</u>
Bonnie G. Dougherty	Acting Asst. Principal Clopper Mill ES	Principal Ritchie Park ES Effective: 7-25-95

RESOLUTION NO. 504-95 Re: PERSONNEL APPOINTMENT

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

Resolved, That the following personnel appointment be approved:

<u>Appointment</u>	<u>Present Position</u>	<u>As</u>
Janet L. Dunn	Acting Asst. Principal Beall ES	Principal Takoma Park ES Effective: 7-25-95

July 24, 1995

RESOLUTION NO. 505-95 Re: PERSONNEL REASSIGNMENT

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

Resolved, That the following personnel reassignment be approved:

<u>Reassignment</u>	<u>From</u>	<u>To</u>
Robert E. Hatchel	Acting Principal East Silver Spring ES	Principal East Silver Spring ES Effective: 7-25-95

RESOLUTION NO. 506-95 Re: PERSONNEL TRANSFER

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

Resolved, That the following personnel transfer be approved:

<u>Transfer</u>	<u>From</u>	<u>To</u>
Rebecca K. Newman	Principal Paint Branch HS	Principal Thomas S. Wootton HS Effective: 7-25-95

RESOLUTION NO. 507-95 Re: PERSONNEL TRANSFERS

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

Resolved, That the following personnel transfers be approved:

<u>Transfer</u>	<u>From</u>	<u>To</u>
Sarah S. Pelham	Asst. Principal Albert Einstein HS	Asst. Principal Ridgeview MS Effective: 7-25-95
Carrie H. Miller	Asst. Principal Martin Luther King MS	Asst. Principal Albert Einstein HS Effective: 7-25-95

RESOLUTION NO. 508-95 Re: PERSONNEL APPOINTMENT

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

Resolved, That the following personnel appointment be approved:

<u>Appointment</u>	<u>Present Position</u>	<u>As</u>
George H. Margolies	Asst. Superintendent for Compliance Baltimore City Schools	Staff Director Office of the BOE Effective: 8-25-95

Re: CORPORATE PARTNERSHIP ON MANAGERIAL
EXCELLENCE

Dr. Vance stated that the Board had a copy of the proposal to continue the efforts of the Corporate Partnership. He thanked Mr. Larry Shulman and other members of CPME who had continued to volunteer their time and energy towards helping MCPS improve its administrative functions. The vast majority of CPME's original recommendations had been fully or partially implemented. The efforts to implement the recommendations would continue.

The question before the Board of Education this evening and the community at large was the extent to which the corporate relationship should be maintained, strengthened, modified, and taken to new or greater heights. It was Dr. Vance's view that the various departments with corporate partners had continued to engage in thoughtful and productive liaisons. He had concluded that the future might very well be in rethinking the role and purpose of CPME and to decide whether such initiatives might well be invested in the instructional side of their house where headway had already been made by the Montgomery Education Connection, the Alliance for Educational Excellence, and the Chamber of Commerce. Strategic planning among all these groups as well as other potential partners such as the High Tech Council, the Private Industry Council, and the MCPS Foundations might be a source of great dividends for the corporate leaders of Montgomery County.

Dr. Vance noted that the paper was not without issues and concerns. He said that one of his concerns was that staff might be unable to commit the time and other resources required to work on projects identified by the not-for-profit corporation. They had priorities approved by the Board, and in a time of economic belt tightening it might not be possible to make further commitments. Another area of concern would be the impact on other business partnerships such as MEC, Adopt-a-School, and the Chambers. This was a reaction to the designation of the not-for-profit corporation was the designated communication link between the business community and MCPS. However, the benefits emerged because MCPS could continue to build on the successes of CPME. There would be an opportunity to expand the number of companies involved in partnerships with other administrative units in MCPS. This would continue to provide expertise to individual managers and units with specific concerns. They would continue to have corporate advocates for the future success and well being of MCPS.

Mr. Shulman agreed that CPME did not fix everything because they could never fix everything totally. This was an incremental process, and he thought they had made progress. In terms of the recent of reorganization that impacted the MIS function in the school system, CPME felt good about this. He thought that CPME members had learned a lot. A lot of people came with their own ideas about how government and school systems operated, and as a past member of the State Board of Education he had learned a lot.

Mr. Shulman remarked that the working together as a partnership was a very unique thing which was part of the reason for its success. They had looked back at whether or not this effort should continue; however, it was the Board's decision. The suggestion CPME had come up with related to a loose organization that would work with the schools. The companies that wished to continue and the companies that wished to join would be paired up with different departments in MCPS. They would also work toward an annual systemwide operational project to be agreed upon.

Mr. Shulman stated that they had thought about doing some kind of annual report to the Board of Education. They would be available to Board members and the superintendent on particular projects. The corporation would meet on a quarterly basis, and there would be an executive committee of seven, four from the private sector and three from the school system. One of those from the school system might be a principal. The deputy superintendent might serve as the executive vice president of the group, and the third person might be a manager.

In regard to Dr. Vance's comments, Mr. Shulman agreed that the amount of staff time available was limited. This would be a decision the Board would have to make in terms of weighing of value of something of this nature. He did not think that they looked at themselves as the only link to the business community. The organizations mentioned by Dr. Vance served different purposes; however, at a point in time it would behoove the school system and the business community to look at the big picture. He did not know whether this was the right time to undertake this. He knew there were lots of people out there who were interested in helping the school system, but at times they stepped on each other's shoes.

Mr. Abrams commented that the focus of the recommendation was to continue on the business side; however, they had discussed having CPME look at the instructional side of the house. He asked why they did not pursue that course. Mr. Shulman replied that this was the Board's decision to ask them to do this. It would be presumptive of them to suggest that. They concentrated on what they were doing in their companies to support business functions. If the Board wanted them to look at the instructional side, they would be more than happy to consider this.

Mr. Felton commended the group in terms of their support for the school system. He asked whether the group had discussed a potential conflict of interest wherein the community might see some efforts as an opportunity for business to market their products. Mr. Shulman replied that this was something they had discussed from the beginning of CPME. They tried to avoid in all cases putting in a computer firm to evaluate computer functions. They looked at other situations where someone might have wanted to bid on something; therefore, a rule was established that companies could not bid for at least a year. However, he thought that somewhere along the line this would happen. Nevertheless, they had to look at whether the help provided by corporations was worth the risk.

Mr. Ewing was delighted that they had made the proposal. He remarked that they owed the CPME a huge debt of thanks. He knew they would want to continue in some fashion to work together. They needed to keep at the effort to make their business operations as efficient as possible. He believed that they had made great progress with the help of CPME. He was encouraged that MCPS staff and the superintendent had been so responsive to the CPME recommendations. He was very enthusiastic about finding a way to continue this effort. He shared the superintendent's concern over resources because MCPS had not fared particularly well in this current budget year. He had been told by one of the CPME partners that the Council would be astonished if they truly understood what Mr. Shulman was saying about the need for investment in modernization in order to be able to be efficient in the future. He hoped that the Board could schedule this soon for further discussion and action.

Ms. Gutierrez said she was an enthusiastic supporter of what had happened. She thought that the CPME effort had surpassed their expectations as to the benefit it had been for the school system. It was clear to her why they would want to continue it. There were areas they had not really addressed and other areas that could be improved. She did have a couple of questions about the non-profit organization and the advocacy role. She wondered about their having a member of the Board as part of the steering committee. She asked about the advantage in having a much more formal organization. CPME had been very much of an ad hoc group, and she thought that their role had been advisory. She sensed that the formalization would take away some of the flexibility and openness. Now they matched up companies with departments which was a natural way to continue expanding.

Mr. Shulman replied that some people thought that ad hoc groups were the best groups because they had the ability to focus on specifics. However, he thought that after a couple of years these groups ceased to be ad hoc. He believed that the spontaneity of CPME was waning which was normal. They needed an infrastructure to keep the organization moving. For example, CPME did not have a means or a mandate to bring in other companies.

Ms. Gutierrez commented that CPME had succeeded because it was a one-on-one and a personal relationship without constraints and approvals. Mr. Shulman explained that they had structured the new organization with an executive committee so that it did not have lots of rules and regulations. Ms. Gutierrez thought that the advocacy role was very important. She said there were opportunities they had not fully explored for strengthening that advocacy. If they taught the lessons learned to the rest of the business community, they would increase the buy in. She would like them to give the advocacy role more thought. They needed to sell the idea that the school system was fundamental to the success of every business. As far as looking at the other side of MCPS, she said that while it would be interesting to have their view on instruction, CPME could be most effective in areas in which they had expertise and natural strengths.

Dr. Cheung expressed his appreciation to CPME. He agreed that the education of children was an investment that benefitted the entire community. In administration there were three major areas: operational, technical, and strategic. CPME had looked at the operational aspects, and he would like them to begin to look at the technical and strategic. As a Board member, he would like to learn from other boards including those of major corporations.

Dr. Cheung noted that they had wanted to include a principal on their executive board. He would like to get some viewpoints on the cluster concept and the interrelationship among and between the high school and the feeder schools. This would help them improve how they planned for and administered a whole cluster. In the area of executive information, he would like them to look at the needs at the policy level. The Board wanted to know whether the school system was operating efficiently and effectively. He pointed out that the corporations had spent resources in terms of volunteer hours, equipment, and in-kind contributions. He would like to see corporations include involvement with the public schools as part of their strategic plan. It certainly was part of the strategic plan for MCPS.

Mrs. Gordon joined with her colleagues in extending the Board's appreciation for everything that CPME had done. Beyond what they had done with the school system, some CPME partners had assisted the Board's strategic planning subcommittee. She suggested that the CPME or the new organization could also work with the Board's subcommittees. She had heard support among Board members for a continuation of the group and the need to build on something that had worked very well. She said they would schedule this for an additional discussion. Board members might want to contact individual members of CPME to clarify or follow up on issues raised this evening. She thanked them for their presentation.

*Mr. Abrams left the meeting at this point.

Re: MCPS IMPLEMENTATION OF MSDE BYLAW ON
MULTICULTURAL EDUCATION

Dr. Vance introduced Dr. Mary Helen Smith, acting associate superintendent; Dr. Cindy Sullivan, director of the Department of Academic Programs; and Mr. Woodrow Grant, branch chief, Equity Assurance and Compliance, Maryland State Department of Education. Dr. Vance stated that MCPS had had a firm commitment to multicultural education since 1969 when the Board of Education issued a human relations policy statement that set goals and guidelines for educating students to respect and appreciate all people in their culturally diverse society. These goals were further defined by recommendations in the 1990 report by Dr. Edmund W. Gordon which was a study of minority student achievement in MCPS. The findings of that report were the cornerstone of the Success for Every Student plan which detailed strategies and tasks to ensure equity and excellence in MCPS.

Dr. Vance noted that, in addition, MCPS staff participated in the drafting of the new state regulation, "Education That Is Multicultural." The new regulation required the development and implementation of five-year action plans and annual progress reports. The Montgomery County Board of Education had considered the development of a policy on multicultural education and requested a policy analysis. He recalled that during the discussion he recommended that the state regulation be published in the MCPS policies and regulations handbook, and the Board concurred with this recommendation.

This evening the staff would present the MCPS five-year action plan with contained current initiatives and a description of planned tasks for achieving the goals of the regulation. A countywide steering committee would review the plan and make recommendations for systematic implementation. The plan would then be submitted to MSDE in September, 1995.

Dr. Smith reported that MCPS staff had been actively working with MSDE on the development of the regulation. MCPS staff had been consulted because for the last six years they had consistently included multicultural materials in their curriculum. The three items of information in the Board folder showed the specific attention that was given to multiculturalism in curricula.

Dr. Smith explained that the compendium provided to Board members was a draft, and additional things would be added to it as it was being reviewed. It was the first of five years worth of documents that needed to be developed and submitted. There were other groups that needed to review this draft. They used Success for Every Student as a framework to build from, and they had included planned activities that related to other school system policies, initiatives, and action areas. She also reported that three MCPS

staff members had received in-service training on the new state regulation and had developed a course for MCPS staff.

Dr. Sullivan stated that the regulation required that all LEAs in the state develop a five-year plan for implementation. It further required that accountability would be assessed in four major areas: curriculum, instruction, staff development, and instructional resources. In order to implement the plan, staff looked very carefully at the charge. They examined their current status, and they looked at their history from 1969 to 1989 when OIPD issued the first mission on the infusion of multiple perspectives in the curriculum. The Gordon report further charged that they should follow the plan to infuse as opposed to any parallel structure or separate curriculum.

Dr. Sullivan indicated that the regulation stipulated the five-year plan should address the four areas as well as the Maryland State Performance Program outcomes. The Success for Every Student document emerged as the most logical vehicle for that implementation. They wanted to make sure the vehicle used for implementation would not be considered something that was considered to be an add-on by staff. In terms of its goals and outcomes, the Success document had a very striking resemblance to the regulation. This document was familiar to staff, and its mandate was clear and systemwide. They had provided the Board with a draft of the first year of a five-year cycle. The draft would be disseminated to a steering committee comprised of groups delineated in the regulation including parents, business, community, staff, and students. At the same time this fall, a needs assessment would be developed and disseminated by the Department of Educational Accountability so that they could gain a broader perspective to guide implementation of the regulation.

Dr. Sullivan reported that the results of the survey plus the work of the steering group would be shared with the superintendent in the form of recommendations. They expected these recommendations to guide future implementation and to be included in the Year 2 draft they would forward to MSDE. They knew that their current status was not satisfactory to the Board, the superintendent, and staff, and they believed they would make gains as they implemented the evolving five-year plan.

Mr. Grant commented that MCPS staff had done a very good job with their first shot of what would be a five-year effort. In 1972 an ethnic and cultural minorities bylaw was promulgated by the State Board of Education. Some students had not done well in school, and in the early 1980s the effective schools research told them that many children were not having success because they were not expected to be successful. Now they were talking about school improvement and systemic school reform.

Mr. Grant explained that when they talked about education that was multicultural, they were talking about looking at some things they did not ordinarily look at as they addressed diverse populations of students. In Maryland they had over 110 language groups statewide, and most of them were in Montgomery County. They were expected to provide instruction to these children, and for at least 25 percent of that day, instruction should be in their home dominant language. All of this fell into the area of multicultural education. This evening the Board had talked about total quality management of the school system, and education that was multicultural was part of this. They were talking about a perspective they put on a process that was already in place.

Mr. Grant commented that when a youngster came into a classroom it was not what the child expected of himself, it was what he expected the teacher to expect of himself. This created the child's esteem and encouraged him to succeed. When they talked about TQM, they talked about adding value, continuous improvement, and meeting customer needs. Their customers were the children. Success for every student had been the code word at the State Department of Education and across the state for a number of years. The MCPS staff had done a wonderful job in putting together a first cut and what they expected to happen over the next 10, 15, or 20 years. They would have to change the minds, attitudes, and perceptions of folk who had had those mindsets for years. He commended the MCPS staff for the work they had done and the expertise they had provided to MSDE. He expressed his appreciation to Dr. Vance for the MCPS staff who would continue on the state's advisory board.

Mr. Ewing explained that he has raised a number of questions in a memorandum addressed to the superintendent. He hoped that the superintendent would provide some answers and that there would be an opportunity at another juncture to talk about those. There was one issue he would like to discuss. In terms of multiculturalism, there were those who believed that people advocating this wanted to change everything about the curriculum, and some of those folks who believed that wanted to change nothing. Some people believed that all must be scrapped. There were those who wanted them to rid the school system of Euro-centric hegemony. This made other people anxious because they saw this as an attack on the whole Western cultural tradition.

Mr. Ewing believed that they had to exercise enormous care because this issue could become inflammatory. It seemed to him that the state regulation was a sensible one because it finessed this issue. He was not sure they could always avoid this issue, and he thought they needed to talk about it candidly. He was one who believed that the Western canon was an important part of their culture and one they could not afford to dispense with; however, he was not suggesting that anyone around the table or at the state expected this would happen. He did not believe that this tradition was without its flaws. This did not mean they tossed it out, but

rather that they offered a variety of perspectives. He was a great believer in challenging the perceived wisdom. He agreed with Mr. Grant that they had to add perspectives and look at issues in new ways. They had to recognize that the traditional point of view might be countered by other views that they had not heard before. If they were approaching this in that fashion, he was very happy with what they were doing. He did not think they would find it would be easy to achieve that balance.

Mr. Ewing commented that he was intrigued by a statement in the bylaw. He quoted, "In studying other cultures, teachers may not imply that there are no universal values." This was a double negative, and he was not quite sure what it meant.

Mr. Ewing thought that the staff was doing a good job of taking a requirement and building a response that was reasonable.

Mr. Grant remarked that the state Board was very insistent that that kind of wording got into the bylaw. Some Board members were concerned that they were no longer going to teach children that there were things that were right and things that were wrong. There were some advocates who wanted to live in situational ethnics. The state Board was afraid that if things were left open that this might be the interpretation by teachers and principals. The state Board had spent hours talking about these issues and had brought consultants in for this purpose. Mr. Ewing commented that in one section the regulation stated that one should respect all groups. He cited what was happening in Bosnia, but if there were no universal values there was no reason to condemn what was going on.

Ms. Gutierrez indicated that she had read Mr. Ewing's memo, and she thought the superintendent's response would be valuable. She was concerned about using Success for Every Student in the way it was used in the staff paper. They were saying that Success was already in place and it responded to what was in the multicultural regulation. She did not think this was quite valid. She had a strong objection to their claiming that within Success they were already addressing multicultural issues.

Ms. Gutierrez stated that she had been particularly interested in having the Board address multicultural education. She had put it on the table at least twice, and they had gone around with it. However, it had never blossomed into a policy statement. They had adopted the state paper as an exhibit, but she would hope that the Board would consider moving forward with a policy statement. It was not clearly evidence that MSDE was expecting local Boards to do that, but it was the natural way to do business. She thought that not having a policy statement undermined the effort they were mandated to take. Mr. Grant commented that it would add value to what they wanted to get done. Ms. Gutierrez said she would like to

put the policy statement issue on the table for the Board to consider.

Ms. Gutierrez commented that she was a little bit confused about the timelines. It seemed to her they should have started the five-year cycle last year, and she sensed they were already one year behind. Mr. Grant replied that they could not have started this last year because they did not approve the regulation until February, 1995.

Ms. Gutierrez was concerned that the action plan would take five years to write. What they had before them for the first year was not a plan. It was very important for them to write a plan, and a plan was not a collection of actions that they were doing. The information supplied by the staff was general and not necessarily to the point. It was going to be very important to look at how they drafted this plan. She did not necessarily see the staff paper as being the appropriate instrument they needed. Someone had done an incredible amount of work in looking at all the multicultural activities, but in her mind they should be looking at what they needed to do from a multicultural education. Not everything in Success was multicultural education.

Mr. Grant explained that they were not expecting finished plans in September. He did not think there was a school system in the state that could do that. They were talking about new paradigms and systemic reform. The biggest piece of this would be the staff development part. He felt that it was important that they not penalize school systems for not having complete plans. It would take five years to write themselves out of the mess they had gotten into for the last 105 years.

Ms. Gutierrez thanked Mr. Grant for the clarification because the assumption was that the state had its act together, and she was glad to know it was not quite there yet. She agreed that the steering committee and the needs assessment were very important. She thought they should constitute the steering committee before they did any more drafting. She had seen a disconnect with the strong focus on training. MCPS was doing quite a bit of staff development, but it was necessarily the type and kind needed for the regulation. She was delighted about the plan because she would have started on it four years ago. She particularly liked the very clear framework and the four areas that were identified.

Dr. Sullivan explained that it was necessary for the system to pull together all of its efforts into one document to be disseminated to a steering committee so that they could know what was in place. This along with the needs assessment would help them focus on those areas where they were missing something. The Success document was selected as the strategic vehicle for implementation. They did not mean to imply that they had met those guidelines. In regard to the

training, she reported that the three people trained by the state would begin staff training in September, 1995.

Dr. Cheung complimented the staff for coming up with a plan to meet the state regulation. While he was not an expert in multiculturalism, he knew it was very difficult to develop a multicultural curriculum, train staff, and provide instructional resources. He said that culture involved tradition, values, history, story telling, arts, and religion. He had learned to appreciate culture from Joseph Campbell who revealed the commonalities among the various peoples of the world.

Dr. Cheung commented that today America was in the information/ technological world. Other cultures were in different time frames. He had thought about the best way to teach multiculturalism, and he supported the Campbell approach which shared information about cultures. The best way to learn about culture was through story telling. Mr. Grant remarked that they knew they had to help the story teller to teach children verbally and non-verbally.

Mr. Felton thought that staff had done a tremendous amount of work to categorize how they were meeting the state regulations. He was pleased that the state had moved in this direction. On the other hand, he saw this as a philosophy of inclusion and expectation that perhaps the average citizen did not fully comprehend. He would buy into the principles, but as a community and as a Board, they had to look at what was the measure of accountability. They had to have something to put in front of their community so that they would have the community interpreting this 100 different ways only to find out they could not meet anyone's needs. Mr. Grant thought it was important that each school system define exactly what it was going to do. A policy would add direction and specify exactly how Montgomery County was going to regulate itself.

Mrs. King said that looking at the list of current and on-going action, she would think that as the community changed they would have to keep coming up with more ideas. She asked how Montgomery County stacked up next to the rest of the state as far a multicultural education. Mr. Grant replied that Montgomery County was doing well, but not as well as it should and could. Montgomery County was looked at as a leader, and each school district needed to have high expectations of itself and needed to be serious about teaching all children. Mrs. King commented that they also had a county that expected this of its school system. Mr. Grant remarked that the important thing was for this message to get down through the school system.

Mrs. Gordon thanked staff and Mr. Grant for their advice and comments. She stated that this was a long term initiative that they were committed to, and they wanted to do a good job. They realized they were looked to as a model by others, and they valued that position. The Board was committed to doing a good job and

making education everything that it could be for all students and giving them the perspective they needed to move into a multicultural world.

Re: BOARD/SUPERINTENDENT COMMENTS

1. Dr. Vance stated that he had provided a memorandum to the Board informing them that the federal court compliance requirements regarding the identification and placement of eligible special education students for extended school year (ESY) services had been achieved in nearly all instances. This was the result of a collaborative effort by the Department of Special Education and local schools. He was very proud of that. This effort involved thousands of hours of work by principals, special education staff, classroom teachers, and parents. This resulted in the identification and placement of almost 1500 special education students in ESY services. The major deadlines for identifying potential students needing ESY services were met in 97 percent of all cases. This meant that nearly all annual reviews for Intensity 1 to 3 were completed by May 20, and nearly all reviews for Intensity 4 and 5 were completed by April 15. He would keep the Board informed about this important initiative.

2. Dr. Vance reported that he, Mrs. Gemberling, and Mr. Bowers had had a very delightful meeting this morning with 15 to 16 members of CC-B-CC. This group had been very active for the past year and had come up with an open admissions International Baccalaureate program, and he would be working closely with them. He had asked the director of information to provide the Board with the press packets distributed by the committee.

3. Mr. Ewing said that he had sent a memo to the superintendent about the reduction of a counselor position at Stephen Knolls School. In the Board's budget reductions, they had reduced one counselor position related to Longview and Stephen Knolls. However, this action left Stephen Knolls without any school counselor. This seemed to him to be a serious problem, and he hoped that the superintendent could look at the situation to see whether they could get some part-time counseling support there.

4. Mr. McCullough remarked that in the past Dr. Vance and Mrs. Gemberling had supported SMOBSAC by communicating to area high school and middle school principals. Principals had been asked to recommend one or two students from their schools to sit on SMOBSAC. He asked that they again request principals to submit these names.

5. In regard to multicultural education, Mr. McCullough felt that as long as they kept moving they would be on steady ground. There was no one goal for multicultural education because it involved the world, and the world was always changing. He hoped that the educational system would catch up to the world and change with it.

This would ensure the success of their multicultural education program.

6. Mr. Felton continued to be alarmed with the lack of information that the community believed it had. He suggested that they explore further use of the cable television system to put together some program to allow interaction among the community, staff, and Board members to help close this gap. He asked the superintendent to comment on this. Dr. Vance replied that last week they had discussed external and internal communications. He would be sharing these plans with the Board and his recommendations to improve communications. It was a major concern of staff, and it was much broader than parents.

RESOLUTION NO. 509-95 Re: CLOSED SESSION - AUGUST 2 AND 29,
1995

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Dr. Cheung seconded by Ms. Gutierrez, 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 closed session meeting on Wednesday, August 2, 1995, at 7:30 p.m. to discuss personnel matters and appeals; and be it further

Resolved, That the Board of Education of Montgomery County hereby conduct a portion of its meeting on Tuesday, August 29, 1995, at 9 a.m. and at noon to discuss personnel matters and contract negotiations, 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. 510-95 Re: MINUTES OF JUNE 13, 1995

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

Resolved, That the minutes of June 13, 1995, be approved.

RESOLUTION NO. 511-95 Re: MINUTES OF JUNE 26, 1995

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 minutes of June 26, 1995, be approved.

Re: REPORT ON CLOSED SESSION - JULY 11,
1995

On June 26, 1995, by the unanimous vote of members present, the Board of Education voted to conduct a closed session on Tuesday, July 11, 1995, 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, July 11, 1995, from 9:05 a.m. to 9:35 a.m. and from 12:45 p.m. to 1:35 p.m. The meetings took place in Room 120, Carver Educational Services Center, Rockville, Maryland.

The Board met to discuss the monthly personnel report and personnel appointments and transfers. Votes taken in closed session were confirmed in open session.

Board members discussed dates for a meeting with the Montgomery County Delegation and agreed to hold October 25 and November 8. They also discussed attendance at the MACO conference. They received a report on the status of transfer appeals, and Mrs. Gordon asked that staff be informed that there was a possibility that the August 2 meeting would be cancelled.

Board members reviewed Decision and Orders in BOE Appeal No. 1995-15 and 1995-19.

Board members talked about the possibility of recommending some form of compensation for student Board members and coupling that guidelines for student Board member attendance and participation. Board members reviewed the status of personnel recruitment to fill vacancies in the Board Office.

In attendance at the closed session were Larry Bowers, Alan Cheung, Blair Ewing, Tom Fess, David Fischer, Phinnize Fisher, Kathy Gemberling, Bea Gordon, Ana Sol Gutierrez, Nancy King, Elfreda

Massie, Brian Porter, Lois Stoner, Paul Vance, Mary Lou Wood, and Melissa Woods.

Ms. Gutierrez assumed the chair.

Re: REVIEW OF OPERATING BUDGET MODEL

On June 26, 1995, Mrs. Gordon moved and Mr. Abrams seconded the following:

Resolved, That the Board of Education direct the superintendent to schedule a complete review of the operating budget utilizing a budget review model based on the Lincoln County (Oregon) School District which will include a category and program review with community, Board, and employee participation and will provide advice to the superintendent prior to his FY 1997 budget recommendations to the Board; and be it further

Resolved, That recommendations for reductions by category be included as part of any advice to the superintendent and that this review begin this summer for the FY 1997 Operating Budget; and be it further

Resolved, That this budget review model's community involvement replace the current practice of fall forums.

RESOLUTION NO. 512-95 Re: A SUBSTITUTE MOTION ON A REVIEW OF OPERATING BUDGET MODEL

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

Resolved, That the Board direct the superintendent to work with the Board of Education to develop a process for the fall that would serve as a pilot for more extensive involvement of the public in budget review which would involve looking at selected areas in a way that focused on what they were doing and what they could do better; and be it further

Resolved, That the superintendent be asked to review the Lincoln County, Oregon model as one excellent source of ideas; and be it further

Resolved, That recommendations for reductions by category and/or program be included as part of any advice to the superintendent.

Mrs. Gordon assumed the chair.

Re: A MOTION BY MS. GUTIERREZ ON ADULT ESOL AND ABE PROGRAMS

The following motion by Ms. Gutierrez failed of adoption with Dr. Cheung, Mr. Ewing, Ms. Gutierrez, and Mr. McCullough voting in the affirmative; Mrs. King voting in the negative; Mr. Felton and Mrs. Gordon abstaining:

Resolved, That the Board of Education request the superintendent to present to the Board for discussion and approval any proposals affecting the Adult ESOL and ABE programs including staffing changes and funding prior to their implementation; and be it further

Resolved, That a long-term solution proposal for maintaining and expanding the program be also presented.

RESOLUTION NO. 513-95 Re: TAKOMA PARK ANNEXATION

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

Resolved, That the superintendent be asked to bring the Board of Education recommendations about housing students who may be added to the Montgomery County student population as a result of Takoma Park annexation.

RESOLUTION NO. 514-95 Re: TRANSFERRING PROJECTS FUNDED WITH CURRENT OPERATING RECEIPTS

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education schedule a time to discuss the proposal for transferring projects funded with current operating receipts from the CIP to the Operating Budget.

RESOLUTION NO. 515-95 Re: REMEDIATION FOR MCPS GRADUATES ATTENDING COLLEGE

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education schedule a time as soon as possible to discuss the issue of remediation of students who leave MCPS and go to college in light of the work of the task force and in general; and be it further

Resolved, That the superintendent be asked to bring the Board a description of where the issue stands, where he thinks it ought to be, how he thinks it ought to be resolved, and what action the Board might reasonably take.

RESOLUTION NO. 516-95 Re: ADEQUACY OF HOLDING SCHOOLS AND PORTABLES

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education discuss, in conjunction with the discussion on the Adequate Public Facilities Law, the issues of holding schools and their use and their quality as well as portables and their use and quality, focusing on the adequacy of

alternative locations for students when modernizations occur and MCPS was short of space because of inadequate public facilities.

Re: NEW BUSINESS

1. Mrs. King moved and Mr. Felton seconded the following:

Resolved, That the Board of Education request the superintendent to undertake a full review of summer school including the purpose for summer school (original credit/remediation) and what the level of expectation is for students completing a summer school course.

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education request the superintendent to proceed with the next step in policy development which would lead to a proposal for a multicultural education policy for MCPS.

Re: ITEMS OF INFORMATION

Board members received the following items of information:

1. Recommendation for Approval of Revised Objectives for World Studies, Grades 6-8 (for future consideration)
2. Recommendation for Approval of Nutrition Science A and Nutrition Science B, Grades 11-12 (for future consideration)
3. Recommendation for Approval of Technology Education, Grades 9-12 (for future consideration)

RESOLUTION NO. 517-95 Re: ADJOURNMENT

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education adjourn its meeting at 12:10 a.m.

PRESIDENT

SECRETARY

PLV:mlw