

NUMBER: 26-1991
STATUS: APPROVED
PLACE: ROCKVILLE, MARYLAND
DATE: APRIL 9, 1991
TEXT:

APPROVED
26-1991

Rockville, Maryland
April 9, 1991

The Board of Education of Montgomery County met in regular session at the Carver Educational Services Center, Rockville, Maryland, on Tuesday, April 9, 1991, at 10:10 a.m.

ROLL CALL Present: Mr. Blair G. Ewing, President
in the Chair
Mrs. Frances Brenneman
Mr. David Chang
Dr. Alan Cheung
Mrs. Sharon DiFonzo
Mrs. Carol Fanconi
Ms. Ana Sol Gutierrez
Mrs. Catherine E. Hobbs

Absent: None

Others Present: Dr. Harry Pitt, Superintendent
Dr. Paul L. Vance, Deputy Superintendent
Mr. Thomas S. Fess, Parliamentarian

#indicates student vote does not count. Four votes are needed for adoption.

RESOLUTION NO. 333-91 Re: BOARD AGENDA - APRIL 9, 1991

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Mrs. DiFonzo seconded by Mrs. Hobbs, the following resolution was adopted unanimously:

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education approve its agenda for April 9, 1991.

RESOLUTION NO. 334-91 Re: APPOINTMENT OF SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS

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

WHEREAS, The Public School Laws of Maryland require the appointment of a superintendent of schools for a four-year term commencing July 1 following said appointment; and

WHEREAS, The Public School Laws of Maryland require the approval of the state superintendent of schools for such appointment; and

WHEREAS, The Board of Education of Montgomery County, Maryland, acting in executive session on March 25 by unanimous vote authorized a subcommittee of the Board to negotiate an agreement between the Board of Education and its designated appointee; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education of Montgomery County hereby appoints Dr. Paul L. Vance as superintendent of schools of Montgomery County for a term of four years commencing July 1, 1991, and concluding June 30, 1995; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education incorporates in this resolution the attached required letter of approval of the state superintendent of schools; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education hereby authorizes the president of the Board to execute the attached agreement between the Board of Education of Montgomery County and Dr. Paul L. Vance, said agreement to be appended to the minutes of this meeting.

Re: ANALYSIS OF MANAGEMENT IMPROVEMENTS
- BOARD OF EDUCATION TASK FORCE ON
EFFICIENCY

Mr. Ewing stated that the Board believed that it was important to give additional time to the recommendations of the task force on efficiency as well as the internal studies on efficiency. The Board wanted to reach some conclusions about those items which should be pursued for the long-term and for their potential for FY 1992 reductions in the budget.

Dr. Pitt indicated that he was prepared to talk about the staff recommendations, and he would have a memo in a week or so on the items proposed by the Board task force because he wanted to hear Board views on the topics. Mr. Ewing welcomed Dr. Michael Richman and Mr. Ronald Wohl, task force members, to the table.

Dr. Richman reminded the Board that the task force made its recommendations with some principles in mind. "More efficient" meant more than "less expensive." It also meant a result equal to what now existed, if not better. It was sometimes necessary to spend some money in the short run to spend less in the long run. Finally, they did not understand their charge to require that their recommendations result in immediate savings, so some recommendations might be most efficient if implemented over a period of time.

Dr. Richman stated that the Board should make its budget reductions and introduce efficiencies with a clear, articulated idea of where they wanted MCPS to be in the future. When they recommended saving transportation costs, for example, by returning most special education students to their neighborhood schools, the task force did not do so with the idea that the same programs would be restored when funding was again available. Rather, they saw this fiscal situation as an opportunity to implement a new way of educating these students, an opportunity

to remodel the system.

Dr. Richman indicated that they now had their recommendations in a different format. The list showed when a recommendation could be implemented. They still did not have exact information on savings for each recommendation; however, this could be provided in their final report. He also thanked Mr. Larry Bowers and Dr. Joy Frechtling for their work on the internal study.

In regard to what the school system would look like in the future, Mr. Ewing asked staff to provide the task force with the materials the Board had presented at the County Council meeting.

The Board had also talked with the Council in brief terms about the business of enterprise funds for a number of activities. He thought there was interest on the Council for working with the Board on enterprise funds.

Mr. Wohl reported that the task force was meeting with various organizations, and last week they had met with the Council's committee on effectiveness. Dr. Pitt indicated that he was prepared to give some preliminary reactions as they discussed the recommendations.

In regard to health insurance, Dr. Pitt pointed out that they were in negotiations on this. However, it would be possible to offset the tax so that people would not pay taxes on money they contributed. He said that everyone had talked about the possibility of enterprise funds, and they would have to see what happened there. In regard to adult ESOL programs, he noted that the county provided the funds for that in the Board's budget. He had a problem with this recommendation because these were people who were on the very low end of the wage scale. The question was whether it should be part of the school system's budget.

In regard to returning special education students to their home schools, Dr. Pitt had a great concern. There was a duality of thinking in this area. Everyone believed youngsters should be moved into the least restrictive environment. However, there was a difference in a youngster with severe handicaps being integrated into a school with four or five other youngsters and having each youngster in his or her home school. There were a number of services that had to be received. Some people argued that they could reduce those services, but he questioned this because there were certain requirements in the law. Secondly, the transportation issue was a mixed bag. Many of these children would not be able to be transported on a regular bus, although many students could go on the regular bus. He believed that projecting a \$14 million saving was misleading to the public. He did think they should examine this, however.

Dr. Pitt agreed that they needed to improve the technology for computer scheduling of high school students and hire aides to do

the data entry. They were working on using volunteers and paid aides to handle classroom paperwork functions. In regard to the substitute bank using teachers assigned to nonclassroom duties, he noted that another county had tried this with considerable disruption. He questioned how effective this would be. Another concern was the proposal to reduce the time of some of these people such as resource teachers. However, he agreed that this was something to look at because in the past they had used surplused teachers for this purpose.

Concerning the one-time retirement incentive, Dr. Pitt reported that they had taken some preliminary looks at this and while there was a short-term saving, there were long-term costs. He suggested that Larry Bowers meet with the committee to discuss this issue. Reducing EYE days by contracting with staff to produce finished curriculum development products was a contractual issue, but he agreed they should look at this.

In regard to examining the one teacher/one classroom model, Dr. Pitt indicated that this was something that had been talked about for years. The question was the amount of pull-out service tied to this. However, he thought they could pursue this, but he did not see immediate savings. Dr. Pitt asked that Mr. Bowers talk with the committee about special education costs of Medicaid-eligible children.

Dr. Pitt pointed out that they could not charge tuition to children of families with diplomatic visas. Congress would have to change the law. He agreed that they should work to find a way to expand staff development activities.

Concerning ESOL, Dr. Richman said he had a strong interest in this because Blair High School had a large program for adults receiving ESOL help. He did not want to see those services diminished. The concern the task force had was trying to understand the history of how the program started and whether it was directly related to K-12 education. Dr. Pitt replied that Mrs. Fanconi had raised the issue of adult education. In the state of Maryland there were a number of systems having responsibility for adult education, but in other systems the community college had the program. The question was whether this was an area where MCPS should spend a great deal of time and money. It was not a question of not providing the program.

Mr. Wohl said they had the responsibility for doing certain activities and they also had the responsibility for paying for these activities. The county offered a great deal of services to the recent immigrant populations, and these were paid for out of county funds and were not part of the Board's budget. He suggested that the county might want to fund the ESOL services provided by the Board in an enterprise fund so that it would not be part of the Board's regular budget. Dr. Pitt agreed that they

needed to pursue this through the enterprise fund. The public saw the Board's budget as a total figure and did not realize that such things as ESOL for adults were in that budget. Mr. Wohl reported that the task force had already discussed this with the Council's committee. One of the areas was responsibility and coordination, and a lot of education in the county was done by different agencies. It was a question of who should have the responsibility.

Mr. Ewing asked that the Board go on the record regarding the recommendations. He suggested going through the recommendations one by one.

In regard to II.A (If current negotiations result in an increase in the employee's share of health insurance, offset this added burden to employees by allowing premiums to be paid as a deduction from salary before taxes), Dr. Pitt had stated that this was doable but was related to negotiations. Mr. Ewing thought they should continue to explore this. Dr. Pitt explained that the tax part of it was doable, but taking that money and reducing benefits was a different story.

In regard to III.A (Place income from all fee-bearing programs in an enterprise fund), Mr. Ewing said the superintendent thought this should be pursued and they ought to look at a variety of fee-bearing programs. They needed a recommendation from staff as to which of those funds could be put into an enterprise fund. Dr. Pitt pointed out that adult education cost about \$1.2 million, and about \$1 million of that was revenue. If they put \$1 million in an enterprise fund, their budget would be reduced by \$1 million, but it was not really a \$1 million savings. The second part was that they might be able to charge a higher rate in some cases. If they were to do this for summer school, it would be a savings to the budget.

Mrs. Fanconi thought they needed to know where the obstacles were and what the Board needed to do in order to have this happen as well as what the timeline was on that. Dr. Pitt said they should pursue the areas where there was difference between last year's revenue and this year's revenue. The longer-term issue was the issue of reducing the total budget. Mr. Bowers reported that the executive's staff supported the concept of raising the fees and that they would work with MCPS staff on this. Mr. Ewing said the Board agreed that they should pursue this and that the superintendent should develop a set of action steps. Dr. Pitt added that they ought to pursue the idea of foundations which the Board had already started.

III. B was to discontinue the practice of offering adult ESOL programs free of charge. Mr. Ewing said that the task force was recommending they not decrease services but to find a way to shift the costs. Ms. Gutierrez was concerned about this issue.

She pointed out that these courses were not free of charge because there was a partial payment by the students along with state and federal funding. Dr. Richman agreed and said that the language would be changed in their final report.

Ms. Gutierrez stated that students did pay for this because she had been paying for several people she had encouraged to take English. No one was getting this free of charge. It seemed to her that they were targeting a special single population within the Adult Education Program. If they looked at the cost benefit of this investment, they would see that for very little cost they were getting an enormous capability in level of work and productivity. For many it was an enormous effort to attend the adult ESOL courses. She believed that MCPS was the place to have this. If Montgomery College offered these courses, it would be very difficult for people to get transportation to attend these courses. MCPS had locations throughout the communities, and they also had the teachers. Many teachers did depend on these teaching assignments for additional income. She agreed that the county government had to recognize that this was a growing population and there was a growing need for these services. She did have a problem with the way the recommendation had been phrased by the task force.

Mrs. Fanconi recommended that the wording be changed to state that the recommendation would reflect all Adult Education, not just the ESOL program, and show accurate data in terms of cost. There were a number of things that the county and MCPS worked together on, and she had requested a memo on the impact of the budget cuts in the county government on social services and other programs that impacted school programs. She asked that the Task Force be provided with that memo.

Dr. Pitt commented that this was an area the Board ought to take some time on. This was the issue of who should be responsible for educational areas outside of K-12. The issue was what was best for the school system to do and included the whole issue of enterprise funds. If Adult Education ought to stay with MCPS, the revenue ought to be put in an enterprise fund. The responsibility for Adult Education evolved without good rationale, and the Board should study this. Mr. Ewing thought that the Board's position might be that they were not prepared to pursue it as it stood. Mr. Wohl reported that the Task Force had an issue they would be coming back to regarding the coordination function.

Mr. Ewing said the next issue was I.A. - Return the great majority of special education students to their home schools. This was also on the staff's list. He asked Dr. Joy Frechtling, director of the Department of Educational Accountability, to join the Board at the table. The staff had suggested phasing this in over a period of five years and starting right away.

Mr. Bowers explained that their recommendation was to look at the high school level as the initial place they would look at programs. They also felt they could begin to look closely at how they would do it next year in terms of planning. This would take time in terms of planning, development, and implementation. Mr. Ewing said the point was to start the planning right away, and Mr. Bowers agreed.

Mrs. Fanconi thought that this was one that staff should work on.

Mr. Ewing suggested that staff also ask for the advice of the several advisory committees working in the area of special education. Mr. Wohl pointed out that an important component of this was training. Dr. Pitt commented that the issues involved in this were enormous.

Mrs. Fanconi was concerned that the Council did not understand the multiple impacts on the ability of MCPS to do staff training.

They were losing area office people, people doing curriculum development, and cutting into EYE days. This would affect their ability to mainstream children and their ability to respond to minority achievement efforts.

Dr. Pitt said there was another issue involving the goodwill of people. It was one thing for a parent to say his or her child should be in a local school and that some services would be given up. There was another group that insisted on the full services required by law. Legally, MCPS would have to respond if parents demanded these services.

Mr. Ewing thought the Board was in agreement that they ought to start with the planning immediately and that they were not committed to any particular model or the timing. They would want staff to be sure to examine all of the disadvantages and advantages as well as the cost savings. The Board did not believe that cost savings would occur in the first year and might not occur for a number of years. Mrs. Fanconi said they were looking at the delivery of special education services, and their primary concern should be the quality of educational services to these children. This would be a different service delivery model, and the cost savings were not the issue. Mr. Ewing thought that the community proposing this had that view but were also convinced that there were cost savings.

Mrs. DiFonzo asked whether there would be cost savings. For example, if they had to provide speech therapy in every school, it might offset the transportation savings. She would question whether this was a valid statement and did it save them money. Where did the savings come from?

Mr. Ewing said the next recommendation was to improve the technology for computing scheduling of high school students and

hiring aides to do the data entry. It was Dr. Pitt's view that this ought to be explored, and that they were moving in that direction.

The next recommendation was to use volunteers and paid aides to handle classroom paperwork functions. This produced no dollar savings, and Dr. Pitt had commented that they were moving in this direction. Mr. Wohl pointed out that this also required training to teach staff using these aides to delegate responsibility. Mr. Chang asked about the use of students as aides, and Dr. Pitt replied that they already used students.

Mr. Ewing said the next recommendation was to use certified teachers assigned to non-classroom duties as a substitute bank until budget stringencies were eased. For example, people from the central office could serve as substitutes. Dr. Pitt reported that this was being tried out in Prince George's, and it had real problems. He thought they ought to review the possibility, but he cautioned that there would be relatively small savings. A substitute was paid \$85 a day, and having administrators do this would disrupt their work schedule. MCPS had done this when they had people who were surplused or not assigned to jobs. Dr. Pitt pointed out that they had had 28 teacher specialists in the areas, and if they had them they could argue that in a bad year they could do some substituting. However, they no longer had these people. They had reduced the central office staff by 12 percent; therefore, the availability of people was limited. Using those people would pull them away from other tasks.

Mr. Ewing suggested that they examine how they used staff to provide for substitutes, examine the experience of those school systems which were presently doing something like this, and decide where they went from there. Dr. Pitt thought they should look at the cost effectiveness as well.

Mr. Ewing said the next recommendation was to offer a one-time retirement incentive. Dr. Pitt had suggested that Mr. Bowers and the committee meet to go over the staff analysis. Beyond that, the Board needed to take a position on the early retirement incentive program that was presently in existence. Dr. Richman explained that they were trying to focus on the issue of the teacher who already had over 30 years in the school system.

The next recommendation was to reduce EYE days by contracting with staff to produce finished curriculum development products at a fixed fee. Mr. Ewing stated that the superintendent had said this was a negotiated item. It could be priced out. Dr. Pitt thought that contracting out was legal, but they had to review the issue of EYE days. Mr. Bowers reported that the staff report had included this as well. Mr. Ewing said the Board was in agreement that staff would look at this.

Mr. Ewing said that the next recommendation was to examine the one teacher/one classroom model that prevailed in the elementary school with an eye to possible efficiencies and improved instruction that might result. Board members agreed that this was worth exploring.

The next recommendation was to arrange to have the related special education costs of Medicaid-eligible children paid for by Medicaid. Mr. Bowers reported that this was also a staff recommendation although they had looked further toward parents' insurance covering this. Mr. Ewing recalled that about a year and a half ago he had written a memo suggesting that there were other school systems where Medicaid was being tapped for those services. The amount of money was substantial, and there were people in Health and Human Services and the Department of Education who were sympathetic to this idea.

Mrs. DiFonzo asked about what was involved in "arranging" for this. Mr. Ewing replied that they would have to identify what the costs were and what was eligible for payment under Medicaid.

Dr. Pitt added that there were administrative costs involved in doing something like this. They had to look at the cost of doing this versus the payoff. Mr. Bowers remarked that Baltimore City's experience had not been everything that they had originally expected it to be. One of the options would be to consider having a contractor do it and be paid for out of the savings that would be generated. Mrs. DiFonzo asked about resistance they might anticipate from Medicaid and private insurance providers. Mr. Bowers believed that the private providers would be more of an issue than Medicaid because other school systems were doing this. Mr. Ewing said that the Board's position would be to pursue the development of an approach for this recommendation. A determination would have to be made of the costs involved.

Mr. Ewing said that the next recommendation was to pursue legislation to permit the charging of tuition to children of families with diplomatic visas. He reported that in 1979 the State Board of Education had ruled against this proposal. They had cited both Maryland and federal law. The Supreme Court struck down the University of Maryland on the same issue in 1982.

Congresswoman Morella's staff believed that MCPS could not do this except through the possibility of impact fees that would have to be agreed to by the Congress. He thought there would not be much interest in Congress to do this.

Mr. Wohl pointed out that because of the United Nations, New York might have some interest in this along with Maryland and Virginia. Mr. Ewing stated that the notion that the Board of Education had never looked at this issue was simply not true. They had taken it all the way to the state Board of Education in 1979 and had lost decisively. It was his view that they ought to

try again through some other mechanism.

Dr. Richman pointed out that the Fairness in Taxation Group had issued a statement that this would be an instant \$9 million savings. Dr. Pitt noted out that Mrs. Morella's staff had researched this and had come up with the conclusion that it could not be done. He thought they should pursue the idea of a change in the law. It appeared to Mr. Ewing that the Board wanted to pursue this with the view that there was (a) no certainty that there was a legal way to achieve the results, (b) therefore, no certainty they would have savings, and (c) this would be done in such a way that parents were not doubled taxed or penalized.

Ms. Gutierrez remarked that these families were purchasing property and paying taxes. If they were renting, they were also paying that property tax through the rent. Many diplomats did have an income tax waiver because their income was not being derived from a source in the United States. This was reciprocal for Americans living abroad.

Mrs. Fanconi was not sure that she agreed this should be pursued.

They had to look at the larger issue of whether they were charging fees to students who should pay the fees. Mr. Ewing said the issue was whether they could work with members of Congress representing Montgomery County on the issue of whether or not there was a way to obtain a change in the law that would lead to resources coming to Montgomery County. Mr. Ewing said there appeared to be agreement to explore this issue with Congress. Mrs. Fanconi said she was not ready to sign a letter, but she would like staff to work on this. Mr. Ewing said the recommendation would be to explore with Congressional staff, the members who represent Montgomery County, the possibility of an impact fee or other legal mechanism to return funds to Montgomery County. Secondly, the Board should be briefed on impact fees in general.

Mr. Ewing said the last recommendation was to find a way to expand staff development activities. He thought they ought to consider changing what was being done now in terms of staff development functions. He doubted that the Board would receive more money for staff development. Dr. Pitt pointed out that many of the county executive's recommendations reduced funds available for staff development. Mrs. Fanconi said she would like staff to develop a short paper showing the effect of the budget cuts on their ability to do staff development. The paper should point out why staff development was so critically important in a system the size of MCPS with the kinds of changes they were having to address.

It seemed to Mr. Ewing that they needed to go beyond that. He believed they needed a plan for a new approach in staff development which would be addressed in part by decisions on the

Gordon report. Mrs. DiFonzo wondered whether developing a paper might be a huge project involving a lot of staff time, and she questioned whether it would be worth it. Dr. Pitt said they had already done that in the course of preparing budget impact statements. Mr. Ewing agreed that staff should put this information in one place for the Board and the Council.

Mr. Wohl commented that it was not just the days of staff time available for training, it was the effect of any of the cuts and the training required to implement the cut. Mr. Ewing stated that the Board was well aware of this and deliberately did not cut central office staff development resources. He believed they had to restructure the resources they had.

Mr. Ewing stated that the Board was in agreement that this issue should be pursued and that staff would pull together a paper.

RESOLUTION NO. 335-91 Re: AN AMENDMENT TO THE BOARD'S AGENDA
FOR APRIL 9, 1991

On motion of Mrs. Hobbs seconded by Ms. Gutierrez, the following resolution was adopted unanimously:

RESOLVED, That the Board's agenda for April 9, 1991, be amended to postpone the facilities discussion to the afternoon in order to take up the staff report on efficiencies and costs savings.

Re: EFFICIENCIES AND COST SAVINGS
REPORT

Dr. Pitt said he would give the Board a brief statement on concepts that could be implemented by July 1 and concepts that would require more time. The first was the transportation time window, and he thought it would be possible to reduce this by another \$250,000. The second was the computer-assisted bus routing system. He said there was money budgeted for the software, but staff had not yet figured out possible savings here. He thought it might be \$80,000 to \$100,000 in savings, but he would not want to cut it out of the budget right now.

In regard to merging phototypesetting and graphic arts, Dr. Pitt thought that about \$50,000 could be saved. However, this had already been built into the budget. There was a savings if they purchased 1 percent milk of about \$73,000, and this was not in the budget. Mr. Bowers pointed out that the milk recommendation would be in the enterprise fund. Dr. Pitt said they were already doing value engineering, and the savings would be in future budgets. In regard to joint procurement, Dr. Pitt thought there might be a modest savings there. They would work with the county on this issue. Mr. Bowers pointed out that this was an area where they had talked about receiving some costs from other agencies when MCPS provided delivery services.

In regard to revenue increases, Dr. Pitt said if they were to take the \$500,000 in revenue from summer school and put that in some kind of enterprise fund, they could reduce the budget by \$500,000. If they were to increase the charges, they could say to the county that funding could be increased by 10 percent which would be additional money and would reduce the budget. Raising fees for summer school and adult education were part of this issue.

Dr. Pitt said they would have to talk about the joint occupancy recommendation. He did not think there was much they could do with that at the moment. Changing the requirement to seek Board approval before contract and grant proposals could be submitted did not save money. It did save time. In regard to delivery of maintenance supplies to work sites, he believed they could save around \$50,000 here.

The idea of electronic bulletin boards would take a modest investment but would save time rather than money. Recovering disability costs from retirees who were now working might save about \$50,000, but Dr. Pitt cautioned that this would have to be tested out. He agreed they ought to start with cost effective purchasing. They were developing a memo on new practices, and he believed they could save about \$25,000. Mr. Bowers added that the Board had already taken some of this by cutting inflation; however, this would have some benefits to help their purchasing power next year.

In regard to changing the pay period on July 1, Dr. Pitt said this would have to be discussed with the union. In FY 1993, they could probably save around \$180,000 to \$200,000. They ought to pursue having people go directly to work sites. The schedule of maintenance workers was more flexible, and again this was something to pursue after July 1. They had tried to contract out painting of buildings and schools by putting money in the budget. He thought that as they expanded they should have painting on a contractual basis.

Mr. Bowers said the immediate issues to pursue were revenue and widening the transportation window. In many of the others, they were looking at projected savings that might take more time. Mr. Ewing asked whether the Board was comfortable with endorsing Dr. Pitt's comments on these. Dr. Cheung said he needed some things to help him to look at these issues. He would like a table of what could be implemented, the timing, and what the savings would be. Dr. Pitt said that in the next month to six weeks Mr. Bowers would have an outline paper of where and when they would be moving.

Mr. Ewing said it was important to have clear what items could be

identified for inclusion and reductions in the FY 92 budget. They needed to do this in advance of the Council's vote, so that the Board could present further reductions to the Council. These would be in the form of an amendment to the Board's budget. Ms. Gutierrez thought they were not giving as much credit as they should to what this effort represented. This was the kind of efficiency and the approach a large system such as MCPS should be taking. They would not reach the best benefit if they did everything by having a gun-to-their-head type of approach which was what the budget crisis was forcing them to do. Management in industry pointed to the fact that best improvements to a system were long-term. A system must be stable before it could be improved. As they were cutting, they were "unstabilizing" the system, and some of these cost-saving measures might be short-sighted. The message of the document was that the system was looking at how they could be more efficient in the long term with the level of understanding and responsibility that was needed to make positive changes. For that reason, it was important to begin to show some results with this.

Dr. Pitt agreed that this effort was a tremendous one. He pointed out that if they looked at the budget book the last two pages talked about cost savings over the last five years. Some of those were very effective and far outplayed what any government agency had done. The energy efficiency program produced savings of almost \$1 million a year, and it had been duplicated by other systems around the country. He wanted to point out that all of this was a continued effort which had started about four years ago. Mr. Ewing stated that the Board was comfortable with Dr. Pitt's recommendations. Dr. Pitt would move ahead as he had reported, with the qualifications on those recommendations having to do with negotiations.

Re: EXECUTIVE SESSION

The Board met in executive session from 11:55 a.m. to 1:35 p.m. to discuss site items, appeals, and budget strategy.

Re: PUBLIC COMMENTS

The following individuals appeared before the Board of Education:

1. Jean Mallon, MCCPTA
2. Catherine Geisler
3. Karen Ringen, Planned Parenthood

Re: CURRENT CRITERIA FOR FACILITIES
MODERNIZATIONS AND RENOVATIONS

Dr. Philip Rohr, associate superintendent for supportive services, reported that when the State of Maryland took over public school construction funding in the early 1970's and were paying for almost all construction, they developed a policy that favored modernizations. When they went into an older school to make improvements, they did not just bring the building up to code. They made educational improvements at the same time, which included the construction of gyms when they modernized elementary schools and art and music rooms. Prior to that time, the school system had been doing renovations and making minor improvements to a number of buildings rather than modernizing a few. Staff had agreed with the state's concept of modernization. For renovations they used the definition of bringing a building up to current codes and standards. They had to deal with some 20 agencies in order to get permits and meet codes. Once they spent 50 percent of the value of the building, they had to bring the building up to all codes and standards. When they spent between 25 and 50 percent of the value, it was up to the code officials to decide what codes had to be met. With a modernization, they brought a building up to current educational standards.

Dr. Rohr indicated that they had been doing modernizations from the mid-1970's to the present. When they had declining enrollment, they had not done many modernizations. The fact that a school needed improvements was a major determination in making a decision about which school to close. At the same time, the availability of state funds dried up. When enrollment turned around in 1983, they embarked on a new school construction program and a modernization program. They had wrestled with the idea of doing modernizations or renovations. Until now, the concept of modernization had been endorsed by boards of education, county councils, and several county executives. MCPS generally modernized on about a 30-year cycle.

Dr. Rohr said that in the mid-1980's they did a physical evaluation of buildings and developed a score by which they tried to determine which schools would be done and when. This had served as a basis for decisions since 1987. However, the score was tempered by concerns such as the heating system and the availability of holding schools. They had had a very successful modernization program.

Dr. Rohr reported that this year the Board had approved a number of projects. The six-year capital improvement program had project description forms (PDF's) for the last five years of the program of modernization. One form had all projects for the remaining five fiscal years. In the following fiscal year, the projects for that fiscal year moved off the generic future PDF on

to individual PDF's. This year the Board approved construction for seven modernization projects. These were White Oak, Pyle, Meadow Hall, Pine Crest, Travilah, Fairland, and Springbrook. The Board also approved planning funds to design additional schools. The County Council in its tentative action approved the concept of a generic PDF for the upcoming fiscal year rather than individual project description forms. Two of the seven were still on individual PDF's: Fairland and Springbrook High School.

The remaining five projects were on the generic project description form. There were also 10 projects in the planning stages that were included on that generic project description form. The decisions as to the timing and the scope of the 17 projects were the Board's. The total amount of funds for the 17 projects were within 3 percent of the Board's request. The real distinction was the timing because they were stretched out over a longer period of time.

Dr. Rohr stated that the Board had to make several decisions. The first was whether to do modernizations as they had done in the past, do renovations, or do both. A decision on a policy on renovations and modernizations would have to be made by August at the latest in preparation for the FY 1993 capital program. For the projects scheduled to start this summer a decision would have to be made by mid-May. The decision was not whether to modernize or renovate, but which schools would be done. All of the schools had been designed and were ready to go. They could not go back and redesign the schools to turn them into renovations. This would be time-consuming and delay the work past the summer starting time.

Dr. Rohr indicated that the county executive had recommended in favor of all projects with the exception of Pine Crest. The funds were there to do four of the five projects. In the staff's opinion, the two mid-level schools should proceed because of the holding school situation and Pyle's heating system. He pointed out that the Board's facilities policy had a section on emergency situations. The superintendent would have to make a recommendation on April 11, and there would have to be a public hearing in early May with a decision to follow.

Mrs. Fanconi thanked Dr. Rohr for an excellent briefing. His sequencing was very good, and it was clear to her what the decisions were the Board had to make.

Mrs. Hobbs suggested that instead of delaying one project for a year they consider delaying one project for six months in order to do all three. Dr. Rohr replied that it might be possible and explained that staff had not explored all the variations. However, it might be necessary to do two that way. In addition, there would be an impact on the holding schools. He and staff would explore this option.

Mr. Ewing hoped that when the policy came to the Board that it would consider several options. In regard to the three projects, Ms. Gutierrez asked about how tied in they were to those designs.

Dr. Rohr replied that there was no easy answer. The projects had been designed in accordance with Board of Education standards. They would have to review each project to determine whether they could change individual components. Ms. Gutierrez thought they needed to look at how they could have a modular design concept to provide them with choices. Dr. Rohr stated that if the Board went that way they would have to review the standards. For example, they might be able to do something between a renovation and a modernization by not providing certain spaces in order to save money.

Mrs. DiFonzo indicated that she would like to sit down with staff and talk about the ranking and scoring system on school facilities. She was very curious about how staff determined the "average age" of the building.

*Mr. Chang temporarily left the meeting at this point.

RESOLUTION NO. 336-91 Re: APPROVAL OF PASCAL PLUS AND
ADVANCED PLACEMENT COMPUTER SCIENCE
A AND B FOR INCLUSION IN THE
PROGRAM OF STUDIES

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

WHEREAS, The Board of Education on December 13, 1983, approved the policy on Instructional Uses of Computers (Resolution No. 995-83); and

WHEREAS, The above policy mandates that computer science curricula be described in the MCPS PROGRAM OF STUDIES; and

WHEREAS, Staff has prepared the course description and objectives for the Pascal Plus and Advanced Placement Computer Science semester courses and has conducted pilots; and

WHEREAS, The Pascal Plus and Advanced Placement Computer Science courses have been recommended by the Council on Instruction and the superintendent based on pilot results; and

WHEREAS, The superintendent recommends that the Board of Education approve these courses; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education approve the Pascal Plus and Advanced Placement Computer Science A and B courses for inclusion in the MCPS Grades 9-12 Computer Science PROGRAM OF STUDIES as a

April 9, 1991

basic core Category 2 course with Honors and Certificate of Merit beginning with the first semester of the 1991-92 school year.

RESOLUTION NO. 337-91 Re: RESOLUTION FOR APPROVAL OF ADVANCED
 PLACEMENT HISTORY OF ART

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

WHEREAS, The public school laws of Maryland specify that the county superintendent shall prepare courses of study and recommend them for adoption by the county board (THE ANNOTATED CODE OF THE PUBLIC GENERAL LAWS OF MARYLAND EDUCATION [Volume], Sec. 4-205; and

WHEREAS, The public school laws of Maryland also state that the county board of education, on the written recommendation of the county superintendent, shall establish courses of study for the schools under its jurisdiction (IBID., Sec. 4-110); and

WHEREAS, The PROGRAM OF STUDIES is the document that contains the prescribed curriculum elements, including instructional objectives, of all MCPS curriculum programs and courses (MCPS Regulation IFB-RA Development and Approval of Curriculum and Supporting Materials); and

WHEREAS, Excellence in curriculum can be maintained only by continuing attention to the need for curriculum change; and

WHEREAS, The Council on Instruction, charged by the superintendent with considering recommendations for curriculum change, has recommended approval of an art sequence entitled Advanced Placement History of Art; and

WHEREAS, The superintendent recommends that the Board of Education approve this new sequence; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education approve the courses Advanced Placement History of Art A and B for inclusion in the MCPS PROGRAM OF STUDIES, to become effective for the 1991-92 school year.

RESOLUTION NO. 338-91 Re: FY 1991 SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION
 FOR THE EISENHOWER SPECIAL PROJECTS
 IN SCIENCE AND MATHEMATICS

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

RESOLVED, That the superintendent of schools be authorized,

subject to County Council approval, to receive and expend an FY 1991 supplemental appropriation of \$151,516 from the Maryland State Department of Education (MSDE) under the Dwight D. Eisenhower Mathematics and Science Education Act, Title II, to provide training to improve the mathematics and science backgrounds and teaching methods of elementary and secondary teachers in the following categories:

	CATEGORY	AMOUNT
	1 Administration	\$144,026
	10 Fixed Charges	7,490

	Total	\$151,516

and be it further

RESOLVED, That the county executive be requested to recommend approval of this resolution to the County Council and a copy be transmitted to the county executive and the County Council.

RESOLUTION NO. 339-91 Re: PROCUREMENT CONTRACTS MORE THAN
\$25,000

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

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:

91-05	Maintenance Service on Microscopes and Balances	
	AWARDEE	
	Alpha and Omega Service	\$ 28,350
96-91	Floor Maintenance Supplies	
	AWARDEES	
	District Supply, Inc.	\$138,570*
	Hillyard, Inc.	7,335
	Huntington Laboratories, Inc.	11,035

	Total	\$156,940

100-91	Wood Mulch	
	AWARDEE	
	The B. Y. Lumber Company	\$ 44,000
117-91	Industrial and Technology Education Electronic Supplies (formerly Industrial Arts Electronic Supplies)	
	AWARDEES	
	Alleghany Educational Supply Company, Inc.	\$ 248
	H. C. Baker Sales Company, Inc.	2,465
	BCS Supply Company	101*
	Brodhead-Garrett Company	295
	Capitol Radio Wholesalers, Inc.	10,802
	Collins Electronics	10,610
	Fairway Electronics	642
	FIC Corporation	98
	Harco Electronics, Inc.	4,262
	Mark Electronics Supply, Inc.	1,304
	Midwest Shop Supplies, Inc.	517*
	Par Electronics, Inc.	23*
	Nicholas P. Pipino Associates	466
	Ritz Audio-Visual Associates, Inc.	1,088*

	Total	\$ 32,921
123-91	Industrial and Technology Education Automotive Supplies (formerly Industrial Arts Automotive Supplies)	
	AWARDEES	
	Automotive Parts Plus	\$ 433
	Brodhead-Garrett Company	1,224
	Ervin Layne Company	924
	Estes Fleet Services and Supply	4,689*
	Ferguson Corporation	352
	Graves-Humphreys, Inc.	29
	K S & B Enterprises, Inc.	421*
	Mattos, Inc.	619
	McHenry Associates, Inc.	8,541
	MSF County Services Company	6,056
	Potomac Airgas, Inc.	1,013
	Satco, Division of Satterlee Company	563
	Vipond Brothers, Inc.	253
	Wareheim-Air Brakes, inc.	4,704

	Total	\$ 29,831
	MORE THAN \$25,000	\$292,042

*Denotes MFD vendors

RESOLUTION NO. 340-91 Re: DISPOSITION OF A PORTION OF THE
LINCOLN CENTER SITE

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

WHEREAS, The Lincoln Center building is no longer required for public school purposes; and

WHEREAS, The Board of Education wants to encourage the use of this historic structure to meet community needs; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education authorizes the superintendent to convey the Lincoln Center structure and surrounding grounds as generally outlined on the site plan, to Montgomery County Government as soon as feasible, reserving perpetual access to the telephone line vault, and subject to the approval of the state superintendent of schools.

RESOLUTION NO. 341-91 Re: CAPITAL PROJECTS TO BE CLOSED
EFFECTIVE JUNE 30, 1991

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

WHEREAS, As part of the capital budget process, the Board of Education closes projects that are completed and transfers the unencumbered balances to other accounts; and

WHEREAS, The Department of School Facilities has reviewed capital projects that may be closed effective June 30, 1991, providing a net capitalization of \$44,211,202.87; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the superintendent be authorized to close, effective June 30, 1991, capital construction projects listed below and to transfer the local unencumbered balances totaling \$64,170.30, subject to final audit, to the Local Unliquidated Surplus Account, Project 999:

PROJECT NO.	SCHOOL	BALANCE
051-12	Laytonsville Elementary School	\$ 25.17
111-01	Capt. James E. Daly Elementary School	147.55
115-01	Up-County Career Center	59,722.97
220-06	Luxmanor Elementary School	309.75
304-06	Broad Acres Elementary School	-0-
308-04	Cloverly Elementary School	-0-

April 9, 1991

518-01	Brooke Grove Elementary School	54.45
606-08	Cabin John Middle School	-0-
756-07	East Silver Spring Elementary School	-0-
764-11	Woodlin Elementary School	-0-
776-09	Montgomery Knolls Elementary School	2,815.30
818-07	Col. E. Brooke Lee Middle School	324.46
999-03	Kennedy Cluster	-0-
999-61	School Kitchen Modernizations	770.65
999-68	Closure Consolidation	-0-

	Total	\$64,170.30

and be it further

RESOLVED, That the county executive be requested to recommend approval to the County Council of these transfers.

RESOLUTION NO. 342-91 Re: PARTIAL RENOVATION - RICHARD
MONTGOMERY HIGH SCHOOL

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

WHEREAS, The following sealed bids were received on March 21, 1991, for the final phase of the partial renovation of Richard Montgomery High School:

BIDDER	BID AMOUNT
1. Tri-M Construction, Inc.	\$440,548
2. Northwood Contractors, Inc.	441,000
3. Heritage Builders, Inc.	444,900
4. Ronald Hsu Construction Co., Inc.	460,700
5. Smith & Haines, inc.	463,900
6. E. H. Glover, Inc.	495,500
7. Raycon Incorporated	500,548
8. Thurman Company	501,525
9. Bob Porter Co., Inc.	504,922
10. C. M. Parker & Co., Inc.	510,575
11. Dustin Corporation, Inc.	514,500
12. Mantayo Company, Inc.	524,750
13. The Gassman Corp.	527,000
14. The McAlister-Schwartz Co.	533,631
15. Corum Construction Company, Inc.	599,769
16. Heidenberger Construction, Inc.	613,000

and

WHEREAS, The low bidder, Tri-M Construction, Inc., has successfully completed similar projects in the Washington metropolitan area; and

WHEREAS, The low bid is within the staff estimate of \$475,000; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That a \$440,548 contract be awarded to Tri-M Construction, Inc., for the partial renovation of Richard Montgomery High School, in accordance with plans and specifications prepared by Grimm & Parker, Architects.

RESOLUTION NO. 343-91 Re: REDUCTION OF RETAINAGE - SHERWOOD HIGH SCHOOL

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

WHEREAS, Dustin Corporation, Inc., general contractor for Sherwood High School, has completed 80 percent of all specified requirements, and has requested that the 10 percent retainage, which is based on the completed work to date, be reduced to 5 percent; and

WHEREAS, The project bonding company, The Insurance Company of North America, Inc., has consented to this reduction; and

WHEREAS, The project architect, Strang and Samaha, recommended this request for reduction be approved; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the 10 percent retainage withheld from periodic payments to Dustin Construction, Inc., general contractor for Sherwood High School, be reduced to 5 percent, with the remaining 5 percent to become due and payable after completion of all remaining requirements and formal acceptance of the completed project.

RESOLUTION NO. 344-91 Re: REDUCTION OF RETAINAGE -
GAITHERSBURG ELEMENTARY SCHOOL #9

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

WHEREAS, Regina Construction Corporation, general contractor for Gaithersburg Elementary School #9, has completed 80 percent of all specified requirements, and has requested that the 10 percent retainage, which is based on the completed work to date, be reduced to 5 percent; and

WHEREAS, The project bonding company, The American Insurance Company, has consented to this reduction; and

WHEREAS, The project architect, Thomas Clark Associates, recommended this request for reduction be approved; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the 10 percent retainage withheld from periodic payments to Regina Construction Corporation, general contractor for Gaithersburg Elementary School #9, be reduced to 5 percent, with the remaining 5 percent to become due and payable after completion of all remaining requirements and formal acceptance of the completed project.

RESOLUTION NO. 345-91 Re: ACCEPTANCE OF JOHN F. KENNEDY
HIGH SCHOOL AUDITORIUM AND SECOND
GYMNASIUM

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

RESOLVED, That having been duly inspected on April 3, 1991, John F. Kennedy High School auditorium and second gymnasium now be formally accepted, and that the official date of completion be established as that date upon which formal notice is received from the architect that the building has been completed in accordance with the plans and specifications, and all contract requirements have been met.

Re: CARL B. PERKINS VOCATIONAL AND
APPLIED TECHNOLOGY EDUCATION ACT OF
1990

Mr. Ewing noted that the superintendent had provided the Board with a summary of the impact of the Perkins Act.

Dr. Pitt reported that he had attended the state superintendents' meeting where the Act had been discussed. The Act focused on trying to help young people who were at risk; however, the Act shifted funds from some systems to others. Some superintendents from rural areas were concerned about whether it was worth applying for funds because of the paperwork involved. Montgomery County would lose money under the Act; however, it was his feeling that the Act made sense and was moving federal funds in the right direction.

Mr. Jack Schoendorfer, director of the Division of Career and Vocational Education, stated that in the past the Perkins Act had funded program improvement through the purchase of up-to-date equipment and materials, developing and revising curricula, providing vocational support staff to assist special needs students, and to provide staff training on equity issues. The paper provided the Board contained a summary of the impact of the new Perkins Act on MCPS, and the other was a summary of the Act

which had been prepared by the Maryland State Department of Education.

Mr. Schoendorfer explained that the basic changes in the ACT were changes in the funding formula, the new criteria for how the money might be spent, and the dropping of the traditional matching requirements. These changes meant that federal resources would be focused on areas of greatest need. All federal vocational programs had to provide for the equitable participation of special populations. Funded programs had to integrate academic and vocational learning. There was also support for tech-prep or 2+2 programs with community colleges. MCPS already had several such agreements in place with Montgomery College. The LEA had to continue a maintenance of effort for these programs.

Mr. Schoendorfer said that the change in the funding formula was anticipated to have a negative impact. The new funding formula placed great emphasis on areas with high populations of economically disadvantaged citizens. Next year they would receive slightly more than the FY 1991 allocation, but FY 1991 was about \$80,000 less than anticipated. He reported that FY 1993 funding would depend on the federal allocation as well as how the state decided to split its basic grant between secondary and post-secondary education. There were now no set-asides in the new grant. In the past they had had set-aside categories for handicapped students, disadvantaged students, etc. This put a cap on the spending for special populations. Now the new law called for programs with full participation of special populations. Programs to be funded had to pass three "gates." The first was that the program should be of such size, scope, and quality as to be effective. The second called for providing for the equitable participation of special populations..."individuals with handicaps, educationally and economically disadvantaged individuals, individuals with limited English proficiency, individuals who participate in programs to eliminate sex bias, and individuals in correctional institutions." The third "gate" was that programs must integrate academic and vocational competencies.

Mr. Schoendorfer reported that once a program passed these three gates then they could use the funds much more flexibly than they did before under the previous law. They had assessed their special population enrollment in each of the high schools and the Edison Center. They were looking at the vocational support services teams to have a greater role in supporting special populations in attaining the academic enablers that were part of those vocational programs. They would be reviewing and revising vocational curriculum to identify those enabling academic competencies and to develop materials for the vocational teachers to present. They would also have training to support the vocational teachers and vocational support services staff in

implementing the integrated curriculum. They planned to organize teams of academic and vocational teachers to revise curriculum for each of the areas, vocational program by vocational program.

For example, they would match vocational teachers with math and English teachers to integrate those disciplines with the vocational program. Teachers would revise the curriculum and develop lessons and activity packets.

Mr. Schoendorfer stated that an important component of this was continued funding of the vocational support service teams. They had already been advised that the vocational support service teams would pass through the "gates." They would continue to provide some funds for equipment and supplies. They had developed these plans in collaboration with other divisions in OIPD. They had also kept the local advisory council informed of their progress.

Mr. Ewing thanked Mr. Schoendorfer for a good summary of the law and what MCPS was going to be doing.

Mrs. Hobbs said she wanted to ask a question that focused on the responsibility of principals and counselors at the high school. Given the fact that they had been decreasing the number of vocational-technical courses available to students because the high school population had been decreasing and given the fact that the state would be making recommendations to change graduation requirements, she asked about what principals and counselors would be faced with. For example, would they have a different set of criteria to work with? Mr. Schoendorfer thought that the Maryland School Performance Program would call for principals and counselors to focus education much more than had been the case. This would eliminate some of the opportunities to cross over from one focus to another. He thought they would see students participating in vocational programs for a longer period of time. They would see students taking a more complete sequence of vocational courses within a program. They would see fewer instances where students who were not planning to enter work after graduation experimented in some of the vocational programs.

Previously, a lot of students had taken these courses as electives.

Mrs. Hobbs asked how students and parents would find out that flexibility was limited. For example, eighth grade students were developing their four-year plans. Dr. Pitt replied there would still be some flexibility. However, he was concerned about the trend of focusing a student into an area with less flexibility. He thought they needed to carefully examine where they were going in vocational education. It was his personal view that vocational-technical education ought to be a chance for students to broaden their opportunities. He did think that the opportunity for choice would be somewhat limited. If that did occur, they had to decide where they wanted to go with it in

Montgomery County and build their plan accordingly. He believed there was great opportunity in the 2+2 program, and he thought there would be funds available for the community college under this Act.

Dr. Vance said he had another major concern which was unique to Montgomery County. This was the perception of who got involved in vocational education. It was his sense that these new guidelines would reinforce the image that they had tried to move away from. He pointed out that in the Act 70 percent of the funds would be available to Chapter 1-identified youngsters, 20 percent for special education, 10 percent other disabilities including language. He said that the implications of this were a major concern in the county. Mr. Schoendorfer replied that there was another side to this. The new law required the integration of academic and vocational competencies. They anticipated that it would make vocational programs more rigorous and better prepare students. He hoped that the programs would appeal to students with wide ranges of abilities. As the integration of academic and vocational skills developed, he saw vocational programs preparing students for more than just entry into the work force. He predicted that they would be looking at 2+4 programs as well.

Ms. Gutierrez asked how the funding formula had changed and why they did not seem to be benefitting. For example, Montgomery County had 50 percent of the non-English speaking students in the state. She asked whether it was the profile of their enrollment that determined the funding. Mr. Schoendorfer replied that it was, and the previous use formula weighed heavily on vocational enrollment. He reported that they ranked third or fourth in the state in the amount of their grant.

Mr. Ewing thanked Mr. Schoendorfer for his summary.

Re: SCHOOL-BASED INSTRUCTIONAL
MONITORING SYSTEM (SIMS)

Dr. Pitt stated that SIMS was an effort to enable the local school using modern technology to be able to take data about young people and manipulate it in a number of ways. This provided data to the school which helped them look at individual students in a variety of ways.

Mrs. Katheryn Gemberling, associate superintendent, explained that today's demonstration would show the Board different data bases and a variety of applications. She emphasized that SIMS was an internal management and monitoring program. The school system itself collected a lot of external data and would continue to do so. SIMS was on-going and was individualized rather than pre-set. The school could decide what it wanted to do. She said there were three major trends that were affecting every school in

Montgomery County. The local trend was the change in student demographics, a much higher mobility rate, and a much more diverse student population. The second trend was MSPP at the state level, and they could not have a reasonable plan for school improvement unless they had a reasonable way of gathering information about the school. The third trend was at the national level and was the issue of site-based management. This was based on the idea that decisions made close to the students were the right decisions, but they had to have a way of gathering information to see how well those decisions worked.

Board members viewed a demonstration of how SIMS worked at the local school and how the data could be manipulated. Mrs. Gemberling indicated that they now had 11 secondary, 11 elementary, and one special school in the pilot. Several principals described what their schools were doing with SIMS and how it had helped them to look at exactly what was going on in their schools down to the level of the individual student. Ms. Gutierrez stated for the record that she was impressed by SIMS and wanted to recognize the enormous contributions made by Mrs. Gemberling and her staff. This had unleashed the power of information. She suggested that the Board consider how to advance the timing on the system to make it available to all schools.

Mr. Ewing thanked Mrs. Gemberling and the principals for an excellent presentation.

*Mr. Chang rejoined the meeting at this point.

Re: STATUS REPORT ON COMMISSION ON
EXCELLENCE RECOMMENDATIONS AND
POLICY ON LOCAL SCHOOL FLEXIBILITY

Mr. Ewing explained that the Commission on Excellence in Teaching had reported to the Board in 1987 after two years of study on how to ensure that Montgomery County could find, recruit, hire, train, and retain excellent teachers. The paper before the Board was an update on the status of the recommendations.

Dr. Pitt said that the purpose of the discussion was to give the Board an overview of the recommendations. They also tried to take each of the major areas and give some indication of the status of the recommendations. There were several major areas he wanted to comment on. One of the recommendations was on recruiting, and he thought they had improved greatly. Of all the areas, a lot had happened on new teacher induction. Very little had happened in regard to the teacher career ladder steps although there were resource teacher opportunities and curriculum specialist positions. However, they still had a long way to go on the idea of a step approach.

Dr. Pitt indicated that the Board had had reports on new teacher induction, flexibility at the local school level, staff development to allow people to have some say in their own training, and teacher evaluation. He reported that very little progress had been made on evaluation. He had brought a group of people together including MCEA representatives, principals, central office people, and parents. His goal was to come up with an evaluation system that would build in some form of peer evaluation. This met with resistance. He pointed out that the Board had the unilateral right with certain limitations to come up with any evaluation system they wanted. It was his recommendation that unless they had some agreement a new system would not work.

In regard to the other three areas, Dr. Pitt said he was most pleased with induction for new teachers. They had absolute evidence through evaluation that the system worked. He had personally done some interviewing and the results were excellent. With school flexibility, they had a committee which had shown an ability to overcome enormous concerns that people had. He applauded the efforts of Seth Goldberg and Ken Muir. Out of that they had come up with a flexibility pilot which had shown very good results. They were now at the point where they should move to some Board policy. The staff development area was moving forward, and the Board had just received a report on that. He was very pleased that they had made progress in these areas. The whole concept was the involvement of people in making decisions, and he believed that this had happened.

Mrs. Brenneman asked about how much they really worked with local colleges to let them know what was lacking in teacher preparation. Dr. Pitt replied that they were moving in this direction. They now had a teacher development center with the University of Maryland. At the university level there had been at least three major studies in the last six or seven years about teacher training. The Maryland State Board of Education had made some recommendations regarding a flexible approach and a greater involvement of local school systems in that process. However, the universities had asked for more time to work with the state in this area. He had just signed an agreement with Johns Hopkins University regarding training for leadership. The big problem was what should teacher education entail. He personally had written two papers to the state on this issue. The question had to do with how much training should be done by the local school system in terms of teaching people how to teach as opposed to subject matter information. Some of the private universities were moving toward programs where people majored in a field and spent an additional year taking a master's degree in teaching.

Dr. Carl Smith, associate superintendent, added that the state was looking at the issue of certification for beginning teachers and recertification. There was also a higher education

commission looking at this. Mrs. Brenneman pointed out that all of their teachers were not coming out of Maryland. Dr. Smith replied that when they looked at certification they had been concerned about what other states were doing. He explained that Maryland did not produce enough teachers to meet their needs. Therefore, MCPS recruited from outside the State of Maryland and other Maryland jurisdictions did so as well. There was a higher education commission looking at the issue of teacher preparation. This was also a major topic of discussion at the national level.

Mrs. Brenneman asked whether there was much exchange between school systems and higher education across the country. Dr. Smith said he could not talk about the nation as well as he could about the state. He thought there was a growing interest in the issue of certification and recertification, and he thought there was more collaboration and communication between the institutions of higher education and the school systems. Dr. Pitt added that many of the private universities were working in this area. One of the private colleges in Maryland was following up with school superintendents on the success of their graduates. Dr. Smith explained that a lot of the MCPS staff development focused on the implementation of MCPS curriculum and other school system needs.

Mrs. Brenneman thought that this was fine, but she said it was unfortunate when they had to teach people how to teach.

Mrs. Brenneman asked about the number of student teachers in MCPS. Dr. Smith replied that they had a significant number from most of the surrounding universities. Mrs. Brenneman said there was a curious statement in the report about using student teachers to relieve teachers of noninstructional tasks. Dr. Pitt explained that this was the language of the commission. He assured Mrs. Brenneman that student teachers had not been used in that way. He said that in the last four years they had tried to increase the support to teachers by providing more planning time, by providing more aide time, and by providing more support at the area level which had just been reduced.

Mrs. Fanconi noted that there was mention of the resident teacher certification program. She did not know a great deal about it, but the report stated that MCPS planned to start the program in the summer of 1992. She asked why they were doing this and how it would be designed. Dr. Smith replied that the resident teacher certificate enabled them to bring in individuals who had been trained in other disciplines and to provide them with 90 hours of teacher training to prepare these individuals to go into the classroom as teachers. MCPS would have to make a commitment to supervise these teachers for their first two years. They saw this as a possibility at the secondary level in such areas as science and as an opportunity to advance affirmative action goals. Dr. Pitt did not see this as replacing the hiring of teachers from colleges. He saw it as a small program to get some very special individuals into teaching. MCPS had the ability to

do this kind of training. Dr. Smith pointed out that in their French Immersion Program they had had problems in getting teachers certified because these teachers had been trained in universities outside the United States.

Mrs. Fanconi asked about safeguards in terms of being sure that these people could be effective teachers. She asked whether the Board had to make these decisions, and Dr. Pitt replied that it was a decision the superintendent could make. The Board could direct the superintendent not to do this. It was his impression that most Board members felt MCPS should be moving in this direction. These people would have 90 hours of work before they went into a classroom. Dr. Smith added that these people would also have continuing supervision during the first two years. Mrs. Fanconi explained that she was not saying it was a bad idea but rather than she had a lot of questions about it. She wanted to know what was planned and how they were doing to evaluate it.

Mr. Ewing reported that when the Commission on Excellence had made its report in 1987, the Board took no action. It said the superintendent was to act and keep the Board informed. He thought that was a big mistake. He felt that the Board should have taken a position. The superintendent had implemented a good many of the recommendations, and the Board had discussed these on an annual basis and did provide its views. But the Board made virtually no policy decisions except in terms of putting money in the budget for some of the implementation activities. He hoped that the Board could come back and be clearer about what it wanted to pursue. He suggested that the Board should take another look at the issue of teacher evaluation. Dr. Pitt said he was not going to argue with Mr. Ewing. The Board of Education did discuss this a number of times and did take a number of actions. The flexibility committee had had a number of meetings with the Board. In defense of his superintendency, he suggested that if the Board didn't like what he was doing they should tell him. Mr. Ewing explained that he was not being critical of Dr. Pitt's taking the initiative. He was critical of the Board for not giving guidance and direction.

Ms. Gutierrez pointed out that during the Board's retreat they had identified this as one of the issues they wanted to work on in the next 12 to 18 months. She appreciated receiving the update and felt that there were some issues they might be able to make some policy decisions on. However, it should be reflected that this Board had come back to the report of the Commission on Excellence.

Dr. Pitt said that the site-based participatory management committee had been working for a long time. He agreed with Mr. Ewing that they did need to talk about a policy here. What they had in front of them was a draft put together by members of the committee and Dr. Muir. It was a beginning draft. The Board

needed to react to the draft and decide whether they wanted a policy and whether they wanted to move in this area. The committee had requested to meet with the Board after this discussion to talk about this issue. He recommended that the Board do this.

Mr. Seth Goldberg reported that Dr. Pat Sweeney had been appointed by Dr. Pitt to act as liaison to the committee. He said that the committee had learned that everything they did seemed to involve a process. He believed there would also be a process involved in the Board's adopting a policy. The committee saw today as essentially the kick-off of that process. He hoped that the Board would spend some time with the committee in some sort of a workshop, perhaps on a Saturday. He thought that the Board would want to hear from the employee organizations and perhaps from some members of the Commission on Excellence.

Mr. Goldberg said that for the last two and a half years they had been working on this and knew that the Board had never taken a stand on the nature of the recommendations of the Commission. The Board had allocated the funds for the pilot process, but it had reached the point where it needed a top-down component. If the experiment were to go further, it needed the Board to provide the direction. He knew that as individuals Board members had feelings about the site-based management process and where it fit into any potential reform of the school system. It was also clear that the Board did not have any particular position as a unit on those concepts.

Dr. Pitt reported that when he had approached this issue he had decided to take a bottom up approach, and this had not happened any place else in the country. He agreed fully now that the Board needed to move to give clear direction, but he thought the Board ought to take the time needed to make a decision. Mr. Ewing commented that the virtue of having a policy in terms of very limited management was that it made it clear to the staff throughout the school system what it was they wanted to spend those limited resources on. The policy should be flexible while making it clear what the objective was.

Mrs. Brenneman thought that many people had different ideas about what site-based management was. She asked whether they needed to have some idea of what they were pursuing because her definition of site-based management might differ from those of other Board members. Mr. Ewing said that this was the initial difficulty he had had with the policy draft. He thought they needed to be reasonably specific about the definition because the proposed definition was not specific enough. The definition had to include objectives. Dr. Pitt asked that Board members give the group drafting the policy a little more direction.

Mrs. Fanconi said they ought to be trying to accomplish being

able to meet the needs of the students better in that school because the school had some flexibility in addressing those needs. The ultimate goal of this was to improve achievement which was not mentioned in the policy. Perhaps they wanted to improve the efficiency of staff in identifying the needs of students. They had to know what it was that they were trying to accomplish so that they would know what it was they were trying to evaluate. She commented that she was very fuzzy on what a policy did, and she thought they needed that clarification on the meaning of "policy." If they used one definition, they would need to say what the responsibility of MCPS was in terms of training and support and assistance. It would also have to have something delineating the obligation of the school in terms of their progress. She was excited about site-based management as one of a number of strategies to identify the needs of children and to address those needs. However, she was concerned that the pilots had not received the resources to train staff to make it an easier process. There was a considerable difference in skills needed to do well in the classroom and the skills needed to do site-based management. She suggested it should be the responsibility of the Board to make sure that those resources were available.

Dr. Pitt explained that they were never going to have enormous amounts of money there, and whatever money there was ought to be put into training. The ultimate outcome should not be one of providing additional funds as much as allowing people to be more flexible. They had used about \$600,000 in the process over a two-year period in implementing recommendations of the Commission. This year site-based management had \$100,000 which was being used for training. He felt that a policy ought to give direction, good definitions, and provide direction as to how staff was expected to get there.

Dr. Muir pointed out that part of site-based management was a product and part of it was a process or a way of working together to improve the product. The outcome was students educated to the best of their abilities. The outcome wasn't different if you used the strategy of site-based management or some other strategies. This focused on the relationships of people and how that brought better communication to parents and better involvement of staff toward the goals of better education for children.

Dr. Pitt said that one of the assumptions they made was that if teachers were to consider themselves professionals they needed to be involved in the educational process in a meaningful way. They wanted to find ways to have the teacher and others feel they were part of the decision-making process. By doing that, they would feel responsible and more capable, and this would improve the school.

Dr. Cheung said in terms of definition of program there were probably three areas: structure, process, and outcomes. If they were looking at the same product, they should look at school-based management in terms of another process to reach their goals. Flexibility was part of the structure and part of the process. They had to look at how they defined "management" in site-based management. Was it management of operations, management of resources, management of staff? He asked how much they were willing to have decided at the local level.

Mr. Ewing explained that his view stemmed from the Commission's report. They had talked about the need to make teaching more fully a genuine profession and teachers genuine professionals. For example, if you were a patient, you did not tell a medical doctor how to perform an operation. The patient decided whether or not he or she would have the operation and made a number of other decisions, but solving the problem was the job for the professional. The Commission had stated that the school system was virtually obsessed with specifying input and specifying the details of what everyone was supposed to do day-by-day and hour-by-hour in the classroom. They suggested that the system concern itself with results, not with input. This could never be a complete and total separation because there were state rules, regulations, and laws. Taking all that into account, they could still tell a school that the Board had the objective of well-educated children. That objective was one that would vary some from school to school because the needs of children would vary. They ought to be able to call on the professionals in that school to address themselves to and find solutions for how they would educate those children. The Board ought to be more concerned with the results and less with input.

Mr. Ewing saw site-based management as a way of pursuing professionalism of teachers and treating teachers as professionals and reaping the benefits from that on behalf of the children. The professionals should be able to address themselves to how to educate those children successfully. They did not know whether this would actually work because it was still a pilot. However, from other experiments around the country, there was some evidence that this could be very effective. It did not mean that the Board and the superintendent totally gave up their prerogatives. It was not total autonomy for the individual school. It was a matter of the system saying, "here is our goal and here is a tool that would help us achieve it and simultaneously enhance the professionalism of teachers and principals." This would also fully utilize their capabilities as professionals. He thought this would pay off for the students and that this was a powerful idea. He believed that some of that concept should be in the policy so that the public could understand the policy. This would be a shift in emphasis, and bringing in parents and other staff in the schools would be a way of enriching that possibility for greater success for students.

Ms. Gutierrez thought that the idea of the Board's meeting with the committee to discuss this would be very valuable. Her general reaction to the proposed policy was that it did not do what she expected a policy to do. It did not have teeth and a clear definition. It did not delineate authority, levels of responsibility, scope of actions, reporting systems, etc. It did not do justice to the experience they had gained from the pilots.

She would like to see the policy reflect a little more of reality. She knew there was language available for this kind of policy from other sources. They needed to make sure the policy clearly stated their goals. She looked forward to meeting with the committee as soon as possible. To her it was a restructuring of the school system. It would be valuable as they went through the budget with the County Council to have a better understanding of where they wanted to go in this direction.

Mrs. Hobbs inquired about the timeline for selecting the next ten schools. She knew there was some anxiety that principals had for this, and she thought it was crucial for the Board to have a policy in place as soon as possible. Mr. Goldberg replied that the schools would have to be selected before the end of the school year. They had scheduled a training session in August. It was their sense that they would like to see a policy adopted by the Board before the end of the school year. He explained that they would like to have a Board commitment to the process before starting up the next programs.

Mrs. Fanconi thought the proposed policy should be modified to have more specifics about the application process. Mr. Ewing said it was the sense of the Board that it wanted a policy and would be pleased to meet with the committee. If Board members had policy suggestions, they should provide them to Mr. Fess. Mr. Ewing and Dr. Pitt thanked the committee for all their work.

Re: MONTHLY FINANCIAL REPORT

Mr. Ewing asked whether they would have fiscal solvency by the end of the fiscal year. Mr. Larry Bowers, budget director, explained that they were looking at all expenditures. As they got closer to June 30, they would shut down as much as necessary to get through. The report before the Board did not reflect the effects of their latest measures which should save over \$700,000.

Dr. Pitt was worried about next year because they might be in a tougher situation because of budgetary limitations. In regard to legal fees, Mrs. Hobbs thought they had anticipated saving fees because of the new legal services unit. Mr. Bowers explained that it was only last month that the unit became operational. They would start seeing the benefits of that in the future. The increase in legal fees was largely due to the high cost of paying for attorneys of parents in special education cases.

Re: BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS

1. Mrs. Brenneman reported that last month she had attended "A Salute to Outstanding Black Women in Montgomery County." Twelve women were honored for their volunteerism and work. One thing that all of these women stressed was the value of education. She would add her congratulations to these women.

2. Ms. Gutierrez stated that the Board would have another worksession on minority achievement on April 11 which was the last of the four sessions. They would discuss ESOL/bilingual programs and multicultural curriculum. They had also requested Dr. Gordon to help the Board in determining general policy issues that should be discussed by the Board. The Board had also scheduled a Saturday session on April 27, and she asked Board members to jot down the kind of policies they felt were important for the Board to cover.

3. Mrs. Brenneman added that one of the outstanding black women honored was Gladys McGill Magwood, an MCPS employee. Mr. Ewing suggested that a resolution be drawn up to honor these women.

4. Mr. Ewing reported that the Educational Foundation which received funds from the estates of people who died lacking heirs had been in operation for about a year and a half. Last year the Foundation had given grants in the total amount of \$10,000 to 12 MCPS employees. In June they would have reports on those grants, and this year they would be making additional grants of up to \$1,000 each. In addition, the Foundation would be spending \$3,000 to \$5,000 for a visitor/assessor program which would bring people to MCPS where they would assess programs, give lectures, and meet with groups of teachers and administrators. The Foundation planned to ask a distinguished science educator to look at the Blair magnet program. The members of the Foundation were eager to have suggestions from Board members and the public about people who might be invited.

RESOLUTION NO. 346-91 Re: EXECUTIVE SESSION - APRIL 22, 1991

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

WHEREAS, The Board of Education of Montgomery County is authorized by Section 10-508, State Government Article of the ANNOTATED CODE OF MARYLAND to conduct certain of its meetings in executive closed session; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education of Montgomery County hereby conduct its meeting in executive closed session beginning on April 22, 1991, at 7:30 p.m. to discuss, consider, deliberate,

and/or otherwise decide the employment, assignment, appointment, promotion, demotion, compensation, discipline, removal, or resignation of employees, appointees, or officials over whom it has jurisdiction, or any other personnel matter affecting one or more particular individuals and to comply with a specific constitutional, statutory or judicially imposed requirement that prevents public disclosures about a particular proceeding or matter as permitted under the State Government Article, Section 10-508; and that such meeting shall continue in executive closed session until the completion of business.

RESOLUTION NO. 347-91 Re: MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 26, 1991

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

RESOLVED, That the minutes of February 26, 1991, be approved.

RESOLUTION NO. 348-91 Re: MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 27, 1991

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

RESOLVED, That the minutes of February 27, 1991, be approved.

RESOLUTION NO. 349-91 Re: MINUTES OF MARCH 7, 1991

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

RESOLVED, That the minutes of March 7, 1991, be approved as corrected.

RESOLUTION NO. 350-91 Re: AWARDS FOR DISTINGUISHED SERVICE

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

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education schedule time for discussion and possible action on a new set of awards to be sponsored by the Board of Education and the superintendent of schools for distinguished service to public education to be given to MCPS employees.

RESOLUTION NO. 351-91 Re: NATIONAL PROFESSIONAL SECRETARIES' WEEK, APRIL 21-27, 1991

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Mrs. Hobbs seconded by Mrs. DiFonzo, the following resolution was

adopted unanimously:

WHEREAS, A well-qualified and dedicated staff of secretarial and clerical employees is an integral part of an effective school system; and

WHEREAS, The Montgomery County public school system is extremely fortunate in having such a staff; and

WHEREAS, The Board of Education wishes to recognize publicly the competence and dedication of this group of employees and express its appreciation for their efforts in the effective, courteous, and economical operation of our school system; and

WHEREAS, The week of April 21 through April 27, 1991, has been designated as National Professional Secretaries' Week; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That National Professional Secretaries' Week with its theme of "Changing Profession, Changing World" be observed by the school system during the week of April 21 through 27, 1991; and be it further

RESOLVED, That Wednesday, April 24, 1991, be designated as Secretaries' Day for the Montgomery County Public Schools.

RESOLUTION NO. 352-91 Re: NATIONAL VOLUNTEER WEEK, APRIL 21-27, 1991

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

WHEREAS, The week of April 21-27, 1991, has been designated National Volunteer Week and has been proclaimed Volunteer Recognition Week by the Montgomery County Council; and

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

WHEREAS, During the past school year, 33,100 volunteers brought more than two million hours of dedicated service to students and teachers in school programs; and

WHEREAS, If a dollar value were attached to the hours of service volunteers provided, the sum would be more than \$18.6 million; and

WHEREAS, As volunteers share their time, energy and experience in schools, they inspire the school and the community to remember and renew our commitment to excellence in education; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the week of April 21-17, 1991, be proclaimed Volunteer Week in Montgomery County Public Schools; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the Montgomery County Board of Education express its appreciation to all volunteers for their assistance and encourage all school personnel, parents and students to recognize and support the contributions of these volunteers.

For the record, Mrs. Fanconi recognized the efforts of Mrs. Sally Marchessault for the wonderful job she did in coordinating the services of volunteers.

RESOLUTION NO. 353-91 Re: STUDENT LEADERSHIP WEEK

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

WHEREAS, This year in Montgomery County the week of April 22-28 will be recognized as Student Leadership Week; and

WHEREAS, The Montgomery County Board of Education has a continuing commitment to support active student participation in school and community activities; and

WHEREAS, The dialogue among the Board of Education, county government, and student leaders representing individual schools and student organizations is productive and useful; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the members of the Board of Education hereby proclaim the week of April 22-28, 1991, as Student Leadership Week; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education commend student leaders for their efforts and achievements on behalf of Montgomery County Public Schools.

RESOLUTION NO. 354-91 Re: BOE APPEAL NO. 1991-04

On motion of Mrs. Hobbs seconded by Mrs. DiFonzo, the following resolution was adopted unanimously:

RESOLVED, That in the matter of BOE Appeal No. 1991-04, an administrative matter relating to transportation, the Board adopts its Decision and Order affirming the Board's previous vote which was to affirm the decision of the superintendent.

Re: ITEMS OF INFORMATION

Board members received the following items of information:

1. Items in Process
2. Construction Progress Report
3. Staff Response to the Annual Report of the Citizens
Advisory Committee for Career and Vocational Education
4. Results from the 1991 Maryland Citizenship Test
5. Interim Report on Staff Development Pilot

Re: ADJOURNMENT

The president adjourned the meeting at 5:30 p.m.

PRESIDENT

SECRETARY

HP:mlw