



RESOLUTION NO. 106-99

Re: **APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA**

On recommendation of the Superintendent and on motion of Mr. Abrams seconded by Mrs. O'Neill, the following resolution was adopted unanimously:

Resolved, That the Board of Education amend and approve its agenda for February 24, 1999, by adding a Report from Hazard, Young, Attea, and Associates, Ltd. prior to Item 1.2.

Re: **REPORT FROM HAZARD, YOUNG, ATTEA, AND ASSOCIATES, LTD.**

Mr. Sam Mikaelian reported the findings of the *Leadership Profile Assessment* conducted by Hazard, Young, Attea & Associates, Ltd. for the Montgomery County Public Schools (MCPS). Upon appointment of the firm as consultant to the Board in its search for a new Superintendent, an assessment instrument was prepared to structure data collected by interviews of Board-designated individuals and groups. Approximately 160 people were interviewed by Charles Almo, Joan Levy and Sam Mikaelian. In addition to interviewing all seven Board members, the consultants met with administrators, faculty members, parents, students, support staff, former Board members, retired teachers, the County Executive and the County Council President. Representatives from the business community and several local organizations were also interviewed. A total of 40 residents attended the three community forums on February 4 and twenty-one people attended the Saturday morning forums. Over 750 completed questionnaires provided equally valuable information. MCPS also distributed the questionnaires in Spanish, two of which were received and read by the consultant. Local newspapers assisted in the effort to obtain a wide range of community views by publishing the questionnaire which was either mailed or faxed to the office.

In developing the leadership profile, the consultants sought opinions, recommendations and general comments with respect to preferred candidate traits and qualifications as well as MCPS strengths, issues and concerns which could bear upon future leadership requirements and influence the selection criteria for the next Superintendent of schools. It was agreed at the outset that the consultants would report the findings to the Board, enabling it to use the data as it proceeds to define the qualifications sought in the next Superintendent. At the interviews, group meetings and forum sessions the consultants noted that the Board was seeking the views from the community and staff but that the Board alone would determine the leadership characteristics and selection criteria to be utilized in the search.

The assessment instrument that was used to solicit responses provides the framework for reporting comments expressed to the consultant. To highlight broad themes within each topic, data are aggregated into seven response groups. Under the category "consistent" are comments which were frequently heard from most of the groups. Comments raised by

only one or two of the groups are listed under the respective group designated on the *Leadership Profile Assessment Form*: Board, administrator, community, faculty, parents, students and support staff. Under each of these groups, the comments expressed with some regularity are listed alphabetically. It should be emphasized that the data are not a scientific sampling, nor should they necessarily be viewed as representing the majority opinion of a group. Items were included if, in the consultants' judgment, they were repeated with sufficient regularity to warrant the Board's attention.

The information obtained from approximately 750 completed questionnaires, in addition to individual or group interviews with more than 160 people, provided a significant amount of agreement with respect to the Montgomery County Public Schools' (MCPS) strengths and concerns. Respondents are proud of the MCPS national reputation for its high academic standards, innovative programs, magnet schools, and its many gifted and talented students. From all constituencies, the most consistently cited strengths of the MCPS were: actively involved and supportive parents and community; highly motivated students; competent, dedicated teachers and administrators; and a strong, comprehensive instructional program. Also cited were the ethnic, racial and socioeconomic diversity of the student body, and the strong financial support from a County Executive and County Council that value educational excellence.

Underlying discussions with Board members, staff and administrators were expressions of optimism concerning the positive impact of the new relationship between the union and administrators outlined in the teachers' agreement, with all groups "dedicated to the continuous improvement of the quality of education." A clear understanding of the parameters within which the Quality Management Councils operate appears essential to the success of the compact.

The two most frequently mentioned concerns were: the ability of MCPS to maintain its academic excellence while meeting the special needs of its changing student population; and the perception of major inequities between up-county and down-county schools in allocation of resources, quality of education, special programs and rigor of student performance expectations.

The depth of many of the concerns expressed depended upon the attendance area in which the respondent lived. Issues raised included overcrowded buildings and classes, student safety, futile efforts to discipline disruptive students, the need to upgrade deteriorating older schools and the lack of updated technology. Almost all respondents felt the decline in academic standards had to be reversed and that some teachers and administrators were not being held accountable for their performance. Improving the achievement of minority students and encouraging their parents to participate in the education process were viewed by many as critical to achieving success for every student. However, many felt it was also important to motivate students with high academic potential

to even stronger performance and that mainstreaming them with regular students was not accomplishing that objective.

Many comments were made in regard to the unresponsiveness of the "bureaucracy tied to the status quo." In a system with as many students, schools and square miles as MCPS, such feelings toward a central office might be inevitable, but perhaps more effort could be expended to personalize services and communicate more effectively with the constituent groups.

Areas of special expertise desired in a new Superintendent were focused on the need for someone with exceptional communication skills, experience in a large multicultural district, success in improving the academic achievement of minority students while providing academic challenges for high performing students and a strong commitment to continuous improvement and shared decision making. Knowledge of sound fiscal management, educational and administrative uses of technology, special education/inclusion issues, human resource management and the dynamics of teaching and learning were also viewed as important areas of expertise. Excellent public relations skills and political savvy were deemed essential as the individual would be expected to work effectively with business leaders and government officials at the county, state and national level.

The attributes repeatedly cited in regard to leadership style emphasized the desire for a collaborative, accessible team builder with the self confidence to delegate and hold subordinates accountable and with the courage to recommend change, take risks and defend proposals offered in the best interests of all students. The individual must be a thoughtful listener who seeks views from constituent groups, develops consensus when practicable and makes a decision. As the ambassador for the MCPS, the new Superintendent must be sensitive to the needs of minority residents and feel comfortable interacting in a multicultural environment, whether under political pressure or responding to demands by special interest groups. Throughout the interviews and written responses, one message came through quite clearly; the citizens of MCPS care passionately about the quality of their schools, academic standards and student performance and they are willing to pay the taxes to return their schools to the forefront of educational innovation and student achievement.

In closing, Sam Mikaelian thanked the members of the staff for their cordiality during the visits to MCPS and to all of the respondents whose concern for their schools and commitment to educational excellence were evident as they provided us with the perspective we were seeking.

RESOLUTION NO. 107-99

Re: **WOMEN'S HISTORY MONTH RECOGNITION**

On recommendation of the Superintendent and on motion of Mrs. Gordon seconded by

Ms. Signer, the following resolution was adopted unanimously:

WHEREAS, In 1987, Congress passed a resolution proclaiming the month of March as "National Women's History Month;" and

WHEREAS, The Maryland Women's History Project has selected the theme Women in Science, Mathematics and Technology to commemorate Women's History Month in 1999; and

WHEREAS, Our state and, in particular, Montgomery County, are home to many outstanding women who have made invaluable contributions to science, mathematics, and technology; and

WHEREAS, The Board of Education takes special pride in the K-12 curriculum and activities that promote awareness of the significant achievement of women in the fields of mathematics, science, and technology; and

WHEREAS, The Board of Education salutes the efforts of all the students who participated in the Women's History Month Essay Contest and congratulates those individuals whose outstanding essays were honored today; now therefore be it

Resolved, That on behalf of the Superintendent, staff, students, and parents of Montgomery County Public Schools, the members of the Board of Education hereby declare the month of March 1999 to be observed as "Women's History Month."

**Re: SCHOOL BUS SAFETY POSTER CONTEST AWARDS**

The most outstanding posters representing MCPS and the state of Maryland were submitted to the National School Bus Safety Contest, sponsored by the National Association for Pupil Transportation. This year's winning entries for MCPS, in three different categories, were created by Yvonne Shiau, Grade 2, DuFief Elementary School; Ethel Powell, Grade 5, Whetstone Elementary School; and Katherine Kiang, Grade 8, Gaithersburg Middle School. We will be presenting each student with a \$50 United States Savings Bond and a certificate.

**RESOLUTION NO. 108-99**

**Re: RATIFICATION OF MCAASP AGREEMENT**

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

WHEREAS, Section 6-408 of the Education Article, Annotated Code of Maryland, requires the Board of Education to enter into negotiations with the designated employee

organization concerning "salaries, wages, hours, and other working conditions"; and

WHEREAS, The Montgomery County Association of Administrative and Supervisory Personnel (MCAASP) was properly designated as the employee organization to be exclusive representative for these negotiations; and

WHEREAS, The parties have a negotiated agreement for the 1997-2000 school years and said agreement provides that negotiations be reopened on salaries and benefits; and

WHEREAS, Said negotiations have occurred in good faith, as directed by law; and

WHEREAS, The parties have reached tentative agreement and the agreement has now been duly ratified by the membership of MCAASP; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Board of Education approve the amended agreement for the period of July 1, 1997, through June 30, 2000; and be it further

Resolved, That the president of the Board of Education be authorized to sign the agreement, which will be implemented by the Board of Education when funds are properly authorized, all according to the said agreement and to the law.

RESOLUTION NO. 109-99            Re:    **ITEM OF LEGISLATION**

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education support with amendment Senate Bill (SB) 272 "Teacher Certification Incentive Grants Establishment." which would permit local school boards to establish incentive grants through the collective bargaining process for teachers certified by the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards.

RESOLUTION NO. 110-99            Re:    **ITEM OF LEGISLATION**

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education support Senate Bill (SB) 273 "Permanent State and Local Aid Programs for Certification of Teachers National Board for Professional Teaching Standards," which would make permanent the Pilot Program for Certification by the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards, established in 1997 as a pilot program.

**RESOLUTION NO. 111-99            Re:    ITEM OF LEGISLATION**

On recommendation of the Superintendent and on motion of Ms. Signer seconded by Mrs. King, the following resolution was adopted unanimously:

Resolved, That the Board of Education strongly support House Bill (HB) 685 "Education School Renovation - State Payments," which would require the state to pay a higher percentage of the state school construction allocation than the current regulations require for renovating an existing school building.

**RESOLUTION NO. 112-99            Re:    ITEM OF LEGISLATION**

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education support with an amendment to lower threshold to \$5,000 on House Bill (HB) 689 "Education - Aging School Maintenance and Repair Program," which would establish a matching grant program for three years for the maintenance and repair of aging schools for projects that cost between \$10,000 and \$100,000.

**RESOLUTION NO. 113-99            Re:    ITEM OF LEGISLATION**

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education support Senate Bill (SB) 269/House Bill (HB) 377 "Education Instructional Materials in Nonvisually Accessible Media," which would require textbook publishers of books adopted by local boards of education to furnish the state Instructional Resource Center with an electronic version of the text that is encoded for conversion into Braille.

**RESOLUTION NO. 114-99            Re:    ITEM OF LEGISLATION**

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education oppose House Bill (HB) 701 "Education Noncertified Public School Employees - Negotiations," which would add discipline and discharge to the list of items that must be negotiated between noncertificated public school employee unions and local boards of education.

**RESOLUTION NO. 115-99            Re:    ITEM OF LEGISLATION**

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education strongly oppose House Bill (HB) 579 "Educational Opportunities Program of 1999," which would provide state aid for parents of children attending private school by establishing a Maryland School Resources Conservation Program and a commission to administer it.

**RESOLUTION NO. 116-99            Re:    ITEM OF LEGISLATION**

On recommendation of the Superintendent and on motion of Mrs. Gordon seconded by Mrs. King, the following resolution was adopted unanimously:

Resolved, That the Board of Education oppose House Bill (HB) 725 "Education - State Share of Basic Current Expenses Minimum," which would provide each county Board a minimum of \$1,000 per pupil in basic current expense aid.

**RESOLUTION NO. 117-99            Re:    ITEM OF LEGISLATION**

On recommendation of the Superintendent and on motion of Mrs. King seconded by Mrs. Gordon, the following resolution was adopted unanimously:

Resolved, That the Board of Education strongly support Senate Bill (SB) 391/House Bill (HB) 907 "School Safety Act of 1999," which would provide greater protection for students and school employees from threats and acts of violence.

**RESOLUTION NO. 118-99            Re:    ITEM OF LEGISLATION**

On recommendation of the Superintendent and on motion of Mr. Abrams seconded by Mrs. King, the following resolution was adopted with Mr. Abrams, Mr. Burnett, Mr. Butler, Mrs. Gordon, Mrs. King, Mrs. O'Neill, and Ms. Signer voting in the affirmative; Mr. Felton voting in the negative:

Resolved, That the Board of Education support with amendment House Bill (HB) 322 "Courts and Judicial Proceedings - Sharing of Juvenile Court Records and School Records," which would permit representatives of specified agencies within each county, including local school superintendents, to share records that have been confidential in the past.



**RESOLUTION NO. 119-99            Re:    ITEM OF LEGISLATION**

On recommendation of the Superintendent and on motion of Mr. Abrams seconded by Mrs. Gordon, the following resolution was adopted with Mr. Abrams, Mr. Burnett, Mr. Butler, Mrs. Gordon, Mrs. King, Mrs. O'Neill, and Ms. Signer voting in the affirmative; Mr. Felton voting in the negative:

Resolved, That the Board of Education strongly oppose Senate Bill (SB) 658 "Procurement Prevailing Wage School Construction," which would change current law, where prevailing wages are not required to be paid for school construction projects if the funds received from the state are less than 75 percent of the total cost (this bill would reduce that percentage to 50 percent).

**RESOLUTION NO. 120-99            Re:    ITEM OF LEGISLATION**

On recommendation of the Superintendent and on motion of Mrs. Gordon seconded by Ms. Signer, the following resolution was adopted with Mr. Burnett, Mr. Butler, Mr. Felton, Mrs. Gordon, Mrs. King, Mrs. O'Neill, and Ms. Signer voting in the affirmative, Mr. Abrams voting in the negative:

Resolved, That the Board of Education oppose House Bill (HB) 564 "Tax Credit for Learning Income Tax Credit and Subtraction Modification for Education Expenses," which would provide for a subtraction from income for education-related expenses defined in the bill and permits a tax credit for these expenditures for individuals whose gross income is less than \$33,500.

**Re:    ITEM OF LEGISLATION**

The Board of Education deferred action to March 9, 1999, on House Bill (HB) 837 "Teachers' Pension System Benefits," which would amend the formula for calculating benefits for Teachers Pension System members for years of service after July 1, 1998.

**RESOLUTION NO. 121-99            Re:    ITEM OF LEGISLATION**

On recommendation of the Superintendent and on motion of Mrs. O'Neill seconded by Mrs. King, the following resolution was adopted unanimously:

Resolved, That the Board of Education had no position on House Bill (HB) 962 "Education Class Size Reduction Program Establishment," which would encourage county school systems to reduce class size in Grades K-12 core curriculum classes to 18 or fewer students.

RESOLUTION NO. 122-99      Re:    **ITEM OF LEGISLATION**

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education support House Bill (HB) 485 "Education Notice of Arrest Controlled Dangerous Substance Offenses," which would add controlled dangerous substance violations to the list of crimes defined as "reportable offenses."

RESOLUTION NO. 123-99      Re:    **ITEM OF LEGISLATION**

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education strongly oppose House Bill (HB) 431 "Estates and Trusts Limitation period for Refund Claim," which would undercut last year's legislation by permitting individuals to file claims for twelve years after property is distributed to a Board of Education from a deceased person's estate.

Re:    **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

The following people testified before the Board of Education:

	<u>Person</u>	<u>Topic</u>
1.	Judy Gaskin	Home Instruction
2.	John Hoven	Gifted Education
3.	Steve Ramsey	Double A Exam Exemption and Recycling

Regarding Judy Gaskin's testimony on home instruction, Ms. Signer asked the Superintendent to provide a response.

RESOLUTION NO. 124-99      Re:    **CONTRACTS FOR MORE THAN \$25,000**

On recommendation of the Superintendent and on motion of Ms. Signer 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 be awarded to the low bidders meeting specifications as shown for the bids as follows:

1021.2	Developmental Activities Supplies and Equipment	
	<u>Awardees</u>	
	Cannon Sports, Inc.*	\$ 10,144
	DVF Sporting Goods Company	11,032
	Bill Fritz Sports Corporation	816
	Gopher Athletic Sport	2,318
	Morley Athletic Supply Company, Inc.	2,154
	Passon's Sports	12,678
	Sportmaster Recreation Equipment	<u>3,360</u>
	Total	\$ 42,502
1025.2	Softball Supplies and Equipment	
	<u>Awardees</u>	
	Anaconda*	\$ 11,489
	Cannon Sports, Inc.	4,143
	DVF Sporting Goods Company	15,601
	Morley Athletic Supply Company, Inc.	359
	Passon's Sports	2,437
	Riddell All American	1,780
	Sportmaster Recreation Equipment	974
	Sports Stop, Inc.	<u>15,770</u>
	Total	\$ 52,553
1081.1	School Security Initiative Review	
	<u>Awardee</u>	
	National Alliance for Safe Schools	\$ 38,050
9002.1	Door Hardware, Closures and Exit Devices	
	<u>Awardees</u>	
	Ace Lock and Security Supply	\$ 41,810
	Door Closer Service Company, Inc.	8,531
	Hardware Discounters, Inc.	1,084
	Precision Door and Hardware	737
	Roberts Company of D.C., Inc.	2,500
	Safemasters Company, Inc.	196
	Southern Lock and Supply Company	7,000
	Taylor Security and Lock Company, Inc.	<u>15,887</u>
	Total	\$ 77,745

MORE THAN \$25,000

\$210,850

\* Denotes MFD vendor

RESOLUTION NO. 125-99      Re:    **ARCHITECTURAL APPOINTMENT - ROCK CREEK VALLEY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL**

On recommendation of the Superintendent and on motion of Ms. Signer seconded by Mrs. King, the following resolution was adopted unanimously:#

WHEREAS, It is necessary to appoint an architectural firm to provide professional and technical services during the design and construction phases of the Rock Creek Valley Elementary School modernization project; and

WHEREAS, Funds for architectural planning were programmed as part of the FY 1999 Capital Budget; and

WHEREAS, The Architect Selection Committee, in accordance with procedures adopted by the Board of Education on July 14, 1998, identified McKissack & McKissack, architects, as the most qualified firm to provide the necessary professional architectural and engineering services; and

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

Resolved, That the Montgomery County Board of Education enter into a contractual agreement with the architectural firm of McKissack & McKissack to provide professional architectural services for the Rock Creek Valley Elementary School modernization project for a fee of \$589,380, which is 7.4 percent of the construction budget.

RESOLUTION NO. 126-99      Re:    **AWARD OF CONTRACT - ENGINEERING SERVICES FOR BURTONSVILLE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL**

On recommendation of the Superintendent and on motion of Ms. Signer seconded by Mrs. King, the following resolution was adopted unanimously:#

WHEREAS, Funds have been approved to design a new access road to Burtonsville Elementary School; and

WHEREAS, The Montgomery County Department of Public Works and Transportation (MCDPW&T) has agreed to manage the design and construction of the new access road to Burtonsville Elementary School to facilitate coordination of the access road with

potential subdivision streets; and

WHEREAS, The Board of Education awarded a contract to Hurst-Rosche Engineers, Inc., in October 1997 to provide preliminary design services for MCDPW&T; and

WHEREAS, MCDPW&T is satisfied with the work of Hurst-Rosche Engineers, Inc., and wishes to continue the project to final design; and

WHEREAS, MCDPW&T has negotiated a proposal with Hurst-Rosche Engineers, Inc., to provide final engineering design services for the Burtonsville Elementary School Safe Access road project; now therefore be it

Resolved, That a contract in the amount of \$100,672.58 be awarded to Hurst-Rosche Engineers, Inc., for final engineering design services for the Burtonsville Elementary School Safe Access road project.

RESOLUTION NO. 127-99      Re:    **CHANGE ORDERS OVER \$25,000**

On recommendation of the Superintendent and on motion of Ms. Signer seconded by Mrs. King, the following resolution was adopted unanimously:#

WHEREAS, The Department of Facilities Management has received change order proposals from Henley Construction Company, Inc., that exceed \$25,000; and

WHEREAS, Staff and the project architect have reviewed these change orders and found them to be reasonable; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Board of Education approve the following change orders to the contract with Henley Construction Company, Inc., for the Walter Johnson Middle School #2 project:

Change Order #11

Description: Portions of the existing corridor walls had to be removed for the installation of new student lockers. The masonry that was exposed as part of the demolition is unfinished and needs to be covered with metal studs and drywall.

Amount:                    \$32,774

Change Order #17

Description: In order to conform to Montgomery County Department of Permitting

Services requirements, it is necessary to upgrade the primary conductors for the main power transformer.

Amount: \$34,235

RESOLUTION NO. 128-99 Re: **UTILIZATION OF FY 1999 FUTURE SUPPORTED PROJECT FUNDS FOR THE MARYLAND EQUIPMENT INCENTIVE FUND**

On recommendation of the Superintendent and on motion of Ms. Signer seconded by Mrs. King, the following resolution was adopted unanimously:#

Resolved, That the Superintendent of schools be authorized to receive and expend within the FY 1999 Provision for Future Supported Projects a grant award of \$13,480 from the Maryland Equipment Incentive Fund, a component of the Governor's Mathematics/Science Initiatives, for the purchase of selected science materials and equipment to be placed in elementary and secondary schools, in the following categories:

<u>Category</u>	<u>Amount</u>
4 Textbooks and Instructional Supplies	\$ 6,736
5 Other Instructional Costs	<u>6,744</u>
Total	<u>\$13,480</u>

and be it further

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

RESOLUTION NO. 129-99 Re: **UTILIZATION OF FY 1999 FUTURE SUPPORTED PROJECT FUNDS FOR THE EVENT-BASED SCIENCE: EARTH OBSERVING SATELLITE CONNECTION PROJECT**

On recommendation of the Superintendent and on motion of Ms. Signer seconded by Mrs. King, the following resolution was adopted unanimously:#

Resolved, That the Superintendent of schools be authorized to receive and expend within the FY 1999 Provision for Future Supported Projects an award of \$75,880 from the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for the first year of the three-year Event-Based Science: The Earth Observing Satellite Connection Project, in the following categories:

<u>Category</u>	<u>Amount</u>
1 Administration	\$ 1,844
3 Instructional Salaries	16,918
4 Textbooks and Instructional Supplies	1,163
5 Other Instructional Costs	54,601
12 Fixed Charges	<u>1,354</u>
Total	<u>\$75,880</u>

and be it further

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

RESOLUTION NO. 130-99      Re:    **FY 2000 BUDGET AMENDMENT FOR TENTATIVE AGREEMENT WITH THE MONTGOMERY COUNTY EDUCATION ASSOCIATION**

On recommendation of the Superintendent and on motion of Ms. Signer seconded by Mrs. King, the following resolution was adopted unanimously:#

WHEREAS, Section 6-408 of the Education Article, Annotated Code of Maryland, permits the Board of Education to enter into negotiations with designated employee organizations concerning "salaries, wages, hours and other working conditions;" and

WHEREAS, The Montgomery County Education Association (MCEA) was properly designated as the employee organization to be the exclusive representative for these negotiations; and

WHEREAS, Negotiations have occurred in good faith, as directed by law; and

WHEREAS, Following negotiations and mediation, the parties have received a recommended settlement, and the report, having been approved by the MCEA Board of Directors, is now pending ratification; and

WHEREAS, On February 9, 1999, the Board of Education amended its Fiscal Year 2000 Operating Budget to \$1,093,504,856; and

WHEREAS, In order to assure funding by the County Council to conclude this agreement, the Board must take budgetary action at this time to secure funding for this tentative agreement; and

WHEREAS, The tentative agreement with MCEA includes a salary increase equivalent to 3 percent; and

WHEREAS, The tentative agreement with MCEA includes an increase of 3 percent in substitute teachers' daily rate of pay; and

WHEREAS, The tentative agreement with MCEA increases the cap for summer school and evening high school pay to MA Step 8 for FY 2000 and MA Step 9 for FY 2001; and

WHEREAS, The tentative agreement with MCEA recommends the allocation of up to \$25,000 for an independent consultant to review insurance trust questions; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Board of Education amend its Fiscal Year 2000 Operating Budget Request by \$16,169,484 from \$1,093,504,856 to \$1,109,674,340 to reflect the cost of changes tentatively agreed to with MCEA as follows:

Category	Board Adopted February 9, 1999	Amendment	Amended Budget Request
Systemwide Support	\$29,905,878		\$29,948,613
		42,735	
Mid-level Administration	74,223,597		74,307,546
		83,949	
Instructional Salaries	471,572,429		483,852,251
		12,279,822	
Textbooks and Instructional Supplies	23,830,566		23,830,566
Other Instructional Supplies	12,433,455		12,433,455
Special Education	127,008,007	2,208,850	129,216,857
Student Personnel Services	4,392,580	99,288	4,491,868
Health Services	26,609	0	26,609
Student Transportation	49,395,460	0	49,395,460
Operation of Plant	64,658,920		64,658,920
Maintenance of Plant	23,781,355	2,377	23,783,732
Fixed Charges	176,057,462	1,411,411	177,468,873
Community Services	748,560	7,129	755,689
Adult Ed/Summer School Fund	3,360,625	29,232	3,389,857
Real Estate Management Fund	1,268,935	2,314	1,271,249
Food Services Fund	28,118,050	0	28,118,050



Field Trip Fund	1,814,972	0	1,814,972
Entrepreneurial	907,396	2,377	909,773
All Funds	<u>\$1,093,504,856</u>	<u>\$16,169,484</u>	<u>\$1,109,674,340</u>

Re: **NON-RECOMMENDED REDUCTIONS OF THE FY 2000  
OPERATING BUDGET**

On recommendation of the Superintendent and on motion of Mrs. Gordon seconded by Mrs. O'Neill, the following resolution was placed on the table:#

WHEREAS, The Board of Education will consider the adoption of an FY 2000 Operating Budget Request of \$1,008,552,226, excluding grants and enterprise funds, on February 24, 1999; and

WHEREAS, The County Council designated a spending affordability guideline allocation for MCPS for FY 2000 of \$961,300,000; and

WHEREAS, The County Code (Section 20-63) requires the Board of Education to submit to the county executive and County Council with its operating budget request a list of prioritized expenditure reductions that would be necessary if the County Council appropriates no more for Montgomery County Public Schools than the amount designated as the spending affordability allocation, together with an explanation of the effect of such reductions on MCPS programs; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Board of Education submit the following non-recommended expenditure reductions by category, totaling \$47,252,226 as follows:

Category	Amount
1 Administration	\$ 1,384,648
2 Mid-level Administration	3,299,326
3 Instructional Salaries	21,185,438
4 Textbooks and Instructional Supplies	975,819
5 Other Instructional Costs	402,526
6 Special Education	5,593,477
7 Student Personnel Services	189,418
9 Student Transportation	2,316,051
10 Operation of Plant and Equipment	3,038,969
11 Maintenance of Plant	1,062,845
12 Fixed Charges	7,768,192
14 Community Services	35,517
Total	\$47,252,226

and be it further

Resolved, That instructional categories identified as Category 2 Mid-level Administration, Category 3 Instructional Salaries, Category 4 Textbooks and Instructional Supplies, Category 5 Other Instructional Costs, and Category 6 Special Education have the highest priority for funding; and be it further

Resolved, That if full funding of the Operating Budget Request is not approved and the identified reductions are made, the consequences for MCPS programs by category would be as follows:

Category 1 Administration (\$1,384,648)

Reductions would delay completion of the Year 2000 computer project beyond the date when mission critical computer systems must be Year 2000 compliant. This would threaten the normal operation of basic administrative functions, such as personnel, payroll, and employee benefits systems. It also would threaten implementation of the Student Information System, central to the maintenance of accurate student records. Reductions also would be needed in proposals for better computer security and disaster preparedness. If cuts were not made in the Year 2000 project, it would be necessary to cut at least 23 of the 328 administrative positions in Category 1 in areas such as personnel, financial management, and Global Access Technology, areas that have been severely cut in the past few years.

Category 2 Mid-level Administration (\$3,299,326)

Reductions would cut the number of assistant principals, student support specialists, security assistants, and school-based clerical staff, and affect the Office of School Administration, field office supervision, and instructional support provided by the Office of Instruction and Program Development, including curriculum coordinators and instructional specialists responsible for curriculum development initiatives in reading, language arts and mathematics.

Category 3 Instructional Salaries (\$21,185,438)

Reductions would cut the number of teaching positions by over 400 or the number of instructional assistants by more than 900 positions. This would prevent improvements in class size, increase class size by approximately 2.5 students per class, and increase substantially the number of oversize classes. Significant cuts also might be necessary from elementary art, music, and physical education

positions, guidance counselors, and in the media program. Reductions also might delay implementation of the new teacher evaluation system.

Category 4 Textbooks and Instructional Supplies (\$975,819)

Reductions would limit the supply of textbooks, computer software, media center supplies, and other materials, and increase the number of outdated or damaged textbooks that need to be replaced. The flexibility of teachers and principals to provide up-to-date curriculum and materials to students would be sharply limited. Reductions also may affect the provision of supplies and materials to four new schools scheduled to open in FY 2000.

Category 5 Other Instructional Costs (\$402,526)

Reductions would limit required repair or replacement of instructional equipment, including school-based computers, science laboratory equipment, media equipment, musical instruments, and fine arts equipment.

Category 6 Special Education (\$5,593,477)

Reductions would prevent the addition of teaching positions needed to support schools heavily impacted by the special education cluster model. It also would be necessary to cut more than 100 positions, requiring a review of student-teacher ratios, limit the amount of available part-time salaries for instructional personnel and contractual services, and make it more likely that the services identified on student Individual Educational Plans would be delayed, thereby increasing the possibility of litigation.

Category 7 Student Personnel Services (\$189,418)

Reductions would prevent the addition of psychologists and pupil personnel workers as required by enrollment growth and the increasing needs of a diverse student body and their families.

Category 9 Student Transportation (\$2,316,051)

Reductions would require a deferral of bus replacement above the waiver limit already set by the state on buses that exceed 12 or 15 years, and a reduction in transportation services to students by eliminating service for special programs or increasing the number of students who must walk to school.

Category 10 Operation of Plant and Equipment  
(\$3,038,969)

Reductions would necessitate the loss of over 90 building service worker positions. Alternatively, it might be necessary to make utilities cost savings by changing school thermostat settings.

Category 11 Maintenance of Plant (\$1,062,845)

Reductions would prevent the addition of staff needed for preventive maintenance of heating, ventilation, and air conditioning (HVAC) equipment, increasing the likelihood of classroom air quality problems. The backlog of repair orders also would rise, thereby increasing future repair and replacement costs.

Category 12 Fixed Charges (\$7,768,192)

Reductions would be made in employee benefits costs associated with positions and salaries that would be eliminated as a result of reductions in other categories. In addition, the Retiree Health Trust Fund would have to assume an even greater proportion of the costs of retiree health, thereby substantially increasing future operating budget costs.

Category 14 Community Services (\$35,517)

Reductions would reduce program and instructional support for instructional television.

and be it further

Resolved, That reductions such as those listed above would have a highly detrimental effect on the quality of education in Montgomery County; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be transmitted with the MCPS FY 2000 Operating Budget Request to the county executive and County Council.

Re: **DISCUSSION**

Mrs. Gordon was concerned about putting items on the list that the Board would not be willing to reduce when the budget was finalized. She did not feel comfortable putting \$21 million of instructional salaries on the list, especially with the rationale in the resolution. She did not want to get into budgetary decisions that put students against employees; therefore, she would not support the resolution.

Ms. Signer would not support the list of reductions for many of the same reasons that had been articulated by Mrs. Gordon. She had calculated \$28 million would come from classroom instruction. She did not intend to vote for anything on the non-recommended reduction list that she would not be willing to vote for when the budget was finalized.

Mr. Abrams supported the list because he had a different understanding than his colleagues. The Superintendent's rationale reduced the budget across the Board. He had not heard an alternative put forward by those who would not support the Superintendent's recommendation.

**Re: AN AMENDMENT TO THE NON-RECOMMENDED  
REDUCTIONS OF THE FY 2000 OPERATING BUDGET**

On motion of Mrs. Gordon and seconded by Ms. Signer, the following amendment was placed on the table:

Resolved, That the Board of Education remove from the non-recommended reductions all instructional categories, and the remainder of the reductions needed to meet the Spending Affordability Guidelines would be divided equally among non-instructional categories.

**Re: DISCUSSION**

Mr. Abrams asked how that reduction would be distributed and what were the implications. Dr. Spatz replied that it would be a 12 percent reduction of the non-instructional categories. Category 12 - Benefits - should not be reduced if instructional salaries were not reduced. Mr. Abrams thought 88 percent of the school system's costs were personnel, and he wanted to know the reality of the amendment.

Mrs. O'Neill thought the process of non-recommended reductions was unrealistic because revenue projections would be different when the budget was finalized.

Mrs. Gordon understood that the Board was working with incomplete information. However, she believed that the budget should clearly reflect the Board's priorities. MCPS had emphasized that lowering class size and the reading initiative were the number one priorities. Therefore, the items should not appear on the list of non-recommended reductions.

Mr. Abrams was concerned with the proposal. Student transportation was a non-instructional cost, but the school system would be unable to transport students to a classroom with lower class size.

RESOLUTION NO. 131-99

Re: **AN AMENDMENT TO THE NON-RECOMMENDED REDUCTIONS OF THE FY 2000 OPERATING BUDGET**

On motion of Mrs. Gordon and seconded by Ms. Signer, the following amendment was adopted with Mr. Burnett, Mr. Butler, Mrs. Gordon, Mrs. King, Mrs. O'Neill, and Ms. Signer voting in the affirmative; Mr. Abrams and Mr. Felton voting in the negative:

Resolved, That the Board of Education remove from the non-recommended reductions all instructional categories, and the remainder of the reductions needed to meet the Spending Affordability Guidelines would be divided equally among non-instructional categories.

RESOLUTION NO. 132-99

Re: **NON-RECOMMENDED REDUCTIONS OF THE FY 2000 OPERATING BUDGET**

On motion of Mrs. Gordon and seconded by Ms. Signer, the following resolution, as amended, was adopted with Mr. Burnett, Mr. Butler, Mrs. Gordon, Mrs. King, Mrs. O'Neill, and Ms. Signer voting in the affirmative; Mr. Abrams and Mr. Felton voting in the negative:

WHEREAS, The Board of Education will consider the adoption of an FY 2000 Operating Budget Request of \$1,009,871,670, excluding grants and enterprise funds, on February 24, 1999; and

WHEREAS, The County Council designated a spending affordability guideline allocation for MCPS for FY 2000 of \$961,300,000; and

WHEREAS, The County Code (Section 20-63) requires the Board of Education to submit to the county executive and County Council with its operating budget request a list of prioritized expenditure reductions that would be necessary if the County Council appropriates no more for Montgomery County Public Schools than the amount designated as the spending affordability allocation, together with an explanation of the effect of such reductions on MCPS programs; and

WHEREAS, Reductions in instructional programs would have an especially harmful effect on the students of Montgomery County Public Schools, and therefore all unavoidable reductions should come only from programs that do not directly affect the classroom instructional program; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Board of Education submit the following non-recommended expenditure reductions by category, totaling \$48,571,670 as follows:

<u>Category</u>	<u>Amount</u>
1 Administration	\$ 5,983,446
7 Student Personnel Services	818,528
9 Student Transportation	10,008,500
10 Operation of Plant and Equipment	13,137,247
11 Maintenance of Plant	4,592,849
12 Fixed Charges	13,877,620
14 Community Services	<u>153,480</u>
Total	\$48,571,670

and be it further

Resolved, That instructional categories identified as Category 2 Mid-level Administration, Category 3 Instructional Salaries, Category 4 Textbooks and Instructional Supplies, Category 5 Other Instructional Costs, and Category 6 Special Education have the highest priority for funding and should under no circumstances be reduced; and be it further

Resolved, That if full funding of the Operating Budget Request is not approved and the identified reductions are made, the consequences for MCPS programs by category would be as follows:

**Category I Administration** (\$5,983,446)

Reductions would delay completion of the Year 2000 computer project beyond the date when mission critical computer systems must be Year 2000 compliant. This would threaten the normal operation of basic administrative functions, such as personnel, payroll, and employee benefits systems. It also would threaten implementation of the Student Information System, central to the maintenance of accurate student records. Reductions also would be needed in proposals for better computer security and disaster preparedness. If cuts were not possible in the Year 2000 project, it would be necessary to cut at least 65 of the 328 administrative positions in Category I in areas such as personnel, financial management, and Global Access Technology, areas that have been severely cut in the past few years. Reductions might delay hiring of teachers or other instructional personnel. It would be impossible to provide timely support to schools and other MCPS units and difficult to enforce existing MCPS policies and procedures.

**Category 7 Student Personnel Services** (\$818,528)

Reductions would prevent the addition of psychologists and pupil personnel workers as required by enrollment growth and the increasing needs of a diverse student body and their families. In addition, it might be necessary to reduce

approximately 12 of the existing 36 non-school based positions in this category, including personnel who meet the pupil services needs, especially those pupils with family, psychological, or legal problems.

**Category 9 Student Transportation** (\$10,008,500)

Reductions would necessitate major changes in transportation services for regular education, since federal and state laws mandate special education transportation. This would involve a cut of approximately 40 percent in regular education transportation, including all high school and special program transportation, and possible increases in the number of students who must walk to middle school. It also would require a deferral of bus replacement above the waiver limit already set by the state on buses that exceed 12 or 15 years.

**Category 10 Operation of Plant and Equipment** (\$13,137,247)

Reductions would necessitate the loss of over 300 building service worker positions. In addition, it might be necessary to make utilities cost savings by changing school thermostat settings. This level of cuts would make it impossible to maintain a safe learning environment for students and teachers.

**Category 11 Maintenance of Plant** (\$4,592,849)

Reductions would require a reduction of up to 75 maintenance staff of the existing 368 positions and would prevent the addition of staff needed for preventive maintenance of heating, ventilation, and air conditioning (HVAC) equipment, increasing the likelihood of classroom air quality problems. There would be delays to complete even emergency repairs in schools, which might result in serious dangers of illness or injury to pupils and staff. The backlog of repair orders also would rise, thereby increasing future repair and replacement costs.

**Category 12 Fixed Charges** (\$13,877,620)

Reductions would be made in employee benefits costs associated with positions and salaries that would be eliminated as a result of reductions in other categories. In addition, the Retiree Health Trust Fund would have to assume an even greater proportion of the costs of retiree health, thereby substantially increasing future operating budget costs.

**Category 14 Community Services** (\$153,480)

Reductions would reduce program and instructional support for instructional



television.

and be it further

Resolved, That reductions such as those listed above would have a highly detrimental effect on the quality of education in Montgomery County; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be transmitted with the MCPS FY 2000 Operating Budget Request to the county executive and County Council.

Re: **UPDATE ON THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE TEACHER  
EVALUATION SYSTEM**

Dr. Vance invited the following people to the table: Mr. David Fischer, associate Superintendent for the Office of Supportive Services; Mrs. Katheryn Gemberling, consultant to the Teacher Evaluation Project; Ms. Sandra Spooner, project manager for Research for Better Teaching, Incorporated; and Dr. Elizabeth Arons, director, Department of Personnel Services.

Staff reported that this was the second in a series of updates to the Board of Education on the development of the new teacher evaluation system. The focus this discussion was the critical role and function of the performance standards in the teacher evaluation system.

**BACKGROUND**

The new teacher evaluation system represents the most ambitious effort to create a comprehensive structure for continuous improvement for teachers ever undertaken in the Montgomery County Public Schools (MCPS). The system is indeed complex and multidimensional because the issues being addressed in teacher evaluation are not simple. These issues reflect the dynamic human interaction and collaboration necessary between teachers and students, teachers and parents, teachers and other teachers, and teachers and principals.

The teacher evaluation system is an initiative established by the Board of Education to improve the quality of teaching in order to improve student performance. Various aspects of the new system, including the linking of teacher performance to student performance and the identification of outstanding teacher performance, continue to place Montgomery County Public Schools in the forefront nationwide. The three primary elements of the new teacher evaluation system are:

- # the goals
- # the structure and processes
- # the training and support of administrators and teachers needed to implement the system.

Since the inception of this project, there has been a commitment on the part of MCPS teachers and administrators to work closely with the Research for Better Teaching consultants to develop a system that will significantly raise expectations for teacher performance and provide for continuous improvement.

### **GOALS OF THE NEW SYSTEM**

The goals of the new teacher evaluation system are:

1. To create a system that bases effectiveness ratings on competencies that relate directly to student performance
2. To create a differentiated evaluation system that deals with less than satisfactory teachers honestly, skillfully, and humanely and also recognizes highly proficient teachers
3. To develop a culture of openness and continuous improvement for teachers with a primary focus on professional growth

### **STRUCTURE AND PROCESSES**

The structure and processes are the means to attain the goals of the new teacher evaluation system. By developing processes that clearly define what is expected of teachers and incorporate the principles of continuous improvement, MCPS relates teacher accountability to student achievement.

#### ***Performance Standards***

Performance standards are the foundation of the new teacher evaluation system. In simple terms, the standards establish what teachers should know and be able to do proficiently. The standards are adapted from criteria developed by both the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards and the national organization of heads of state departments of education, the Council of Chief State School Officers. Input was solicited from many stakeholders for the performance standards document, which is attached. Staff discussed these standards with the Research and Evaluation Subcommittee of the Board of Education on January 19, 1999. The six performance standards are:

1. Teachers are committed to students and their learning
2. Teachers know the subjects they teach and how to teach those subjects to students
3. Teachers are responsible for establishing and managing student learning in a positive learning environment
4. Teachers continually assess student progress, analyze the results, and adapt instruction to improve student achievement
5. Teachers are committed to continuous improvement and professional development
6. Teachers exhibit a high degree of professionalism

Regardless of the status of the teacher - probationary or experienced, outstanding or in need of assistance - the performance standards define clearly the criteria that will be used to evaluate the success of staff.

The National Board for Professional Teaching Standards has developed performance standards that reflect the most rigorous expectations for teacher performance of any standards available. As they have been adapted for Montgomery County Public Schools, they reflect more than a dozen references to student outcomes and performance, which is more than any other similar set of standards reviewed nationwide by the consultants. In addition they refer to teacher expectations for students at least seven times, more frequently than comparable standards in other school systems.

### ***Multi-year Cycle***

Now under review is the evaluation process for the experienced teacher, the "Multi-Year Cycle." This process includes a four or five-year appraisal cycle, with built-in time for self-appraisal and professional development plans. Teachers who are identified as "highly proficient" will be considered for more recognition by the school system. Similarly, teachers not meeting the proficiency-level of the performance standards will be assigned to a more intensive review program for "underperforming" teachers.

### ***Peer Assistance and Review***

The new evaluation system includes procedures to ensure that teachers performing below standards either improve their performance or are non-renewed/dismissed from employment. It also has procedures to ensure that teachers new to MCPS receive the mentoring and assistance necessary to be successful, and are subject to intensive review prior to the issuance of a continuing contract. The details of these procedures will be fully developed and reviewed over the next several months.

### **TRAINING AND SUPPORT**

The new teacher evaluation system recognizes that the most important part of a successful teacher evaluation system is the human capacity of those who implement it their knowledge, their skill, their courage, and their persistence. To improve the skills of those who are charged with implementing the new system, a multi-year training plan has been established. During the first year of development, the consultants have trained 240 school-based and central office administrators, resource teachers, interdisciplinary resource teachers, and instructional support teachers. The school-based staff members were selected from seven clusters, two additional middle schools, and two special education schools (Bethesda-Chevy Chase, Damascus, Col. Zadok Magruder, Quince Orchard, Sherwood, Walt Whitman, and Thomas S. Wootton clusters, Eastern and Silver Spring International middle schools, Mark Twain School and Carl Sandburg Center).

The first level of training addressed the observation and analysis of teaching, teaching

participants what to look for in classroom observations and how to assess the effects of that behavior on student learning. The second level of training will teach participants how to apply the evidence gathered from observations to the performance standards. The training will also focus on assessing a teacher's performance through the connection between the material gathered through an array of measures and the high expectations set forth in the MCPS performance standards that we are discussing this evening.

Several validation studies are planned at the completion of various levels of training to ensure the correlation of the new model to student outcomes and interrater reliability among participants. Additionally, MCPS will develop a cadre of school system trainers by the end of the consultant's contract.

### **CONCLUSION**

A high level of communication with various stakeholder groups has been maintained throughout the development phase of the new teacher evaluation system. The response from those in training, as well as stakeholder groups reviewing the new processes, continues to be extremely positive. The Maryland State Department of Education has established a statewide committee in response to inquiries by other Maryland school districts as to the project being developed in Montgomery County Public Schools.

A steering committee had been established to continue to facilitate the successful and timely development of the teacher evaluation system and to ensure continuing involvement of and communication with stakeholder groups. Teachers, school-based administrators, and critical decisionmakers from executive staff and other central administrative offices are included. I am pleased with the progress made to date and am confident the steering committee will bring this project to fruition.

### **Re: DISCUSSION**

Mr. Felton thought that the Board was pleased with the progress made in the development of the teacher evaluation system; however, the Board was concerned with the clear relationship between improvements in student achievement and teacher performance.

Mr. Butler thought the new teacher evaluation system was very important to the school system. It was a new and innovative way to evaluate teachers, and he stressed the importance of student input. Dr. Arons commented that a new student survey had been developed, and it was more focused and dealt with student outcomes.

Mr. Abrams noted that collaboration among the stakeholders had been stressed in the presentation, and he questioned why Mr. Whigham and Mr. Simon had not participated in the presentation since he was interested in their perspective.

Mrs. King believed that staff should take sufficient time to develop an evaluation system that was fair and equitable. She was pleased with what she had seen to date.

Mrs. Gordon was excited with the development of the teacher evaluation system. Over the last two years at the national level, there had been an ongoing dialogue of performance-based evaluations, improved standards, and teacher professionalism. She thought MCPS was on the front end of responding to national trends. Also, she was pleased that there had been collaboration in the development of the system. She supported the development of the standards, as well as the other components. High standards would encourage teachers to be all that they can be. Eventually, she hoped that there would be performance-based evaluations for all employees. When the Board asked for a new teacher evaluation system, it wanted evaluations tied to student outcomes and the ability to reward highly able teachers, help teachers in need, and cull out teachers who were ineffective. She thought the standards were moving toward those goals. However, she believed that some of the standards would be difficult to measure. She wanted to be assured that the standards for student performance would be part of the evaluation measures. It should be clear to the teacher what the expectation was and that that expectation was measurable. Ms. Spooner replied that stakeholders had worked on a peer system and review model to refine those components. The entire context of the system included a multi-year cycle where there were check-ins to assure that teachers were meeting the standards, exceeding the standards, or failing to meet the standards. The fundamental piece of the system was professional development which was rigorous, documented, and specific to the goals and objectives within a school or the system.

Mr. Felton thought professional development was clear; however, what was not as clear was the nexus with student performance and achievement. Mrs. Gemberling replied that the whole validation process would be incorporated throughout the system. As the performance measures and criteria were developed for teacher performance, the school system must train people to evaluate in a consistent way. Also, the measured criteria must correlate with improved student performance. Validation studies would (1) determine if the training produced consistency with observers and acquired skills, and (2) did measures align with student results.

Mr. Burnett was encouraged with the teacher evaluation system. He looked forward to the remaining components of the system. He thought the staff should take the time to develop a fair and comprehensive system.

Ms. Signer agreed with her colleagues that the teacher evaluation system was unique and exciting. She was pleased that the discussion began with the standards, because the standards were the heart of a good evaluation system. Also, the peer evaluation component was very important, not just for the ineffective teachers, but to encourage new teachers. New teachers were in need of a mentoring program to help them succeed and

become teachers of excellence. Also, the standards were the heart of the program since the principals needed tools to assess teacher competence. It was important to her to know that the standards and, indeed, the entire system were developed in collaboration with MCEA, MCAASP, parents, and students. Eventually, she would like the school system to look at a 360-degree evaluation process. In that process, students evaluate teachers, principals evaluate teachers, and teachers and students evaluate principals. The multi-year cycle was important, but feedback from principals indicated that five years was too long between evaluations. In the validation study, Ms. Signer questioned how teacher evaluations were linked to student outcomes. She wanted student progress year after year.

Mrs. O'Neill observed that when the Board adopts a teacher evaluation system, there must be evidence of the collaborative effort among MCAASP, MCEA, and MCPS, and it should be reflected in the document. She wanted a timeline on how the school system was proceeding on the development of the peer review and assistance. The training of resource teachers and principals provided "new eyes" on how to evaluate teachers in the classroom and was critical in the process.

Mr. Felton asked when the school system would develop the measurement for the standards. Outside of the use of tests, Dr. Arons replied that the county already had in place an array of measures, such as grade books, portfolios, written work, participation in class, lesson plans and objectives, among others. Staff would present a list of comprehensive measurements that relate to the standards.

Mr. Felton felt the Board understood the comprehensive approach to assessment, but the concern throughout the country was that there was not the appreciation of that approach. The Board supported that strategy, but the Board knew that parents and elected officials would not support evaluated "outstanding" teachers without improved student performance. There had to be a relationship between evaluation of teachers and student achievement. Mrs. Gemberling pointed out that there was a different philosophy behind the new teacher evaluation system, and what evaluators looked for in the classroom. Learning objectives stressed purposeful activities, mastery of the subject, critical thinking skills, and the teachers able to differentiate learning within the classroom. The real issue around student outcomes was not only once a year assessments, but teachers constantly monitoring the individual student progress and adapting the instructional strategies to the student in order for the student to master the learning objectives.

Mrs. Gordon was pleased to hear that professional development was part of the teacher evaluation system. In the past, evaluation was viewed as a separate, punitive action that bore no connection to professional growth. Professional development must be the main part of the system as employees move forward to increase their abilities to be effective educators. However, that was the reason she had concern about the standards. The

professionals will do the job expected of them if they understand the standards. She hoped that the teacher evaluation system would be very clear about the standards, what they mean, and how they would be measured.

Mr. Simon indicated that there had been a high level of collaboration on the teacher evaluation system with all the stakeholders. He was very hopeful that collaboration would continue as well as be reflected in the final document.

Mr. Whigham thought the standards were moving in the right direction and it would take time to work out the philosophical and mechanical details. An accountability system based on student outcomes would lead to a useful evaluation instrument.

Mr. Abrams stated that it would be helpful to the Board if all of the stakeholders address the Board at one time. The collaboration should be reflected in all of the reports and presentations that come to the Board. Of course, there would be areas of disagreement, and those issues should be discussed with the Board. Therefore, no one group would feel disenfranchised, and the Board could pursue areas of concern with all the stakeholders.

Mrs. Gordon referred to the fact that the Board of Education had not been included in the collaboration. When the Board received a document that had been collaboratively produced by staff, the Board's concerns were viewed as contentious. It was important for the Board to have input throughout the process, especially when the Board had requested a substantive change in an operational document. Mrs. Gordon asked that the Board, as a stakeholder, should be involved in the collaborative efforts in developing the system.

Mr. Felton thanked the staff for the progress report, and the Board was excited by the teacher evaluation system. He asked that the Superintendent's staff prepare a contingency plan if other school systems within the state were interested in the evaluation instrument in order to share developmental costs. Also, he wanted the Superintendent to keep the Board informed regarding development and training costs. Often, those costs were presented as one, but many people in the community wanted those costs separated.

Mrs. Gordon remarked that as the teacher evaluation system was further developed, it would come before the Research and Evaluation Committee. Mr. Fischer stated that staff would be ready for another committee meeting in four to six weeks.

**Re: BOARD/SUPERINTENDENT COMMENTS**

Mr. Felton expressed the Board's appreciation and good wishes to Dr. Patricia Hahn upon her retirement from MCPS.

Mrs. Gordon reported that when some Board members attended the AASA Conference,

many of the sessions included topics that the Board had considered. There were seminars on continuous improvement, and she hoped that MCPS would explore other programs and innovations taking place in other parts of the country.

Ms. Signer requested that the Superintendent provide an update on MCPS' participation in TIMSS-R.

Mr. Felton asked the Superintendent to provide recommendations regarding involvement in the Network of Community Resources program.

RESOLUTION NO. 133-99            Re:    **CLOSED SESSION RESOLUTION**

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

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education of Montgomery County conduct a portion of its meeting on Tuesday, March 9, 1999, in Room 120 of the Carver Educational Services Center from 8:30 to 10:00 a.m. and 12:30 to 2:00 p.m. to discuss personnel matters, as permitted under Section 10-508(a)(1) of the *State Government Article*, consult with counsel to obtain legal advice, as permitted by Section 10-508(a)(7) of the *State Government Article*; and to review and adjudicate appeals in its quasi-judicial capacity and to discuss matters of an executive function outside the purview of the Open Meetings Act (Section 10-503(a) of the *State Government Article*); and be it further

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

Re:    **REPORT OF CLOSED SESSION**

On January 12, 1999, by unanimous vote, the Board of Education voted to conduct a closed session on February 9, 1999, as permitted under the *Education Article* § 4-107 and *State Government Article* § 10-501, *et seq.*, of the *Annotated Code of Maryland*.

The Montgomery County Board of Education voted and met in closed session on February 9, 1998, from 8:35 to 9:25 a.m. and 1:15 to 2:00 p.m. in Room 120, Carver Educational Services Center, Rockville, Maryland, and

1.     Discussed and reviewed the Personnel Monthly Report, subsequent to which the vote to approve the report was taken in open session



2. Reviewed and/or adjudicated the following appeals: T-1998-133, 1998-34, 1998, 36, 1998-42, 1999-1, and 1999-3.
3. Received an update on the *Bus Aides' Social Security Litigation* from its attorney
4. Discussed matters relating to MCEA and MCAASP collective bargaining negotiations

In attendance at part or all of the above closed sessions were: Elizabeth Arons, Steve Abrams, Larry Bowers, Kermit Burnett, Geonard Butler, Reggie Felton, David Fischer, Bea Gordon, Pat Hahn, Roland Ikheloa, Nancy King, Don Kopp, George Margolies, Patricia O'Neill, Brian Porter, Tom Reinert, Glenda Rose, Mona Signer, Roger Titus, Paul Vance, and Ron Walsh.

**RESOLUTION NO. 135-99****Re: BOARD APPEAL 1998-42**

On motion of Mrs. O'Neill and seconded by Ms. Signer, the following resolution was adopted:

Resolved, That the Board of Education adopts its Decision in Appeal 1998-42, survey procedures, reflective of the following vote: Mr. Abrams, Mr. Burnett, Mr. Butler, Mr. Felton, Mrs. Gordon, Mrs. O'Neill, and Ms. Signer voting to dismiss; Mrs. King was absent.

**RESOLUTION NO. 136-99****Re: BOARD APPEAL 1999-1**

On motion of Mrs. O'Neill and seconded by Ms. Signer, the following resolution was adopted:

Resolved, That the Board of Education adopts its Decision in Appeal 1999-1, course scheduling, reflective of the following vote: Mr. Abrams voting to dismiss, Mr. Burnett, Mr. Butler, Mr. Felton, Mrs. Gordon, Mrs. O'Neill, and Ms. Signer voting to remand; Mrs. King was absent.

**RESOLUTION NO. 137-99****Re: BOARD APPEAL 1999-3**

On motion of Mrs. O'Neill and seconded by Mr. Butler, the following resolution was adopted:

Resolved, That the Board of Education adopts its Decision in Appeal 1999-3, course scheduling, reflective of the following vote: Mr. Abrams, Mr. Burnett, Mr. Butler, Mr. Felton, Mrs. Gordon, Mrs. O'Neill, and Ms. Signer voting to reverse; Mrs. King was absent.

RESOLUTION NO. 138-99

Re: **BOARD APPEAL T-1999-1**

On motion of Mrs. O'Neill and seconded by Mr. Abrams, the following resolution was adopted:

Resolved, That the Board of Education adopts its Decision in Appeal T-1999-1, student transfer, reflective of the following vote: Mr. Abrams, Mr. Burnett, Mr. Butler, Mr. Felton, Mrs. Gordon, Mrs. O'Neill, and Ms. Signer voting to affirm; Mrs. King voting to reverse.

RESOLUTION NO. 139-99

Re: **GIFTED AND TALENTED EDUCATION**

On motion of Ms. Signer and seconded by Mrs. O'Neill, the following resolution was adopted unanimously:

WHEREAS, Board of Education Policy I0A, Gifted and Talented Education, which was adopted on November 14, 1995, requires that an annual report be made to the Board on the progress of implementing this policy during its first three years; and

WHEREAS, The last annual update was on November 11, 1997, and no update was provided during November 1998; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Board of Education schedule time no later than May 31, 1999, for an update on Policy I0A.

RESOLUTION NO. 140-99

Re: **DOUBLE A EXAM EXEMPTION**

On motion of Mr. Butler and seconded by Mrs. Gordon, the following resolution was adopted unanimously:

WHEREAS, High school students in Montgomery County Public Schools are challenged daily by a rigorous curriculum; and

WHEREAS, High achieving students evidence their mastery of the curriculum throughout a semester through tests, quizzes, homework, assignments, and long-term projects; and

WHEREAS, Students who attain an "A" for both marking periods that comprise a semester have demonstrated such mastery and are likely to receive an "A" for their semester grade;

WHEREAS, Administrative Regulation ILA-RA, but not Board policy, requires end-of-course examinations to be administered and that such examinations constitute apart of the student's final course grade; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Superintendent of Schools provide a memorandum to the Board of Education that addresses the pros and cons, as well as his recommendation, for revising Administrative Regulation ILA-RA so as to exempt all high school students from taking end-of-course examinations when they have attained an "A" for both marking periods that comprise a semester; and be it further

Resolved, That such memorandum include, to the extent feasible, computer-generated data from recent semesters evidencing the extent to which grades on the end-of-course examinations have affected the final grades of students who had attained an "A" for both marking periods; and be it further

Resolved, That the Superintendent submit his memorandum in sufficient time for the matter to be considered by the Board of Education at a meeting no later than June 30, 1999; and be it further

Resolved, That exemption from semester exams may not be granted if such exemption interferes with state requirements for graduation.

**Re: NEW BUSINESS**

1. Ms. Signer moved and Mrs. Gordon seconded the following

Resolved, That the Superintendent provide a memorandum on (1) the timetable for further development of countywide final exams, (2) school by school variations and what constitutes a passing grade on countywide final exams and the practice of local schools substituting their own questions or deleting questions, and (3) the relationship between MCPS final exams and the Maryland State High School Assessment program.

2. Mrs. King moved and Mrs. O'Neill seconded the following:

WHEREAS, The Board of Education's Operating Budget request includes funds to accelerate the initiative to improve elementary school reading instruction by reducing the size of Grades 1 and 2 reading classes in all elementary schools to a maximum of 15 students; and

WHEREAS, The Board's Operating Budget request also proposes to expand the all-day kindergarten program by an additional 12 classes; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Board of Education direct the Superintendent to present to the Board a paper showing clearly the differences in curriculum between

half-day and all-day kindergarten classes in Montgomery County Public Schools; and be it further

Resolved, That such a paper include an analysis reflecting how the kindergarten curriculum is aligned to meet the objectives of the Board's reading initiative, or proposed changes to the curriculum to reflect the objectives of the reading initiative; and be it further

Resolved, That this paper, inclusive of any recommendations from the Superintendent as to the curriculum and the expansion of all-day kindergarten classes, be presented to the Board for its consideration at the time the Board takes final action in June 1999 on its FY 2000 Operating Budget.

RESOLUTION NO. 141-99            Re:    **ADJOURNMENT**

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education adjourn its meeting of February 24, 1999, at 10:50 p.m.

---

PRESIDENT

---

SECRETARY

PLV:gr

# MONTGOMERY COUNTY BOARD OF EDUCATION SUMMARY SHEET

February 24, 1999

CLOSED SESSION RESOLUTION .....	1
APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA .....	2
REPORT FROM HAZARD, YOUNG, ATTEA, AND ASSOCIATES, LTD. ....	2
WOMEN'S HISTORY MONTH RECOGNITION .....	4
SCHOOL BUS SAFETY POSTER CONTEST AWARDS .....	5
RATIFICATION OF MCAASP AGREEMENT .....	5
ITEM OF LEGISLATION .....	6
PUBLIC COMMENTS .....	10
CONTRACTS FOR MORE THAN \$25,000 .....	10
ARCHITECTURAL APPOINTMENT - ROCK CREEK VALLEY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL .....	12
AWARD OF CONTRACT - ENGINEERING SERVICES FOR BURTONSVILLE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL .....	12
CHANGE ORDERS OVER \$25,000 .....	13
UTILIZATION OF FY 1999 FUTURE SUPPORTED PROJECT FUNDS FOR THE MARYLAND EQUIPMENT INCENTIVE FUND .....	14
UTILIZATION OF FY 1999 FUTURE SUPPORTED PROJECT FUNDS FOR THE EVENT-BASED SCIENCE: EARTH OBSERVING SATELLITE CONNECTION PROJECT .....	14
FY 2000 BUDGET AMENDMENT FOR TENTATIVE AGREEMENT WITH THE MONTGOMERY COUNTY EDUCATION ASSOCIATION .....	15
NON-RECOMMENDED REDUCTIONS OF THE FY 2000 OPERATING BUDGET .....	17
UPDATE ON THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE TEACHER EVALUATION SYSTEM .....	25
BOARD/SUPERINTENDENT COMMENTS .....	31
CLOSED SESSION RESOLUTION .....	32
REPORT OF CLOSED SESSION .....	32
BOARD APPEAL .....	33
GIFTED AND TALENTED EDUCATION .....	34
DOUBLE A EXAM EXEMPTION .....	34
NEW BUSINESS .....	35
ADJOURNMENT .....	36