

APPROVED
22-1987

Rockville, Maryland
April 21, 1987

The Board of Education of Montgomery County met in regular session at the Carver Educational Services Center, Rockville, Maryland, on Tuesday, April 21, 1987, at 2:10 p.m.

ROLL CALL Present: Mrs. Marilyn J. Praisner, President
in the Chair
Dr. James E. Cronin
Mrs. Sharon DiFonzo*
Mr. Blair G. Ewing
Mr. Bruce A. Goldensohn
Dr. Robert E. Shoenberg
Mrs. Mary Margaret Slye
Mr. Eric Steinberg**

Absent: None

Others Present: Dr. Wilmer S. Cody, Superintendent of Schools
Dr. Harry Pitt, Deputy Superintendent
Mr. Thomas S. Fess, Parliamentarian

Re: ANNOUNCEMENT

Mrs. Praisner reported that Mr. Steinberg would be joining the Board after school.

RESOLUTION NO. 211-87 Re: BOARD AGENDA - APRIL 21, 1987

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

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education adopt its agenda for April 21, 1987, with the addition of a discussion on budget, the postponement of the policy on citizen inquiries, complaints and appeals to the late afternoon, and the deletion of Bid 87-07 from the procurement item.

RESOLUTION NO. 212-87 Re: NATIONAL VOLUNTEER WEEK, APRIL 26 -
MAY 2, 1987

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

WHEREAS, The week of April 26 - May 2, 1987, has been designated National Volunteer Week and has been proclaimed Volunteer Recognition Week by the Montgomery County Council; and

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

WHEREAS, During the past school year, 22,800 volunteers brought more than 1,410,000 hours of dedicated service to students and teachers in school programs; and

WHEREAS, If a dollar value were attached to the hours of service volunteers provided, the sum would be more than \$8 million; and

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

RESOLVED, That the week of April 26 - May 2, 1987, be proclaimed Volunteer Week in Montgomery County Public Schools; and be it further

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

RESOLUTION NO. 213-87 Re: NATIONAL STUDENT LEADERSHIP DAY

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

WHEREAS, May 7, 1987, has been designated as Student Leadership Day by the Montgomery County executive's office and Montgomery County Public Schools; and

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

WHEREAS, The continuing dialogue between the Board of Education and student leaders representing individual schools and countywide student governments is productive and useful; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education join with the superintendent and county executive in proclaiming May 7 as Student Leadership Day in Montgomery County; and be it further

RESOLVED, That our student leaders be commended for their efforts and achievements on behalf of Montgomery County Public Schools; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the superintendent inform school system employees and student government organizations of this action and encourage appropriate recognition activities on May 7, 1987.

*Mrs. DiFonzo joined the meeting at this point.

Re: FY 1987-88 OPERATING BUDGET

Dr. Pitt stated that he felt a little bit like a broken record

because a number of people in the room had already heard this discussion. He said that unless they got some more money the Council and county executive would break some things that were not easily fixed. They were talking about budget cuts that were very severe and were going to have an impact on the school system.

Dr. Pitt reported that last year they had a budget of \$477.7 million. To get to the same services this year, they added \$4.2 million for enrollment growth and new schools, \$3.5 for normal step increases, and \$7.6 million for inflation which totalled \$493 million for same services. Their total inflationary increase was 1.6 percent which was under the area and national rates of inflation. They had salary agreements that added up to approximately \$33 million which totalled \$525 million which would keep what they now had and add salary increases. He explained that all of that money was not purely salary increase. For example, OMB had recommended cutting \$500,000 out of funds they had for aides, but this was part of the contract with MCEA to provide planning time for elementary teachers. The Board had added approximately \$12 million of improvements which brought them to \$538 million.

Dr. Pitt reported that the county executive had recommended \$515 million, and with Civiletti money that totalled \$515.7 million. The Council's education committee had recommended \$518 million with the Board's budget at \$538 million. He said that most of the improvements focused on things that the citizens felt were very important and included class size, support for gifted and talented, and a variety of programs for young people. These programs represented a long-term commitment made by the Board of Education. During this period of time the school system was growing, the population was changing and becoming more diverse.

Dr. Pitt recognized that they would not get \$538 million. He hoped that the Council would recognize that cuts being made went beyond improvements and reduced what they now had. These were items that the Council had given to the Board over a period of time. The \$12 million of improvements might have to be wiped out which brought them to \$526 million. Therefore, they had to find \$8 million more in same services. The county executive had said they should cut \$1.7 million out of their HMO's, but this was illegal. They had cut \$700,000 out to lower the hiring rate to BA-4 which meant they could not be as flexible in hiring as they were now. They had cut \$100,000 from activity buses with the recommendation they use Ride-On which was not possible to the level of \$100,000. They had cut into extended year employment which would affect summer school and some programs. For example, they had summer programs for students having difficulty in gaining as much as they should during the school year in academic achievement. He believed that some of the minigrant money would have to go. The education committee did not want to go with the same program for ICB which provided for overtime for MCPS employees working for ICB. Therefore, they had cut \$225,000 out of the school-day custodial support which meant 22 to 23 fewer custodians.

Dr. Pitt thought they were going to have to look at class size. If

they raised class size by one student at the elementary level, it would be about \$1.6 million. He explained that they had a terrible situation in their high school program because they were losing high school students. This meant they needed 91 fewer teachers, and the county executive had recommended a cut of another 16 teachers, for a total of 107 teachers. He said that part of it was MCPS's problem because they had put in 20 more high school teachers to reduce the impact and keep class size down, and that would be wiped out. They might have to cut out improving the non-English speaking youngsters, improving drug and alcohol abuse efforts, and new initiatives for minority student education. They would have to look at class size and materials of instruction. A cut of \$1.4 million had been recommended for Category 1, which was not administration but rather system-wide support. He noted that there were fewer superintendents and directors in MCPS than in comparable jurisdictions. This category included library services, curriculum, and computers. If they cut \$1.4 million, they were talking about the loss of 30 and 60 positions in area and central office. He believed they would have to cut in this area and that it would hurt because about eight or ten years ago previous Boards of Education had cut into those areas and hurt the school system. If they did consider renegotiating the agreements, they had to keep in mind that for each one percent of teacher salary they would get \$2.7 million, and for each one percent of supporting service they would get \$1.1 million. He noted that the Board had agreed to raise salaries for administrators, and that \$256,000 had been cut.

Dr. Cody commented that the county executive and County Council had expressed a concern about increasing taxes. The county government had expressed an interest in supporting three-year contracts with MCPS and county government employees. Honoring those contracts over the next three years, taking care of growth, maintaining the same level of services, and restoring the cuts of the current proposal were likely to require a tax increase every year. He explained that during the 1989-90 school year, it would be necessary to have a further tax increase for the following year to maintain services and accommodate growth. The Council members and executive would be running for office, and the county government and the school system would be in the process of negotiating a contract. It seemed to him that the county would be well served to do it now and avoid the cutbacks in education. This would make it less likely that they would still be dealing with a catch up problem three years from now. Board members expressed their views on this year's budget process and the importance of having citizens understand what had happened to date and what was likely to happen in MCPS if the budget was not funded.

Re: BOARD/PRESS/VISITOR CONFERENCE

Mr. Hanley Norment and Mrs. Gladys Young of the Montgomery County NAACP appeared before the Board of Education.

** Mr. Steinberg joined the meeting at this point.

Re: NORTHWOOD HIGH SCHOOL

Mrs. Praisner reported that the Council had adopted a resolution on the reuse of Northwood, and there was some reference to the Board's voting today. This was not correct. The Board's staff had been working with Council staff, but the Board had not discussed this issue. The Board had requested its attorney to review these materials, and the Board would make every effort to meet the May 1 deadline imposed by the Council, but at this point no meeting had been scheduled.

Re: REVIEW OF LONG-RANGE EDUCATIONAL
FACILITIES POLICY

Dr. Cody recalled that last year they had said they would review the policy after one year's operation. The Board had before it some minor modifications. Dr. Phil Rohr, director of educational facilities, planning, and development, commented that they had been pleased with how the policy has worked this past year. The changes proposed had been reviewed with MCCPTA.

Mrs. Slye suggested that staff look at the wording under "desired enrollment," and Dr. Shoenberg asked that they substitute "average" for "aggregate" in that section. Mrs. Slye also asked whether or not it was reasonable to keep "minimum enrollment" next to "desired enrollment" or to refer to it here and spell it out in the section on school closure. Mrs. DiFonzo asked that they take another look at the section on minimum and desired enrollments so that they did not have different standards for two-grade intermediate schools, three-grade intermediate schools, and middle/intermediate/junior high schools. Mr. Goldensohn asked that they change the "aggregate" on page 8 to "average." Mr. Ewing requested that they look at the wording about associate superintendents forwarding "appropriate" comments.

Mrs. Praisner noted that at some point they would have to discuss the issue of high school program capacity. Mr. Ewing suggested that until they resolved that issue they should reflect the fact they were still using state rated capacity.

Mrs. Praisner requested that staff look again at the public hearing process for civic associations to assure consistency from civic group to civic group and from issue to issue.

RESOLUTION NO. 214-87 Re: PROCUREMENT CONTRACTS OVER \$25,000

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

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

WHEREAS, Staff inquiries have shown that a rebid would gain more competition for Bid No. 94-87, Vinyl Clad Drywall Panels; and

WHEREAS, The specifications need to be reevaluated for Bid No. 100-87, Lawn Care Services; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That Bid Nos. 94-87 and 100-87 be rejected; and be it further

RESOLVED, That having been duly advertised, the contracts be awarded to the low bidders meeting specifications as shown for the bids as follows:

	NAME OF VENDOR(S)	DOLLAR VALUE
COG		
#70149	Gasoline	
	Fannon Company	\$ 12,938
	J. E. Meintzer & Son, Inc.	883,207

	TOTAL	\$ 896,145
44-87	Industrial Arts Hand Tools	
	Bowie Bolt & Supply, Inc.	\$ 581
	Brodhead-Garrett Co.	890
	Carey Machinery & Supply Co., Inc.	1,336
	Chown, Inc.	470
	Albert Constantine and Son, Inc.	55
	Crown Refrigeration Supply, Inc.	113
	Diamond Core Drilling and Sawing Co.	4,002
	Empire Electronic Supply Co.	287
	Frederick Trading Company	251
	Graves Humphreys Co.	465
	T. B. Hagstoz & Son, Inc.	205
	J & M Supply Co.	4,599
	Meyer Feed Company	3,329
	Noland Company	9,362
	T. W. Perry, Inc.	4,339
	Rudolph & West Company, Inc.	1,748
	Rutland Tool & Supply Co., Inc.	4,108
	Satco	5,996
	J. P. Scott & Son, Inc.	131
	Seldon Enterprises	200
	Suburban Tools Corp.	86
	Thompson & Cooke, Inc.	3,666

	TOTAL	\$ 46,218
50-87	Electrical Supplies and Equipment	
	ASI Electronics	\$ 117
	Branch Electric Supplies	7
	Central Wholesalers, Inc.	31
	Empire Electronic Supply Company	152
	Frederick Trading Company	135

	Fries, Beall & Sharp Co., Inc.	151
	General Electric Supply Company	5,299
	W. W. Grainger, Inc.	666
	Graybar Electric Co., Inc.	29
	Interstate Electric Supply Co., Inc.	802
	Lee Electric Company of Baltimore City	2,567
	Maurice Electrical Supply Co., Inc.	5,433
	Noland Company	14,647
	R & S Electric Supply	327
	C. N. Robinson Ltg. Company	11,266
	Tri-County Electrical Supply Co., Inc.	9,064
	U.S. Electric Supply Co.	2,460
	Veteran Wire & Cable Corporation	1,480
	Westinghouse Electric Supply	9,194
	TOTAL	\$ 63,827
65-87	Paint and Paint Sundries	
	C. M. Athey Paint Company	\$ 13,025
	Bruning Paint Center	2,296
	Duron, Inc.	57,191
	McCormick Paint Works	2,109
	Parrs Ridge Supply	277
	TOTAL	\$ 74,898
69-87	Industrial Arts Lumber	
	Allied Plywood Corporation	\$ 5,398
	Brodhead-Garrett Co.	1,503
	Eastern Wood Products Company	9,153
	Hyatt Building Supply	2,255
	Mann and Parker Lumber Co.	41,427
	Nelco Lumber and Home Centers	988
	TOTAL	\$ 60,724
71-87	Physical Education Supplies and Equipment	
	Allied Recreational	\$ 5,044
	Aluminum Athletic Equipment Company	442
	American Physical Fitness	334
	American Institutional Sales	6,018
	Anaconda-Kaye Sports, Inc.	3,811
	Atlantic Fitness Products	1,380
	BSN	8,304
	D. R. J. Exercise Equipment, Inc.	60
	DVF Sporting Goods Company	17,268
	Dekan Athletic Equipment	454
	Direct Trade International	2,320
	Dugout Sporting Goods	11,212
	E & S Recreation, Inc.	18,260
	Eagle Sports Company	923
	Flaghouse, Inc.	4,299
	Gopher Athletics	1,490
	Graves-Humphreys Company	273

H & G Associates	1,708
HL Sports	3,060
J. L. Hammett Company	54
Hi Tech Tools	9,872
Longstreth Sporting Goods	292
Louisville Badminton Supply	895
Marlow Sports, Inc.	35,172
Micro Bio-Medics, Inc.	207
Mini-Gym Company	8,235
Mitchell & Ness USA	1,567
Palos Sports, Inc.	3,502
Resilite Sports Product, Inc.	1,010
Rock Terrace School	2,035
George Santelli, Inc.	4,587
Shipley's Sporting Goods	8,179
Snitz Manufacturing Company	15
Sportsmans, Ltd.	88
Sportmaster	1,121
Sport-Tech	1,475
Springriver Corporation	555
Street Hockey Originals	560
John W. Taylor & Associates	3,958
Things from Bell, Inc.	59
Tiffin Athletic Mats, Inc.	2,741
Bob Windsor's All Pro Sports	2,246
TOTAL	\$ 175,085

74-87 Art Equipment	
Brodhead-Garrett Co.	\$ 2,914
Chaselle, Inc.	136,827
Chesapeake Ceramic Supply, Inc.	1,965
Graves Humphreys Co.	32,617
Moll Co.	900
TOTAL	\$ 175,223

79-87 Art and School Papers	
Barton, Duer and Koch Paper Co.	\$ 79,405
Chaselle, Inc.	136,707
Garrett-Buchanan	10,622
Intac, Inc.	8,103
Kurtz Brothers	2,103
TOTAL	\$ 236,940

80-87 Art Supplies	
Dick Blick East	\$ 19,730
Chaselle, Inc.	78,573
Elgin School Supply Co., Inc.	10,910
Interstate Office Supply Company	53,667
Kaplan School Supply Corp.	1,843
National Office & School Supplies	5,329
Sax Arts & Crafts	2,379

	TOTAL	-----	\$ 172,431
83-87	Art Tools		
	Dick Blick East	\$	774
	Brodhead Garrett Company		2,027
	Charvoz Carson Corporation		700
	Chaselle, Inc.		5,355
	Elgin School Supply Co., Inc.		23,363
	Graves Humphreys Company		44
	J. L. Hammett Company		18,579
	McKilligan Supply Corporation		820
	Modern School Supplies, Inc.		662
	National Office & School Supplies Corp.		18,020
	Sax Arts & Crafts		3,972
	Thompson & Cooke, Inc.		3,530
	Utrecht Mfg., Company		1,799
	Visual Systems Co., Inc.		22,320
	TOTAL	-----	\$ 101,965
95-87	Office Furniture		
	Baltimore Stationery Company	\$	1,086
	Douron, Inc.		259,407
	Future Furniture		5,806
	Glover School & Office Equipment		17,336
	Hertz Furniture System Corporation		2,088
	Systems Furniture Gallery, Inc.		30,064
	TOTAL	-----	\$ 315,787
96-87	Classroom Furniture		
	Baltimore Stationery Co.	\$	9,051
	Douron, Inc.		1,137,882
	M. S. Ginn Company		8,363
	Glover School & Office Equipment, Inc.		97,737
	Jakanna Woodworks		51,453
	Systems Furniture Gallery, Inc.		15,900
	TOTAL	-----	\$1,320,385
97-87	Library Furniture		
	Baltimore Stationery Co.	\$	269
	Douron, Inc.		64,650
	Gaylord Bros. Inc.		5,103
	Glover School & Office Equipment, Inc.		22,271
	The Library Store, Ltd.		26,985
	Systems Furniture Gallery, Inc.		6,670
	TOTAL	-----	\$ 125,948
99-87	Early Childhood & Kindergarten Equipment and Supplies		
	ABC School Supply	\$	1,540

	H. B. J. Beckley Cardy Co.	124
	Books & Things	5,652
	Chaselle, Inc.	5,716
	Childcraft Education Corp.	35,938
	Community Playthings	33,426
	Constructive Playthings	4,856
	Creative Publications	836
	Crown Educational & Teaching Aids	16,935
	Cuisenaire Co. of America, Inc.	486
	Educational Teaching Aids	2,204
	J. L. Hammett Company	8,383
	Intac, Inc.	338
	Kaplan School Supply	47,387
	NASCO	4,164
	TOTAL	\$ 167,985
107-87	Floor Maintenance Supplies	
	Alliance Group, Inc.	\$ 7,432
	Baer-Slade Corp.	4,797
	District Supply, Inc.	38,400
	Huntington Laboratories, Inc.	10,493
	TOTAL	\$ 61,122
123-87	Asphaltic Concrete	
	A. H. Smith	\$ 373,180
	GRAND TOTAL	\$4,354,925

RESOLUTION NO. 215-87 Re: DUFIEF ELEMENTARY SCHOOL - EXTERIOR
RENOVATIONS (AREA 3)

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

WHEREAS, Sealed bids were received on March 26, 1987, for exterior renovations to DuFief Elementary School as indicated below:

BIDDER	LUMP SUM
1. Ulysses Contractors, Inc.	\$162,000
2. Brisk Waterproofing, Inc.	204,400
3. Century Enterprises, Inc.	227,700

and

WHEREAS, The low bidder, Ulysses Contractors, Inc., has performed similar projects in the metropolitan jurisdiction; and

WHEREAS, Low bid is within staff estimate and sufficient funds are available in Account 241-04 to effect award; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That a contract for \$162,000 be awarded to Ulysses

Contractors, Inc., for exterior renovations to DuFief Elementary School in accordance with plans and specifications prepared by Grimm & Parker, Architect.

RESOLUTION NO. 216-87 Re: GAITHERSBURG HIGH SCHOOL - PARTIAL
REROOFING (AREA 3)

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

WHEREAS, Sealed bids were received on March 26, 1987, for partial reroofing Gaithersburg High School as indicated below:

BIDDER	LUMP SUM
1. R. D. Bean, Inc.	\$262,648
2. Raintree Industries, Inc.	327,720
3. J. E. Wood & Sons Co., Inc.	354,950
4. Orndorff & Spaid, Inc.	368,285
5. AGMILU & Co., Inc.	397,838
6. J & R Roofing Co., Inc.	454,236

and

WHEREAS, The low bidder, R. D. Bean, Inc., has performed similar projects satisfactorily for MCPS; and

WHEREAS, Low bid is within staff estimate and sufficient funds are available in Account 999-42 to effect award; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That a contract for \$262,648 be awarded to R. D. Bean, Inc., for partial reroofing Gaithersburg High School in accordance with plans and specifications prepared by the Department of School Facilities.

RESOLUTION NO. 217-87 Re: GAITHERSBURG HIGH SCHOOL - ADDITION AND
KITCHEN MODIFICATIONS (AREA 3)

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

WHEREAS, Sealed bids were received on April 16, 1987, for Gaithersburg High School addition and kitchen modifications as indicated below:

BIDDER	LUMP SUM
1. Hanlon Construction Co., Inc.	\$147,305
2. Smith & Haines, Inc.	154,000
3. Century Enterprises, Inc.	164,700

and

WHEREAS, The low bidder, Hanlon Construction Co., Inc., has performed similar projects in the metropolitan jurisdiction; and

WHEREAS, Low bid is within staff estimate and sufficient funds are available in Account 555-17 to effect award; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That a contract for \$147,305 be awarded to Hanlon Construction Co., Inc., for an addition and kitchen modifications to Gaithersburg High School in accordance with plans and specifications prepared by the Department of School Facilities.

RESOLUTION NO. 218-87 Re: THOMAS S. WOOTTON HIGH SCHOOL -
GYMNASIUM ADDITION (AREA 3)

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

WHEREAS, Sealed bids were received on February 26, 1987, for the Thomas S. Wootton High School Gymnasium Addition as indicated below:

BIDDER	BASE BID	DEDUCT ALT.1	DEDUCT ALT.2	TOTAL
1. Patrick Quinn	\$750,000	\$27,200	\$ 4,500	\$718,300
2. Hess Const. Co.	785,578	26,800	15,307	743,471
3. Northwood Constr.	815,000	28,000	30,500	756,500
4. N. S. Stavrou Con.	894,000	25,000	25,000	844,000
5. Jenkins Const.	949,000	27,000	15,000	907,000

Description of Alternates: Alt. #1 - Cost for folding partitions
Alt. #2 - Gymnasium equipment

and

WHEREAS, The low bidder, Patrick Quinn, Inc., has satisfactorily completed a number of projects for MCPS; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That a contract be awarded to Patrick Quinn, Inc. for \$718,300, which constitutes acceptance of the base bid and Deduct Alternates 1 and 2, for the construction of a gymnasium addition to Thomas S. Wootton High School in accordance with plans and specifications prepared by Fox, Hanna Architects.

RESOLUTION NO. 219-87 Re: DEDICATION OF LAND FOR PUBLIC RIGHT-OF-WAY AT THE FORMER SADDLEBROOK ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

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

WHEREAS, The Maryland State Highway Administration is planning to widen MD 182 (Layhill Road) between MD Route 97 and Briggs Road which

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education enter into contractual agreements, as indicated, subject to County Council approval:

ARTIST	WORK	SCHOOL	COMMISSION
Judith Inglese	Ceramic Tile Mural	Goshen	\$23,000
Glen Moy	Mural	Goshen	\$10,000
Julio Teichberg	Sculpture	Goshen	\$20,000
Franklin Boggs	Relief	Waters Landing	\$10,000

and be it further

RESOLVED, That the County Council will be requested to expeditiously approve the above commissions to the indicated artists.

RESOLUTION NO. 221-87 Re: DEDICATION OF LAND FOR PUBLIC RIGHT-OF-WAY AT THE FORMER WOODLEY GARDENS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

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

WHEREAS, The Maryland State Highway Administration is planning to construct a noise barrier along I-270 between MD Route 28 and Shady Grove Road which will require a public dedication of 8,757 square feet of land from the Board's property located at 1150 Carnation Road in Rockville; and

WHEREAS, This property together with the improvements thereon, formerly known as the Woodley Gardens Elementary School, has been and continues to be leased to Montgomery County Government until final disposition and transfer of title has been effected; and

WHEREAS, The Montgomery County Government has reviewed the proposed dedication and received the approval of the City of Rockville, which subleases the property through its Office of Elderly Affairs; and

WHEREAS, Final design and construction of the noise barrier includes temporary access for the construction of a sediment trap within the property; and

WHEREAS, All construction, restoration, and future maintenance will be performed at no cost to the Board of Education, with the Maryland State Highway Administration and contractors assuming liability for all damages or injury; and

WHEREAS, This land dedication for a noise barrier and temporary access for construction of the sediment trap will benefit the surrounding community and the former school site; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the president and secretary be authorized to execute a final deed for the additional land required to construct the noise barrier and an Entry Agreement to install the required sediment trap

at the former Woodley Gardens Elementary School.

RESOLUTION NO. 222-87 Re: CHARLES W. WOODWARD HIGH SCHOOL - STORM DRAINAGE EASEMENT (AREA 2)

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

WHEREAS, The Montgomery County Department of Environmental Protection has requested a right-of-way and stormwater drainage easement on 1,200 square feet of land across the Charles W. Woodward High School site to install a storm drainage pipe to connect to an existing pipe; and

WHEREAS, The proposed storm drainage improvement will benefit both the school and the community and will not affect any land now utilized for school programming and recreational activities; and

WHEREAS, Montgomery County will assume all liability for damages or injury resulting from the installation and future maintenance of the subject improvement; and

WHEREAS, All construction, full restoration and any future repair activities will be performed at no cost to the Board of Education; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the president and secretary be authorized to execute a grant of storm drain easement and right-of-way to the Montgomery County Department of Environmental Protection at the Charles W. Woodward High School site for the purpose of installing a storm drainage improvement.

RESOLUTION NO. 223-87 Re: TELECOMMUNICATIONS/CABLE TV NETWORK INSTALLATION AT VARIOUS SCHOOLS

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

WHEREAS, Sealed bids were received on April 7, 1987, for installation of a cable television/telecommunications network at Thomas S. Wootton High School, Eastern Intermediate School, and Forest Knolls Elementary School as indicated below:

BIDDER	LUMP SUM
1. B & L Services, Inc.	\$57,500
2. Dickinson-Heffner, Inc.	77,200
3. Amtek Systems, Inc.	85,000

and

WHEREAS, The recommended bid is within the staff estimate and

WHEREAS, The general contractor, Jesse Dustin & Sons, Inc., has submitted a cost to MCPS through the project architect, SHWC, Inc., in the amount of \$207,023 which is consistent with the unit price previously identified; and

WHEREAS, School Facilities staff and the project architect have reviewed these extra costs and have agreed to the proposed modification in the existing contract; and

WHEREAS, Funds are available in the project account for this purpose; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the Board approve a change order to Jesse Dustin & Sons, Inc., in the amount of \$207,023 for the payment of earth work at Rolling Terrace Elementary School; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the state superintendent of schools be forwarded a copy of this change order as required by state law.

Re: AMENDMENT TO THE FY 1987 CAPITAL BUDGET
PHOENIX II PROGRAM (FAILED)

The following resolution failed of adoption with Dr. Cronin, Mr. Ewing, Mr. Goldensohn, Mrs. Slye, Dr. Shoenberg, and (Mr. Steinberg voting in the negative); Mrs. DiFonzo and Mrs. Praisner abstaining:

WHEREAS, A need exists to provide a permanent home for the Phoenix II Program; and

WHEREAS, Staff and parents of students in the Phoenix II Program have reviewed several alternatives and favor a new building to be placed on a portion of the future Hadley Farm school site; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education request an FY 1987 Capital Budget supplemental appropriation of \$285,000 to plan, construct, and equip a facility on the future Hadley Dairy Farm school site for the Phoenix II Program.

*Mrs. DiFonzo temporarily left the meeting at this point.

RESOLUTION NO. 226-87 Re: FY 1987 SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION,
CATEGORICAL AND OBJECT TRANSFER WITHIN
THE VOCATIONAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS

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

RESOLVED, That the superintendent of schools be authorized, subject to County Council approval, to receive and expend additional grant awards of \$57,006 in the following categories from the MSDE under the

Carl D. Perkins Vocational Education Act for vocational education programs:

CATEGORY	SUPPLEMENTAL
03 Instructional Other	\$34,465
04 Special Education	20,863
10 Fixed Charges	1,678

	\$57,006

and be it further

RESOLVED, That the superintendent of schools be authorized, subject to County Council approval, to effect within the FY 1987 vocational education programs, the following categorical transfers:

CATEGORY	FROM	TO
02 Instructional Salaries		\$ 257
03 Instructional Other		20,092
07 Student Transportation	\$ 2,100	
08 Operation of Plant & Equipment	1,255	
10 Fixed Charges	16,994	
	-----	-----
	\$20,349	\$20,349

and be it further

RESOLVED, That the superintendent of schools be authorized to effect the following object transfer within Category 03, Instructional Other:

CATEGORY	FROM	TO
02 Contractual Services		\$ 482
03 Supplies and Materials	\$18,750	
04 Other		5,920
05 Furniture and Equipment		12,348
	-----	-----
	\$18,750	\$18,750

and it further

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

RESOLUTION NO. 227-86 Re: UTILIZATION OF FY 1987 FUTURE SUPPORTED PROJECT FUNDS FOR HOUSING OPPORTUNITIES COMMISSION STUDENT LEADERSHIP CONFERENCE

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

RESOLVED, That the superintendent of schools be authorized, subject to County Council approval, to receive and expend a \$4,500 grant award in the following categories from HOC for the leadership training of 60 MCPS students in Grades 6 through 9:

CATEGORY	AMOUNT
01 Administration	\$4,400
10 Fixed Charges	100

TOTAL	\$4,500

and be it further

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

RESOLUTION NO. 228-87 Re: FY 1987 CATEGORICAL TRANSFER WITHIN THE PROVISION FOR FUTURE SUPPORTED PROJECTS

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

RESOLVED, That the superintendent of schools be authorized to effect within the FY 1987 Provision for Future Supported Projects the following categorical transfer in accordance with the County Council provision for transfers:

CATEGORY	FROM	TO
01 Administration		\$1,749
10 Fixed Charges	\$1,749	
	-----	-----
TOTAL	\$1,749	\$1,749

and be it further

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

RESOLUTION NO. 229-87 Re: PRESENTATION OF PRELIMINARY PLANS - WHITE OAK JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL (AREA 1)

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Dr. Cronin seconded by Dr. Shoenberg, the following resolution was adopted unanimously:

WHEREAS, The architect for White Oak Junior High School has prepared the schematic design in accordance with the educational

specifications; and

WHEREAS, The White Oak Junior High School Planning Committee has approved the proposed schematic design; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the Montgomery County Board of Education approve the schematic design report prepared by SHWC, Inc., architect.

Mrs. DiFonzo rejoined the meeting at this point.

RESOLUTION NO. 230-87 Re: PERSONNEL MONTHLY REPORT

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

RESOLVED, That the following appointments, resignations, and leaves of absence for professional and supporting services personnel be approved: (TO BE APPENDED TO THESE MINUTES).

RESOLUTION NO. 231-87 Re: EXTENSION OF SICK LEAVE

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Dr. Cronin seconded by Dr. Shoenberg, the following resolution was adopted unanimously:

WHEREAS, The employees listed below have suffered serious illness; and

WHEREAS, Due to the prolonged illness, the employees' accumulated sick leave has expired; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education grant an extension of sick leave with three-fourths pay covering the number of days indicated:

NAME	POSITION AND LOCATION	NO. OF DAYS
Lewis, Norma J.	Bus Operator Area III	30
Patterson, James	Building Service Worker Walter Johnson HS	30

RESOLUTION NO. 232-87 Re: DEATH OF MR. HENRY L. CARPENTER,
BUS OPERATOR IN AREA 3 TRANSPORTATION
OFFICE

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

WHEREAS, The death on March 6, 1987, of Mr. Henry L. Carpenter, a bus operator in Area 3, has deeply saddened the staff and members of the Board of Education; and

WHEREAS, Mr. Carpenter had been a loyal employee of Montgomery County Public Schools for over six years; and

WHEREAS, Mr. Carpenter's dedication to his job was recognized by students, staff, and the community; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the members of the Board of Education express their sorrow at the death of Mr. Henry L. Carpenter and extend deepest sympathy to his family; and be it further

RESOLVED, That this resolution be made part of the minutes of this meeting and a copy be forwarded to Mr. Carpenter's family.

RESOLUTION NO. 233-87 Re: PERSONNEL APPOINTMENT AND REASSIGNMENTS

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

RESOLVED, That the following personnel appointment and reassignments be approved:

APPOINTMENT	AS
Wayne A. Moyer	Coordinator of Secondary Science Department of Academic Skills Grade N Effective April 22, 1987

TEMPORARY REASSIGNMENTS FOR FY 1988

Name and Present Position	Position Effective July 1, 1987	Position Effective July 1, 1988
James H. Larson A&S Counselor (Requesting Extension)	A&S Counselor	Assistant Principal
F. Michael Bonner Principal Lake Seneca ES	A&S Teacher	Elementary Principal

REASSIGNMENT

NAME	FROM	TO
Philip Sheridan	Principal Hoover JHS	Assignment as a teacher Effective 7-1-87 Maintain present salary benefits Retirement 7-1-88

Ivan Spencer

Principal
Beall ES

Assistant Principal
Location to be determined
Effective 7-1-87
Maintain present salary
benefits until 7-1-89

RESOLUTION NO. 234-87 Re: PERSONNEL APPOINTMENT

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

RESOLVED, That the following personnel appointment be approved:

NAME	PRESENT POSITION	AS
Paul L. Vance	Area Assoc. Supt. Office of Administra- tion of Instructional Areas	Deputy Supt. of Schools Effective July 1, 1987

Re: FINAL 1987 LEGISLATIVE REPORT

Mrs. Lois Stoner, legislative aide, emphasized once again the value of the Green Street Coalition in following education legislation. She thanked staff members who provided her with information, particularly Stan Sirotkin, who came to Annapolis twice to testify; Al Anderson of the Budget Office; and Dr. Kenneth Muir, director of long-range planning.

Dr. Shoenberg thanked Mrs. Stoner for how well she had kept the Board informed and for her success in working with other counties and legislators. Mr. Ewing asked that Mrs. Stoner keep him informed about the council on early childhood development by providing him with a copy of the actual bill, supplying him with the names of the appointees, and following the activities of the council. Mrs. Stoner expressed her appreciation to elections administrator Doug Jernigan who had discovered one precinct was incorrectly placed in the bill for school board elections by district.

Mrs. DiFonzo added her congratulations for the work that Mrs. Stoner had done. Mrs. Stoner said that she was disappointed that the systemic renovation issue was not included in the bond bill for school construction. On behalf of the Board, Mrs. Praisner thanked Mrs. Stoner for the superb job she had done in Annapolis.

Re: BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS

1. Dr. Cronin commented that one of the things that had pained him in dealing with the Council was the way citizen support had been dismissed as "just people who support the school system." He said they were seeing a resurrection of the silent majority. It was a majority, it won, and it was silent, and it supported whoever was using it. If someone said something they were part of the vocal

- minority and automatically lost.
2. Dr. Cronin recalled that the superintendent had sent them a statement about the appointment of the task force to address J/I/M school issues, and he would appreciate receiving a list of the members of that task force.
 3. In regard to the NSBA convention, Mrs. Praisner reported that Dr. Cronin had chaired a presentation on troubled and troubling youth with the participation of Mrs. DiFonzo, Dr. Towers, and Mr. Berthiaume from the Phoenix program. She said it was an excellent presentation, and it was very gratifying to receive comments from the audience. She thought that Dr. Fountain and Dr. Towers would be receiving many requests for information about programs in MCPS.
 4. Mrs. Praisner stated that last time she had mentioned the national poster for academic fitness. That poster had been done by Carey McBroom, an MCPS graduate from the Visual Arts Center. In addition, there were other finalists from MCPS.
 5. Mrs. Praisner reported that she and Dr. Cody had received notice from the NSBA that MCPS had been selected for one of the five certificates of recognition for their outstanding services to disabled students and adults.
 6. Mrs. Praisner said that at the NSBA convention the Board's resolution request on crash tests for seat belts in buses was passed by the delegate assembly.
 7. Mrs. Praisner congratulated Margit Meissner, who had been selected to receive the Governor's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped 1987 Chester A. Troy Senior Public Service Award in recognition of her outstanding contribution to the employment of persons with disabilities.
 8. Mrs. Praisner thanked staff members who gave so much of their time to prepare the budget briefing booklet for the County Council which was an excellent document.
 9. Mr. Ewing said the Board had received an information item on a plan of action for students awaiting OT/PT services. He wanted to be sure that the three options were not alternatives to one another but were all three being pursued, and Dr. Cody replied that they were. Mr. Ewing thought that it was important for the Board to be made aware at several points along the way of how well this was meeting the needs. He suggested a July 1 status report.

RESOLUTION NO. 235-87 Re: EXECUTIVE SESSION - MAY 12, 1987

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

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

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education of Montgomery County hereby conduct its meeting in executive closed session beginning on May 12, 1987, at 9 a.m. to discuss, consider, deliberate, and/or otherwise decide the employment, assignment, appointment, promotion, demotion,

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

RESOLVED, That such meeting continue in executive closed session at noon to discuss the matters listed above as permitted under Article 76A, Section 11(a) and that such meeting shall continue in executive closed session until the completion of business.

RESOLUTION NO. 236-87 Re: MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 10, 1987

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

RESOLVED, That the minutes of February 10, 1987, be approved.

RESOLUTION NO. 237-87 Re: MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 25, 1987

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

RESOLVED, That the minutes of February 25, 1987, be approved.

RESOLUTION NO. 238-87 Re: MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 26, 1987

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

RESOLVED, That the minutes of February 26, 1987, be approved.

RESOLUTION NO. 239-87 Re: MINUTES OF MARCH 10, 1987

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

RESOLVED, That the minutes of March 10, 1987, be approved.

RESOLUTION NO. 240-87 Re: MINUTES OF MARCH 11, 1987

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

RESOLVED, That the minutes of March 11, 1987, be approved.

RESOLUTION NO. 241-87 Re: MINUTES OF MARCH 12, 1987

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

RESOLVED, That the minutes of March 12, 1987, be approved.

RESOLUTION NO. 242-87 Re: MINUTES OF MARCH 23, 1987

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

RESOLVED, That the minutes of March 23, 1987, be approved.

Re: CHARGE TO ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON THE
EDUCATION OF MINORITY STUDENTS

Mrs. Praisner reported that the vote on the charge would take place on June 22. Dr. Cody thought they she have further discussion in June after the late May report on minority education. Mr. Ewing suggested that it would be important to hear from the committee about the proposed charge as well as from others in the minority community. Dr. Cody indicated that he would ask Dr. Paul Scott to share copies with the committee and the minority community.

RESOLUTION NO. 243-87 Re: APPOINTMENT TO THE ETHICS PANEL

On motion of Mrs. DiFonzo seconded by Mrs. Slye, the following resolution was adopted with Dr. Cronin, Mrs. DiFonzo, Mr. Goldensohn, Mrs. Praisner, Dr. Shoenberg, Mrs. Slye, and (Mr. Steinberg) voting in the affirmative; Mr. Ewing abstaining not because he had an objection to Mr. Rosenthal but because he preferred another individual:

WHEREAS, The Board of Education adopted Resolution No. 162-84 which appointed three members to the Ethics Panel; and

WHEREAS, Dr. Alan Cheung has completed a three-year term of office and has indicated that he does not wish to be reappointed; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That Mr. Alan S. Rosenthal be appointed to serve on the Ethics Panel for a three-year term, from April 21, 1987, through April 30, 1990.

RESOLUTION NO. 244-87 Re: BOE Appeal No. 1987-2

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

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education adopt its Decision and Order in

BOE Appeal No. 1987-2.

Re: NEW BUSINESS

Dr. Shoenberg called attention to a typographical error in the information item on new social studies courses which was scheduled for action on May 25.

Re: POLICY ON CITIZEN INQUIRIES, COMPLAINTS
AND APPEALS

Dr. Cody suggested that staff needed a lot more contact with Mr. Roger Titus, the Board's attorney. Mr. Titus explained that the Board had an existing regulation which they wished revised. He had given the Board his version in January, and now the staff had prepared its own regulation.

Mrs. Praisner thought that the staff needed to get together with Mr. Titus before Board discussion was held on this item. Dr. Cody thought that there should be a meeting with Mr. Titus, Dr. Pitt, and the officers of the Board. Dr. Cronin suggested that Mr. Fess, as ombudsman, be included in that meeting. Dr. Cody agreed to set up such a meeting and to get back to the Board when they had held their work session.

Re: ITEMS OF INFORMATION

Board members received the following items of information:

1. Items in Process
2. Construction Progress Report
3. Status of Richard Montgomery IB Program
4. Status of Oak View/New Hampshire Estates Magnet Programs
5. Plan of Action for Students Awaiting OT/PT Services
6. Recommendation for Approval of New Social Studies Courses,
AP American Government and Politics and AP Comparative
Government and Politics (for future consideration)

Re: RECESS

The Board recessed at 4:40 p.m. and resumed its meeting at 7:30 p.m.

Re: RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE COMMISSION ON
EXCELLENCE IN TEACHING

Mrs. Praisner reported that this was the Board's second discussion with members of the Commission. The first discussion focused on attracting quality teachers and retaining those teachers. Tonight they would focus on teacher evaluation and training, career structure, compensation, and increased flexibility and accountability. She noted that the Board had already received information from the staff on plans for dealing with recruitment issues. She pointed out that many of the recommendations did have some financial implications, and as everyone knew they were in the

deep throes of a significant budget crisis. She thanked Mr. Michael O'Keefe, chair of the Commission, for the letter he had sent to the County Council regarding the Board's budget.

Mr. O'Keefe stated that they would like to talk about evaluation and training as a package, career structure and compensation as another set, and finally increased flexibility and accountability. In regard to evaluation, the Commission's major finding was that MCPS had a single system which was applied rather uniformly and mechanically when in fact the purposes of evaluation and the role of evaluation in the whole instructional process varied dramatically from the beginning teacher to the experienced teacher. During a person's first two years as a teacher, evaluation should be for helping that individual become a more effective teacher. At the end of the two years, an evaluation would be conducted for tenure. Once that individual was granted tenure and been judged effective as an independent classroom teacher, that person did not need evaluation as frequently or the same kind of evaluation as a person being considered for tenure. There was also the person with tenure who was not performing well, and that person needed a very different evaluation than that needed for the senior teacher performing very well.

Mr. O'Keefe said that their recommendation followed from that diagnosis, and they were suggesting there be different evaluations for different situations. They thought the tenure review should be done with a committee with more involvement of senior teachers and less involvement of the principal. With the tenured teacher, the evaluation would be a personal development plan in the form of self evaluation and identification of training needs and professional development. This would be a topic of discussion between the supervisor and that teacher on a regular basis. Occasionally there would be a regular evaluation of that person. For the person in trouble there would be a due process established with its first intent being how could that person be helped. If the attempts to improve performance failed, the person would be counseled into some other career pattern in or out of the system. Their recommendations implied more involvement of teachers in the evaluation process and less involvement of principals.

In regard to training which was tied into evaluation, Mr. O'Keefe explained that the new teacher needed intensive preservice training with regular interaction with a mentor. The nature of that training would be negotiated with the teacher, the mentor, and the principal. The career teacher would identify areas that needed to be strengthened or developed through training. They were recommending that the resources available for training be close to the sets of decisions made by the principal and the teacher. Whatever a teacher or a group of teachers needed could be something that the school planned for and could obtain through the system or outside the system. He noted that evaluation and training really meant professional development or the continuing development of an individual's capacity to perform as a professional.

Dr. Cronin asked if they had thought of the way in which the senior teacher would be selected as the mentor. He also wanted to know if they had thought how the confidentiality of the evaluation process would be maintained if they had a recognized program for someone in trouble. Mr. O'Keefe thought they would identify the characteristics and qualifications of the mentor and accept applications on a competitive basis. On confidentiality, he thought a process could be designed so that there was little distinction between the teacher in trouble and for the on-going effective senior teacher. However, when an individual was not performing well, that performance was generally well known to almost every other member of that institution. In fact, the judgment that the person was not performing well would trigger the principal to take some action.

Mrs. Nancy Wiecking thought the selection of career teachers would be clearer when they discussed career structure. She commented that one of the frustrating things about the evaluation system was there was nothing built in which identified excellence.

Dr. Cody explained that in MCPS there was a formal action by the supervisor which called for a special evaluation bringing more people in to observe. If that evaluation resulted in a recommendation for dismissal, the teacher could ask for a review in which case other teachers could sit on the panel to review all material. "Confidentiality" meant that people could not talk about the situation and make public statements. He was not sure that what was being recommended was really any different from what they had now.

Dr. Laura Dittmann stated that when there was recognition of the poor performance of a teacher that had a therapeutic value for the school and the community. It was the recognition that the school system was not ignoring this situation. Mr. Ewing thought the section on evaluation was excellent and agreed with Dr. Dittmann about recognizing performance problems and dealing with them. He thought that this could be done in a way that didn't harm people. It could be made clear that there are standards by which everybody should be judged and to which everyone would be held.

Mr. Ewing pointed out that the present evaluation system focused very heavily on the methods by which teaching was carried out and very little on the outcomes which teachers achieve. Thus if a teacher had good results, the evaluation system did not recognize that achievement. Mr. O'Keefe stated that if they concentrated on methods this tended to homogenize the system so that a certain set of methods became the acceptable methods. He said that from educational research they knew that they did not know what worked. In fact, for a given set of young people and a teacher, a particular technique might work while another method used down the hall might not work. It was difficult to isolate the influence of the classroom teacher on how much children learned and on the rate at which they learned. To judge a teacher solely on outcome measures was unfair because the teacher could not control most of the factors affecting whether children were learning or not. This was the dilemma of education. He thought they had to have flexibility about methods and blend in

some outcome measures. He reported that some work was being done on this issue by the Carnegie Forum on Education in looking at ways of assessing teacher performance.

Dr. Cody remarked that with a shift in resources of supervisory time and the addition of teachers into the process and with a focus on tenure decisions and on teachers having difficulty, the ability to collect observations on what was happening in the classroom rose. Lots of data and information can be gathered by extended observation over time. In this case they were only talking about a few people out of 6,000 teachers; therefore, the nature of the task could be much more varied than they thought about in the past. He would like to talk with MCEA and others about involving teachers in the tenure decision and having a personal development plan for all teachers. While the mentoring plan was important, that had to do with duties and responsibilities and would take some time to work out. In regard to teachers in trouble, he thought that as they looked at this carefully they already had something that was not too different from what was being recommended. He said it was constructive to involve the profession more actively in the decision of who got licensed. He asked whether they were recommending that teachers be involved concerning dismissal. Mr. O'Keefe replied that they did suggest involving teachers in the evaluation of the teacher in difficulty.

Dr. Cody recalled that recently in the media there was an announcement that a school system was going to recommend 17 teachers for nonrenewal. In Montgomery County they made no public announcements, and usually teachers who were not going to be renewed were persuaded to resign. There was a perception that MCPS did not deal with problems, but they did in an effective manner.

Mr. O'Keefe said they had to look at the mechanical structure of the form in use for evaluation because a teacher could be seriously deficient in an important area of performance but if that teacher got good scores on the other parts, the teacher would not be in trouble. He was not sure they had to publicize how many teachers were not renewed. He thought it was a matter of building confidence at the school level that the issues were being dealt with.

Mrs. Praisner commented that when she was in a PTA role she had seen many occasions when if a parent community had its own way, a teacher would be counseled out of teaching. When that teacher was moved to another community, that community thought they had the best teacher in the system. She agreed that they had to review and refine the evaluation process, but she was a little nervous when she heard that parent communities would feel more comfortable if they knew that something was being done. What they meant by this was that the teacher had to go, and in many cases it was the match that was wrong rather than the teacher. Mr. O'Keefe thought that the match should be corrected and pointed out that he did not say the teacher should be dismissed. He said they were talking about a process whose first purpose would be to counsel that individual and identify training to make that individual more effective. It seemed to him that one thing would be a relocation to a different school community. Mrs. Praisner

recommended that Board members look at the publication sponsored by AASA and the principals' associations on teacher evaluation which was consistent with the recommendations of the Commission.

Dr. Pitt said that the idea of not providing the same evaluation process for all teachers made sense. However, he had found that sometimes the idea of transferring someone who wasn't doing well to be a "cop out." It was easier to transfer someone than face the possibility of doing a good job of evaluation. He agreed that the evaluation form itself needed improvement, but he pointed out that a lot had to do with the willingness of the evaluator to recognize that the person had problems. He thought that part of being a good evaluator was being trained to be a good observer. When there was a special evaluation they did bring in supervisors and others to observe the classroom process and try to determine what was happening with children in that classroom. He asked about the need to assure that the evaluator was well trained. A good teacher or a principal wasn't necessarily someone who was a skilled observer.

Dr. Cody commented that the problem right now was that they had to have a certain number of "unsatisfactories" before someone was considered for dismissal. If they used the same form for everyone, the question was how many did you have to have before dismissal. If they put that whole issue aside, the special evaluation might not necessarily be for a person's full set of responsibilities. It might be for a specific area, especially if their initial objective was to help. He agreed that the present form and the way it was used were not constructive.

Mr. O'Keefe agreed with Dr. Pitt that this was a professional activity that could not be handled by a mechanical form with a checklist. While it might be comfortable to do it that way, it was ineffective and did not do the job that needed to be done. He explained that they were talking about a process that in its first intent was to try to make that person more effective as a professional.

It seemed to Dr. Shoenberg that the one thing that was good about the evaluation instrument they had now was that it suggested that there were judgments possible and that we were not simply going with things they could measure. The Commission's recommendation was to have more people involved in that process so that they would have a series of judgments that converged on a particular conclusion. He did not think that freed them from trying to find other ways of measuring outcomes. He noted that the process of mentoring was going to take time, and he was uneasy about taking teachers away from students. It seemed to him at some place they had to talk about the way they organized for instruction and using the teacher's time in different ways. It would not be taking "the" teacher away from "a" group of students, but rather taking one experienced member of the team away from different groups of students whose education that person was supervising.

Mrs. Slye thought that the professional development plan was an

excellent concept with the potential for many uses. She could imagine if training were coordinated and teachers had an opportunity to sit down and discuss needs and critical needs were subsequently identified within the system, that there would be a systematic way to find those teachers who had availed themselves for those professional opportunities. Mr. O'Keefe replied that they did view this in a broader sense than just the individual's personal plan. They talked about the team work within the school and the sum total of the personal development plans as a professional development program for the school. In a large high school the teachers would assess their own effectiveness as a group and training for them as a group or for individuals within that group. The plans really related to the broader context of the school, its goals, and its objectives for the upcoming years.

Mrs. Slye had in mind an interlocked effort which would become a valuable resource for the system to say they anticipated having these types of professional needs and had this many professional staff members who had progressed so far toward being able to meet these. Mr. O'Keefe emphasized that the identification of those needs had to emerge out of the individual teachers and the individual schools. Mrs. Slye agreed that it had to flow up. She could see great value in dissemination of information as it related to the whole organization so that the teacher would have a strong sense of where their background and professional development put them in terms of the system's development as a whole.

Mrs. Praisner commented that the professional development component was consistent with what the State Commission on School-based Administration recommended as a component of the evaluation of principals. The Commission recommended to Superintendent Hornbeck the development of a personal professional development plan. The individualization of that plan was to meet the individual person's needs not for weakness but as a growth plan.

Dr. Carl Smith stated that he had been involved in evaluating teachers for 10 or 15 years. It was never the really poor teacher who was difficult to evaluate or separate, and it was certainly never the excellent teacher. It was the marginal teacher who was relatively uncommitted. That teacher might be holding three jobs and teaching was only one of them. He thought that motivation and career incentive might help, but if the goal was excellence, he wanted to know how to begin to deal with that group of professionals. It seemed to Mr. O'Keefe that the personal development plan became the most powerful tool an evaluator could have. The intent of the plan was to link evaluation with training to help that person improve. One strategy was how to refresh people and recharge them. Dr. John Diggs commented that one of the most effective factors in stimulating growth was the involvement of the individual in self appraisal. Once that individual identified their needs in order to be effective, that person began to grow. As Mr. Ewing had discussed earlier, it was difficult to separate all of the things. He was reluctant to be on the side of increased flexibility, but he would not support increased flexibility without accountability. If a

person participated in personal development, a determination could be made at the end of the year as to whether their growth and development needs had been satisfied and whether they could see some changes in outcomes. He said they had to look at test scores, but not exclusively. He thought that involving the educator in self appraisal, identification of his or her own needs, and being involved in their own professional growth would pay later dividends.

Dr. Kenneth Muir reported that the average principal in an elementary school doing the minimum would have to spend 12 days a year on evaluation. An elementary principal would spend 39 percent of that time evaluating experienced teachers, and in a high school it would be more than 12 days and up to 44 percent experienced teachers. Presumably they could use that time and not increase the principal's commitment on some of these professional development plans. Mrs. Praisner thought in some cases the implication was that the principal's involvement was decreased. Mr. O'Keefe explained that the time got shifted over to what amounts to the professional development interaction.

Dr. Cronin pointed out that they continually heard that Fairfax was doing a better job. He asked if the Commission made the distinction that Montgomery County did have an employee union which was not the case in Fairfax. In several evaluation situations, there might be a negative decision, and very often elements of the process became the subject of grievances. He wondered how they put into the equation that which must be done to maintain the process predicated on an entirely grievable process. He was concerned that the more collegial aspects of the plan might void the process which, in turn, might lead them to all sorts of grievances and a return of process right back to where they were now.

Mr. O'Keefe recognized those problems. The Commission was proceeding with the conviction that the kind of professionalism they were recommending was in the best interest of everyone, including the teachers, the union, the school system, and the community. They were recommending that some of the discussion of these issues take place outside of the formal bargaining process and in a collegial environment. They were asking that all parties step back from formal conversation and try to figure out what made educational and professional sense. They were convinced that what emerged from those discussions could be translated by the parties into something that could work. They were not suggesting that there would not be some guarantee of due process. He said they were proceeding with a confidence that these collegial discussions could take place and that they could make progress on the issues.

It seemed to Dr. Diggs that in terms of managing the process it would be easier to hold one accountable if that person had been given the increased flexibility. It would be a "cop out" for a person to say in terms of his or her evaluation that he or she had no options in the matter and was mandated to use this curriculum or that text. Given the degree of flexibility recommended by the Commission, he thought the process would be more easily managed in terms of

grievances.

Mr. Ewing asked if they would agree that the success of the professional development plan required as much in the way of training of supervisors as it did the training of teachers in order for it to have a beneficial effect for either the teacher or the supervisor or the school system as a whole. In his working career, perhaps two of his supervisors had had any interest in his development or thought that that had any relationship to the well-being of the organization. He thought that was probably the norm. While the federal government had a description of individual development plans in its personnel regulations, he doubted that one percent of its employees had these plans. This did not happen because supervisors did not require it because no one really believed in it, took it seriously, or thought it was important. Even when it was in place, the training available did not inspire a great deal of enthusiasm. Even when a plan was in place, there was not the notion that it was the duty of the supervisor to see to this commitment. He suspected part of the reason was that supervisors were never trained to do this and there was no reward for helping people. He thought this was general in American society. To do what the Commission was proposing flew in the face of all of the traditions of the American workplace which were for the most part very authoritarian and not collegial at all. While he thought the professional development was a good idea, he thought it required a lot of work, energy and training on the part of the supervisor to make it work.

Dr. Shoenberg suggested that if they were going to make the professional development plan idea work, they were going to have to think about the kind of in-service they offered. The program was now geared toward training large numbers of people for particular needs such as computers in the classroom. Here they would be trying to individualize training. Mrs. Wiecking pointed out that the Commission was recommending much more than just school system in-service training. Sometimes this would involve bringing a consultant in or sending teachers off to a seminar.

Mrs. Praisner commented that they should not lose sight of the fact that their in-service training must continue to meet the needs of the school system at the same time which would mean more resources and perhaps a better monitoring of what was needed. They had seen some school goals with the minigrants, and in many cases schools had identified needs and brought in consultants.

In regard to compensation and career structure, Mr. O'Keefe stated that they had discussed compensation in their first meeting. With regard to the structure of the teaching career, it was a highly structured and rather rigid career pattern. It had a heavy work load, and there was limited potential for variety, for other responsibilities, for greater responsibilities, and for high salary associated with those greater responsibilities if the person remained in the classroom. The structure of the teaching profession was such that it drew people out of the classroom. To get ahead, to gain greater stature, and greater financial reward, the teacher had to

leave teaching, not perform better in the classroom. They had to create a more professional working environment where the individual had more control and more responsibility. One of the differences between a professional and a nonprofessional was the amount of judgment one exercised in how you used your own time to accomplish ends that you had agreed upon with the person for whom you were performing the services. What this meant was a broader range of responsibilities, the ability to be a mentor on occasion, the ability to do curriculum development or run a training program, and the ability to shift back and forth between roles. Ultimately that person would have the ability to gain a higher salary for staying in that classroom and being a teacher. He pointed out that some people would not want to do these other things; therefore, the salary structure needed to recognize that.

Mr. O'Keefe said they saw three tiers in teaching careers. The first one would be the person new to the system. That person was in the classroom and was being mentored. The more experienced teacher would become eligible to be a mentor, do training, and do curriculum development. That person would be at a higher pay scale and would be evaluated less frequently. The most senior level would be a teacher doing these other tasks and playing a leadership role. That person would move into an 11-month contract and might be performing some tasks now done by central and area personnel. The key difference between this plan and the plan in the neighboring county would be that MCPS would put no limit on the number of people who would work into these higher levels. This was not a merit pay plan which limited the number of people who could earn those higher levels. In regard to pay scale, Mr. O'Keefe said the beginning salaries would be competitive with those of other employers. The career salaries in the higher levels would be much more comparable to those in the outside world. The Commission had found that once a person had been teaching for some time, he or she started to fall behind colleagues in other professions. They suggested stretching out the pay scale, which meant that some teachers in schools might be making as much as school-based administrators.

Dr. Pitt asked how the commission would react to the structure they had now regarding resource teachers at the secondary level. That person was selected because he or she was an outstanding teacher, and that person worked with beginning teachers, was paid extra, and worked for a longer time during the year. At the elementary level they had the curriculum specialist as a teacher level person, and that person worked with helping people with curriculum and teaching process.

Mrs. Wiecking thought that not all resource teachers were chosen for their excellence as teachers. She said that many of them were simply willing to take on the paperwork load in the school. Dr. Pitt disagreed and pointed out that the resource teachers were chosen for excellence and there were any number of people in competition for those positions. Mrs. Wiecking said that what they were trying to do was to keep teachers working with students part-time rather than going into administration.

Dr. Shoenberg commented that the fact remained that the students had a part-time teacher. The problem was the single teacher classroom, and they hadn't even gotten into talking about aides. He said there were a number of teachers now involved with curriculum development, had EYE days, and got involved with all sorts of management issues without ever leaving the classroom. He pointed out that part of the success of the program being recommended involved there being enough work in the system to recognize, reward, and give various opportunities to people.

Mr. Ewing observed that there was a tendency in MCPS to regard suggestions about how things might be done differently as suggestions that were unnecessary because MCPS was already doing that. The Commission was recommending that they needed a structure and a set of expectations associated with that structure so that people would know there were opportunities for them to have flexibility in their careers. People had some of that now, but it was not a regular thing which was well articulated. It seemed to him the Commission was saying they needed clearly articulated statements about what people might expect. Mr. O'Keefe agreed and noted that the principle they felt was tremendously important was that these people be school-based and classroom-connected. This would mean that the school would be using its resources and at its option drawing on resources elsewhere to solve its problems and meet the needs of the youngsters in that school.

Dr. Pitt explained that he wasn't really trying to say that things were all right now, but he did think they had to debate some of these issues openly. He asked about costs and whether the Commission saw this as a question of utilizing resources in different ways. Mr. O'Keefe replied that they did not do extensive cost estimates of the recommendations because they did not carry the recommendations to a level of detail so that one could look at costs. They did not do this because of time and because they felt the details of the recommendations needed to be worked out by the people who were going to implement them. They did think that some of this could be done through reallocation of resources, but they agreed that there would be increased costs, but not excessive costs. All of this could be phased in.

Dr. Cronin was concerned about the recommendation which stated that teachers and principals would be given increased responsibility, authority, and accountability to determine the structure of their school and how they would achieve the goals of learning established by the Board of Education. This would call for budget building and decision making from the bottom up. Mrs. DiFonzo said that she would like to tie accountability in with that question.

Mr. O'Keefe said that that question brought them to the next section. He said the education of a child was an art that could not be reduced to a formula. Each child had various talents and educational needs; therefore, no single school program could be the best learning environment for every child in that school. The management of the

learning experience had to be done by the person who was there making the judgments. That had to be done in a collegial environment where teachers spent as much time as possible on the process of teaching and creating a learning environment. Time taken away from those was counterproductive.

Mr. O'Keefe said that in regard to Dr. Cronin's question they did not make these recommendations unaware of the fact that they were talking about a substantial restructuring of relationships and systems. However, they felt that this had to be done to improve the effectiveness of education.

In regard to accountability, Mr. O'Keefe explained that they were not talking about taking the functions of the Board and of the superintendent and moving those down to the schools. They were not talking about autonomy for schools. Rather they were talking about freeing up a group of professionals in whom the system should have some confidence. These people would be given tasks with specific outcomes and objectives. They would be given the necessary resources and the flexibility to use these resources to accomplish those ends. They would be held accountable for doing so in a way that they could not be held accountable today. Now in education they tended to emphasize inputs and to homogenize. They were recommending working their way toward a better balance of responsibility, authority, and accountability in the interests of more effective education.

As to measuring accountability, Mr. O'Keefe said that now they asked whether the schools were following the prescriptions that had been set, and they also measured how students did on tests. Each year they looked at a whole variety of data, and on the basis of those data they assessed what was happening in the schools. The Commission's point was that school people found it difficult to feel themselves accountable for doing the job because they were being told how to do the job. They were saying there would be negotiation between the Board and the school regarding how the school was going to improve, how it identified its own strengths and weaknesses, and how it identified how it was going to do the job. They did not think the accountability issue was really so much of an issue because they would use the same accountability measures used today.

Mrs. DiFonzo pointed out that there was a recommendation for open transfers to schools with transportation provided within a given limited geographic area. Staffs, principals, and parents would establish the type of school they wanted. If that were done, they might have a school where everyone was happy but where children were not learning. She asked if they were to go into this happy school and tell them they had an ineffective school. The school might point out that they had been told to make this their school and that students were in the school by choice. Yet the Board of Education was going to be held responsible if those students could not read. Mr. O'Keefe said that the problem with this illustration was that they had given the school a single measure of happiness. He said that the Board had not clearly identified that the Board's happiness was based on those students actually learning. He would assume that the Board would not establish a sole criterion of happiness and that

the Board would establish objectives that the students must learn. While this took them back to test scores, it also took them back to judgments about the effectiveness of what was going on in that school.

Dr. Cronin wondered how they would accomplish the system change of the magnitude called for in the recommendations. It seemed to Dr. Shoenberg that they were recommending abandoning the principle of the neighborhood school. They would have to try to make the teaching and learning styles different in each school and have enough variety so that students with a certain learning style would have enough places to go to school. Mr. O'Keefe cautioned that they were talking about staging this and not going to the furthest reaches of the vision suggested by the Commission. They were saying that the community had some expectations on what a school was supposed to accomplish for children. They had some ways of measuring whether a school was doing what it was supposed to do. They would have a dialogue with the teachers, the principal, and the parents on what they expected to be accomplished next year in that school. The professionals would suggest goals, and these would be agreed to. The school would have flexibility to use its resources in various ways but would be held accountable for accomplishing the agreed-upon goals.

Dr. Shoenberg said that point was made in the report that no single school program could be the best learning environment for every child. Here they had given the school the resources and the flexibility to go about setting up the school learning environment the way they wanted to. He wanted to get students back into the plan because from kindergarten on different children had different learning styles. One of the reasons they had problems with students was that the predominant learning style in that school was not comfortable for some substantial proportion of students in that school. While the teachers and the parents might be comfortable, that did not necessarily mean the students were going to be comfortable. Therefore, they needed someplace where those students could go where they could be taught in ways in which they could learn.

It seemed to Mrs. Slye that the Commission was suggesting that inherent in the description of what would be appropriate for that school would be the students' predominant learning style and/or educational needs. This would be the base upon which they would build. She did not see this as the type of thing in which the student would need to use the transfer process frequently. In fact, she saw it as quite the reverse. The Commission was suggesting they now asked schools to provide the maximum amount of differentiation for student needs with a minimal amount of flexibility in resources to do that job. The Commission was asking the Board to change that perspective to permit maximum flexibility in resource allocation within given constraints to achieve the needed degree of differentiation.

Dr. Pitt saw them as starting off in a small way. He saw them saying to a staff that they wanted children to learn certain things. The

staff had so much money for textbooks, materials of instruction, and other components. The staff would develop a plan and use that material as they saw fit, getting some community input and involvement. In that school they might see teachers using very different techniques and very different approaches to the curriculum. This happened now but not very easily. He did have a problem, however. He pointed out that they had so many art teachers, so many music teachers, and so many media specialists. The school might say that it did not need these services and would rather have all classroom teachers rather than specialists. He wondered what would happen to these specialists if a number of schools decided to go this way. He believed that this had worked in some places on a limited basis, but they would run into problems if they allowed it over a greater part of the system.

Dr. Cody said that the term used was indicators of accomplishment, and Mr. O'Keefe had said it was almost like what they were doing now, but he would maintain that it was not. One of the problems now was they used a wide variety of indicators of accomplishment, part of which ought to be in the realm of the professional prerogatives of the local school staff. Now they had curriculum objectives, and as an indicator of accomplishment they sent people to the classroom to see whether or not people were doing what they were supposed to do. Dr. Shoenberg added that they were really testing hard data outcomes of those things that they could measure. In other areas they specified how much time a week should be spent on the activity. They determined what specialized staff should be assigned to a school. In ISM they specified pedagogy. He felt they had to identify all of the indicators of accomplishment and possibly create some new kinds before they could resolve this issue.

Dr. Cody agreed that there was no way to deal with that without coming up with a series of very precise statements defining the different kinds of results they wanted. He commented that this was not an issue that was being worked on in isolation in Montgomery County. A major report has been issued in North Carolina, and the National Association of Governors had a project on restructuring the governance of schools. He thought that this would lead toward modified ways in which a Board of Education could fulfill its obligations and responsibilities to the public and at the same time provide wider latitude and discretion at the professional level and essentially professionalize the business of teaching.

Mr. O'Keefe suggested that they not approach this task centrally. The task ought to be undertaken with the teachers, with MCEA, and with the parents so that a discussion of what the schools would be held accountable for would be a discussion with the people whose children were being educated and with the people who were going to be held responsible for that education.

Mrs. Praisner remarked that the comment had been made that they were in the mode of monitoring input rather than outcome. As they started to come to closure on next steps, they needed to discuss inputs versus outcomes and identify what kinds of outcome measures were

needed. She thought there would be some disagreement about the kinds of input and reports the school system needed to continue to maintain. She said it would be useful for them to have an understanding of what those were now that were required of the local school. She thought it would be useful for the Board to have a list of the demands on a local school. Mr. O'Keefe said they had been unsuccessful in finding such a list, and Dr. Cody reported that there was a list that had been generated several years ago. Since that time, about one third of the items had been cut from the list. Dr. Cronin asked if they were envisioning that a school could explore a variety of methods and organizations or were they envisioning a cluster of schools having the ability to mix and match programs. Mrs. Praisner said that this was not a recommendation of the Commission, and she thought this had been clarified during the first discussion. The free transfer choice was not a recommendation of the Commission. Mr. O'Keefe explained that this was the wrong place to start. The comment was in the report because they felt the process might end up moving toward this. Over a longer period of time they might find that schools would develop some particular style and characteristics and those styles and characteristics might be more attractive to particular parents.

It seemed to Mr. Ewing that the Commission was not saying its recommendations should be implemented all at once. It was suggesting it would be necessary to try out the recommendations in some fashion in some places. He thought that one of the flaws in the report was that there was only one paragraph about accountability, and if there had been more, the Board might have spent less time on this subject. He said that if they wanted teachers to behave like professionals they had to be given the sense that they were participating in the design and the conduct of the work. However, they did not have to be the sole determinants of what the work should be or what its outcomes ought to be. In fact, the Board might decide that it wanted to specify initially among a list of indicators. On the other hand, over time, the Board might be increasingly satisfied with fewer input controls and fewer outcome expectations and move toward being a policy-making board. Teachers would have to understand that this was an evolutionary process, and part of the contract by which they became increasingly in charge of their lives as professionals would be that they had these outcomes measures that would be communicated to them, developed with them, and agreed to with them. Those would be the basis for the way in which the school system as a whole was managed. That would happen over time.

Mrs. Praisner agreed with Mr. Ewing because she was hoping for more discussion of the issue of accountability in the report. She thought that the Commission had given short shrift to some of the flexibility they already had. For example, in reviewing the survey of elementary principals, the Commission stated that only about half felt they had flexibility to rearrange professional staff rather than stating that more than half thought they now had the flexibility with staff. If four out of ten said they had no flexibility in implementing new curricula, that meant that six out of ten did. This meant that maybe there were some things they were not necessarily doing wrong, or

maybe they were doing wrong by not rewarding those principals doing certain things. She said that the success of their being able to convince people that the Commission's recommendations were necessary was in their being able to deliver on the accountability component. Before they could convince anyone including the Council, the Board, and the six principals out of ten who thought they had it good now, they were going to have to have those outcome measures identified and were going to need some help in working through that process. Mrs. Wiecking thought that when they solicited comments they would find some good answers.

Mrs. Praisner said that Dr. Cody was recommending that they now solicit reactions to the Commission's report and recommendations. The Board would then have a discussion with recommendations from the superintendent on next steps. Dr. Cody agreed and said that on the basis of comments received he would bring back a series of processes.

Mr. O'Keefe thanked the members of the Board for their interest and responsiveness. He reiterated that there was no one way to educate young people. They did not know the formula and did not have it. They did know that education was affected when the people engaged in it felt they had a part in creating it and some control and flexibility. They asked the Board to start dealing with these issues as an evolutionary process, deal with these issues, and start down the path. He said that the Commission would continue to work with the Board and with the administration on these issues. Mrs. Praisner thanked the Commission for the work that had gone into their report.

Re: ADJOURNMENT

The president adjourned the meeting at 10:20 p.m.

PRESIDENT

SECRETARY

WSC:mlw