

APPROVED  
21-1995

Rockville, Maryland  
April 11, 1995

The Board of Education of Montgomery County met in regular session at the Carver Educational Services Center, Rockville, Maryland, on Tuesday, April 11, 1995, at 10:05 a.m.

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

Absent: None

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

RESOLUTION NO. 259-95 Re: APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA - APRIL 11,  
1995

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education approve its agenda for April 11, 1995.

RESOLUTION NO. 260-95 Re: APPROVAL OF THE AGREEMENT WITH  
THE MONTGOMERY COUNTY COUNCIL OF  
SUPPORTING SERVICES EMPLOYEES

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

WHEREAS, Section 6-510 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 expires on June 30, 1995, and the Board of Education and MCCSSE began negotiations in November of 1994 for a successor agreement; and

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

WHEREAS, The parties have reached tentative agreement and the agreement has now been duly ratified by the membership of 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, 1995, through June 30, 1998; 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.

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

RESOLUTION NO. 161-95          Re:    NATIONAL VOLUNTEER WEEK, APRIL 23-29

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

WHEREAS, A goal of Success for Every Student is to secure the commitment of the entire community to maintain quality education in Montgomery County by building partnerships that promote and support initiatives to help all children succeed; and

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

WHEREAS, Schools rely on both paid and volunteer staff to provide coordinated efforts to develop and manage school volunteer and partnership programs that serve staff and student needs; and

WHEREAS, Last year, 130 schools met the criteria and earned a citation of merit from the Maryland State Department of Education for an outstanding school volunteer program; and

WHEREAS, During the last school year more than 44,500 volunteers gave 2.9 million hours of service to staff and students and provided the equivalent hours of 1,400 full time, 12-month staff people; and

WHEREAS, If a dollar value were attached to the hours of service volunteers provided, the sum would be more than \$29.5 million; and

WHEREAS, As volunteers share their time, energy and experience in schools, they inspire the school and the community to renew our commitment to success for every student; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Montgomery County Board of Education express its appreciation to all volunteers and volunteer coordinators for their assistance, generosity of spirit, and

commitment to our schools and our young people and for their outstanding contribution to the Montgomery County community.

RESOLUTION NO. 262-95 Re: NATIONAL WEEK OF THE YOUNG CHILD

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

WHEREAS, A goal of Success for Every Student is to secure the commitment of the entire community to maintain quality education in Montgomery County by building partnerships that promote and support initiatives to help all children succeed; and

WHEREAS, The Board of Education reaffirms its strong commitment to early childhood education and recognizes the importance of involving families in a child's education; and

WHEREAS, The Week of the Young Child will be celebrated nationally during April 23-29, 1995; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the National Week of the Young Child be observed by Montgomery County Public Schools during the week of April 23 through April 29, 1995; and be it further

Resolved, That the Board of Education commend the efforts of volunteers and staff for their contributions to the Week of the Young Child celebration.

RESOLUTION NO. 263-95 Re: STUDENT LEADERSHIP RECOGNITION

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

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

WHEREAS, An open dialogue between the Board of Education and student organizations is productive and useful; and

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

WHEREAS, In April student leadership activities include the election of the student member of the Board of Education, Montgomery County Region of the Maryland Association of Student Councils and Montgomery County Junior Councils elections, and National Student Leadership Week; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Board of Education hereby join with the superintendent of schools in designating the week of April 23-29, 1995, as Student Leadership Week in Montgomery County Public Schools; 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. 264-95 Re: NATIONAL PROFESSIONAL SECRETARIES' WEEK

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

WHEREAS, Professional Secretaries' Week will be celebrated nationally the week of April 23-29, 1995; and

WHEREAS, The Board of Education wishes to recognize publicly the competence and dedication of its staff of secretarial and clerical employees and express its appreciation for their efforts in the effective, courteous, and economical operation of the Montgomery County Public Schools; and

WHEREAS, The Board of Education thanks its secretarial staff for their contributions to excellence in education and for their commitment to "Success for Every Student;" now therefore be it

Resolved, That National Professional Secretaries' Week be observed by the school system during the week of April 23 through April 29, 1995; and be it further

Resolved, That Wednesday, April 26, 1995, be designated as Professional Secretaries' Day for the Montgomery County Public Schools.

RESOLUTION NO. 265-95            Re:    PROPOSED REVISION OF HUMAN  
RELATIONS POLICY - BOARD  
SUBCOMMITTEE TO REVIEW POLICY

On motion of Mr. Felton seconded by Mr. Abrams, the following resolution was adopted unanimously:

Resolved, That the Board of Education establish a small working group of three Board members who would advise the staff on the direction the Board wanted to go for human relations policies; and be it further

Resolved, That this group would complete its task by May 19, 1995, and bring recommendations to the Board.

Re:    WELCOME

Mrs. Gordon welcomed Dr. Larry Zenke, superintendent of schools in Duval County, Florida, and Dr. Susan Wilkinson, president of the Duval Board of Education. They were visiting Montgomery County to find out about the Success for Every Student plan.

Re:    GLOBAL ACCESS STATUS REPORT

Dr. Vance stated that they were keeping the Board informed on a monthly basis regarding implementation of global access.

Mrs. Gemberling noted that they had provided the Board with a written update. This morning they would share some of the highlight points they shared with the Council members at the Education Committee meeting. At that meeting they had talked about their vision and whether or not they saw their year-old vision of global access beginning to come into practice. They would also speak about what they had learned in this past year.

Mrs. Gemberling recalled that a year ago they had talked about their vision and the potential for educational reform which made her nervous because "educational reform" had a somewhat negative connotation. She stated that this was not about educational reform. This was about societal reform--the information age of which they must be a part. This was no longer optional for them. This was when and how they got into the information age.

Mrs. Gemberling commented that over time education had reflected rather than led society. For example, the educational system reflected the agricultural society. When they moved to an industrial society, their educational system began to reflect that in mass production and efficiencies. As they looked at society today, they saw that the information age had brought customization and individualization which was lacking in the industrial view. This was what they saw in their vision of global access.

She described her visit to a foreign language class where a computer talked back to her. The computer spoke, she responded, the computer recorded what she said, and the computer played it back so that she could hear the instructor and herself. The teacher in the classroom could move around, save what each student had done, and listen to students. This gave them an individual one-on-one oral communication which was necessary for developing foreign language skills. In a class of 30, with one teacher, they could not provide that individual attention. They saw tremendous possibilities for this individualization for every child within the educational continuum. They did see their vision coming into reality, and this was exciting.

In terms of what they had learned, Mrs. Gemberling said there were no real surprises. The first thing was the issue of teacher training. They could have all the hardware in place and all the software in place, but if teachers were not comfortable using it, it would not be an instructional tool. MCPS had, therefore, changed a lot of their training models. In business as people learned about technology, they had the benefit of acquiring that skill in a private setting. MCPS was asking teachers to go in front of a class where they were accustomed to being in control, but teachers were trying out something that many of their students were more comfortable with and more knowledgeable of. This created an anxiety setting for teachers. If they could make teachers computer comfortable while they were not in front of students, they had a lot more success. Therefore, they were doing more and more management activities on the computer and making this mandatory. Teachers became comfortable with technology in a private setting.

Mrs. Gemberling reported that because the comfort levels differed teachers in some cases would not want to use technology as part of their instructional mode. In time, it had to be the case that this would not be an option. Part of education in Montgomery County had to be technology literacy and a required part of the program. Therefore, they were developing instructional units which could not be done without the use of technology.

Mrs. Gemberling commented that the third thing they learned was that this project touched every office and division in the school system. The need for cooperation and common direction had been an over-whelming reality for them, and they had put some strategies in place to have a coherent focus on how they approached the use of technology in MCPS for all purposes. They also learned that budget was everything. Expecting that everything would be an add-on was not a reality. They had had to look very carefully at redeploying resources, budgeting, and staffing.

Dr. Cindy Sullivan, director of the Department of Academic Programs, explained that they had been focusing on curriculum development and training. While most of the curriculum development was for global access prototypes, it was not exclusive to those things. This material could be used in other settings. The new social studies curriculum was now being distributed on hypercard stacks. This material included lessons and resources for students. It included the presentation format, and it also carried with it the expectation that students would problem solve as well as carry out their assignments through the use of these instructional models. Teachers of secondary social studies must use a computer to deliver this part of the curriculum. For example, students were studying immigration patterns by using the computer to model and analyze primary data sources. In Grades 4 and 7, students and teachers were using computers and telecommunications to gather data about water quality in the various streams feeding into the Chesapeake Bay. This information was shared with schools across the state in order to bring about more progress in the area of ecology.

Dr. Sullivan reported that in the course replacing lab science, they used computers to data measurements and record data for analysis. They used computer simulations to analyze and study motion and acceleration. They also used computers to look at changes in matter states. The graphing calculator was used to collect data which increased the utility of the graphing calculator which was used in mathematics. Teachers and students were relying on the research hubs. There was widespread use of the hubs before and after school. Teachers were finding that students were learning at a much more rapid pace.

Areas under review included the use of computer programs with special needs students. It was both remedial and accelerated. They were working with Stanford University in terms of adapting a system the university had for high level mathematics students. Students would be able to earn university credit as well as receiving monitoring and coaching by staff at Stanford. This would help MCPS address the post-calculus courses that they needed to challenge students.

Dr. Sullivan commented that the other prong of global access dealt with staff training. Coordinators in the Department of Academic Programs felt anxiety in terms of going out to try to instruct individuals in an area about which they knew little. Therefore, MCPS sought out vendors who were able to provide training in their labs and loan equipment. This gave MCPS staff an exposure to technology and enabled them to design curriculum in which technology would have to be used. In addition, they provided training for all staff. In their technology academy, teachers, principals, and staff came to learn basic computer skills. Last summer they had all secondary staff engaged in these academies. In addition, staff in the Division of Instructional Technology went to each school one day per week to provide technical support. Lastly, coordinators from Academic Programs worked with disciplines in the prototype schools in order to help teachers develop lessons.

Mr. Bowers stated that there were some concerns on the part of Board members when the Corporate Partnership made a presentation in February and discussed information technology. The concern was that global access represented the school-based component of information technology. He explained that global access was the information technology plan that covered both instruction and administration. The first recommendation of the task force was to develop a strategic plan for information technology, both instructional and administrative. He believed that the Corporate Partnership saw the need for the that and emphasized this as they worked with MCPS

and looked at its organizational structure in an effort to bridge the gap between administration and instruction. This recommendation led to the formation of the task force to prepare the strategic plan. They now had a task force of over 30 people to begin working on the plan over the next couple of months. This task force represented all units within the school system.

Mr. Bowers commented that they saw this as a part of the Success for Every Student plan. There were some components that they were going to be working on very quickly. For example, they had to address Special Education immediately and could not wait for the completion of the strategic plan. A separate group was working on these informational needs, and again the group had representatives from all sides of the organization. These cross functional efforts were key to looking at how they worked together. They would continue to make presentations to the Board on this issue.

Mr. Bowers observed that there would have to be some organizational changes. They would have to make recommendations on how the organization needed to be changed in order to respond better to the information needs of all units throughout the system. In terms of the operating and capital budgets, global access was their first big attempt to tie the two budgets together as had been recommended by the Corporate Partnership. They had developed a six-year plan that had been included in the operating budget that corresponded with the Board's request in the capital budget. They were looking at adding additional resources and realigning some of their current resources.

Mr. Bowers reported that next year's request in the operating budget was \$1.3 million, and slightly more than half of that was for training. They also saw the need for instructional support at the school level. At the elementary level, the plan was to add positions to do that. At the secondary level, schools would have to determine one position to trade off for a user support specialist position. They had traded off or realigned resources to get materials, and they had added about \$100,000 to purchase software. Communications and maintenance costs were additions because they would have to increase telecommunications and the need for maintenance in the out years.

Mr. Bowers provided the Board with a handout on the implications of reducing the capital budget to the amount of money the County Council approved. They had four different worksheets. The first one was a high school intensive model. In FY 1996 the priorities would be the eight new and modernized schools and five existing high schools. This stayed within the Council's parameters of \$7 to 7.5 million a year and stayed within the six-year parameter. The handout showed the bondable and non-bondable dollars. Originally all of the funds were in current receipts, but they were now putting a significant portion into the bondable because it was longer term. They were working with county staff, and they hoped it would open up some potential for the out years. Based on what the Council approved, there would be \$23 million to be budgeted beyond the six years. The second handout placed the higher priority on middle schools, and the third handout cut the work stations in half and was not an acceptable alternative. The last sheet put the elementaries as a slightly higher priority. In FY 1996 they wanted to do all eight new and modernized schools and five high schools within the \$7.5 million.

Mr. Abrams reported that he had sat through the sessions with the Council. He was concerned about the public perception of global access because he thought he was in

never-never land listening to those Council discussions, listening to the county executive, and reading an editorial in the Gazette. He pointed out that MCPS was not state of the art. They were playing catch up. The rationales used to reduce the program were anecdotes by observations of Council members not seeing computers being used. It was also the rationale that Montgomery County held such potential that the private sector would be willing to come in and re-invent the wheel in Montgomery County at their cost. Mr. Abrams rejected both of those.

Mr. Abrams said that a Fairfax county administrator who was a parent of a Montgomery County public school student had stated that Montgomery County was way behind in terms of the introduction of technology in the schools. Mr. Abrams observed that they were talking about the information highway, and global access was an information highway program. It was their building of the information highway within the public school network. The interstate highway program took an easy way out in the 1950's. They decided to build public support for the program and take the areas where they could build quickest first. They left the more difficult decisions of the more expensive urban areas until later. He suggested that they look at where 270 and 95 ended going into Washington which would give them the implications of that kind of thinking. He raised this to challenge the high school first approach because in his mind this was equivalent to the rural first approach of the interstate highway system. Mr. Hanna challenged this as well. Mr. Abrams believed they needed to get young people accustomed to technology to benefit from it, and this suggested an earlier introduction not a later one. He was struck by the penny-wise, pound-foolish approach being taken by policy makers who were looking for ways to get control of a school system budget by imposing an arbitrary limitation. This was similar to the same arbitrary limitation those same people were complaining about in the school lunch program.

Mr. Abrams stated that in order to achieve efficiencies in education, they had to have available the technology to adapt education and education administration to the information age. The investment they made now was going to facilitate those kinds of savings on the operational side. The school system budget was 88 percent personnel related, and the only way they were ever going to make the kinds of shifts necessary to move towards a technology-based approach to service delivery as opposed to a labor-intensive approach was through the introduction of technology at the earliest possible date. He was concerned that what he was hearing from the executive and the Council did not jibe with their stated intentions of finding new and improved ways of delivering services here in Montgomery County.

Mr. Abrams reported that at Richard Montgomery High School a parents' evening to learn about access to the information network was the highest attended activity run by the PTA. This afternoon the Board would be taking up the recommendations on the gifted and talented policy which required MCPS to deliver customized, individualized, and differentiated services at the elementary schools. They could not do this without technology in what was likely to be an environment with increased class sizes. However, people were talking about a high school first approach which was not consistent. Mr. Abrams thought they had to articulate their program in more basic terms. They needed to talk about per-student cost over the lifetime of an education. The learning experience was going to come from student to teacher, but younger teachers would be coming in much more computer literate and a lot less afraid of utilizing the technology. It seemed to him that the discussion he had heard up to this point on this issue had been going on the wrong track.



Mr. Felton said that he shared the excitement of what he hoped would be their system. He thought they needed to do more to be sure they articulated to the community at large that this was not an add-on luxury for students. He said they had to talk about this in terms of what it did for the school system, the administration, and their ability in the long-run to influence the labor-intensive ratio they had in the school system. He thought that in their efforts to be so global they had missed the population out there that did not understand what MCPS was trying to do for its students and for its system. He wanted to be sure they had more specific goals in terms of impact. The goals should state that by some year this was how they expected to deliver various aspects of instruction. If people understood where MCPS was headed, they might get on the bandwagon a little faster. He suggested that they start talking about when they expected total systems to shift even if they missed the dates.

Mrs. King also shared the excitement about the global access plan. She had visited a lot of schools and in the schools with the technology she could sense the excitement when she walked in the doors. Her major concern was for the student who ended up going through high school and did not have the availability of technology. She thought they were doing a disservice to that student. If they had the money, they should do every school; however, when the funding started to shrink, she would do the high schools first so that every student going through MCPS would have the opportunity of having some experience with technology.

Mr. Ewing stated that he was largely in agreement with Mr. Abrams in his description of how the public was being presented with this issue through the media and through the Council. It seemed to him the image was that they were rushing to dump computers into the schools with staff training or a plan. There were teachers who confessed ignorance, and there were classrooms where computers were not put to use. There were visits to classrooms that showed that teachers could not answer all the questions. There was also the argument that it cost too much. There was also the argument that since Montgomery County was behind they ought to get it done faster and cheaper which was inconsistent with the other parts of the perception.

Mr. Ewing thought they had to acknowledge that what they were engaged in was not only a planned effort to create global access but also an experiment in which they were approximating better understanding of what it meant to have computers available for instruction in the schools. The point that needed to be made over and over again was that teachers and students could not learn about how to use computers without computers. If a person took training and then there was no computer available, the training would be virtually useless. The computers had to be there. As students and teachers worked with computers, they would learn about their uses and applications. MCPS would not know all of the uses in curriculum, teaching, and business operations until they had experimented with it. This seemed to have been lost on the media and on the Council.

Mr. Ewing felt that they needed to present this in terms of a continuous evolution. This was true in the business world. It took longer than expected and cost more than initially estimated. This idea was saleable in the business world but was not as saleable in the public world. He agreed that in the business world mistakes were more easily hidden from public view. He was firmly convinced that what they were doing was not different in kind from what business was going through. MCPS could not take a step without public scrutiny, but he did not object to public scrutiny; nevertheless, it was important to

recognize that the scrutiny to which they were subjected revealed that they were learning and learning involved making mistakes.

Ms. Gutierrez congratulated staff for the visible communication and reporting. From the beginning of the global access effort, she had strongly recommended that they make sure they had good and clear communication as to how they were doing. They had to have project planning and controls in place. She felt that they needed almost more of this kind of communication. She thought the paper and discussion were helpful to get them focused on the plan. She was pleased that they were using this very visible approach to demonstrate the plan. They were showing both the gains as well as where they were not moving as fast as they had hoped. There was a reality that they could not go out and just buy all of this and make it work instantly.

Ms. Gutierrez was also concerned about how global access was being perceived. The whole impact of what they were doing was being misunderstood. She was trying to put together the ten worst reasons not to fund global access. For example, the too-little-usage-of-it observation seemed to her to be an incredible basis on which to decide the fate of such an important program. The concept that there should be instant use of this meant that people did not understand what the whole technology revolution was all about. They were just now seeing it in the schools, and they were far behind other school systems and the world of technology. They were playing catch up, and they were being told they were going to have to slow down in their efforts.

Ms. Gutierrez noted that the private sector and government had had access to computer technology for many years, but they were not exposed to the same scrutiny of usage. In her own agency, every desk had a computer being used minimally because there had not been a focus on the training. Understanding how to use the technology did not happen overnight. She said that people had pointed to hardware vendors as a cost savings which meant they did not understand the world of technology. For MCPS to be dependent upon a single vendor would be absolutely the wrong approach to take. Technology had a half life of five to seven years which meant MCPS needed the flexibility to seek the technology and move with it. They had to be able to move quickly to establish that minimum configuration baseline. In the diagrams provided to the Board, she said that their original option was missing which did not have schools waiting for technology beyond the six years. She did not think it was acceptable to leave 83 schools beyond the six-year period.

Ms. Gutierrez thought it would be important to let the public know what the original plan was and what they were losing every time external factors were brought in to change the plan. She was delighted to hear how much they were looking at how they needed to reallocate their resources. This was an investment, and it was important that the community and parents recognize what an important investment it was for children and the school system. However, this was not being heard. She personally felt it was the responsibility of the Board and the school system to be as much of a strong advocate to what had been the underlying premise of all their efforts in global access. They had to make sure that barriers put before them did not derail these efforts.

Dr. Cheung recalled that five years ago when he ran for the Board of Education one of his priorities was to try to introduce technology into the school system. He thought that everyone would support that because they were a technology county. Increasingly he was very concerned about some of the political leadership in the county because they did not have vision in terms of the future of the county. They talked about economic

growth, but they were not doing anything to promote this growth. He did not know who was advising these people.

Dr. Cheung pointed out that a recent survey by American Management Association looking at the year 2015 and the critical factors to be successful in the business world. First, one had to think of globalization. The second was that people had to invest in technology. Third was supporting education, and the fourth one was employee training. He did not know why the political leaders wanted to interfere with what the experts in the school system had determined needed to be done. Their job was to find adequate resources so that they could invest in the future. He was concerned about the future of Montgomery County. If the public school system were not able to meet the needs of students, they would no longer be able to remain as a quality school system. In this case, Montgomery County would not be able to attract businesses as well as people. Property values would go down. He indicated that he had recently put some thoughts on paper about political leadership. It was very scary in terms of where their leaders were.

Dr. Cheung expressed his appreciation for the global access update. He suggested they needed to make technology more available to their staff and employees. It might mean a lease loan to make it easier for employees and staff to have access to technology. He was pleased to hear Mrs. Gemberling talk about the use of information and knowledge as well as the use of computers. All the technology would not do any good unless it supported their mission, vision, and goals. They needed to think about planning for their own software development. He called attention to the Event-Based Science program, and he suggested they needed this in software to benefit more students.

Mrs. Gordon thanked staff for an excellent report and a good discussion. She had heard everyone talk about the need to make the public, the media, and the County Council aware of what they were doing. She challenged Board members to do that because staff had been there and met with Council members and the community. Dr. Cheung had talked about leadership, and it was important that the Board exhibit the leadership to defend what they knew was the right thing for their students.

Re: ANNOUNCEMENT

Mrs. Gordon announced that the Board had been meeting in closed session on appeals and legal matters.

Re: PUBLIC COMMENTS

The following individuals appeared before the Board:

1. Luella Mast, MCCPTA
2. Sandra Hill
3. Joe Pauley
4. Joyce Taylor

RESOLUTION NO. 266-95

Re: COUNTY EXECUTIVE'S SPENDING  
GUIDELINES



87-93	Fresh Produce - Extension <u>Awardee</u> Lexington Produce Company	\$260,000
116-94	Fresh Donuts - Extension <u>Awardee</u> Montgomery Donut Corporation	\$ 55,100
37-95	Frozen Foods, Fish and Eggs <u>Awardees</u> Carroll County Foods, Inc. Dori Foods, Inc. Hearn Kirkwood/Gilbert Foods Karetas Foods, Inc. Mazo-Lerch Company, Inc. Sandler Foods Smelkinson/Sysco TOTAL	\$ 45,249 12,360 1,376 186 401 5,876 <u>8,472</u> \$ 73,920
38-95	Processed Meats <u>Awardees</u> Carroll County Foods, Inc. Feeser's Inc. Smelkinson/Sysco TOTAL	\$ 25,377 20,320 <u>12,080</u> \$ 57,777
131-95	Ceiling Board and Grid Systems Materials <u>Awardees</u> Capitol Building Supply Kamco Building Supply TOTAL	\$ 34,056 <u>11,088</u> \$ 45,144
	MORE THAN \$25,000	\$521,641
	* Denotes MFD vendor	

RESOLUTION NO. 268-95      Re:    CROSS-AGENCY MASTER LEASE PROGRAM

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

WHEREAS, It is necessary to acquire funds for the acquisition of school buses and other essential equipment; and

WHEREAS, Montgomery County Public Schools participation in a Cross-Agency Master Lease Program is cost effective and in the public interest; and

WHEREAS, Legal counsel has reviewed this resolution and will approve all documents prior to Montgomery County Public Schools committing to the program,; now therefore be it

Resolved, That contingent on approval of documents, the Board of Education enter into the Cross-Agency Master Lease Program with the Montgomery County Government; and be it further

Resolved, That the Cross-Agency Master Lease Program be given first consideration as the primary source of financing school buses and other essential equipment; and be it further

Resolved, That the Board of Education president and superintendent of schools be authorized to approve and execute documents necessary to enter this Master Lease Program.

RESOLUTION NO. 269-95                      Re:    UTILIZATION OF FY 1995 FUTURE SUPPORTED PROJECT FUNDS AND CATEGORICAL TRANSFER WITHIN THE VOCATIONAL EDUCATION PROGRAM

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

Resolved, That the superintendent of schools be authorized to receive and expend within the FY 1995 Provision for Future Supported Projects a grant award of \$37,691 from the Maryland State Department of Education, under the Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Applied Technology Education Act, for the Vocational Education program, in the following category:

<u>Category</u>	<u>Amount</u>
3    Other Instructional Costs	\$ 37,691

and be it further

Resolved, That the superintendent of schools be authorized to effect an FY 1995 categorical transfer of \$117,367 within this same program, in the following categories:

<u>Category</u>	<u>From</u>	<u>To</u>
2    Instructional Salaries	\$ 41,708	
3    Other Instructional		\$117,367
4    Special Education	49,595	
10 Fixed Charges	<u>26,064</u>	
TOTAL	\$117,367	\$117,367

and be it further

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

RESOLUTION NO. 270-95                      Re:    ACCEPTANCE OF ROCKVILLE HIGH SCHOOL - GYMNASIUM ADDITION



RESOLUTION NO. 272-95                      Re:    AWARD OF CONTRACT - SENECA VALLEY  
MIDDLE SCHOOL #2

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

WHEREAS, The following bids were received on March 23, 1995, for the construction of Seneca Valley Middle School #2, with work to begin immediately and be completed by August 1, 1996:

	<u>Bidder</u>	<u>Amount</u>
1.	Hess Construction Company	\$12,026,100
2.	Henley Construction Company, Inc.	12,063,700
3.	Dustin Construction, Inc.	12,294,000
4.	The Gassman Corporation	12,342,000
5.	Glen Construction Co., Inc.	12,370,300
6.	The McAlister-Schwartz Co.	12,425,852
7.	Kimmel & Kimmel, Inc.	12,444,600
8.	S.B. Construction Co., Inc.	12,546,600
9.	R.J. Crowley, Inc.	13,022,000

and

WHEREAS, Hess Construction Company has completed similar work successfully for Montgomery County Public Schools, including Thurgood Marshall and Lois P. Rockwell elementary schools; and

WHEREAS, the low bid is below the architect's estimate of \$12,100,000; now therefore be it

Resolved, That a \$12,026,100 contract be awarded to Hess Construction company for the construction of Seneca Valley Middle School #2, in accordance with plans and specifications prepared by The Lukmire Partnership, Architects, contingent upon the County Council's action on the Board of Education's FY 1995 supplemental appropriation request for this project.

RESOLUTION NO. 273-95                      Re:    CAPITAL PROJECTS TO BE CLOSED  
EFFECTIVE JUNE 20, 1995

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

WHEREAS, The Board of Education annually closes capital projects and transfers the unencumbered balances to the appropriate accounts; and

WHEREAS, The Department of Facilities Management has reviewed capital projects that may be closed effective June 30, 1995; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the superintendent be authorized to close, effective June 30, 1995, capital construction projects listed below and to transfer the local unencumbered



balances totaling \$1,952.55, subject to final audit, to the local Unliquidated Surplus Account.

<u>Project No.</u>	<u>School</u>	<u>Balance</u>
101-008	Clarksburg Elementary School	\$ -0-
157-001	Roberto Clemente Middle School	894.81
425-007	Ashburton Elementary School	-0-
427-021	Walt Whitman High School	362.69
428-009	Thomas W. Pyle Middle School	-0-
508-008	Candlewood Elementary School	212.71
511-005	Cashell Elementary School	340.00
769-013	Oakland Terrace Elementary School	-0-
803-008	Forest Knolls Elementary School	-0-
811-005	White Oak Middle School	-0-
9913-013	Ceiling Fans	142.34
9924-024	Gender Equity in Athletic Facilities	<u>-0-</u>
		\$1,952.55

and be it further

Resolved, That the county executive be requested to recommend approval of these actions to the County Council.

RESOLUTION NO. 274-95            Re:    SURPLUS FUTURE GREENCASTLE MIDDLE SCHOOL SITE

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

WHEREAS, The future Greencastle Middle School site, located at 3300 Briggs Chaney Road in Silver Spring, is not needed for school construction; and

WHEREAS, The Board of Education, with the approval of the state superintendent of schools, is required by law to transfer school sites no longer needed for school construction purposes to the Montgomery County Government; and

WHEREAS, The Montgomery County Government is considering the future Greencastle Middle School site for the construction of the East County Community Recreation Center; and

WHEREAS, In exchange for the conveyance of the Greencastle Middle School site, the Montgomery County Government has acquired a 14.92-acre parcel on Bournefield Way in the West\*Far Technology Park for the East County Transportation/Maintenance Facility; and

WHEREAS, The proposed land exchange will benefit the school system by providing a site for a new bus facility in a compatible neighborhood that will relieve overcrowding at existing depots and provide the opportunity for future expansion to accommodate growth; and

WHEREAS, The proposed land exchange will benefit the community by providing land for the construction of a much needed recreation facility; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the future Greencastle Middle School site, consisting of 16.4271 acres, is no longer needed for school construction purposes and, with the approval of the state superintendent of schools, shall be conveyed to the Montgomery County Government; and be it further

Resolved, That the Board of Education accept the 14.92-acre parcel on Bournefield Way from the Montgomery County Government in exchange and select this site for the location of the future East County Transportation/Maintenance Facility.

RESOLUTION NO. 275-95            Re:    AWARD OF CONTRACT - MAINTENANCE PROJECT AT CABIN JOHN MIDDLE SCHOOL

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

WHEREAS, The following sealed bids to replace the piping and mechanical equipment at Cabin John Middle School were received on March 27, 1995, in accordance with MCPS procurement practices, with work to begin April 12, 1995, and be completed by September 15, 1995:

<u>Bidder</u>	<u>Amount</u>
1. Calvert Mechanical, Inc.	\$179,350
2. M & M Welding & Fabricators, Inc.	214,000
3. EMD Mechanical Specialists	228,774
4. G & L Mechanical Services	267,438
5. American Combustion Industries, Inc.	294,398
6. E. J. Whelan, Inc.	381,853

and

WHEREAS, The low bid is below the staff estimate of \$200,000, and Calvert Mechanical, Inc., has completed similar projects successfully for Montgomery County Public Schools at Sherwood and Wood Acres elementary schools; now therefore be it

Resolved, That a \$179,350 contract be awarded to Calvert Mechanical, Inc., to replace the piping and mechanical equipment at Cabin John Middle School contingent upon County Council approval of the FY 1996 Capital Improvements Program.

RESOLUTION NO. 276-95            Re:    GRANT OF EASEMENT AT WOODLIN ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

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

WHEREAS, The Washington Gas Light Company proposes to install a natural gas line along the northwestern portion of Woodlin Elementary School, located at 2101 Luzerne Avenue in Silver Spring;

WHEREAS, The proposed grant of easement of 5,172 square feet, configured in a 10-foot wide strip, will not adversely affect any land anticipated to be utilized for school purposes and would benefit the school and community by providing improved gas service; and

WHEREAS, All construction, restoration and future maintenance will be at no cost to the Board of Education, with Montgomery County and its contractors assuming all liability for all damages or injury; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the president and secretary of the Board of Education be authorized to execute a grant of easement to the Washington Gas Light Company at Woodlin Elementary School; and be it further

Resolved, That a fee of \$1,293.68 be paid to Montgomery County Public Schools by Washington Gas for the subject right-of-way.

#### Re: MONTHLY FINANCIAL REPORT

Mr. John Finan, director of the Department of Management, Budget, and Planning, reported that they were seeing continuing progress in efforts to curtail expenditures and bring the deficit down. The projected deficit was now down to \$1.3 million from the previous deficit of \$1.7 million. They also saw revenues continue to increase, and the bulk of that was increased state revenue as their share of special education costs. The other side of the coin was they were seeing increased expenses in this category. He felt they would continue to see improvement over the next couple of months.

\*Mr. Abrams rejoined the meeting at this point.

Mr. Ewing noted that they had placed additional resources in special education in order to help meet summer school and other procedural mandates. He asked if they had an estimate about whether or not funds set aside for that purpose were going to be adequate to meet the need. Mr. Finan replied that they had allocated money to schools. The schools had not returned any funds,, but they had not asked for additional resources. They had had some requests for exemptions for spending allocations for special education which they had approved. Mrs. Gemberling added that she had received a couple of requests and had been able to accommodate these. She believed the funds were adequate.

Mr. Ewing asked whether it was the staff's judgment that the trend for meeting the deficit would continue so that they could cover the deficit. He asked if there were actions they expected to occur or demands on their resources that could cause this trend line not to be realized. Mr. Finan replied that they never knew particularly in the legal area; however, he assumed that their projections would continue the way they were doing.

Dr. Vance asked Mr. Finan to give the Board an update on the Council proceedings today. Mr. Finan reported that the full Council had reviewed the MFP recommendations as presented by Mrs. Praisner. Mrs. Ewing amended the proposal to increase spending affordability guidelines by 1 percent, and she proposed putting \$15 million back in the revenue area for the excise taxes that were supposed to sunset. She proposed increasing the revenue stabilization fund from \$1 million to \$2.8 million and increasing the executive's position on the capital budget for pay-go from about \$26

million up to \$33 million. She also proposed putting an \$8 million undesignated kitty which might be used later on for additional allocations to the agencies or against further reductions in taxes or additional increases to the revenue stabilization fund. The vote was five to four in favor.

\*Ms. Gutierrez rejoined the meeting at this point.

Re: MINORITY-, FEMALE-, AND DISABLED  
(MFD) CONTRACTING

Dr. Vance stated that the purpose of this discussion was to review the school system's program to attract minority-, female-, and disabled-owned companies to participate in contracts. The Board-approved program established procedures to purchase a minimum of 10 percent of the value of all materials, supplies, equipment, and services from MFD companies. This program was administered by the Procurement Office and the Department of Facilities Management.

Mr. Giles Benson, director of the Division of Materials Management, introduced Ms. Dianne Jones, senior buyer.

Ms. Jones remarked that Procurement and Facilities Management staff shared the Board's commitment to equal opportunity for companies owned and operated by minorities, females, and disabled persons. An affirmative program designed to facilitate and encourage MFD participation in contracts had enabled staff to develop strong and mutually profitable relationships with the minority business community. Last year MFD contractors were awarded contracts in excess of \$15 million, and MCPS acquired competitively priced and quality services from MFD companies. The Board has established a minimum of 10 percent for these purchases, and in FY 1994 and for the first six months of FY 1995 they had exceeded that goal with 13.2 and 17.2 percent respectively. Awards were made to firms in all minority groups, and 40 percent of the business went to firms located in Montgomery County.

Ms. Jones said that all vendors and contractors were made aware that minority participation in contracts was important to MCPS. Majority vendors and contractors were encouraged to develop partnerships with minority businesses through subcontracting and joint ventures. Majority contractors were provided with lists of minority firms to facilitate this process. Technical assistance was provided to minority firms through pre-bid or individually scheduled conferences. These conferences clarified bid conditions, explained procurement procedures, and promoted understanding of the unique requirements associated with student-related programs and the school environment. They recognized that education and communication were two-way streets. Therefore, procedures were in place to assure that MCPS staff continued to learn about new minority businesses. MCPS visited these businesses and scheduled tours of MCPS facilities. MCPS participated in regional minority procurement fairs and functions, and they consulted regularly with minority organizations including the NAACP, Maryland/D.C. Minority Suppliers Development Council, Pan Asian and Hispanic chambers of commerce, and various minority subcontractor associations.

Ms. Jones remarked that they were pleased with the results of the program, and they were confident they would continue to maintain as well as increase minority participation in all contracts.

Mr. Felton was pleased that they had exceeded their goal and hoped they would have higher goals to exceed in the future. He asked about the percentage of contracts under competitive bid. Ms. Jones replied that about 90 percent of their contracts were bid competitively.

Mr. Felton asked if they were expanding the number of minority vendors on their list. Ms. Jones replied that she hoped they were expanding the list. Last week they met with 600 minority vendors at a conference, and MCPS staff tried to explain their procedures and regulations and communicate the requirements of contracting with MCPS. Mr. Felton requested the numbers in terms of what those increases had been. Ms. Jones said that when they attended a minority fair they were happy if they got five to ten vendors interested in bidding. She would do some research and provide this information to the Board. Mr. Benson commented that all of their contracts were competitively priced. It was a matter of how they went about it. State law required set procedures for contracts over \$15,000. If the contract were under \$15,000, they had local requirements to go out to five or ten vendors.

Mr. Ewing said he would like to see the trends by category -- Asian, African-American, female, Hispanic, native American, and disabled -- for the last several years. What he saw in the paper was a rise overall and at the same time a substantial increase in Asian and female participation and a drop in African-American participation and in Hispanic participation in the last six months. He would be interested in seeing trends and any information to indicate why this is occurring.

Ms. Gutierrez commented that this had been an area of interest for her and for Carol Fanconi. She thought that it was important to focus on outreach, but they also needed to look at what their own internal procedures were. She did not know if they were maintaining databases as they identified vendors to help them do that outreach. Did they maximize their exposure? For example, did they translate the bids? She had seen bids published in Latino newspapers but in English. She asked if they could publish those ads in Spanish.

For facilities, Ms. Gutierrez wondered how they involved MFD contractors. She knew a Latino architect who was trying to get on the MCPS list. She asked for a description of the larger procurements.

Ms. Jones replied that they did maintain databases that designated companies by their minority categories. They have translated into EI Montgomery their advertising on one or two occasions. However, they were told that some of their high technology bids were difficult to translate into Spanish.

Mr. William Wilder, director of the Department of Facilities Management, added that his staff maintained a database. They achieved most of their success through their outreach program. They had good success in working directly with general contractors to suggest names of qualified minority subcontractors. If they were shy in any area, it had to do with materials. With respect to the architectural appointments, they selected a review team for a project. The team consisted of school-based staff, central office staff, and parent representatives. That team would review all of the applications on file, and they narrowed the candidates to around five firms. They conducted interviews of the five firms.

Ms. Gutierrez asked whether the selection group was looking for increased minority participation. Mr. Wilder replied that they were, but the PTA and the school principals were looking for something they could see that the architect had done locally. He commented that in all candor it was very difficult to break into this process.

Dr. Cheung requested information on the various minority vendors by the type of major categories of products and services such as construction, computer, furniture, etc. This would give them some idea where minority vendors had done well. Mr. Wilder noted that the Board had just awarded an architectural contract to a minority firm. Mr. Felton asked for staff to identify the contractors as well as the subcontractors on the facilities list.

Re: SUPERINTENDENT'S ADVISORY  
COMMITTEE ON THE EDUCATION OF THE  
GIFTED AND TALENTED REPORT AND  
STAFF RESPONSE

Dr. Vance introduced Dr. Cindy Sullivan, director of the Department of Academic Programs; Dr. Waveline Starnes, former director, Division of Enriched and Innovative Instruction; Ms. Judie Muntner, co-chair of the committee; and Mr. David Fishback. He indicated that the Board had received the staff response to the report. He met with the group on occasion and met with them last year as they were preparing their recommendations. The report continued to bring the perspective of parents and staff concerned about programs for the most able students. He acknowledged the contribution of Ms. Owens who had served as chair or co-chair of the advisory committee for a number of years. Gifted and talented programs, practices, and policies had been on the Board's agenda frequently. The policy discussion would be coming back to the Board later this year.

Ms. Muntner stated that this year's report responded to requests from Dr. Vance, concluded prior studies, and looked at current issues and ongoing concerns. The first area they addressed this year was the report, National Excellence - A Case for Developing America's Talents. In discussions and forums at their meetings the advisory committee focused on how well the needs of identified MCPS G/T students were being met and how well the needs of these students were likely to be met given current trends and plans in MCPS.

The Excellence report focused on steps needed in resources, standards, opportunities, and assessments. It discussed the lack of challenge for G/T students, the need for increased opportunities for disadvantaged and minority students, the need to broaden and rethink the definition of gifted, and the need for increased access to early childhood education and teacher training. Based on qualitative and anecdotal data, the committee found that implementation of the MCPS policy was spotty. MCPS had yet to find effective ways to ensure that meeting the needs of gifted and talented students was a central goal at every school. Part of the difficulty could be attributed to the disproportionate reduction in support for G/T programs during recent budget cuts. This sent a clear message to schools about the importance of the programs.

Ms. Muntner said they also noted that MCPS was doing a lot of things right. The PADI program, G/T LD, and the magnet school programs all provided ground breaking opportunities in qualitatively differentiated programs. However, they needed to do

better. The executive summary of the national Excellence report was included as Appendix A.

Ms. Muntner reported that their committee had several recommendations. One was to engage teachers, principals, and administrators in discussions of the Excellence report to raise awareness and motivation, to address concerns related to gifted and talented, and to review programs. This was now in process. The Excellence report and the Maryland Task Force report should be valuable resources to the Board as they reviewed the policy.

Ms. Muntner indicated that committee members had visited or contacted Fairfax, Howard, Arlington, and Alexandria counties. After discussions, the committee recommended that an enrichment teacher be provided in every elementary school. Howard County has such an allocated person, and this position allowed them to provide accelerated math instruction and a resource room program for independent study and projects. This model allowed more students than those identified as gifted and talented to participate. They were aware of how tight the MCPS budget was, but as an elementary school principal, she knew MCPS needed help to meet the standards discussed in the Excellence report and even of the new G/T components of the school improvement plans. Principals continued to be overburdened by needs and priorities including G/T, inclusion, MSPAP, CRTs, a new science curriculum, portfolios, renovations, etc.

Mr. Fishback would second the recommendation about having staff people in the schools. When they had the area-based teachers of the gifted, those teachers did wonders in terms of helping teachers teach all the students, not just G/T students. They had an increasingly younger teaching staff, and that kind of training was essential. The committee had several recommendations for the high schools and middle schools. One recommendation was for a .2 position in the high schools. The committee felt this was something they needed to move toward because they were concerned they did not have the level of minority participation in honors classes that they ought to because a large number of minority students came from educated families. Having a .2 coordinator would help identify and encourage enrollment and support for minority students in those honors classes. Some high schools did a better job than others in terms of pulling students in. Mr. Fishback cited the efforts of Don Kress at Springbrook High School.

Mr. Fishback said that another recommendation had to do with the availability of honors classes. One of the problems they found in the high schools, not just in the small ones, was that the numbers of students ready, willing, and able to take honors classes sometimes did not fit class size limitations. There might be too many for one class but not enough for two. The committee wanted to see a lot more flexibility on that. When children could not get the basic honors courses, it would hurt the quality in high schools and make parents push their children into Blair and Richard Montgomery. Mr. Fishback commented that parents should not feel their children had to go to those schools to get a good education. While the movement toward having larger high schools would help that, it would not eliminate that problem. Parents would leave the public schools if they did not get the education they wanted for their children.

In regard to middle schools, Mr. Fishback called attention to the first two paragraphs on page seven of their report. He said they had probably heard more complaints about the middle school program than anything else. The biggest problem was that the

programs were so uneven. The availability of honors programs was left to the judgment of the principal, and sometimes things did not work out the way they should. It was absolutely essential that in English and mathematics they had a grouping of children by ability and motivation. These students should not be held back. They could do a lot more differentiation in an elementary school when the teacher had that child all day. When they got to middle school, the classes were 40 and 45 minutes. Differentiation was asking far too much of even the best teachers. There was some consistency in math, but no consistency in English offerings. He commented that a lot of students in seventh grade were ready for a full year of a foreign language, and the committee believed that every child should have that opportunity. This should not be an accident because of the middle school district he or she lived in.

Mr. Fishback remarked that the middle schools had to be that bridge between elementary school and the high school, and there had to be that increasing rigor. If they did not have this consistently through the county, they were going to have some big problems. People were going to start picking the neighborhoods they were going to move into based on whether the school programs were going to meet the needs of their children. This would result in an economic and class segregation in the county. They had to face up to the issues and mandate some of the levels of courses offered. If they did not, people would be dissatisfied and children would be shortchanged. For the most part these were not matters of money but of policy. They had to have English and math honors classes in the middle schools, have foreign language available, and do it for science as well. Some groups had recommended that all children be in heterogenous grouping for a majority of that time. This might be fine for a lot of students, but for some students that would not work. A child should be able to take classes that would fit where they were in a particular subject at a particular time.

Ms. Muntner reported that they also looked at technology. The committee felt strongly that access to technology was imperative for students in order to provide them with the tools they needed for their future. MCPS had begun to address these needs through the global access initiative and the installation of research learning hubs in all media centers. Connectivity was also being addressed through these advances and through FirstClass. Training was an ongoing concern if they were to realize the full potential of that technology. They would need to seek out creative solutions for training. They needed to look beyond the usual boundaries of training to use the rich talents in the community. This meant looking at students as trainers, parents, and businesses. A major concern was the discussions and cuts proposed at the County Council level which would postpone full implementation of global access. Technology opened learning opportunities for all students while providing easier, broader differentiation possibilities for the gifted and talented.

Ms. Muntner indicated that they had looked at mathematics instruction in the elementary school. They applauded the development of adjusting mathematics instruction for highly able students and suggested that broad training be developed to ensure that all teachers were comfortable and knowledgeable about implementing the delivery of appropriate instruction. Hand-in-hand with this recommendation was the development and dissemination of guidelines for using ISM to provide appropriate instruction to mathematically gifted students. Many students in MCPS had mathematical ability that demanded instruction that allowed them to study more advanced topics, materials, and themes, to move at a faster pace, use higher order thinking skills, to engage in activities that promoted the application of skills and concepts, and to complete independent study projects. If ISM was the keystone of



mathematics instruction, they must ensure that it was flexible enough and powerful enough to meet the needs of all of their students.

Next year the committee would study areas based on the suggestions of the superintendent and the needs of the school system. They would provide on-going reports to the superintendent.

Mr. Abrams complimented the committee on their work. By and large he was in agreement with their observations. Mr. Fishback had commented that middle school implementation was not a matter of money but of policy. While Mr. Abrams shared that view in terms of attitude having a great deal to do about middle school implementation, it seemed to him there was a critical mass issue that was overlooked. This raised the implications of technology as opposed to personnel to ensure the provision and offering of a broader array of gifted and talented options. For example, the utilization of technology could link multiple middle schools. They were looking at that somewhat in BEKS for the high schools. Utilizing technology could help them to provide differentiation. At the elementary school level, they were talking in terms of the Howard County model of having a G/T resource position in the schools as opposed to utilizing the technology as a way of providing that. Ms. Muntner replied that at the elementary level technology could be used to differentiate instruction, but the students needed a resource room with someone to work with them on a variety of techniques and to hook them into the internet so they could find adult mentors. They were also talking about having a broad base of children who could participate in that kind of program. They needed someone to manage the technology so that it worked.

Mr. Abrams noted that one of their recommendations was on access to high school honors programs. He asked whether they discussed the potential of distance learning to provide a broader range of course availability. Ms. Muntner replied that they had discussed this. They were looking for a variety of different options so that schools could pick and choose what would be appropriate for the school given its population and numbers.

Mr. Fishback stated that they had to consider what cost more in times of limited funds. At the high school level if this was the most cost effective to get that kind of education, this was what they ought to do. With respect to the elementary school level, one of the great uses of resource teachers was also training the teachers to do differentiated instruction in the classroom. At the middle school level, he thought there probably were things that could be done with technology. But what they were talking about here wasn't the question of whether there were the right numbers of students to fit the particular honors courses, but they were concerned about the problem of which classes were going to be offered. It did not cost more to offer Spanish 1 than Spanish 1A and 1B. He believed that at the middle school level critical mass would not be a problem. If they gave students opportunity and motivation, there would be enough students to support those classes. He pointed out Sligo Middle School with its new principal and large numbers of students taking algebra.

Mr. Ewing asked the superintendent to provide his comments on the paragraph in the report which stated that "many parents of gifted and talented students report being told by teachers and principals that above-grade level instruction in mathematics and reading is either not permissible or is so unwise and inconvenient that the school will not support it. In the upper elementary and middle school grades in some schools, the very effective differentiation technique of regrouping students by ability for instruction

has been forbidden or forgotten." Mr. Ewing was troubled by that set of observations. He did not recall anything that the Board ever said or did about this that would suggest this ought to be their policy. He would like to hear the superintendent's view of that subsequently.

Mrs. Gemberling observed that they had had several meetings to dispel the myth about the glass ceiling. Documentation was prepared and distributed in schools this year with specific strategies that focused on assessing and challenging bright students. She promised that the Board would receive copies of this. Dr. Starnes noted that the G/T report had been prepared last year, and Mrs. Gemberling indicated that the other document had been done over the summer.

Mr. Ewing recalled that in the area of mathematics they had tried several years ago to obtain agreement from the state Board of Education to allow them to give high school credit for mathematics courses taken in middle school that were high school level courses. Montgomery County had been turned down on this request, and he wondered if they should try again. Mr. Fishback thought they should because children were starting high school level courses early. These students had a lot of other interests, but when they got to high school they were up against the number of state-mandated classes they needed to graduate. If a student could get the mandated work done early, he or she could have more choices for electives. Dr. Vance recalled that the state superintendent was not adverse to the recommendation for credit at the mid level, but other school systems did not give support to this idea. He suggested that Mr. Fishback and members of the PTA needed to contact the Maryland Association of Boards of Education to get other school systems to join with MCPS in this initiative.

Mrs. Gordon thanked the committee and staff for their report.

Re: CHALLENGE GRANT PROGRAM

Dr. Vance introduced Dr. Steven Seleznow, director; Dr. Joseph Dalton, principal of Wheaton High School; Ms. Robin Weaver, principal of Harmony Hills Elementary School; Ms. Roseann Armes, principal of Viers Mill Elementary School; and Ms. Linda Warren, principal of Weller Road Elementary School. He indicated that as appropriate more principals would join them at the table.

Dr. Vance recalled that in 1992 the General Assembly provided funds through the Challenge Grant for School Improvement to Montgomery County, Prince George's County, and Baltimore City. Montgomery County was selected to participate to address the needs of schools with high concentrations of ESOL and highly mobile students. Given this criteria, they selected the Wheaton Cluster for participation. In August of 1992, the cluster schools began planning, and in 1993 they began implementing their Challenge Grant initiatives and programs. Since the start of the program, the Wheaton Cluster schools had received approximately \$4 million of state funds, mostly within the past year and a half.

Dr. Vance pointed out that in the Challenge Grant the funds went directly to the schools. All decisions regarding the use of those funds were determined by the principals and their school improvement teams. All planning occurred at the school level. By directive, central office administrators were forbidden from determining the use of grant funds or from setting program priorities. Each school improvement teams developed improvement plans and proposals. These were then submitted to the

Maryland State Department of Education for review and approval. Each school developed its own budget, and individual school accounts were locally managed and directed. They were now in the process of examining the impact of the grant on the management and administration of the schools and especially on the performance of ESOL and highly mobile students in the Wheaton Cluster. The central office had supported the Wheaton Cluster schools by setting up individual school budget formats, streamlining waiver procedures, and by giving schools the creative freedom to design the reforms they believed necessary; however, the program had been managed by the Maryland State Department of Education. Dr. Vance commended the principals and their school improvement teams for the work they had done and for wisely investing their funds in training and new technology.

Dr. Seleznow stated that when John F. Kennedy accepted the presidential nomination in 1960, he spoke of his vision for America and his agenda for change. He said that the new frontier of which he spoke was not a set of promises, it was a set of challenges. It summed up not what he intended to offer the American people but what he intended to ask of them. Dr. Seleznow commented that the Challenge Grant was not so much about what the schools received from the state of Maryland but what they had asked of the people in the school community. The Challenge Grant had been a catalyst for reform. It had helped raise community expectations and community confidence in the schools. It had forced the staff to question their assumptions about how their schools ought to be organized and how the resources should be best used to make measurable improvements in student performance. The Challenge Grant had been about investing wisely in change and investing wisely in children. It was about getting a return for every dollar spent.

Dr. Seleznow reported that principals would tell the Board that they had succeeded in many areas and were now beginning to identify program models that could be replicated in other schools. Schools could be successful when principals, parents, staff, and school improvement teams were given both the creative license and the budgetary authority to determine their own new frontiers. He said that as they had learned successful school reform underscored the need for bureaucratic change. He thanked the superintendent and the executive staff for their consistent backing of the Wheaton Cluster and the Challenge Grant. The four principals who had been involved in the grant since 1992 would report to the Board.

Ms. Weaver stated that three years ago they began to dream when they learned they would be part of the Challenge Grant. They imagined their building would be open as an active learning center from 8 a.m. to 8 p.m. Today their dream was a reality. At Harmony Hills they focused primarily on staff development. Change was stressful, and they wanted to be sure they had the tools to address the needs of their students. The grant provided them with substitute release time for monthly grade level training and planning for every classroom teacher. It provided outside consultants and trainers to conduct workshops and to coach the instructional staff. It provided the financial resources for every one to attend at least one conference off site. They were able to purchase materials and equipment. They now had a 27-Mackintosh computer lab complete with an integrated learning system. They also had all the resources in their building logged onto their automated media system for easy access. By the end of this year, their fourth and fifth grade classrooms would all be networked to the lab and the media center.

Ms. Weaver related that they had extended their school day from 8 a.m. to 6 p.m. Before the grant, they had an extended day program that addressed the needs of about 20 students. As of today, 125 children were participating in the program in Grades 3, 4, and 5. At Harmony Hills, of the 12 subtests on MSPAP, students made gains in eight areas for a 75 percent increase in a one-year period. They expected these results to continue. They had reached out of their building and formed partnerships with parents, with the community, and with businesses. They offered adult education, English as a second language, life skills, and employability skills. In January in collaboration with the Montgomery County Mental Health Association along with four other Wheaton Cluster schools to implement a new program, "Family and Student Support Network," where three days of counseling services came to their school. Over 140 family and individual counseling sessions had been conducted.

Ms. Armes felt that Viers Mill students were making significant gains. There had been an improvement of an average of 27 percent points when they compared the 1993 and 1994 scores for third graders. They had an improvement in math and language of over 50 percent. They had 412 students in Grades K-3, and 25 percent of those students were currently enrolled in ESOL and another 25 percent had English as a second language. They believed their success was due to a commitment from the staff and the community to create an educational climate with high academic expectations and standards for all students.

Ms. Armes indicated that they had added instructional days to the school year for primary students through their mini-math program. Fifty percent of the students enrolled in mini-math last summer were ESOL students. They had added two hours to their instructional time each week through after-school activities. They had homework support, literature discussion groups, computer classes, and science and math clubs. About 50 students attended these classes each afternoon. They were restructuring their ESOL program to provide more student to teacher contact. They had implemented a co-teaching model in Grades 1 and 2. ESOL students stayed in the classroom for all of their instruction because there was a positive correlation between students who remained in the regular classroom all day and their math, science, and reading levels. They had also created their own staff development center at the school which had enabled them to focus on specific strategies for ESOL students and to promote the infusion of technology into all classrooms. They were strengthening initiatives to help ESOL parents become active partners in the educational process. During the past two years over 50 percent of the ESOL parents had participated in classes and training focused on curriculum issues and parent support programs.

Ms. Warren remarked that at Weller Road they had had academic and parental involvement successes. They had increased in five of the 12 content areas on the MSPAP. They had targeted primary grades and initiated multi-age groupings, ungraded groupings, multi-intelligence centers, and a hands-on learning lab. Their current second graders would be taking the MSPAP next year, and they were anticipating growth. In the past two years they had focused on increasing parental involvement in the school. Parent attendance at their quarterly awards assembly had gone from 0 to 100. ESOL parent meetings now had 45 parents attending. During American Education Week they had gone from about five parents to 125-150 parents attending. In parent-teacher conferences, they had gone from 40 percent to 80 percent participation. At International Night they had doubled attendance from 250 to over 500. Their volunteers had gone from 15 to 80 plus. They now had an adult ESOL class with 45 parents attending. In addition, they had a 5 percent increase in the number of

parents joining the PTA. She believed that at Weller Road they had made a difference because of the Challenge Grant.

Dr. Dalton indicated that the Challenge Grant had had a significant impact on the entire Wheaton High School community. They had examined their fundamental approach to education, and they discovered a need to break down existing paradigms regarding the delivery of instruction and supports for their special populations. The seven-period day with 45-minute classes had to be changed. They rescheduled the high school with alternating 90-minute blocks. This brought them to extensive teacher training, the purchase of current technology, and the establishment of specific programs. Realizing that their highly mobile ESOL students needed special focus, they initiated programs for success. With approval from their school improvement team, parents determined the job description and qualification and participated in the interview and selection process of their new student facilitator. The facilitator met with every student and his or her family. He had a video in four different languages, and he monitored attendance and academic progress of students.

Dr. Dalton stated that during the first semester of this school year the GPA of their new students was 2.22, but last year without the student facilitator, that figure was 0.77. ESOL students did not have access to computers at home; therefore, they used Challenge Grant funds for an ESOL math computer lab, afterschool access to computers, and multi-media equipment for all classes. He reported that an interesting result from their new scheduling was a decline in teacher absenteeism. They had experienced an almost 40 percent decrease in that rate.

Dr. Seleznow reported that the Challenge Grant had passed both houses of the Legislature, and they were awaiting word from the MSDE about what funds would be available for next year. Dr. Vance added that it got increasingly difficult to have that particular legislation re-authorized. He would like to thank Delegate Heller, John Hurson, and the other leaders in the Montgomery County Delegation for salvaging the grant funds.

Dr. Cheung remarked that it was exciting to hear their success story. He would like to hear from each principal in the cluster about the three key reasons for their success.

Dr. Dalton replied that teacher training would be at the very top, followed by advanced technology, and rethinking almost everything which pulled the community together. Other principals suggested partnerships, technology, vision, and parent commitment. It seemed to Dr. Cheung that after listening to the principals they were saying the important reasons were leadership from principals, staff, and parents which meant vision; staff development; technology; and partnership with parents and community. He thought that the bottom line was having adequate resources to support that. Dr. Seleznow added that DEA was undertaking a study to validate just this.

Mr. Felton appreciated the report and the enthusiasm; however, with grants, they got dependent on those funds. He asked whether this would be self sustaining as grant money declined. He did not think that anyone had mentioned the involvement of the business community.

Dr. Dalton replied that they were cognizant from the very beginning that this would not last forever, and they had to plan for the end of the grant from the beginning of the grant. Part of the challenge from the state was to create models that could be

replicable by other schools, not only in the county, but in the state. All of the schools had done things that would last. Teacher training and staff training would last, and technology would last for a while. Some of the things they had done at Wheaton High School did not cost a nickel. Many things were done because of the spirit of the grant - the spirit of togetherness.

Ms. Weaver answered that one of the conditions of the grant was that they involve Maryland businesses in their school improvement teams. All schools had included some business partners. Her partner was a group of consultants who had given hundreds of extra hours of time. This year they had helped with food baskets and clothing bazaars. Dr. Seleznow felt that the principals had made some wise choices when they invested grant funds in programs that could be sustainable as opposed to buying staff. He suspected that the leadership demonstrated in the cluster would continue with or without money. These people were getting together every Friday, and this was a model that did not cost anything extra to sustain.

Ms. Converse remarked that she was enthusiastic about the changes that she heard from not only principals and staff but also from students. Ever since she had been involved in county student government, students had been asking about the programs in Wheaton Cluster especially the four-period day. She, too, was interested in the four-period day because it had a lot of benefits. In talking to Wheaton students, one group thought the four-period day was great; however, another group said they were bored sitting there for 90 minutes. She thought that the students seeing the benefits of the 90-minute period were probably self motivated and high achievers in any situation, but the others would be bored in most any situation. She asked whether part of the staff training at Wheaton focused on creative approaches to instruction so that students did not have 90 minutes of lecturing.

Dr. Dalton agreed with the division among students. They had visited Thomas Johnson High School in Frederick County, and one of his first experiences was hearing a student say to a teacher that this was boring and he was failing all four classes. Dr. Dalton asked the teacher about the problem, and the teacher told him that the student was failing all four classes, but last year the student failed seven classes. The teacher said that this student would fail no matter how many classes were offered. On the other side, there were students who would succeed in any situation. Dr. Dalton noted that many students were in the middle, and for this group, there should be the biggest impact.

Dr. Dalton reported that before they went to block scheduling they had a summer academy of intensive training to focus on how to use the 90 minutes. In addition, they had the use of technology. The whole thrust of this was to vary instruction and have several activities within a given period. It worked well in science labs, but he agreed they still had work together. This year they had changed the schedule to make Monday a traditional day with block scheduling on Tuesday/Thursday and Wednesday/Friday. They had surveyed the staff, and only six wanted to go back to seven-period day.

It seemed to Ms. Converse that one of the real advantages to this plan was that it could present student burnout of trying to focus on seven different subjects every day. The flip side was that a lengthy class period could contribute to student burnout. She also asked how this different approach affected feelings about school climate. For example, was there a change in the rate of discipline problems or student involvement in variety sports or student government? Dr. Dalton replied that discipline was about the same,

but the atmosphere around the school was quieter. He thought student involvement was increasing, and school spirit was increasing.

Ms. Gutierrez said it was obvious that given the money and being asked to use imagination was a wonderful experience. To her the most important parts of the Challenge Grant were the needs of the ESOL population and the highly mobile population. She thought they had done many things, but it was hard for her to see how these correlated to the focus of the Challenge Grant. She hoped that after the Challenge Grant they could find what worked and what did not work. Her concerns were on the evaluation of the outcomes. She knew there was a built-in evaluation to the grant and that DEA had been working on that; however, she did not know how complete that evaluation was.

Ms. Gutierrez commented that a lot of data had been provided to the Board, but she still had a lot of questions because the correlation was not yet evident. She hoped that as each principal decided what to do they were also seeing what was working and what was not. This would be the real valuable lesson learned. If the MSPAP was going to be the indicator, the data showed that some things were working and some were not. They had made some gains, but not enough in her estimation.

Ms. Gutierrez was particularly concerned about the low number of students who were tested. She had taken the Hispanic population of the school, and there were 25 students. Six got tested, but only two passed. This to her was not a good indicator. She thought they should be getting better results. Her measure of improvement was academic not necessarily climate. She would encourage the system to look at how they were doing with these correlations in the evaluation so that they could have more of a comparison across the different schools. From the beginning of the Challenge Grant, she had been concerned about each school's doing their own thing which made it difficult to look at longitudinal data and across the board.

Dr. Seleznow replied that Ms. Gutierrez had raised a very important question. The schools had had the money for only about a year and a half. Some of the development of program would be able to change the data she had identified. They wanted to break some of the normal ways they used for assessment and look at smaller populations and additional instruments. He hoped that next year they would be able to show improved numbers.

Ms. Gutierrez thought that as a minimum they should make it a policy that every student in every school should take the test. This was the only way they could get valid results. When they did not test students in that classroom who had been part of the program, they would have questionable results. If they received the Challenge Grant again, they should regroup and refocus. They should ask whether changing to a four-period day would have an impact on this population. If it had not, what could they do? They had done a lot of things, but this was a shotgun approach. If they were over ambitious and trying to do too much on this, they might not squeeze a lot into the grant.

Mr. Ewing thanked staff for a very good presentation as well as the written information. The memo from Dr. Vance spelled out a broad range of things that had been undertaken. He thought that the combination of parent involvement, staff training, and technology, if sustained over time, ought to pay off in steady improvement. It was important for them to continue to assess how well they were doing, but it was not very

realistic to expect that everything would change overnight. What one would want to see would be a period of four to six years to see whether or not there was a steady upward trend. This was what he was looking for and expecting because he did think that the combination of techniques and strategies they were employing was the right one. He noted that virtually all the schools chose to emphasize math and in some cases math and English for their summer programs. He was interested in the participation level and the results.

Ms. Armes replied that on the elementary level they worked as a cluster on their summer program. They brought children together in one site. MCPS had a program called "Math Power" for Grades 3 through 5. They decided to invite children in Head Start through Grade 2 to participate in summer school as well as the ESOL children. They found that in early language acquisition, the eight weeks over the summer caused children to forget a lot of language. For the mini-math, their goal was to keep children using the language. The first year they were astounded with the results. They had more children enrolled than they could imagine. They had classes of 20 children with two teachers and an instructional assistant. They also tried to put an ESOL teacher with a regular classroom teacher. They started giving children assessments in math during the summer. In the fall children went into the next grade level at a higher level. They considered this to be extending academic time because it was more than the traditional summer school program. Teachers planned together and had curriculum objectives in place. In the afternoon they offered classes to the teachers on planning, bilingualism, and technology.

Dr. Seleznow reported that they had the highest participation rates in Math Power of any cluster. This was due to some aggressive work on the part of principals in calling parents, but offering transportation made a tremendous difference in getting students to participate. Ms. Armes added that they had parent classes during the summer. Parents came in at night or rode in on the buses during the day. They learned the curriculum to help their children with the curriculum during the school year.

Mr. Jay Breakiron, principal of Parkland Middle School, explained that they offered three-week programs in ESOL and four-week programs for at risk students. They did math and remediation in these sessions. They were able to hire supporting staff personnel, special educators, and a health technician. Attending were 36 ESOL students and 44 students at risk. The children received transportation to and from school, and a free breakfast and lunch program. They also had physical education, arts and crafts, language arts, and environmental studies. This year of the ESOL students who enrolled during the summer, 71 percent were passing the Maryland Functional Math test. For the at-risk program, the figure was 85 percent. Combined with that, they offered the remediation program which was county supported, initially they had 24 students enrolled, and they had been able to increase this to 82 students. They projected 96 percent would pass the functional math test.

Dr. Dalton stated that at Wheaton their summer programs were focused on in-coming ninth graders. Students studied algebra and language arts. After the first nine weeks in the fall, they checked up on these students, and 76 percent of those taking the summer program got a C or better compared to 51 percent of the comparable group who did not take the summer program. In language arts, 100 percent got a C or better compared to 29 percent of the comparable group.



Mr. Ewing observed that this made their decision about summer school tuition charging look worse and worse when these sorts of results could be achieved. He indicated that Wheaton High School had preparatory classes for SAT and PSAT, and he inquired about the response and results there. Dr. Dalton replied that 108 either were or had been in the SAT course. Not all of this was due to the Challenge Grant. Their main goal this year was trying to broaden the base of the students taking the SAT and PSAT. Last year only 40 percent of their seniors took the SAT. This year it was 49 percent, and their goal was 60 percent. Of the PSAT, in 1992-93 they had 84 students take the PSAT, and for 1994-95 156 students took it, which was nearly double. Dr. Vance added that these were the youngsters who were finding their way to Montgomery County in increasing numbers.

Mrs. Gordon thought this had been an excellent presentation. More overwhelming were the people in the audience, and this was really what it was all about. In regard to comments made by Ms. Gutierrez, Mrs. Gordon thought that when MSPAP started that very few students could be exempted from the test. She thought it was only the students who were first year non-English speaking students or special education students whose parents exempted them or whose IEP exempted them. She asked whether this was still the criteria for exemption.

Ms. Weaver replied that there was a test which determine which ESOL students took the MSPAP. Dr. Seleznow explained that the MEC test was given to assess whether or not students could take the MSPAP. The only students exempted would be those meeting the MCPS exemptions. They had no special waiver with respect to the Wheaton Cluster.

In regard to block scheduling, Mrs. Gordon noted that in Frederick County a student would take eight courses over the period of a year. She asked why MCPS opted to follow what they had now or had they considered using the extra period. Dr. Dalton replied that they did consider that, but they did not go with that because of their mobility rate. Students transferring in or out would have a difficult time. The mobility rate in Frederick was about 3 to 4 percent. Another reason was that teachers in Frederick taught the equivalent of six classes, and there would be some union issues in Montgomery County.

Mrs. Gordon stated that obviously there had been lots of lessons learned. She would like each principal to say one thing they thought had been a success or one thing that did not work. What they needed to take away from this were the lessons learned.

Dr. Dalton replied that the change they made in the schedule was by far the most visible and the most difficult. There was a lot of resistance to change. If they had to do this over again, they would try to be more cognizant of the whole process of change and perhaps bring in someone from the beginning to talk with staff. Ms. Weaver stated that one of the most enriching parts of the grant had been cluster perspective and K-12 perspective.

Ms. Jacquelyn Davidson, principal of Brookhaven Elementary School, reported that she was new to the group. MCPS had a great principal training program, but jumping into the Challenge Grant doubled what she had learned about administration and the State of Maryland. This helped her in her ability to work with her staff. Ms. Armes stated that she had learned a lot of lessons about change and leadership. In her school they had learned to keep their eyes on the ball, decide what they believed in, and then do it. Ms.

Warren said she joined the Wheaton Cluster in 1992 as a new administrator. By working with her colleagues, she came up with the idea of an instructional council. Being the only administrator in the school, she had to have some support. She had been able to delegate some responsibilities to some of her staff.

Ms. Felicia Lanham-Tarason, principal of Wheaton Woods Elementary School, indicated that she had just completed her first year in February. She had never perceived that an educator would have large sums of money. It was nice to have money, but it took time and planning to make sure they were spending funds wisely to assure improved student outcome. This had forced them to focus on their vision. Mr. Breakiron thought the main lesson he had learned was that they were not out there alone. They had support networks in the community and through outside agencies. They had empowerment of staff and students to give them the message that they could achieve.

Dr. Seleznow added that he had learned to let leaders be leaders. He had learned that leaders were everywhere in their community. He had learned what role the central administration should or should not play in the process of school improvement. Dr. Vance stated that this group had made him very proud. He thanked all of them.

#### Re: REPORT ON LEGISLATION

Mrs. Lois Stoner, legislative aide, stated that the juvenile records bill passed last night. She reported that this was the most stressful last day since 1992. On the juvenile records bill there was a concern about a "designee of the superintendent," but they did substitute "who is an administrator" which should give the superintendent the leeway he needed.

In regard to the budget, they were able to hold fast on the transportation and non-public funding. However, next year there might be a problem because transportation would be studied over the interim. For school construction, there would be \$31 million in pay-go money and \$83 million in bond money. These funds would be allocated by the Board of Public Works although the legislators were working on a priority list.

The school Board immunity bill passed in its original form. The professional standards and teacher education board bill did not pass, and this had been consigned to summer study. They had to pass a weapons bill if they were to continue to get federal funding. The bill passed with an amendment related to alternative education, but it was a permissive amendment and not required for systems that did not have alternative programs. English as the formal language passed but in a greatly amended form. It now stated that English was the state language as the oriole was the state bird.

Mrs. Stoner said that they lost the beeper bill. There was a modification which stated that there must be an investigation, and then the police might use discretion. Over the summer, the legislature would be looking at bills on truancy, animal dissection, transportation, and taxes. In this coming year the legislation would focus on labor issues including the issue of retirement in the context of putting some of the burden on the locals. She thanked Mrs. Gordon, Mrs. King, and Dr. Vance for their numerous trips to Annapolis.

Mr. Abrams asked about the social security issue of \$27 million. Mrs. Stoner replied that they did not get it, but the change in formulas would be the year after next to use in

the 1997 session. Dr. Cheung inquired about line item veto, and Mrs. Stoner replied that those bills died.

Mrs. Gordon commented that having had the opportunity to be in Annapolis many times this year, it sent a strong message from the Board and provided them with an opportunity to seek the support of the Montgomery County Delegation. There were many new members of the Delegation, MCPS was very fortunate that these people were willing to listen and to solicit input from the Board of Education. She knew that they also relied on Mrs. Stoner as did everyone in Annapolis.

Mr. Ewing asked what they needed to pay particular attention to before the next session. It was Mrs. Stoner's view that they needed to be ready for retirement and work with the county to make sure they had all the numbers. Mr. Ewing remarked that Mrs. Stoner had been with the Board for 13 years. She had done a very good job her first year, and he thought she had gotten steadily better. On behalf of the Board, Mrs. Gordon thanked Mrs. Stoner.

Re: BOARD/SUPERINTENDENT COMMENTS

1. Mr. Fess read the following into the record:

"Members of the Board of Education  
Superintendent of Schools

"Dear Colleagues:

"Responding to the official needs of the bureaucracy, I am herewith formally notifying you of my intent to retire July 1, 1995. I would be remiss if I did not indicate to you the bittersweet emotions that this action creates. I must truly state that the position which I have occupied for the last 24 years has been a daily challenge and delight. I think it rare when a person in a position finds something new every day, and I remain convinced that this position is one of the best to have held in MCPS.

"I do regret that I will not be around to actively participate in working with Dr. Vance during his second term. To each of you and the previous eleven Boards of Education and seven superintendents, it has been a distinct honor and privilege to have assisted you in your role of governance for one of the outstanding educational institutions in the United States:

Sincerely yours,

/s/ Thomas S. Fess  
Ombudsman and Staff Assistant"

2. Dr. Vance reported that Chevy Chase Elementary School had been named one of the best schools in the United States in a contest sponsored by Redbook Magazine. In addition, five middle schools (Briggs Chaney, Wood, Key, Sligo, and White Oak) received awards of honorable mention in the Maryland Blue Ribbon School competition. Wheaton, Parkland, Frost, and Banneker received awards for enrolling 90 percent of their students in the White Ribbon Stop the Violence campaign. Daniel Notzon of Tilden Middle School competed with 160,000 students to win the state

geography bee. Six students had won corporate-sponsored National Merit Scholarships. Dr. Vance also encouraged the audience to watch the program on the budget that he and Mrs. Gordon had done which would be shown on Channel 60 at various times through April 28.

3. Ms. Converse reported that tomorrow at 9:30 a.m. at Quince Orchard High School, MCR would elect new officers. On April 27, the new student Board member would be elected. She encouraged Board and staff members to stop by Quince Orchard to listen to the debate and to hear the concerns of students. On behalf of former student Board members, she congratulated Dr. Vance on the renewal of his contract as superintendent of schools.

4. Mr. Ewing said that he had asked the superintendent to provide information on the number of students applying to the Blair magnet and the Richard Montgomery IB program who were not admitted but were qualified for these programs. For Richard Montgomery this figure was over 300 for each year, and for the Blair program the number was slightly over 100. This showed there was a demand for and a high level of qualification for both programs. This was encouraging because the Board had put money in its budget to encourage schools to develop programs of various kinds. He thought that this information should be made available to the high school community.

5. Mr. Ewing indicated that he would have a new business item on high school credit for courses taken in middle schools.

6. Ms. Gutierrez noted that April 27 was "take your daughter to work" day. She commented that last year it was a delightful experience to have so many fathers bring their daughters to work. She hoped that the school system would encourage and facilitate this program.

7. Mrs. Gordon commented that the recognitions that Dr. Vance had enumerated earlier about student achievement and performance were something they needed to continue to recognize. The presentation on the Challenge Grant highlighted a different kind of success. She would suggest that while they heard about schools that were selected as winners, they also needed to learn about highlights of those who had been nominated for these honors and who were not selected.

8. Mr. Abrams stated that they had been hearing a bit about the performance of MCPS graduates at Montgomery College. This was the week in which most colleges finalized their acceptances, and it would be useful for the Board to submit a report to the public on college placements. He had been receiving early reports that MCPS students were getting multiple acceptances at high quality institutions, and they needed to publicize this as well as scholarships won by MCPS students.

RESOLUTION NO. 277-95

Re: CLOSED SESSION - APRIL 24, 1995

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Ms. Gutierrez seconded by Mr. Abrams, 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 Monday, April 24, 1995, at 7:30 p.m. 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 this meeting 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 meeting shall continue in closed session until the completion of business.

RESOLUTION NO. 278-95            Re:    MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 15, 1995

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

Resolved, That the minutes of February 15, 1995, be approved.

RESOLUTION NO. 279-95            Re:    MINUTES OF MARCH 8, 1995

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

Resolved, That the minutes of March 8, 1995, be approved.

Re:    REPORT ON CLOSED SESSION - MARCH  
27, 1995

On March 14, 1995, by the unanimous vote of members present, the Board of Education voted to conduct a closed session on Monday, March 27, 1995, as permitted under Section 4-106, Education Article of the Annotated Code of Maryland and State Government Article 10-501.

The Montgomery County Board of Education met in closed session on Monday, March 27, 1995, from 7:30 p.m. to 8:10 p.m. The meeting took place in Room 120, Carver Educational Services Center, Rockville, Maryland.

The members of the Board of Education discussed the issue of the county executive's budget reductions. Board members reviewed the following appeals: BOE Appeal No. 1994-31, 1994-36, 1995-3, 1995-4, 1995-5, and 1995-7. Board members adjudicated BOE Appeal No. 1995-10. Board members also discussed the schedule for the superintendent's evaluation.

In attendance at the closed session were Steve Abrams, Larry Bowers, Alan Cheung, Wendy Converse, Blair Ewing, Reggie Felton, Tom Fess, David Fischer, Kathy Gemberling, Bea Gordon, Ana Sol Gutierrez, Nancy King, Brian Porter, Paul Vance, Mary Lou Wood, and Melissa Woods.

RESOLUTION NO. 280-95            Re:    EMPLOYEE EDUCATION AND TRAINING

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education schedule a discussion\* on employee education and training.

\*This should include what MCPS was doing currently, what it was costing, what had been results to date, what needs were unmet, the extent to which they were using technology to reduce costs, information on external funding and MCPS participation, and how frequently were MCPS staff used to provide training.

RESOLUTION NO. 281-95            Re:    ANNUAL ACCOUNTABILITY REPORT

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education schedule the following resolution on a Board agenda for action:

WHEREAS, The Board of Education and the Montgomery County Public Schools publish a large number of reports on student performance and system performance; and

WHEREAS, These reports demonstrate the commitment of the Board and the school system to full disclosure of all data and information about school system operations and student performance; and

WHEREAS, The Board has in fact adopted a policy governing disclosure of data and information to anyone who seeks these kinds of information; and

WHEREAS, It would be very helpful to the public, to the county executive, to the County Council and to the legislative delegation in Annapolis to have in a single publication the results on an annual basis of student performance and system operations; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Board of Education request the superintendent to develop a prototype, in outline form, of an annual "Accountability Report for the Montgomery County Public Schools," to be issued beginning in FY 1996 for the year just finished, FY 1995, and to include, but not be limited to the following elements:

I.        LONG-RANGE AND STRATEGIC GOALS, OBJECTIVES, PLANS

- !        System's long-range and strategic goals, objectives and plans set forth so that the public can see where the system wants to go. The remainder of the report would be designed to show where the system stands in relationship to these longer-term goals on an annual basis.

II.       SYSTEM OPERATIONS PERFORMANCE

- !        Audited financial statements

- ! Audit results of significance and management actions on them
- ! Status of school construction and modernization
- ! Status of operating budget, grants made to MCPS, and revolving funds, by major area, e.g., transportation, pay and benefits, etc. This section would show the history of these budgets, including funds requested and funds appropriated by year over the past 10 years, by source (Federal, State, local and grants).
- ! Operating and capital budget efficiencies, by specific project on an annual basis
- ! Employment statistics by gender, race, and ethnic group
- ! Status of negotiated contracts with employee unions

### III. PROGRAM PERFORMANCE

- ! Funding by school and by program, in operating and capital budgets
- ! Special programs (e.g., magnets, the IB, the Leadership Training Institute, BEKS, etc.), their funding, status, plans and results
- ! Technology implementation, funding, status, plans and results
- ! Program assessments, evaluations, and program data showing changes attributable to program interventions, along with long-range plans for program evaluation
- ! Staff development: training, education and other methods of developing and improving staff performance, and results

### IV. STUDENT PERFORMANCE AND RESULTS

- ! Standards for student performance, changes in these standards in the past year, and projected for future years, and student performance against them, by grade, subject, and by student gender, race and ethnic group
- ! Standards for student behavior, and student performance against them, including suspensions, expulsions and lesser disciplinary actions
- ! Student transition to the work force
- ! Student admissions to college and college feedback on readiness of students for college work
- ! Specific measures of student performance, e.g., completion of Algebra 1, etc.

- ! Length of time students have been in school system and performance
- ! Students whose native language is not English and performance data
- ! Students who have disabilities and performance
- ! Students identified as gifted and talented, and performance
- ! MSPP scores, SAT and PSAT scores, other measurements of student performance, with data shown over time
- ! Supports to students beyond the classroom and their effectiveness, including but not limited to counseling, mentoring, internships, extracurricular activities, sports, etc.

and be it further

Resolved, That the superintendent may add to or amend items on this list, as he develops his proposal to the Board of Education; and be it further

Resolved, That when the draft has been completed in outline form and tentatively approved by the Board of Education, comments on it should be sought from the public, and from the county executive and County Council; and be it further

Resolved, That the Board of Education shall complete work on this outline as soon as possible, so that the superintendent can begin to assemble the report during the summer of 1995 for publication in the fall of 1995.

RESOLUTION NO. 282-95            Re:    EXIT EXAMINATIONS FOR GRADUATING STUDENTS

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education schedule discussion on a proposal for the development of an exit examination to be required for all who graduate from the Montgomery County Public Schools.

Ms. Gutierrez assumed the chair.

RESOLUTION NO. 283-95            Re:    ASSESSMENT OF ADMINISTRATIVE REORGANIZATION

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



Resolved, That the Board of Education review the administrative reorganizations that have taken place since the elimination of the area offices and that the superintendent bring forward an assessment of how those reorganizations are working.

Re: REVIEW OF FACILITIES PLANNING POLICY

On March 27, 1995, Mrs. Gordon moved and Mr. Abrams seconded the following:

Resolved, That the Board of Education review the facilities policy with regard to alternatives and when they are needed.

Re: A MOTION BY MS. GUTIERREZ TO AMEND  
THE PROPOSED RESOLUTION ON THE  
FACILITIES PLANNING POLICY (FAILED)

A motion by Ms. Gutierrez to amend the proposed resolution on the facilities planning policy by expanding the motion to add "as well as other recent CIP-related impacts on the policy" failed with Mr. Abrams, Mr. Felton, and Ms. Gutierrez voting in the affirmative; Dr. Cheung, Ms. Converse, Mr. Ewing, Mrs. Gordon, and Mrs. King voting in the negative.

RESOLUTION NO. 284-95 Re: REVIEW OF FACILITIES PLANNING POLICY

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education review the facilities policy with regard to alternatives and when they are needed.

Mrs. Gordon assumed the chair.

RESOLUTION NO. 285-95 Re: BOE APPEAL NO. 1995-10

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education adopt its Decision and Order in BOE Appeal No. 1995-10, a student enrollment matter.

RESOLUTION NO. 286-95 Re: BOE APPEAL NO. 1994-37

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education adopt its Decision and Order in BOE Appeal No. 1994-37, a student discipline matter.

Re: NEW BUSINESS

1. Mr. Felton moved and Mr. Abrams seconded the following:

Resolved, That the Board of Education place on the agenda a review of Board proceedings in terms of how they might make their meetings more efficient.

2. Ms. Converse moved and Mr. Felton seconded the following:

Resolved, That the Board of Education schedule a discussion of the idea of a circumstantial exam exemption for high school seniors.

3. Mr. Ewing moved and Mr. Abrams seconded the following:

Resolved, That the Board of Education schedule discussion and action on the following resolution:

Resolved, That the Board of Education request that the state Board of Education approve the granting of credit for high school graduation for those courses taken in eighth grade that are high school level courses; and be it further

Resolved, That the superintendent be asked to review for the Board, high school mathematics offerings for the purpose of determining whether additional offerings might be needed to permit students to take added advanced courses within MCPS.

4. Mr. Ewing moved and Mr. Abrams seconded the following:

Resolved, That the Board schedule time for discussion/action on the following resolution:

Resolved, That the superintendent be asked to assess the probable impact on MCPS of the county executive's recommendations in his FY 1996 operating budget to contract for some school health services, for hearing/vision screening services, and Head Start health services; and be it further

Resolved, That the Board of Education, having heard from the superintendent, discuss whether it wishes to take a position and what position on these recommendations and findings and communicate its views, if any, to the Council and the county executive.

5. Mr. Abrams moved and Ms. Gutierrez seconded the following:

Resolved, That the Board of Education schedule discussion on the facilities planning policy to take a specific review of changes occasioned by the CIP, namely, the need to regularize our recommendations for CIP considerations and whether there was a need for a comprehensive review of boundaries in Montgomery County.

Re: ITEMS OF INFORMATION

Board members received the following items of information:

1. Items in Process
2. Construction Progress Report

RESOLUTION NO. 287-95      Re:    ADJOURNMENT

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education adjourn its meeting to a closed session at 6:10 p.m.

---

PRESIDENT

---

SECRETARY

PLV:mlw