

APPROVED  
11-1994

Rockville, Maryland  
February 22, 1994

The Board of Education of Montgomery County met in regular session at the Carver Educational Services Center, Rockville, Maryland, on Tuesday, February 22, 1994, at 7:30 p.m.

ROLL CALL            Present:  Mrs. Carol Fanconi, President  
  in the Chair  
  Mr. Stephen Abrams\*  
  Ms. Carrie Baker  
  Mrs. Frances Brenneman  
  Dr. Alan Cheung  
  Mr. Blair G. Ewing  
  Mrs. Beatrice Gordon  
  Ms. Ana Sol Gutierrez

Absent:  None

Others Present:  Dr. Paul L. Vance, Superintendent  
  Mrs. Katheryn W. Gemberling, Deputy  
  Dr. H. Philip Rohr, Deputy  
  Mr. Thomas S. Fess, Parliamentarian

Re:  A MOTION BY MRS. BRENNEMAN ON THE  
      AGENDA FOR FEBRUARY 22, 1994  
      (FAILED)

A motion by Mrs. Brenneman to amend the agenda to add an action item on make-up days for the snow emergency failed with Ms. Baker, Mrs. Brenneman, Dr. Cheung, and Mrs. Fanconi voting in the affirmative; Mr. Ewing, Mrs. Gordon, and Ms. Gutierrez abstaining.

RESOLUTION NO. 144-94      Re:  BOARD AGENDA - FEBRUARY 22, 1994

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education approve its agenda for February 22, 1994.

Re:  PUBLIC COMMENTS

The following individuals appeared before the Board:

1.  Susie Alger, Blair Cluster
2.  Larry Rubin and Mark Elrich, Takoma Park City Council

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

February 22, 1994

RESOLUTION NO. 145-94      Re:    HB 857/SB 720 - EDUCATION - FUNDING  
OF NON- AND LIMITED-ENGLISH  
PROFICIENT STUDENT PROGRAMS

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education support HB 857/SB 720 - Education - Funding of Non- and Limited-English Proficient Student Programs, with the belief that the \$1,000 per student in the Senate bill is much fairer.

RESOLUTION NO. 146-94      Re:    SB 407 - STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION -  
ELECTION OF MEMBERS

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education support SB 407 - State Board of Education - Election of Members.

Re:    A MOTION TO SUPPORT SB 186 -  
WEAPONS IN PUBLIC SCHOOLS -  
MANDATORY PENALTIES (FAILED)

A motion by Mrs. Gordon to support SB 186 - Weapons in Public Schools - Mandatory Penalties failed with Mr. Abrams, Mrs. Brenneman, Dr. Cheung, and Mrs. Gordon voting in the affirmative; Ms. Baker, Mr. Ewing, Mrs. Fanconi, and Ms. Gutierrez voting in the negative.

RESOLUTION NO. 147-94      Re:    HB 815/SB 339 - EDUCATION -  
MANDATORY KINDERGARTEN - EXEMPTIONS  
- CONTINUATION

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education support, with reservations, HB 815/SB 339 - Education - Mandatory Kindergarten - Exemptions - Continuation.

RESOLUTION NO. 148-94      Re:    SB 296/HB 415 - PUBLIC EDUCATION -  
YEAR-ROUND SCHOOL OPERATION

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

February 22, 1994

adopted with Mr. Abrams, Ms. Baker, Mrs. Brenneman, Dr. Cheung, Mrs. Fanconi, Mrs. Gordon, and Ms. Gutierrez voting in the affirmative; Mr. Ewing voting in the negative:

Resolved, That the Board of Education support SB 296/HB 415 - Public Education - Year-round School Operation with the understanding that this does not commit Montgomery County Public Schools to implement a plan for year-round education.

RESOLUTION NO. 149-94      Re:    HB 858/SB 717 - EDUCATION FUNDING -  
  INCENTIVE GRANTS - AVERAGE DAILY  
  ATTENDANCE

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education support HB 858/SB 717 - Education Funding - Incentive Grants - Average Daily Attendance.

Re:    A MOTION BY MS. GUTIERREZ REGARDING  
          HB 1090 (PG/MC 12-94) MONTGOMERY  
          AND PRINCE GEORGE'S COUNTY - CITY  
          OF TAKOMA PARK

A motion by Ms. Gutierrez to support HB 1090 (PG/MC 12-94) Montgomery and Prince George's County - City of Takoma Park failed for lack of a second.

Re:    A MOTION BY MR. EWING ON HB 1090  
          (PG/MC 12-94) MONTGOMERY AND PRINCE  
          GEORGE'S COUNTY - CITY OF TAKOMA  
          PARK

Mr. Ewing moved and Dr. Cheung seconded the following:

Resolved, That the Board of Education support HB 1090; however, it is essential that there be an absolute requirement for financial operating and capital budget resources to be identified, assured, and provided by the state and the county, and that an appropriate schedule for implementation be developed that takes into account the need to plan ahead for the public schools in Montgomery County should the results of the referendum be the unification in Montgomery County.

Mrs. Gordon assumed the chair.

Re: A SUBSTITUTE MOTION BY MRS. FANCONI  
ON HB 1090 (PG/MC 12-94) MONTGOMERY  
AND PRINCE GEORGE'S COUNTY - CITY  
OF TAKOMA PARK

A following motion by Mrs. Fanconi failed of adoption with Ms. Baker, Mrs. Fanconi, and Mrs. Gordon voting in the affirmative; Mr. Abrams, Mrs. Brenneman, Dr. Cheung, Mr. Ewing, and Ms. Gutierrez voting in the negative:

Resolved, That the Board of Education take no position on HB 1090 (PG/MC 12-94) Montgomery and Prince George's County - City of Takoma Park and to ask that Delegation give consideration to changing the date so that the implementation is in the fall of 1997, that there be parallel wording such that if the unification occurred in Prince George's County that the same kinds of things would be in the legislation, and that staff prepare an impact statement dealing with some of the questions raised by the Blair cluster about what kinds of very specific school impact would occur and how that would affect the ability of MCPS to provide education and what the specific costs were.

Mrs. Fanconi assumed the chair.

Mr. Ewing and Dr. Cheung agree to add a statement about the implementation date of July 1, 1997, to their proposed motion.

RESOLUTION NO. 150-94      Re: HB 1090 (PG/MC 12) MONTGOMERY AND  
PRINCE GEORGE'S COUNTY - CITY OF  
TAKOMA PARK

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education support HB 1090; however, it is essential that there be an absolute requirement for financial operating and capital budget resources to be identified, assured, and provided by the state and the county, and that an appropriate schedule for implementation be developed that takes into account the need to plan ahead for the public schools in Montgomery County should the results of the referendum be the unification in Montgomery County; and be it further

Resolved, That the Board of Education recommend that the effective date be July 1, 1997.

For the record, Mrs. Fanconi made the following statement:

"I do believe that if HB 1090 went forward, we do have to have the CIP and Operating Budget in that we do need an appropriate schedule. I support the effective date. What I was not supporting was the legislation on whether or not this should be done."

RESOLUTION NO. 151-94      Re:    HB 639 - EDUCATION - REVIEW OF  
EDUCATIONAL PLACEMENTS OF STUDENTS  
WITH DISABILITIES

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education take no position on HB 639 - Education - Review of Educational Placements of Students with Disabilities.

RESOLUTION NO. 152-94      Re:    SB 475 -- TASK FORCE ON CUED SPEECH

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education support SB 475 - Task Force on Cued Speech.

RESOLUTION NO. 153-94      Re:    SB 490/HB 1342 - BALTIMORE COUNTY  
PUBLIC EDUCATION - IMPASSE  
RESOLUTION PROCEDURES

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education strongly oppose SB 490/HB 1342 - Baltimore County Public Education - Impasse Resolution Procedures.

RESOLUTION NO. 154-94      Re:    HB 1061 - PROHIBITION OF STATE  
FUNDS TO SUBSIDIZE A FOOTBALL  
STADIUM ANYWHERE IN MARYLAND

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education strongly support HB 1061 -

February 22, 1994

Prohibition of State Funds to Subsidize a Football Stadium Anywhere in Maryland.

RESOLUTION NO. 155-94 Re: SB 554 - MANDATED STATE EDUCATION AID - LIMITATION BASED ON GENERAL FUND REVENUE GROWTH

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education oppose SB 554 - Mandated State Education Aid - Limitation Based on General Fund Revenue Growth.

RESOLUTION NO. 156-94 Re: HB 1417 - EDUCATIONAL ACCOUNTABILITY AND ADEQUACY ACT OF 1994

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education oppose HB 1417 - Educational Accountability and Adequacy Act of 1994.

Re: A MOTION BY MR. ABRAMS ON HB 816 - TECHNOLOGY FOR EDUCATION AND SB 721 - TECHNOLOGY FOR EDUCATION

Mr. Abrams moved and Dr. Cheung seconded the following resolution:

Resolved, That the Board of Education support HB 816 - Technology for Education and SB 721 - Technology for Education.

RESOLUTION NO. 157-94 Re: HB 816 - TECHNOLOGY FOR EDUCATION AND SB 721 - TECHNOLOGY FOR EDUCATION

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education support HB 816 - Technology for Education and support SB 721 - Technology for Education if it is amended to include LEAs as in HB 816.

## Re: PUBLIC COMMENTS (CONTINUED)

The following individuals appeared before the Board:

3. Maura Boswell, Rosa Parks MS
4. Bruce Goldensohn
5. Barbara Neustadt
6. Paul Burnsky, Belmont ES
7. John Nghiem, Student Board Member Candidate
8. Marilyn Van Degrift

RESOLUTION NO. 158-94      Re: UTILIZATION OF FY 1994 FUTURE  
SUPPORTED PROJECT FUNDS FOR THE  
EXTENDED ELEMENTARY EDUCATION  
PROGRAM (EEEP)

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

Resolved, That the superintendent of schools be authorized to receive and expend within the FY 1994 Provision for Future Supported Projects a grant award of \$120,000 from the Maryland State Department of Education (MSDE), for the Extended Elementary Education Program (EEEP), in the following categories:

	<u>Category</u>	<u>Positions*</u>	<u>Amount</u>
1	Administration		\$ 1,500
2	Instructional Salaries	3.5	41,845
3	Other Instructional Costs		65,923
10	Fixed Charges		<u>10,732</u>
	TOTAL		<u>\$120,000</u>

- \* 2.0 Teachers A-D (10 month)  
1.5 instructional Assistants (10 month)

and be it further

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

RESOLUTION NO. 259-94      Re:    UTILIZATION OF FY 1994 FUTURE  
SUPPORTED PROJECT FUNDS FOR THE  
TOBACCO USE PREVENTION PROGRAM

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

Resolved, That the superintendent of schools be authorized to receive and expend within the FY 1994 Provisions for Future Supported Projects a grant award of \$46,311 from the Maryland State Department of Education (MSDE), for the Tobacco Use Prevention program, in the following categories:

<u>Category</u>	<u>Amount</u>
2    Instructional Salaries	\$20,694
3    Other Instructional Costs	23,962
10   Fixed Charges	<u>1,655</u>
TOTAL	<u>\$46,311</u>

and be it further

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

RESOLUTION NO. 160-94      Re:    UTILIZATION OF FY 1994 FUTURE  
SUPPORTED PROJECT FUNDS FOR THE  
EMERGENCY IMMIGRANT EDUCATION  
PROGRAM

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

Resolved, That the superintendent of schools be authorized to receive and expend within the FY 1994 Provision for Future Supported Projects a grant award of \$303 from the Maryland State Department of Education (MSDE), under the Emergency Immigrant Education Act (P.L. 98-511, Title VI), to provide supplementary educational services to immigrant students in Grade K-12, in the following categories:



<u>Category</u>	<u>Amount</u>
3 Other Instructional Costs	<u>\$303</u>
TOTAL	<u>\$303</u>

and be it further

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

RESOLUTION NO. 161-94 Re: RECOMMENDED FY 1994 CATEGORICAL  
TRANSFER WITHIN THE PROVISION FOR  
FUTURE SUPPORTED PROJECTS

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

Resolved, That the superintendent of schools be authorized to effect a categorical transfer of \$57,692 within the FY 1994 Provision for Future Supported Projects, in accordance with the County Council provision for transfers, in the following categories:

<u>Category</u>	<u>From</u>	<u>To</u>
2 Instructional Salaries		\$ 246
3 Other Instructional Costs		57,446
4 Special Education	<u>\$57,692</u>	
TOTAL	<u>\$57,692</u>	<u>\$57,692</u>

and be it further

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

RESOLUTION NO. 162-94 Re: PROCUREMENT CONTRACTS MORE THAN  
\$25,000

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

WHEREAS, Funds have been budgeted for the purchase of equipment, supplies, and contractual services; now therefore be it

Resolved, That having been duly advertised, the following

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

COG 09457	Gasoline  <u>Awardee</u> Steuart Petroleum Company	\$ 244,650	
326-4	Fork Kit (Eating Utensils) for the Division of Food Services <u>Awardee</u> Acme Paper and Supply Company, Inc.	\$ 30,768	
144-93	On-Site Service for Maintenance of Microcomputers <u>Awardees</u> Digital Quests MSSI Consultants, Inc. Orange Systems TOTAL	\$ 35,000 35,000 <u>35,000</u> \$ 105,000	
49-94	Office and School Supplies <u>Awardees</u> ABL/dba Alperstein Brothers Boise Cascade Office Products Chaselle, Inc. Diamond Paper Corporation Educational Supply J. L. Hammett Company Interstate Office Lucas Corporate Stationers Monumental Paper Company Price-Modern, Inc. Reliable Reproduction Supply Co. Standard Office Supply R.S. Willard Company, Inc. TOTAL	\$ 91,696 116,346 112,382 9,653 40,813 309,882 143,135 438 201 22,178 1,324 27,615 330 \$ 875,993	*      *
57-94	Musical Instruments <u>Awardees</u> Humes and Berg Manufacturing Co., Inc. Ideal Music Company L & L Musical Instrument Repair Victor Lutz Music Center National Educational Music Company Washington Music Sales Center, Inc. Steve Weiss Music Wenger Corporation The Woodwind and Brasswind Wrights Music Shed TOTAL	\$ 811 1,791 1,679 2,781 2,351 41,526 35,521 1,447 6,080 <u>2,246</u> \$ 96,233	

February 22, 1994

66-94	Office Furniture		
	<u>Awardees</u>		
	Douron, Inc.	\$	432,507 *
	Glover Equipment, Inc.		<u>43,798</u>
	TOTAL	\$	476,305
MORE THAN \$25,000			\$1,828,949

\*Denotes MFD vendors

RESOLUTION NO. 163-94      Re:    REROOFING - GREENWOOD ELEMENTARY  
SCHOOL

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

WHEREAS, The following sealed bids were received on February 3, 1994, for the reroofing at Greenwood Elementary School which will begin on July 1, 1994, and be completed by August 29, 1994:

	<u>Bidder</u>	<u>Amount</u>
1.	R. D. Bean, Inc.	\$190,070
2.	J. E. Wood & Sons Co., Inc.	196,670
3.	Orndorff & Spaid, Inc.	197,982
4.	Korb Roofers, Inc.	240,517
5.	Rayco Roof Service, Inc.	244,100
6.	John H. Cole & Sons, Inc.	255,699

and

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

WHEREAS, The low bid is below the staff estimate of \$205,000; and

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

Resolved, That a \$190,070 contract be awarded to R. D. Bean, Inc., for reroofing Greenwood Elementary School, in accordance with plans and specifications prepared by the Department of Facilities Management and subject to final action by the County Council on the FY 1995 Capital Budget; and be it further

Resolved, That the contract be forwarded to the State Interagency Committee for School Construction for approval to reimburse Montgomery County Public Schools for the state eligible portion

February 22, 1994

of the Greenwood Elementary School reroofing project.

RESOLUTION NO. 164-94      Re:    COMPUTER AND CABLE TV NETWORK  
  INSTALLATIONS AT SPRINGBROOK HIGH  
  SCHOOL

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

WHEREAS, The following sealed bids to install computer and cable TV networks in conjunction with the modernization at Springbrook High School were received on February 14, 1994, with work to begin immediately and be completed by May 1, 1994:

<u>Bidder</u>	<u>Computer Network</u>	<u>Cable TV Network</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>
Netcom Technologies, Inc.	\$ 89,340.00	\$22,740.00	\$112,080.00
B & W Communication	118,250.00	NO BID	118,250.00
Integration Specialist	159,073.74	43,840.89	202,914.63

and

WHEREAS, The low bidder, Netcom Technologies, Inc., has completed similar projects successfully at various schools, including Walt Whitman High School and Thomas W. Pyle and White Oak middle schools; and

WHEREAS, the low bids are below the staff estimate of \$125,000.00, and funds are available to award the contract; now therefore be it

Resolved, That a \$112,080.00 contract be awarded to Netcom Technologies, Inc., for the installation of computer and cable TV networks at Springbrook High School in accordance with plans and specifications prepared by Von Otto & Bilecky, P. C.

RESOLUTION NO. 165-94      Re:    PERSONNEL APPOINTMENT

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

Resolved, That the following personnel appointment be approved:

<u>Appointment</u>	<u>Present Position</u>	<u>As</u>
John L. Finan	Retired, Vice Commander Army and Air Force Exchange Services	Director, Dept. of Management Budget and Planning Grade Q Effective: 2-23-94

RESOLUTION NO. 166-94      Re:    PERSONNEL TRANSFER

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

Resolved, That the following personnel transfer be approved:

<u>Transfer</u>	<u>From</u>	<u>To</u>
David G. Fischer	Director, Department of School Support Operations	Assistant to the Superintendent Effective 3-1-94

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

Dr. Vance noted that Board members had the committee's report as well as his response to their recommendations. Dr. Joseph Villani, associate superintendent, introduced Ms. Judie Muntner and Ms. Ethelyn Owen, co-chairs of the committee. He also invited Ms. Juanita Tamayo Lott, former co-chair, to the table. Dr. Villani indicated that this committee was very helpful to staff in guiding the gifted and talented program implementation. He noted that the staff was in agreement with the recommendations of the committee, but the budget prevented full implementation of their recommendations.

Ms. Owen explained that other members of the committee would be presenting subcommittee reports. Last year the committee looked at assessments of students, system accountability on gifted and talented, and communication between parents and schools. They had a two-year study of the honors program in the high schools. They had recommendations on the issue of grouping of students and on teacher training. The committee appreciated and acknowledged the appointment of Walt Kearney, as the SES specialist, who was helping them to address the area of education of gifted students in the middle schools. She noted that some additional funds had been made available for training, and Dr. Waveline Starnes had informed the committee that these funds were making things better. In addition, another specialist in gifted education had

been assigned to Gifted and Talented office in next year's budget. She felt that they had a ways to go and that some of the things that needed to be done did not take money. They took a change of attitude and a way of implementation. They depended on people, not money, and only the Board and Dr. Vance could deal with that issue.

In regard to communications, Ms. Meg O'Hare reported that the thrust of their recommendations was to try to attempt to provide communication to reduce the general level of confusion on the part of parents, teachers, and the community at large about exactly what the G&T program was supposed to do. Their recommendation was meant to be carried out at two levels. One was at the system-wide level and the other at the school level. In Appendix B, some items had been specified which had consistently been problematic in terms of parents and the information available to them to be sure the education their children needed was actually delivered. Some of these things were very basic such as the Board's policy on the education of the gifted and talented. Another was how the schools were supposed to respond to the Board's policy and the superintendent's initiatives. Another issue was the identification of students at the second grade level and the process involved. One of the most important aspects they would like to see addressed was communication directly to the parent about what it meant when the child was identified as G&T or not identified as G&T. People needed information about the center programs and G&T LD programs and about the selection process for these programs. They would like to see brochures and flyers in the schools and more coverage in the media with respect to G&T education.

Ms. O'Hare said the staff response stated that communication was important. They would like to see more of a commitment regarding the funding and development of these brochures. This was a critical need, and there was not a concrete staff response that said this would happen.

Ms. Carol Starr stated that parents were concerned about a lack of consistency and uniformity in honors courses. The committee did widespread interviews of students, teachers, and staff. They also looked at enrollment data in the courses. They looked at the status of the current curriculum being used in the courses and recommended a look at the curriculum because it had been over 11 years since this had been done. In addition to looking at existing curricula, they needed to develop new curricula. They needed to look at the research-supported strategies that involved the diversity of students they were trying to reach. They looked at the training that needed to go along with curriculum revisions. Then they looked at the identification of students and recommended that a systematic procedure should be implemented at each high school to identify students eligible for the course,

but most particularly to provide additional support for those students who needed nurturing in the courses.

Ms. Lott reported that the fifth recommendation was global and spoke directly to system accountability in the education of gifted and talented students. It did this in two ways, first with the management plan and secondly with day-to-day administration. They developed this recommendation in consultation with Dr. Phinnize Fisher, associate superintendent for school administration. They recommended that the school improvement management plan of each school should specifically address the education of gifted and talented students. The cluster directors should review differentiated and enriched instruction as part of their overall management responsibilities when visiting schools. They were encouraged with the response they had received on this recommendation, and they would like to work with staff on this recommendation.

Mr. Kearney commented that the testing and assessment subcommittee was very active and productive. They looked at the issue of testing and the expanded view of student assessment. Their first three recommendations reflected that expanded view of student assessment. They looked at the idea of alternative forms of assessment such as performance assessment, portfolio assessment, and a writing assessment. These recommendations were drafted last year at this time, and he was pleased to say that a number of the things they recommended had been initiated or were in the beginning stages.

Mr. Kearney remarked that the recommendation having to do with pre-assessment was an important one that was overlooked a lot. They usually thought of assessment at the end of something. They should find out where students were before they started a unit of instruction in order to make some programming decisions for students. They recommended that MCPS take a good look at assessment and how this could be included as a strategy in curriculum-based workshops.

In regard to criterion-referenced tests, Mr. Kearney said they were still hearing from parents about providing for above-level testing on these tests. The tests now were designed to test at a grade level. There was a recommendation on WISC testing because originally the WISC was used as part of the data for identifying students for the highly gifted centers. They knew this was a big budget item, but they were recommending that in certain cases they use WISC as an extra piece in identification.

Mr. Kearney reported that the Maryland Functional Test was another concern. At some schools more than others a lot of time was spent preparing students for these tests, particularly the citizenship test. They needed to look at how much time was being spent in test preparation, especially when they had students who

had already passed the test. Their last recommendation was to look for some standardized test data, and they knew other committees were looking at this to see if this could be built into the assessment program.

Ms. Owen knew that MCPS had a committee looking at assessments and standards in testing. The advisory committee was very supportive of an assessment program which included a variety of assessments. They were pleased that consideration was being given to reinstituting the norm-referenced test; however, they seriously and totally supported the concept of multi-components to the assessment. There were many ways to assess children, and they needed to use these different ways and new approaches so that they could find all of their gifted students from all different backgrounds and locations. They needed to be able to see how these students were doing and whether or not their needs were being met. They could not do this with just a norm-referenced test.

Ms. Muntner reported that recommendation 14 dealt with training and in recommendation 15 they were talking about using technology to provide training. Rather than having people come to one place for training, they were looking at bringing the training to schools. Ms. Owen stated that the last two recommendations addressed the issue of grouping. The committee on grouping practices was scheduled to bring a report to the Board, but her committee was concerned about a number of things. They hoped that when the Board received the grouping report that they took into consideration the needs of gifted students to spend some time with their intellectual peers.

Ms. Muntner commented that this year they would be in the second year of the honors program study. They also had a subcommittee on technology. There was a third committee on elementary programs looking at new trends in gifted education. They would be visiting elementary classrooms in Howard, Fairfax, and Arlington. In addition, they would be producing a paper on National Excellence: A Case for Developing America's Talent from the U.S. Department of Education. They would have a paper on middle schools as well as a paper on budget concerns. They would continue to watch the standards and the grouping committees.

Mrs. Fanconi expressed the Board's appreciation for the work of the committee. A number of their recommendations dealt with staff development, and the Board did add funds to the budget for staff training. She hoped that the committee would testify before the Council on the importance of training. She asked whether Board members had comments or questions.

It seemed to Mr. Ewing that one of the most important recommendations was the fifth one which spoke to what ought to be in the school management plan; however, he was troubled by the



response. It stated that "review of the program and the differentiation of instruction should be a part of the preparation for the management plan...." He took "should" to be a verb that did not mean "must." He thought this should be mandatory and not advisory. The response also stated that "schools are expected to plan for appropriate instruction...." This again seemed to him to be not strong enough. The last sentence stated that "the school improvement management plan is to focus on two or three major objectives, and many times, education of gifted is identified as a priority...." He recognized that in those schools where the education of the gifted was already highly effective, it was probably not necessarily regarded as a priority for improvement. There were also occasions where the education of the gifted was not a priority because there was not a sense on the part of those doing the planning that the education of the gifted even ought to be a priority. It seemed to him that the response did not make enough use of the management plan to achieve what ought to be achieved. He asked whether this could be made stronger.

Mrs. Gemberling explained that a review of the gifted and talented program was a part of the review of the school data and the school plans. The directors felt strongly that they were trying to have schools select two to three specific major outcomes each year. They felt it was not needed to specify gifted and talented as one of these major outcomes across the county. However, this was reviewed along with all other program data in setting priorities.

Mr. Ewing remarked that there were schools in the county where there was no program for the gifted and talented. He wanted to know how they utilized this or some other set of management tools to make sure that this was corrected. Dr. Vance explained that he had pressed this point, and he had been assured that there was no school in the county without an initiative. Mr. Ewing replied that he would expect that was true; however, the question was whether these programs deserved the name of education for the gifted and talented. His point was because they had cut back on the resources there were many people who did not understand what it meant to mount an effective program for the gifted and talented, particularly at the elementary and middle school level. The question was what did they have in mind to do about that.

Mrs. Gordon complimented the committee on an excellent report. She was glad to see recommendations 16 and 17. There had been an emphasis on differentiation, but she did not think they had done a very good job in communicating what differentiation meant. A number of things were taking place in schools with regard to gifted education, but parents were not aware of all of the things that were taking place. There was not a clear way of explaining what differentiation meant. She thought it important that the grouping committee continue to point out the need for various

kinds of groupings that were not static so that some portion of the student's day would be spent with like-ability students. She was pleased to see they would be focusing on what was happening in the elementary schools because this was where the biggest lack of information took place.

Mrs. Brenneman was glad they were going to look at budget concerns. Because of the budget constraints, the Board had had to come back in the area of gifted and talented. She would be curious to find out about the impact of those cuts. In regard to Mr. Ewing's remarks, she said it was a question of how gifted education was being carried out and carried down to the level of the individual child. While teachers would say they believed in differentiation, parents needed to know what it meant for their child. The disconnect came when the parent did not know what was happening for that child. She did not know how they got to that point, teacher by teacher and school by school. They needed to look at their own county to see what they were really doing, not just what they were saying. Ms. Owen replied that they were asking the school system to do this.

Ms. Gutierrez noted that the committee's recommendations were all based on existing programs and improvements to those programs. She asked about the possibility of assessing the overall population to see whether they had the right representation for gifted and talented. They talked about 20 percent of the MCPS population's being gifted and talented, and she wanted to know whether this was a correct figure because it seemed high. She wanted to know if they were distinguishing well enough between the highly gifted and the gifted. She asked if they had looked at what was happening with the under-represented minorities. For example, were they assessing correctly? What were they doing in assessment that would help them address deficiencies? Ms. Owen replied that Ms. Gutierrez needed to be more aware of where they got that 20 percent figure. This was a very legitimate figure, and most gifted students were identified through tests and were being served in their home schools and not the centers. This was a concern, and for this reason they were asking the Board to consider reinstating the funds for testing to identify these children.

Mr. Abrams noted their eighth recommendation on a method for assessing student writing. He asked about the usefulness of methods being used in the Eastern CAPS program and in the International Baccalaureate program for applications elsewhere within the system. Mr. Kearney thought they did need to look at what they had at Eastern. They believed the Educational Testing Service might have something that was useful. Mr. Abrams pointed out that the areas of strength in both programs had been in the writing.

Mrs. Fanconi thanked the committee for their presentation. Board

members might submit follow-up questions in writing.

Re: A MOTION BY MR. ABRAMS TO AMEND THE  
AGENDA (FAILED)

A motion by Mr. Abrams to amend the agenda to take up a discussion of snow days at this time failed with Mr. Abrams and Mrs. Brenneman voting in the affirmative; Dr. Cheung, Mr. Ewing, Mrs. Fanconi, Mrs. Gordon, and Ms. Gutierrez voting in the negative; Ms. Baker being temporarily absent.

Re: EDUCATIONAL TECHNOLOGY FOR GLOBAL  
ACCESS: THE WORLD IS OUR CLASSROOM

Dr. Rohr commented that the document before the Board was an excellent one from the administrative point of view as well as the instructional point of view. It allowed for implementation of the Corporate Partnership recommendations. It would maximize productivity and efficiency in the management of MCPS. The plan allowed for the integration of administrative uses with the instructional uses of technology. This was critical and further linked the administrative support of the school system with instruction.

Mrs. Gemberling remarked that one of the most difficult challenges staff had as they were trying to put together the presentation was that people would want to know what a classroom would look like. They kept describing student and teacher stations and the global access. Finally, they realized that if they implemented this educational technology plan their classroom would never look the same again because the intent here was to make the world their classroom. Knowledge would no longer be contained within the four walls of the classroom. Technology permitted them to have access well beyond whatever that single teacher had to offer to students. It was an opportunity for equity and an opportunity to move into the future. They had talked about educational reform, and they believed if they delayed with the technology plan that students would not be ready for transition that was already upon them. It was important for them to understand how the shift to the world of information would affect the lives of their children. This shift was as important as the shift from the agricultural world to the industrial world. Therefore, they believed this was the heart of educational reform and that the world would be their classroom.

Dr. Villani reported that it had been ten weeks since the Board adopted its policy on educational technology. In that time they brought together about 175 people to get input on what should go into the implementation plan to make that policy a reality. In front of the Board was the result of the thinking of those people. The plan would require an enormous amount of work to get it implemented by staff, but everyone involved was committed

to making this happen.

Ms. Lani Seikaly, director of the Department of Educational Media and Technology, reported that they had invited 193 school-based and central office teachers and supporting services personnel, MCCPTA representatives, and executive directors of chambers of commerce to participate, and 175 people responded positively. This spoke to the commitment people had to providing educational technology.

Ms. Seikaly reported that they considered the document their strategic planning guide. In the document they shared their vision, where they were going, where they were trying to go, and a strategic plan for getting there. Tonight they would focus on that strategic plan. In the document they talked about a prototype and what classrooms would look like in a global access school. They also discussed the capital budget PDFs that would be moving forward.

Ms. Seikaly stated that they were guided by three principles guiding them in the implementation plan. The first one was that technology was a tool for achieving student success and increasing staff productivity, not an end in itself. Educational technology was the underlying infrastructure that would allow them to be successful in achieving the Success for Every Student goals. These were very challenging goals, and they saw educational technology as a means for more effectively attaining those goals.

Another principle was that staff training was critical to the successful integration of technology and should be systematic and systemic. They had done a lot of talking about training, and this was the most challenging aspect of the plan. They were asking folks to relook at how they did things. Schools had staff development time built into their schedules, and Ms. Seikaly thought it critical they not add on additional training. They should look at the training they had set aside to make sure they had integrated educational technology. They had some new training models that should be tested for the educational technology plan, but they also planned to relook at every type of training they currently offered to infuse educational technology.

The last principle was that equitable access to information for all students and staff should be achieved within a six-year time frame. Ms. Seikaly commented that they were hearing from communities there was an incredible amount of inequity in educational technology opportunities for students. Schools that were renovated or new had access to funds for equipment. They believed that a six-year plan was a reasonable amount of time to achieve their vision. They were committed to providing equitable access to the information and communication technologies for all students and staff in the Montgomery County Public Schools.

Every classroom and every office would be electronically connected with voice-mail, telecommunications, multimedia, and production presentation capabilities. They believed they could meet that vision within six years which was ambitious. However, if they went much beyond that they would do a disservice to some school communities. They did not believe they could go any faster because of all the locations they had to cover.

Ms. Seikaly explained that the problem with getting started was that they did not have a working model. They did not have a wide area network in place, but they did have some pieces of their vision in place in newer schools. Therefore, they believed the first step had to be a prototype. They had chosen seven secondary schools because it involved enough schools to test a wide area network prototype. She noted that seven schools would be a challenge because they did not have enough experience on their staff to design, build, or operate this kind of network. The prototype would be a critical time for them to gain the experience necessary to validate the benefit, to get a critical mass of equipment and staff training in place, to test some staff training models, and to gain the kind of experience they needed to move into a much faster implementation in years two, three, four, five, and six.

Ms. Seikaly indicated that they had chosen secondary schools because cluster coordinators thought that students should not graduate from school without these opportunities. When they designed their networks, they would make the high school the hub. In the second year, they planned to bring in ten elementary schools. They would use the first three years to implement the vision in the secondary schools, and the only schools that would remain would be new or renovated schools. Every cluster would be involved in the first three years.

In regard to the wide area network, Ms. Seikaly commented that they had not made a decision. They were collaborating very closely with the county as they developed their wide area network. The G-net transfer from Southwestern Bell would include six high schools and would include the very expensive multiplexing equipment in those buildings. They were also waiting to hear more details with Bell Atlantic and had a meeting scheduled with them next week. Staff was trying to get the kind of data they would need to make a decision about what kind of a wide area structure they wanted to put in place in the prototype year.

Ms. Seikaly explained that they were calling this plan, "Global Access." They started out with educational technology, and they wanted the community to understand that educational technology meant that all students and staff would have access to the resources of the globe. In a few days the superintendent would be presenting the capital budget PDFs, and it was critical that the Board understand how the plan related to the PDFs. The new

PDF was the global access PDF. They also referenced the SIMS and the learning research hubs PDFs that were currently in the CIP request. In the capital budget, they had asked for three positions: a project manager, a technical support position, and a training position. They believed on the first two they needed to contract on a transitional basis. They would need this kind of expertise for the first two years until they could train MCPS staff.

Ms. Seikaly showed a video of students at Blair and Poolesville talking about how they used educational technology for global access. She wanted all students in MCPS to have the opportunities afforded students at Blair and Poolesville.

Ms. Pam Prue, principal of Montgomery Knolls ES, explained that they were a computer technology magnet school serving a diverse group of three to eight year-old students. These students used computer, television, video, laser disk, and CD-ROM technology. Her school had been modernized about four years ago, and the equipment was installed at that time. As a SIMS school, their staff productivity had been enhanced in their ability to acquire and analyze student data. The technology tools had increased student, staff, and parent communication and had supported their multi-cultural educational initiatives. During the past several years their staff and parents had received extensive training in the theory of multiple intelligences. The available technology had served as a catalyst in nurturing the strength of her students and in enhancing their self-esteem while providing many more opportunities to help them conceptualize, experiment, and think about new ideas.

Mr. Amado Narvaez, media specialist at Montgomery Knolls, remarked that some people had questioned whether children so young could effectively use the new technologies in education. At his school, he had seen that they could. To extend the metaphor of the information superhighway, it was important to recognize there was no minimum age requirement for obtaining a learner's permit to travel that highway. Their technology projects supported all of the disciplines. Pre-kindergarten and kindergarten students participated in a language arts project in which computer animation was combined with live action video as a follow up activity to learning traditional nursery rhymes. First graders had used the computer to interface with the laser disk player as part of the science unit on the changing seasons. Second graders had shown they could use and manipulate the new technologies. In a science unit on storms, they programmed buttons in a hyper-media project that showed a variety of video sequences including graphs of tornado distribution nationally and footage of a hurricane. They could play the project's audio sequence in both English and Spanish.

Mr. Narvaez reported that multiculturalism was a primary part of

the social studies curriculum, and they had used the communication center to produce video programs in which parents, students, and members of the community had a chance to share family and cultural heritages with the entire school. For math skills, they produced a regular morning broadcast in which a student presented three arithmetic problems, one for kindergarten, one for first, and one for second grade to be worked out in the classroom under the guidance of the teacher.

Mr. Narvaez indicated that they had taken technology out of the building. They had videotaped parents at their work places talking about how they used computers in their work. These tapes were edited and shown to students so they could see how the computer skills they were learning applied to the real world. These projects and others like them had been possible because the entire staff from the principal to supporting services was committed to the implementation of educational technology. The classroom teachers had agreed to a flexible media center schedule that allowed him the time to work with them and the students in a wide variety of technology-related activities. Mr. Narvaez commented that the successful implementation of the technology tripod would allow every child in every school to benefit from similar projects that would make the goal of Success for Every Student a reality.

Ms. Seikaly concluded their presentation by hoping that the Board would support the major investment that it would take for the technology infrastructure that would allow all students to be contributing members in a global society. This would allow MCPS to continue to be a first rate school system.

Dr. Vance noted that his memorandum to the Board included next steps. He asked Ms. Seikaly to describe the schedule which explained why they wanted to make this presentation this evening.

Ms. Seikaly reported that sometime during the next week the superintendent would be making recommendations for the capital budget. On March 8, the Board would have an alternatives worksession, and on March 23 and 24, there would be public hearings. The Board would take action on technology and facilities issues on April 5. Mrs. Fanconi asked about distribution of the recommendations for public comment, and Dr. Rohr replied that widespread distribution would be made after the Board received the superintendent's recommendations.

Mr. Abrams thanked staff for the presentation. He believed that no school would be prejudiced by where they stood on the modernization schedule and that the presence of asbestos would not be a barrier to including a school in the plan. He was delighted that this was being taken into consideration. He would hope that with the accelerated schedule that there would be some patience in the system. He hoped the process of selection of schools to participate in the prototype would be done in such a

fashion that all those qualifying were given equal chance and that some form of lottery selection would be used to competitiveness out of the process. Ms. Seikaly stated that she would rephrase one piece. A school going to be renovated within the next six-year period would go into the plan in that year. As far as asbestos, they could wire on the outside of walls in some buildings because of the asbestos problem.

Mrs. Brenneman asked why they selected seven high schools and then ten elementary schools. She asked why they did not complete the high schools. Ms. Seikaly replied that the prototype piece was a chance to test the process, the design, and interface equipment. They also had to get started on the curricular integration piece, and they wanted to start this in the elementary schools, too. Mrs. Brenneman commented that she had problems with this. This got back to the question of equity. A cluster would have one elementary school as the prototype and the other elementary schools would be looking at that one school. She also saw the inequity when students from this elementary school went to the middle school. She wondered why they did not start by doing all the high schools.

Mr. Ewing thought the plan was a good one. They had a long way to go to achieve equity, and unless they were blessed with vast sums of money and huge amounts of talent, they could not move fast enough to achieve equity in anything less than six years. Based on his experience with the federal government, he thought MCPS had to be careful not to build capacity they could not use.

For example, in government he saw larger computers being installed in offices where 90 percent of the work was word processing. He did not see this in the proposed plan. Rather he saw carefully constructed expectations about what was needed.

Mr. Ewing pointed out that the document before the Board would be going out to the public. He thought they needed a glossary, and it ought to be fairly basic with explanations of what E-mail was, CD-ROM, the differences between local area networks, wide area, G-net, and internet, etc. He thought that the plan was a great beginning. Ms. Seikaly commented that they had two pages set aside for global access. One could look at those two pages and prioritize the capabilities he or she thought were more important. The problem was that every one of the capabilities relied on an educational technology infrastructure, a wide area network. Without that infrastructure, very few of the capabilities could be accomplished.

Dr. Cheung complimented staff for a very outstanding strategic plan for educational technology. He appreciated the clear explanation of their "tripod," which he called infrastructure. In looking at the plan, he asked how they strengthened computer-assisted learning, computer-assisted instruction, and computer-assisted curriculum development. When they converted from a



manual model, the curriculum development process might change if they used a computer-assisted method. He suggested they might want to look at the research and development in these three areas, particularly curriculum development. Ms. Seikaly replied that this was a great challenge they had ahead of them, and she was working closely with Dr. Smith and Dr. Sullivan on these issues.

Ms. Gutierrez congratulated staff on their efforts in pulling together on-going activities and new directions. It was a very ambitious program, and she hoped they would complete this in the six-year period. Something troubled her, and it was the general feeling that they really were not starting from scratch. The plan implied they were starting from scratch, and it did not reflect the possibility of their using what they already had in place.

Ms. Gutierrez saw the plan as a global approach, but it might be too static. It did not give them the flexibility to also do some very quick and dirty advancements. For example, they already had two schools on the internet. This was a public document, and she did not think it was valid to give the impression that they were starting from scratch. She also suggested using some simple drawings in the document to show what was planned.

Ms. Gutierrez did not see that they were dealing with the equity issue as clearly and as directly as their policy intended. It was not highlighted in the plan. The aspects of the selection of the seven schools should reflect equity because they had raised the community's expectations for equity in the Board's approach. This was not apparent in the document. She suggested that first step should be to do a real good inventory of capabilities, but not just counting computers. For example, they did have experience with the internet in an instructional environment.

She noted that they were going to be using a consultant, and she would like them to look at what other school systems were doing and what were the lessons that MCPS did not have to repeat. For example, was their model based on the good, proven experiences of other schools? She hoped it was. She thought this would give them credibility as they requested all of this funding. She said that they had defined a model, but they needed to know why this was selected, could it be done in parts, was it modular, or were they going to buy all of this equipment all at once. She also pointed out that on the organizational chart Dr. Fisher's group was not included, and they should be big players in the technology leadership group.

Dr. Stephen Raucher, director of the Department of Technology Planning and Data Operations, explained that in an effort to be brief staff did not highlight everything in the document. This was an integration of what previously were three separate



20, 1994, and the last day for staff will be adjusted accordingly; and be it further

Resolved, That the superintendent of schools be authorized to request a waiver of one day from the 180-day requirement by the Maryland State Board of Education because the final day of the amended school year falls on a Monday.

RESOLUTION NO. 168-94      Re:    AN AMENDMENT TO THE PROPOSED  
RESOLUTION ON MAKE-UP DAYS FOR THE  
1993-94 SCHOOL YEAR

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

Resolved, That the proposed resolution on make-up days for the 1993-94 school year be amended to authorize the superintendent to pursue vigorously an interpretation of COMAR to see if a waiver could be granted so that the preferred option of extending the school day could be implemented by the time the fourth quarter begins in the school year.

RESOLUTION NO. 169-94      Re:    MAKE-UP DAYS FOR THE 1993-94 SCHOOL  
YEAR

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

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

WHEREAS, The Board of Education approved a schedule of 185 instructional days for the Montgomery County Public Schools for the 1993-94 school year and calendar; and

WHEREAS, The Montgomery County Public Schools have been closed for nine instructional days thus far this year due to weather conditions and five of those lost days can be made up through the approved school year and calendar; and

WHEREAS, Amendments to the approved school year and calendar are required to make up the remaining four lost instructional days; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Board of Education of Montgomery County hereby approve amendments to the 1993-94 school year and calendar by adding instructional days on June 15, June 16, June 17, and June 20, 1994, and the last day for staff will be adjusted

accordingly; and be it further

Resolved, That the superintendent of schools be authorized to request a waiver of one day from the 180-day requirement by the Maryland State Board of Education because the final day of the amended school year falls on a Monday; and be it further

Resolved, That the superintendent of schools also be authorized to pursue vigorously an interpretation of COMAR to see if a waiver could be granted so that the preferred option of extending the school day could be implemented by the time the fourth quarter begins in the school year.

Mrs. Brenneman left the meeting at this point.

Re: BOARD/SUPERINTENDENT COMMENTS

1. Ms. Gutierrez informed the Board that she had had the honor to be at the White House today with President Clinton during the signing of the executive order on Educational Excellence for Hispanic Americans. The President understood the need for targeting what he identified as the fastest growing and youngest population in the United States. He tied this to the Goals 2000 agenda. The order formed a commission at the top level and asked agencies to direct resources to educational supports for Hispanic Americans.

2. Mr. Ewing noted that the Board was scheduled to meet with the County Council on February 24 to talk about its concern over what the spending affordability guidelines, if implemented, would do to the budget and the students in the county. He hoped that the Council would be persuaded and that the Board could make a very strong statement about where they were and where they needed to go. He had provided the Board a memo with his suggestions.

Mr. Abrams temporarily left the meeting at this point.

RESOLUTION NO. 170-94      Re: CLOSED MEETINGS - FEBRUARY 28 AND  
MARCH 8, 1994

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

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education of Montgomery County hereby conduct a portion of its meeting on February 28, 1994, at 7:30

p.m. to discuss personnel matters, matters protected from public disclosure by law, contract negotiations, and other issues including consultation with counsel to obtain legal advice; and be it further

Resolved, That the Board of Education of Montgomery County hereby conduct a portion of its meeting on March 8, 1994, at 9 a.m. and at noon to discuss personnel matters, matters protected from public disclosure by law, and other issues including consultation with counsel to obtain legal advice; and be it further

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

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

RESOLUTION NO. 170-94 Re: MINUTES OF JANUARY 11, 1994

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

Resolved, That the minutes of January 11, 1994, be approved.

RESOLUTION NO. 171-94 Re: MINUTES OF JANUARY 25, 1994

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

Resolved, That the minutes of January 25, 1994, be approved.

RESOLUTION NO. 172-94 Re: MINUTES OF JANUARY 26, 1994

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

Resolved, That the minutes of January 26, 1994, be approved.

RESOLUTION NO. 173-94 Re: MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 2, 1994

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

Resolved, That the minutes of February 2, 1994, be approved.

Mrs. Gordon assumed the chair.

RESOLUTION NO. 174-94 Re: MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 3, 1994

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

Resolved, That the minutes of February 3, 1994, be approved.

Mrs. Fanconi assumed the chair, and Mrs. Gordon left the meeting at this point.

Mr. Abrams rejoined the meeting at this point.

Re: REPORT ON CLOSED SESSION - FEBRUARY  
8, 1994

On January 24, 1994, by the unanimous vote of members present, the Board of Education voted to conduct a closed session on February 8, 1994, as permitted under Section 4-106, Education Article of the Annotated Code of Maryland and State Government Article 10-501.

The Montgomery County Board of Education met in closed session on Tuesday, February 8, 1994, from 9 to 9:50 a.m. and from 12:30 to 1:20 p.m. The meetings took place in room 120 of the Carver Educational Services Center, Rockville, Maryland.

The Board met to discuss the personnel monthly report, the legal services monthly report, snow days, and a letter of agreement with Mrs. Maureen Steinecke. The Board reviewed Decision and Orders in BOE Appeals 1993-17 and 1993-30 and adjudicated BOE Appeal No. 1993-38, BOE Appeal No. 1993-33, and BOE Appeal No. 1993-37. At noon the Board reviewed the manner in which Personnel handled complaints against employees. The Board also agreed to provide the Bell commission with copies of the Board's agreement with Mrs. Steinecke.

In attendance at the closed sessions were Carrie Baker, Fran Brenneman, Judy Bresler, Alan Cheung, Blair Ewing, Carol Fanconi, Tom Fess, Kathy Gemberling, Bea Gordon, Zvi Greismann, Ana Sol Gutierrez, Marie Heck, Elfreda Massie, Brian Porter, Phil Rohr, Stan Schaub, Paul Vance, Mary Lou Wood, and Melissa Woods.

Re: NEW BUSINESS

1. Mr. Ewing moved and Dr. Cheung seconded the following:

Resolved, That the Board of Education schedule time to consider meeting on a twice a year basis with the secondary school administrators and the elementary school administrators.

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education schedule time to consider meetings in the future with African-American, Asian, and Hispanic leaders to address and discuss issues of concern to each of these groups.

3. Mr. Ewing moved and Ms. Gutierrez seconded the following:

Resolved, That the Board of Education schedule time to discuss a work session, public hearing, or conference on the proposed program for violent offenders.

Re: ITEM OF INFORMATION

The Board received an item of information entitled, "Additional Information on Dropouts."

RESOLUTION NO. 176-94 Re: ADJOURNMENT

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education adjourn its meeting at 12:30 a.m.

---

PRESIDENT

---

SECRETARY

PLV:mlw