

March 21, 1994

WHEREAS, An open dialogue among the Board of Education, Montgomery County Government and student organizations is productive and useful; and

WHEREAS, Participation by our youth is valued by the Board of Education; and

WHEREAS, Activities scheduled in April include the election of the student member of the Board of Education, MCR and MCJC elections, National Student Leadership Week, and National Youth Service Day which involve our youth in their rightful roles as citizens; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Board of Education hereby join with the county executive, County Council and superintendent of schools in designating April 1994, as Student Leadership month in Montgomery County, 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. 227-94 Re: APPROVAL OF AGREEMENT WITH THE
MONTGOMERY COUNTY COUNCIL OF
SUPPORTING SERVICES EMPLOYEES

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

#student Board member's vote does not count.

WHEREAS, Section 6-520 of the Education Article, Annotated Code of Maryland, permits the Board of Education to enter into negotiations with the designated employee organization concerning "salaries, wages, hours, and other working conditions"; and

WHEREAS, The Montgomery County Council of Supporting Services Employees was properly designated as the employee organization to be exclusive representative for these negotiations; and

WHEREAS, The Board's negotiated agreement with MCCSSE was approved in June 1993 for a two-year period until June 30, 1995, and the agreement included a reopener for salary and benefits for Fiscal Year 1995; and

WHEREAS, In November 1993 the Board of Education and MCCSSE began negotiations for salary and benefit terms for Fiscal Year 1995; and

WHEREAS, Said negotiations have occurred in good faith, as

March 21, 1994

directed by law; and

WHEREAS, The parties have reached tentative agreement and the agreement has now been duly ratified by the membership of the Montgomery County Council of Supporting Services Employees; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Board of Education approve the Agreement for the period of July 1, 1994, through June 30, 1995; and be it further

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

Re: PUBLIC COMMENTS

The following individuals appeared before the Board:

1. Claren Holmes, SAFE
2. Allen Prettyman, Damascus Cluster
3. Carolyn Case
4. Marion Haupt
5. Michael Calsetta

RESOLUTION NO. 228-94 Re: MAKE-UP DAYS FOR THE 1993-94 SCHOOL YEAR

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

WHEREAS, The Board of Education of Montgomery County is required under the Education Article of the Annotated Code of Maryland to schedule a minimum of 180 instructional days for a school year; and

WHEREAS, Montgomery County Public Schools has been closed for ten instructional days thus far this school year due to weather conditions; and

WHEREAS, On February 22, 1994, the Board of Education amended the 1993-94 school year and calendar by adding instructional days on June 15, 16, 17, and 20; and

WHEREAS, The Board of Education authorized the superintendent of schools to pursue vigorously and interpretation of COMAR to see if a waiver could be granted so that the preferred option of extending the school day could be implemented by the time the fourth quarter begins in the school year; and

WHEREAS, On March 8, 1994, the state superintendent of schools granted a waiver to Montgomery County Public Schools to lengthen the school day by 30 minutes beginning April 5, through the last day of school, and by adding one day to the school year, June 15, 1994; and

WHEREAS, The last day for teachers will be June 16, 1994, with the understanding that any additional all-day school closing will be made up by adding them to the end of the school year; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Board of Education amend Resolution No. 169-94 by deleting June 16, 17, and 20 as instructional days, making June 15 the last day for students; and be it further

Resolved, That the Board of Education lengthen the school day by 30 minutes beginning April 5 through the last day of school; and be it further

Resolved, That the superintendent of schools be authorized to add any additional make-up days to the end of the school year to meet the state requirement, if necessary, and that the last day for staff be adjusted accordingly.

RESOLUTION NO. 229-94 Re: ENHANCED EARLY RETIREMENT INCENTIVE PROGRAM

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

WHEREAS, On April 22, 1985, the Board of Education approved an Early Retirement Incentive Program from July 1, 1985, to June 30, 1987; and

WHEREAS, The Board of Education has subsequently extended the Early Retirement Incentive Program, and on April 14, 1993, adopted a resolution extending the program through July 1, 1995; and

WHEREAS, the Board of Education's approved FY 95 operating budget assumes a savings of \$1.5 million by increasing the early retirement incentive payment as a one-time opportunity for eligible employees who retire July 1, 1994; and

WHEREAS, MCPS staff has analyzed a variety of options to achieve the desired savings; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the enhanced Early Retirement Incentive Program be adopted as follows:

60-94	Office Papers		
	<u>Awardees</u>		
	Alling and Cory	\$	100,678
	Antietam Paper Company		1,358
	Garrett-Buchanan		130,299
	Nationwide Papers		652,570
	Frank Parsons Paper Company, Inc.		495
	RIS Paper Company, Inc.		3,505
	Stanford Paper Company		690,078
	Toucan Business Forms		6,582 *
	Wilcox, Walter, Furlong Paper Company		3,900
	R. S. Willard Company, Inc.		8,972
	TOTAL		\$1,598,437
61-94	Physical Education Supplies and Equipment		
	<u>Awardees</u>		
	Aluminum Athletic Equipment Company	\$	6,200
	Artistic, Inc.		235 *
	Cannon Sports, Inc.		19,205
	Collegiate Sports		7,471
	Dita USA, Inc.		104 *
	DVF Sporting Goods, Inc.		6,940
	Bill Fritz Sports Corporation		9,995
	Georgi-Sport		11,860 *
	Gill Sports Corporation		1,290
	Gopher Athletic Sport		6,818
	Leapro Sports Company, Inc.		594
	Marlow Sports, Inc.		4,046
	Morley Athletic Supply Company, Inc.		24,320
	Passon's Sports		25,216
	Penn Monto, Inc.		883 *
	Harvey Ratner and Associates		1,450
	Sportime Select Service and Supply		736
	Sportmaster/Recreation Equipment Unlimited		2,697
	Things from Hell, Inc.		650
	Wolverine Sports		430
	Yorktown Sport Shop II		5,967 *
	TOTAL	\$	137,107
68-94	Playground Equipment		
	<u>Awardees</u>		
	Gametime Inc., c/o West Rec., Inc.	\$	57,950
	Iron Mountain Forge		48,610
	Landscape Structures, Inc.		44,807
	Rec-creative, Inc.		50,111 *
	Triple J Construction, Inc.		60,332
	TOTAL	\$	261,810
75-94	Industrial and Technology Education Lumber		
	<u>Awardees</u>		
	Allied International	\$	48,626

March 21, 1994

Allied Plywood Corporation	2,899	
Catskill Mountain Lumber	7,370	*
Expanko Cork Company, Inc.	2,880	
MacLea Architectural Wood Products	2,847	
The Mann and Parker Lumber Company	50,848	
Rex Lumber Company	23,026	
Sports Academic Supplies	1,127	
TOTAL	\$ 139,623	

MORE THAN \$25,000

\$2,136,977

* Denotes MFD vendors

RESOLUTION NO. 231-94 Re: AWARD OF CONTRACT FOR MAINTENANCE
PROJECT AT COL. ZADOK MAGRUDER HIGH
SCHOOL

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

WHEREAS, The following sealed bids to replace the cooling tower at Col. Zadok Magruder High School were received on March 2, 1994, in accordance with MCPS Procurement Practices, with work to begin immediately and be completed by May 15, 1994:

	<u>Bidder</u>	<u>Amount</u>
1.	EMD Mechanical Specialists	\$49,197
2.	M&M Welding & Fabricators, Inc.	59,480
3.	Mech-Air, Inc.	61,000
4.	Arey, Inc.	62,026
5.	R.W. Warner, Inc.	64,200
6.	Combustioneer, Inc.	66,000
7.	W.B. Maske Sheet Metal Works, Inc.	73,349

and

WHEREAS, The low bid is below the staff estimate of \$60,000, and sufficient funds are available to award the contract; and

WHEREAS, EMD Mechanical Specialists has completed similar projects successfully at Argyle Middle School and Montgomery Blair and Richard Montgomery high schools; now therefore be

Resolved, That a \$49,197 contract be awarded to EMD Mechanical Specialists to replace the cooling tower at Col. Zadok Magruder High School.

RESOLUTION NO. 232-94 Re: REROOFING - MARYVALE ELEMENTARY
SCHOOL

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

WHEREAS, The following sealed bids were received on February 17, 1994, for reroofing Maryvale Elementary School which will begin on July 1, 1994, and be completed by August 29, 1994:

<u>Bidder</u>	<u>Amount</u>
1. R.D. Bean, Inc.	\$462,570
2. Rayco Roof Service, Inc.	468,200
3. Orndorff & Spaid, Inc.	503,389

and

WHEREAS, The low bidder, R.D. Bean, Inc., has completed similar projects successfully at various schools, including Belmont, Wayside, and Whetstone elementary schools; and

WHEREAS, The low bid is below the staff estimate of \$475,000; and

WHEREAS, The State Interagency Committee for Public School Construction will fund 50 percent of the eligible work for reroofing Maryvale Elementary School as part of the state systemic renovation program; now therefore be it

Resolved, That a \$462,570 contract be awarded to R.D. Bean, Inc., for reroofing Maryvale Elementary School, in accordance with plans and specifications prepared by the Department of Facilities Management, and subject to final action by the County Council on the FY 1995 Capital Budget; and be it further

Resolved, That the contract be forwarded to the State Interagency Committee for School Construction for approval to reimburse Montgomery County Public Schools for the state eligible portion of the Maryvale Elementary School reroofing project.

RESOLUTION NO. 233-94 Re: AWARD OF CONTRACT - GAITHERSBURG
MIDDLE SCHOOL #2

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

WHEREAS, The following bids were received on March 10, 1994, for the construction of Gaithersburg Middle School #2, with work to be completed by July 1, 1995:

	<u>Bidder</u>	<u>Amount</u>
1.	Glen Construction Co., Inc.	\$10,331,800
2.	Hess Construction Company	10,420,000
3.	Dustin Construction, Inc.	10,519,100
4.	Henley Construction Co., Inc.	10,797,000
5.	Triangle General Contractors, Inc.	10,835,000
6.	Jowett Incorporated	10,846,000

and

WHEREAS, Glen Construction company, Inc., has completed similar work successfully for Montgomery County Public Schools, including Quince Orchard High School; and

WHEREAS, Due to the areawide increase in construction costs, the low bid exceeds the project budget and sufficient funds are not available to award the contract; now therefore be it

Resolved, That a \$10,331,800 contract be awarded to Glen Construction company, Inc., for the construction of Gaithersburg Middle School #2, in accordance with plans and specifications prepared by SHW Group, Architects, contingent upon the approval of \$985,000 in additional funding; and be it further

Resolved, That the county executive be requested to recommend to the County Council approval of a \$985,000 FY 1994 Capital Budget supplemental appropriation.

RESOLUTION NO. 234-94 Re: UTILIZATION OF FY 1994 FUTURE
SUPPORTED PROJECT FUNDS FOR THE
EISENHOWER SPECIAL PROJECTS IN
SCIENCE AND MATHEMATICS

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

Resolved, That the superintendent of schools be authorized to receive and expend within the FY 1994 Provision for Future Supported Projects a grant award of \$337,405 from the Maryland State Department of Education (MSDE) under the federal 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:

	<u>Category</u>	<u>Amount</u>
1	Administration	\$ 318,351
10	Fixed Charges	<u>19,054</u>

TOTAL \$ 337,405

and be it further

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

RESOLUTION NO. 235-94 Re: UTILIZATION OF FY 1994 FUTURE
SUPPORTED PROJECT FUNDS FOR SCIENCE
PROGRAMS

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

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

Resolved, That the superintendent of schools be authorized to receive within the FY 1994 Provision for Future Supported Projects a grant award of \$150,000 from the Howard Hughes Medical Institute, through the Montgomery County Public Schools Educational Foundation, Inc., for three secondary science programs; and be it further

Resolved, That the superintendent of schools be authorized to expend \$65,000 of the award to continue an internship program at the National Institutes of Health for biology teachers and students, in the following categories:

	<u>Category</u>	<u>Amount</u>
2	Instructional Salaries	\$33,000
3	Other Instructional Costs	29,360
10	Fixed Charges	<u>2,640</u>
	TOTAL	\$65,000

and be it further

Resolved, That the superintendent of schools be authorized to expend \$56,500 of the award to continue a biotechnology training program, in the following categories:

	<u>Category</u>	<u>Amount</u>
2	Instructional Salaries	\$26,400
3	Other Instructional Costs	28,000
10	Fixed Charges	<u>2,640</u>
	TOTAL	\$65,000

and be it further

Resolved, That the superintendent of schools be authorized to expend \$56,500 of the award to continue a biotechnology training program, in the following categories:

	<u>Category</u>	<u>Amount</u>
2	Instructional Salaries	\$ 5,000
3	Other Instructional Costs	23,100
10	Fixed Charges	400
	TOTAL	<u>\$28,500</u>

and be it further

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

RESOLUTION NO. 236-94 Re: UTILIZATION OF FY 1994 FUTURE
SUPPORTED PROJECT FUNDS FOR THE
INFANTS AND TODDLERS PROGRAM

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Mrs. Gordon seconded by Ms. Baker, the following resolution was adopted with Mr. Abrams, Ms. Baker, Mrs. Brenneman, Dr. Cheung, Mr. Ewing, Mrs. Gordon, and Ms. Gutierrez voting in the affirmative; Mrs. Fanconi abstaining:

Resolved, That the superintendent of schools be authorized to receive and expend within the FY 1994 Provision for Future Supported Projects a grant award of \$169,248 in federal funds from the Maryland Office of Children, Youth, and Families, through the Montgomery County Government, for the Interagency Infants and Toddlers Program, in the following categories:

	<u>Category</u>	<u>Positions*</u>	<u>Amount</u>
1	Administration		\$ 5,326
4	Special Education	4.0	141,552
10	Fixed Charges		<u>22,370</u>
	TOTAL	<u>4.0</u>	<u>\$169,248</u>

* 1.0 Program Specialist (12 month)
 1.5 Special Education Teachers (10 month)
 .3 Physical Therapist (10 month)
 .2 Occupational Therapist (10 month)
 1.0 Speech Pathologist (10 month)

and be it further

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

RESOLUTION NO. 237-94 Re: RECOMMENDED FY 1994 SUPPLEMENTAL
 APPROPRIATION FOR THE MATHEMATICS
 CONTENT/CONNECTIONS PROGRAM

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Mr. Abrams seconded by Mrs. Gordon, 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 1994 supplemental appropriation of \$741,183 from the National Science Foundation (NSF), under the Teacher Preparation and Enhancement Program, for the Mathematics Content/Connections (MCC) program, in the following categories:

	<u>Category</u>	<u>Positions*</u>	<u>Amount</u>
2	Instructional Salaries	2.5	\$613,833
3	Other Instructional Costs		43,000
10	Fixed Charges		84,350
	TOTAL	<u>2.5</u>	<u>\$741,183</u>

* 1.0 Project Specialist, Grade E (12 month)
 1.0 Fiscal Specialist, Grade 24 (12 month)
 .5 Secretary, Grade 12 (12 month)

and be it further

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

RESOLUTION NO. 238-94 Re: RECOMMENDED FY 1994 SUPPLEMENTAL
 APPROPRIATION FOR THE FIELD TRIP
 FUND

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

WHEREAS, The FY 1994 Operating Budget adopted by the Board of Education on June 10, 1993, included \$500,000 for the Field Trip Enterprise Fund; and

WHEREAS, The number of requests for eligible services has exceeded the anticipated level of activity; and

WHEREAS, The Division of Transportation will receive a number of additional eligible requests for transportation services during FY 1994; and

WHEREAS, A supplemental appropriation to increase the Field Trip Fund is required to cover the cost of projected transportation services through the end of the year; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the superintendent of schools be authorized to receive and expend an FY 1994 supplemental appropriation of \$400,000 from the County Council to increase the Field Trip Fund, in the following category:

	<u>Category</u>	<u>Amount</u>
71	Field Trip Fund	\$400,000

and be it further

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

RESOLUTION NO. 239-94 Re: PERSONNEL APPOINTMENT

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

Resolved, That the following personnel appointment be approved:

<u>Appointment</u>	<u>Present Position</u>	<u>As</u>
Madeline A. Coleman	Asst. Principal	Principal
	Robert Frost MS	McKenney Hills Learning Center Effective: 3-22-94

Re: DISCUSSION OF OUTCOMES AND
ASSESSMENTS

Dr. Vance stated that he was pleased they had this opportunity to explore a critically important area of outcomes and assessments.

Next to instruction, the most important area to consider was how well students were performing. Assuring the success of every student would depend on how well they designed, developed, implemented, and assessed a comprehensive program of measuring student progress. Over the past two years the standards and outcomes workgroup had been working to determine how MCPS could respond to the demands of continual accountability for 114,000 students. Staff would describe the assessment infrastructure within MCPS and would present a comprehensive, state-of-the-art assessment program. In addition, they would provide an update on the new reporting process that clearly reflected established

standards for student competency, school and systemwide achievement, and outcomes for students at each grade level.

Mrs. Gemberling explained that this would be the initial discussion of outcomes and standard setting. They would give the Board examples of the changes in the assessment program in the Grades 3-8 annual assessment CRT's that were now part of the SES reporting process. They would respond to questions that were raised at the recent discussion of the Success for Every Student plan. The third topic was the revised reporting process for individual students which had been modified to show a reporting process that would extend over one year to give an individual student profile.

Dr. Joseph Villani, associate superintendent, said they would use two teams to brief the Board on reporting standards and on the design of their new assessment program. He thanked the members of the standards committee and the committee on assessment, design, and implementation who were in the audience. He introduced Ms. Eoline Cary and Mr. Steve Seleznow, chairs of the standards committee. He noted that as they looked at Success for Every Student and assessment they began to realize that Success for Every Student was at the heart of assessment.

Ms. Cary reported that the standards committee was beginning its third year. This evening they would be looking at reporting to parents and also at the assessment program components. Within the past month, schools had sent home individual notices to parents informing them about the performance of their children in Grades 4, 6, and 7 on the CRT in math which was taken last spring. The letter told parents that the proficiency standard expected at this grade level was 650. It was important to remember that this was a very challenging test. It was not a basic skills test. On the reverse side of the letter to parents was a chart showing how the student did. The report listed the child's current school, where the child took the test, and whether the student met or exceeded the standard. Only three percent of students taking the test exceeded with distinction.

Ms. Cary said that the committee had discussed what constituted a standard. A standard was the level or degree of performance or achievement that was judged to be proficient or distinguished. The individual student standard in MCPS was a high level of proficiency reflected by the 650 scale score. The scale extended from 100 to 900, and students who scored between 800 and 900 exceeded that standard with distinction. They then set the individual school standard. The school was expected to have between 75 and 100 percent of the eligible students taking the test meeting that individual student standard of 650 by 1997. The systemwide standard was that 100 percent of the schools administering the test would have between 75 and 100 percent of their eligible students meeting the individual standard by 1997.

The bottom part of the form had more specifics on the child's performance by mathematics topic.

Mr. Seleznow stated that they wanted to be able to show parents how their children performed year to year. They wanted to give parents a better picture of their child's performance over time.

They showed the Board a prototype of what this would look like in 1998. For example, they would be able to see how a child performed in 1994, 1995, 1996, and 1997. A parent could compare the child's performance each year. On the final notice, there would be the information on percentages of students scoring above a particular score. Mr. Seleznow explained that this was only the first half of the standard setting they were doing. They would have a growth standard and would be reporting to parents on a year-to-year basis. They needed another year's test performance to have the data to draw the standard. They expected to have a similar format for the reading/language arts standards they were setting.

Dr. Villani explained that the second part of their presentation was on what the assessment looked like now. They had been working to develop an assessment design that would tell them what children knew, what they could do, and what opportunity they had had to learn. They were striving to give students, parents, teachers, and the Board information about what children knew and could do. He introduced Dr. Suzanne Clewell, Ms. Joy Odom, and Dr. James Myerberg.

Dr. Clewell said she was going to speak to what knowledge and skills students had to be able to show on a multiple choice test to show they were achieving at grade level. In the past they had given students one paragraph to read and then asked one question about the paragraph. In mathematics, there was a similar type of testing where students were tested on one skill in isolation. In the present system they were asking students to think through math and reading. They asked students to read one passage, and then students had to respond to a series of questions to tap different levels of thinking. The emphasis was on whole text and on a variety of texts including myths, fables, newspaper articles, etc. In math they presented students with a situation so that students could do problem solving and critical thinking.

Ms. Odom stated that another part of the assessment was what could students do with what they knew. In mathematics, they would start with an open-ended problem. Students had to tell the teacher why they chose certain numbers. In another situation, they would give students the answers, and the students had to write the questions that would yield these answers. She provided the Board with some samples of math and reading language arts assessments taken directly from the work of MCPS students.

Dr. Myerberg showed the Board a diagram on the grades that would

be tested this year. They were measuring what students should know through the use of multi-choice tests, questions in context, and open-ended tests. They were calling performance assessment what students should be able to do. This would be an extended activity with a series of questions so that students would have to put everything together. This was an area that was very new and was similar to the state test. Teachers would have to look at different kinds of answers, and staff would have to look at how this new testing could be best used.

In the very preliminary stage, there was another part of the program. It was the opportunity to learn. Did students have a chance to learn the things that were being measured by the test?

This concept had come into research in recent years especially in the international test studies. For example, they had seen newspaper articles that American students scored low on certain tests. Researchers looked at whether or not U.S. students had the opportunity to learn the same things that students in other countries did. If two groups of students performed differently on a test, one possible reason was they did not have equal opportunities to learn.

Dr. Myerberg stated that over the next couple of years they wanted to look at how this all fit together. Once they had some data and some experience, they would look at how it fit together.

Dr. Villani asked Board members if they had questions.

Mr. Abrams said his attention had been caught when they discussed moving toward the standard of opportunity to learn. He asked if they were going toward a qualitative assessment on an individual student basis. Dr. Myerberg replied that it could be both qualitative and quantitative. To him it was more research rather than testing. For example, they could look at portfolios of students to see what they had been doing in class when their test results differed. What math objectives had they covered? How did the students respond to the questions on the test? How were students being encouraged to respond to the questions? If they wanted to do a full-scale research study, it could involve observing in the classrooms.

Dr. Villani added that part of the assessment program they were developing was for accountability purposes. One of the measures of accountability for a teacher and a school was what opportunities did the student have to learn. They were developing an individual student profile, and part of the information in the profile would be the opportunity to learn.

Mr. Abrams commented that he would see the individual student profile applying to what students should be able to do. He presumed that they would be able to tie a portfolio into that process as well to help them determine how the student got there. That seemed to be an assessment that could be made at present as

opposed to going to an opportunity-to-learn standard. Dr. Myerberg explained that it was really under what conditions the student did the work. If the work were done under testing conditions, this would be the assessment. They could also look back to see what was covered in class prior to the activity. He felt that with performance assessment everything would run together, and over the next couple of years they needed to look at this stuff to see how they were going to use it and how it was most useful to teachers and to the Board.

Ms. Gutierrez said she did not hear curriculum mentioned in the presentation. Curriculum should encapsulate what a student should know, and there was the concept of a curriculum audit to see what they were teaching. She asked whether they were talking about this when they said, "an opportunity to learn." She asked if they would be able to get to whether or not the teacher was actually teaching the curriculum or not. Dr. Villani replied that all of the assessments they had developed were based on their curriculum. The approved curriculum was the foundation for the assessment selection. Ms. Gutierrez asked whether this would allow them to find what they should be teaching and were not. Dr. Villani explained that they worked very hard to make sure the MCPS curriculum matched the external standards, and he believed MCPS students would do well on national tests because its curriculum was aligned with the national standards.

Mr. Seleznow reported that they could use the assessments and the standards to audit what was happening in the classroom. He showed the Board a copy of a SIMS database and explained how a principal might react to SIMS information by looking at whether students were on grade level, exceeded the standard, had excessive absences, showed improvement, etc. They could sort the data by race and by gender.

Mrs. Brenneman asked about how far out they could go for testing purposes. Mr. Seleznow replied that the test discriminated for them because only three percent scored over 800 on the tests. This showed them that their tests were challenging enough. They used to give out-of-level tests and tests above grade level, but the problem was that they could never equate the scores and make relative comparisons. When they moved to this model, they wanted to be able to show that variation and see how all students performed.

Mrs. Brenneman said that she had requested a roster of the committee, and the committee had a large number of teachers and principals on it. She would like to hear from the parent point of view. Ms. Cary explained that her committee did not have any parents on it; however, the committee had consulted with parents. At her own school, she had received excellent feedback from parents about the new forms. Ms. Mona Signer, MCCPTA, replied that for her it was a start in the right direction. As a parent,

she had not received any kind of indicator for her child since the CAT was eliminated. She was excited about this, but she was also concerned about what they would do for those top three percent and how they could assess what those children were capable of achieving. She felt that the entire assessment program including tests by MCPS and the state was very confusing to parents. No one understood what any specific test was trying to measure. She thought that the best thing MCPS could do would be to put together some background information for parents so that they would understand what was going on.

Ms. Charlotte Joseph, MCCPTA, explained that the difficulty with MCPS task forces or committees was that a lot of the meetings were during the workday, and most parents could not participate.

She, too, believed that most parents did not have a clue about what was going on. They needed to do a better job of getting information out about changes in the test and the changes in the reporting. Most parents thought the report card was the mechanism for knowing how their children were doing. Now they were going to get a symbol, the thermometer, and some test results, but these had to be linked so that parents would understand. The next question from parents should be, "how can I help my child." Mrs. Brenneman reported that she had received the profile in a folder, but there was no linkage to the report card, and she did not even know she was to receive this. Mr. Seleznow commented that the committee was concerned about the distribution, and they were going to have a standard time when this came out every year, work with parents to let them know it was coming, and explain it to parents.

Mr. Ewing hoped they would get to a long-range strategy for encompassing all other areas in the curriculum. They had started at the right place with reading/language arts and math, but they had a substantial way to go. Once they began to get parental involvement, he believed they would have rising expectations. Parents would want everything, and he suggested the Board needed a plan of action to get them there. He was particularly pleased to see the emphasis on measures that had to do with students who exceeded the proficiency level. Many parents were concerned about a system of measurement that permitted them to see how well students were doing beyond the basic proficiency level. The Gifted and Talented Association had been urging MCPS to move in this direction. He hoped that they would continue with this, particularly with the measures that were appropriate for students who were doing extraordinarily well.

Mr. Ewing noted that in one of the attachments it stated, "What do we want students to know" and "What students should know." He assumed these were interchangeable; however, those were different questions than measuring what students know and set a different kind of standard. This suggested they had thought about changing or had changed what they were teaching. What students once knew

that was adequate had and would change; therefore, they were measuring against what students ought to know. For him it was important to know what was it that had changed. He had a sense of that from some of the sample questions, but he did not have an explanation of what they were doing now that they did not do before. This would be very helpful to him. He thought that the Board would continue to have an interest in this.

Mr. Ewing commented that one of his concerns was that the instrumentality of education tended sometimes to become more important than the knowledge acquisition function. There was a tendency today to believe that there was so much knowledge out there that there was very little point in trying to master anything. Therefore, some people gave up on the notion that there was a basic core of knowledge people ought to have. The school system had not done that, and he thought they had moved in the other direction as in the case of algebra which they were now requiring. He thought they needed to make that direction clearer to the general public; therefore, he would like to know what had changed and what it was they were measuring. Sometime in the future, he would like to see a comprehensive plan to encompass all areas of the curriculum.

Dr. Villani replied that what students should know was not just content, but the line between knowledge and process blurred at times, especially in mathematics and science where it was not just what you knew but how you applied it in real world situations. This was how their program was changing. They did not want students to rank order three numbers; they wanted students to know how to apply that. In reading/language arts they had a curriculum that dealt not just with the structure of literature but the purposes of reading and how did one apply the skills of reading in certain contexts. Today they were teaching children to monitor their own processes. They had learned that being aware of the process helped one transfer that knowledge to other fields. He agreed to provide the Board with more information on this. Mr. Ewing believed there was a substantive body of knowledge that people should acquire and that there were skills in applying it that were important, but it was hard to think about anything unless someone had learned something first. While they needed to focus on skills, they also needed to focus on a knowledge base.

Dr. Cheung expressed his pleasure with the presentation because it was the beginning of many good things to come in terms of assessment. He believed that it was important to communicate to parents and that staff and teacher training was important because they would have to interpret this to the parents and public. He agreed with Mr. Ewing regarding the content standards. They were beginning to hear that a lot of students were content poor. Mathematics and language arts were parts of the puzzle, and all of these were related to strategic thinking. To him, performance

standards were what students were able to do. They should not overlook content standards and should build a bridge between them.

Dr. Cheung stated that his other question concerned how students learned. The examples presented by Ms. Odom showed the creativity of children and their different perspectives and different styles of learning. Staff and parents needed to be trained in how to maximize learning. He had emphasized the individual student profiles in order to be able to individualize learning for every child. He liked the symbol of the thermometer because a picture was worth a thousand words and did not label students. He also liked the longitudinal aspect because it made it easier to see a child as that child grew. He thought they needed to build the content area based on their graduation requirements. When students graduated, they should know content area as well as meeting performance standards.

Ms. Gutierrez commented that after having three sons graduate from MCPS, this was an incredible improvement. She believed they had taken an enormous leap forward. She remarked that the CAT test never did tell her very much about how her sons were doing.

In regard to gifted and talented testing, it was her understanding that this was not the only way they would assess. She was interested in a timeline, and it was evident to her that training of teachers to these assessments was crucial. She asked whether teachers would be fully trained for full implementation by the end of FY 1994.

Dr. Myerberg replied that the parts that would be fully implemented were the two multiple choice tests in mathematics and reading. All students in the specified grades would be tested, and parents and schools would get results based on the standards.

They would be field testing the open-ended math performance test, and after receiving the data from this test they would set standards. If they had satisfactory results, they would go to full implementation. They were doing reading/language arts performance assessment in a few schools as well. Ms. Odom added that they had just completed about 12 hours of training with three or four staff members from each school, and they had received good feedback on the training efforts.

Mrs. Fanconi commented that whenever they did testing, the system moved to the test. She would like to discuss how they were going to use this for systemwide improvements and how the schools were going to use it to look at how they structured the presentation of their curriculum or worked with individual students to improve achievement. She was very concerned about students who totally missed the concepts being tested. She wondered how long it took a teacher to grade those open-ended tests and what criteria the teacher used.

budget request be fully funded. Mr. Potter not only endorsed the Board's request but publicly praised the Board for its own efforts in taking steps to minimize any increases in spending. He believed this was the first time a county executive had recommended full funding of the Board's budget request.

2. Dr. Vance pointed out that this week the Board would be holding public hearings on amendments to the FY 1995 capital budget and CIP. He noted the contribution made by Council member Michael Subin to the question of where and how to modernize and build a new facility for Montgomery Blair High School students. He recommended using the Sligo Creek Golf Course as a new site, and Dr. Vance believed that the idea should be considered but not to the detriment of his original recommendation for Blair on the Kay tract.

3. Dr. Vance reported that Walt Whitman High School had been named one of America's finest high schools by Redbook, and Springbrook High School was named a winner in the overall excellence category. These were the only two high schools in Maryland to receive this recognition.

4. Ms. Gutierrez indicated that after 12 years of defeat the bill regarding English only had come out of committee in Annapolis. The proponents of the bill were getting a large number of sponsors which guaranteed it would get out of committee in both the Senate and the House. It was very important that the Montgomery County Delegation hear from the Board because the bill sent a very negative message to Marylanders. On its face, the bill looked very innocent, but people testifying against the bill identified serious problems with the bill. In education, it was not clear whether they would be able to keep on teaching American sign language. The bill permitted teaching ESOL in a very limited environment, and she hoped that the bill would be defeated or, if adopted, that the governor would veto it. Mrs. Fanconi was pleased that Ms. Gutierrez had been able to testify against the bill because she had been effective in the past in her testimony.

5. Ms. Baker reported that a year ago she had started her journey to the Board table. On March 10, two finalists had been selected for next year's student member on the Board. They were Wendy Converse from Richard Montgomery High School and Chance Hart from Walt Whitman High School. The election would be held on April 28. She invited Board members to attend the April 6 "Voices and Views" telecast which would be a meet-the-candidates forum.

6. Mr. Ewing said that it seemed to him they were much closer to a solution for Blair High School involving a new building. He was very pleased and excited about that. He believed Mr. Subin's proposal moved them in that direction and had many positive

aspects to it. The Springbrook Cluster had written to the Board to indicate they were in favor of a new Blair High School, and this was very significant because it had not been their position in the past. There was also some likelihood that the matter of Council support for state funding of part of the cost of the purchase of the Kay tract might change. The Council might decide to support that. He commented that following the public hearings the superintendent should start thinking about how to craft a position that would achieve the Board's endorsement and subsequent Council support.

7. In regard to the English-only bill, Mr. Ewing pointed out that the bill provides that all the records of the State of Maryland must be in English. This would create a problem since the charter of the state was written in Latin.

8. Mrs. Fanconi said they were being encouraged to contact the House Ways and Means Committee to explain that education funding needs to be increased and that they did not support the cap on teacher retirement. They did support the recommendation of the governor's commission to increase education funding, especially for the foundation grant. The committee was looking at increasing the cigarette tax which was supported by most people in Maryland.

RESOLUTION NO. 241-94 Re: CLOSED MEETING - APRIL 14, 1994

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

WHEREAS, The Board of Education of Montgomery County is authorized by the Education Article of the Annotated Code of Maryland and Title 10 of the State Government Article to conduct certain meetings or portions of its meetings in closed session; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Board of Education of Montgomery County hereby conduct a portion of its meeting on April 14, 1994, at 9 a.m. and at noon to discuss personnel matters, matters protected from public disclosure by law, and other issues including consultation with counsel to obtain legal advice; and be it further

Resolved, That these meetings be conducted in Room 120 of the Carver Educational Services Center, Rockville, Maryland, as permitted under Section 4-106, Education Article of the Annotated Code of Maryland and State Government Article 10-501; and be it further

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

RESOLUTION NO. 242-94 Re: MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 17, 1994

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

Resolved, That the minutes of February 17, 1994, be approved.

RESOLUTION NO. 243-94 Re: MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 28, 1994

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

Resolved, That the minutes of February 28, 1994, be approved.

Re: REPORT ON CLOSED SESSION - MARCH 8, 1994

On February 22, 1994, by the unanimous vote of members present, the Board of Education voted to conduct a closed session on March 8, 1994, as permitted under Section 4-106, Education Article of the Annotated Code of Maryland and State Government Article 10-501.

The Montgomery County Board of Education met in closed session on Tuesday, March 8, 1994, from 8:45 a.m. to 10:05 a.m. and from 12:40 to 2:20 p.m. The meetings took place in room 120 of the Carver Educational Services Center, Rockville, Maryland.

The Board met to discuss the monthly personnel report and the appointment of the director of Head Start. The Board discussed provisions of a new early retirement incentive proposal and received an update on contract negotiations with MCAASP and MCCSSE. The Board took positions on resolutions to amend the FY 1995 Operating Budget regarding MCAASP and MCCSSE. All votes taken in closed session were confirmed in open session.

Board members had lunch with the new members of the Human Relations Staff. The Board received advice from counsel on the effects of the new QIE policy on the transfer process and decided to continue this discussion at another time. The Board reviewed decision and orders in BOE Appeals Nos. 1993-33 and 1993-37 and agreed to dismiss BOE Appeal No. 1993-34 for lack of response from the appellant.

In attendance at the closed sessions were Steve Abrams, Aggie Alvez, Carrie Baker, Greg Bell, Larry Bowers, Fran Brenneman, Judy Bresler, Carole Burger, Alan Cheung, Blair Ewing, Carol Fanconi, Tom Fess, John Finan, Phinnize Fisher, David Fischer, Hiawatha Fountain, Kathy Gemberling, Wes Girling, Ginny Gong, Bea Gordon, Ana Sol Gutierrez, Marie Heck, Oliver Lancaster, Elfreda Massie, Brian Porter, Cristina Riva-Chévez, Phil Rohr, Stan Schaub, Paul Vance, Joe Villani, Mary Lou Wood, and Melissa

Woods.

Re: NEW BUSINESS

Mr. Ewing stated that the Board had received correspondence from the Board's committee on minority student education and Mrs. Joan Karasik suggesting changes in the Success for Every Student plan.

He asked that the superintendent comment on these changes, and Mrs. Fanconi indicated that this item was scheduled for action on April 14.

Re: ITEM OF INFORMATION

Board members received Recommendation for Approval of AP Psychology I and II as an item of information for future consideration.

RESOLUTION NO. 244-94 Re: ADJOURNMENT

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education adjourn its meeting at 11:25 p.m.

PRESIDENT

SECRETARY

PLV:mlw