

NUMBER: 32-1990
STATUS: APPROVED
PLACE: ROCKVILLE, MARYLAND
DATE: JULY 23, 1990
TEXT:

APPROVED
32-1990

Rockville, Maryland
July 23, 1990

The Board of Education of Montgomery County met in regular session at the Carver Educational Services Center, Rockville, Maryland, on Monday, July 23, 1990, at 8 p.m.

ROLL CALL Present: Dr. Robert E. Shoenberg, President
 in the Chair
 Mr. David Chang
 Mrs. Sharon DiFonzo
 Mr. Blair G. Ewing
 Mr. Bruce A. Goldensohn
 Mrs. Catherine E. Hobbs
 Mrs. Marilyn J. Praisner

Absent: Dr. James E. Cronin

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

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

Re: ANNOUNCEMENT

Dr. Shoenberg announced that Dr. Cronin was out of town. He welcomed Mr. Paul Shelby, president of the Maryland Association of Boards of Education.

RESOLUTION NO. 445-90 Re: BOARD AGENDA - JULY 23, 1990

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

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education approve its agenda for July 23, 1990, with the addition of an item on ACT-SO and an item on Practical Arts credit.

RESOLUTION NO. 446-90 Re: COMMENDATION - ACT-SO

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

WHEREAS, The National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) has sponsored, on a national basis since 1976, a youth-development program called ACT-SO, an acronym for Afro-Academic, Cultural, Technological and Scientific Olympics, that provides opportunities for African-American youth to compete and achieve in 24 academically-related fields; and

WHEREAS, During the last five years hundreds of Montgomery County youth have participated in ACT-SO with the assistance of the Montgomery County Chapter of the NAACP and many MCPS staff; and

WHEREAS, Through the partnership of NAACP and MCPS staff, many students are provided with coaches, mentors, and counselors in subject areas that extend beyond their regular classroom assignments; and

WHEREAS, The superintendent and the members of the Board of Education have supported ACT-SO activities by disseminating information on the program throughout the school system; and

WHEREAS, The Montgomery County Chapter of the NAACP recently sent 14 local gold medal winners to participate in the 13th annual national competition in Los Angeles; and

WHEREAS, Montgomery County returned from the competition with the largest number of national winners from any political jurisdiction in the country; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the superintendent of schools and members of the Board of Education commend the Montgomery County Chapter of the NAACP and MCPS staff members for their ACT-SO efforts; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the superintendent of schools and members of the Board of Education extend congratulations to the following national ACT-SO winners:

Craig Rice, gold medal in biology
Opal Booth, gold medal in original essay
Cerece Rennie, gold medal in photography
Marlo Swan, silver medal in sculpture
Catheryn Elliott, bronze metal in music composition
Kevin Allen, bronze metal in oratory

and be it further

RESOLVED, That copies of this resolution be given to the six national ACT-SO winners.

Re: PUBLIC COMMENTS

The following individuals appeared before the Board:

1. Mr. Roscoe Nix and Mr. Hanley Norment introduced Cerece Rennie, Craig Rice, Marlo Swan, Catheryn Elliott, and Kevin Allen, ACT-SO winners.
2. Mr. Joseph Gezelter
3. Ms. Judy Koenick
4. Mrs. Betsy Johnson, Richard Montgomery HS PTSA

July 23, 1990

RESOLUTION NO. 447-90 Re: PROCUREMENT CONTRACTS OVER \$25,000

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Mrs. Praisner seconded by Mr. Goldensohn, 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:

148-90	Art Tables		
	AWARDEE		
	Brodhead-Garrett Company	\$	28,500
153-90	Student Accident Insurance		
	AWARDEE		
	Massachusetts Benefits Consultants, Inc.	\$	155,601
157-90	Plumbing Supplies		
	AWARDEES		
	A-1 Maintenance Supply Company	\$	6,002*
	Bay Hydronics, Inc.		2,921
	D. S. Pipe and Supply Company, Inc.		787
	Industrial Controls Distributors, Inc.		3,783
	R. E. Michel Company, Inc.		323
	Noland Company		41,510
	J. A. Sexauer		4,344
	H. M. Sweeney Company, Inc.		377
	Tri Plumbing Supply		8,329

	Total	\$	68,378
158-90	Shade and Upholstery Material		
	AWARDEES		
	Dazian Fabrics	\$	3,477
	Mileham and King, Inc.		11,987
	Rocky Mount Cord Company, Inc.		3,245
	Tedco Industries, Inc.		6,708
	Window Moods, Inc		16,783*

	Total	\$	42,200

July 23, 1990

162-90	Uniforms		
	AWARDEES		
	A-1 Uniform Sales Company	\$	63,807
	Fashion Seal Uniforms		28,589

	TOTAL	\$	92,896
163-90	Air Conditioner Parts and Controls		
	AWARDEES		
	Aireco, Inc.	\$	670
	Associated Controls, Inc.		1,066
	Boland Services, Inc.		2,339
	Capital Compressor, Inc.		1,114
	Kingswell, Inc.		12,797
	Melchoir/Armstrong/Dessau, Inc.		22,797
	R. E. Michel Company, Inc.		3,552
	Meleney Equipment, Inc.		10,548
	National Energy Controls, Inc.		2,124
	Temp Air Company, Inc.		51,751*
	United Refrigeration		41,124

	Total	\$	149,882
169-90	Frozen Baked Pizza		
	AWARDEE		
	Hershey Pizza (dba B & H Pizza)	\$	451,550
170-90	Microcomputer Equipment Supplement		
	AWARDEES		
	Advance Computer Connection, Inc.	\$	5,050*
	Copley Systems Corporation		6,633
	Frank Parsons Paper Company, Inc.		13,941

	Total	\$	25,624
173-90	Power Mowers, Lawn and Garden Tractors		
	AWARDEES		
	Gladhill Brothers	\$	36,750
	Kohler Equipment, Inc.		23,088
	Virginia Turf Equipment Company		32,006

	Total	\$	91,844
	TOTAL MORE THAN \$25,000	\$	1,105,973

* Denotes MFD vendors

July 23, 1990

RESOLUTION NO. 448-90 Re: PRICE INCREASES IN THE FOOD SERVICE PROGRAM

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

WHEREAS, FY 1991 labor and fixed charges will cost \$676,284 more than in FY 1990, food and supplies will cost an additional \$436,159, and dairy commodities will no longer be bonus items from federal sources resulting in increased food purchases; and

WHEREAS, To maintain a financially solvent MCPS food service operation it is necessary to generate an additional \$1,108,443 in revenue in FY 1991; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the price of the elementary lunch be increased from \$1.10 to \$1.20 and secondary lunch from \$1.20 to \$1.30; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the price of student milk be increased from \$.30 to \$.35; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the price of adult lunch be increased from \$1.75 to \$2.00; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the price increases be effective September 4, 1990.

RESOLUTION NO. 449-90 Re: ASBESTOS REMOVAL - HERBERT HOOVER MIDDLE SCHOOL

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

WHEREAS, The following sealed bids were received on July 6, 1990, for the removal of asbestos ceiling tiles in Rooms 151, 161, 162, 164, 173, 175 and floor tiles in Room 151 and the boiler room hallway at Herbert Hoover Middle School:

BIDDER	BASE BID
AES of Maryland, Inc.	\$ 32,885.10
DML Corporation	39,324.00
Marcor of Maryland, Inc.	46,467.00

and

July 23, 1990

WHEREAS, The low bidder has completed similar projects satisfactorily for Montgomery County Public Schools; and

WHEREAS, The low bid is within the staff estimate of \$40,000; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That a \$32,855.10 contract be awarded to AES of Maryland, Inc., for asbestos removal at Herbert Hoover Middle School in accordance with plans and specifications prepared by the Department of School Facilities.

RESOLUTION NO. 450-90 Re: ASBESTOS REMOVAL - SENECA VALLEY
HIGH SCHOOL

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

WHEREAS, The following sealed bids were received on July 5, 1990, for the removal of asbestos floor tile in the cafeteria and Room 110 at Seneca Valley High School:

BIDDER	BASE BID
DML Corporation	\$ 32,732
AES of Maryland, Inc.	42,092

and

WHEREAS, The low bidder has completed similar projects satisfactorily for Montgomery County Public Schools; and

WHEREAS, The low bidder is within the staff estimate of \$40,000; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That a \$32,732 contract be awarded to DML Corporation for asbestos removal at Seneca Valley High School in accordance with plans and specifications prepared by the Department of School Facilities.

RESOLUTION NO. 451-90 Re: ASBESTOS REMOVAL - TILDEN
INTERMEDIATE SCHOOL

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

WHEREAS, The following sealed bids were received on July 19, 1990, for removal of asbestos floor tile in the cafeteria and lobby at Tilden Intermediate School:

BIDDER	BASE BID
DML Corporation, Inc.	\$31,784.00
Asbestos Environmental Services of MD, Inc.	44,902.56
BARCO Enterprises, Inc.	65,060.00

and;

WHEREAS, The low bidder has completed similar projects satisfactorily for Montgomery County Public Schools; and

WHEREAS, The low bid is within the staff estimate of \$37,400; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That a \$31,784 contract be awarded to DML Corporation, Inc., for asbestos removal at Tilden Intermediate School in accordance with plans and specifications prepared by the Department of School Facilities.

RESOLUTION NO. 452-90 Re: CHANGE ORDERS OVER \$25,000

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

WHEREAS, The Department of School Facilities has received a change order proposal for the removal of rock uncovered during the excavation for the fuel oil tank and foundations for the John F. Kennedy High School auditorium addition; and

WHEREAS, The contract for this project contained a unit price provision for rock removal required during the excavation work; and

WHEREAS, Staff and the project architects have reviewed this proposal and found it to be equitable; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education approved a \$62,662 change order to the contract with Columbia Construction Company, Inc., for the removal of rock at John F. Kennedy High School.

RESOLUTION NO. 453-90 Re: AWARD OF CONTRACTS FOR VARIOUS
 MAINTENANCE PROJECTS

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

WHEREAS, Sealed bids were received on July 13, 1990, for various maintenance projects in accordance with MCPS Procurement Practices; and

WHEREAS, Details of each bid activity are available in the Department of School Facilities; and

WHEREAS, All the low bids are within budget estimates, and sufficient funds are available to award the contracts; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That contracts be awarded to the low bidders for the projects and for the amounts listed below:

PROJECT	AMOUNT
Replacement of Fuel Burners Cresthaven and Forest Knolls Elementary Schools	
LOW BIDDER: G & L Mechanical Services, Inc.	\$43,000
Replacement of Heating and Air Conditioning System Randolph Bus Garage	
LOW BIDDER: Baxter Services, Inc. (heating)	18,500
J. W. Cullop, Inc. (air conditioning)	10,941

RESOLUTION NO. 454-90 Re: CABLE TV/TELECOMMUNICATIONS NETWORK
INSTALLATIONS AT VARIOUS SCHOOLS

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

WHEREAS, The following sealed bids for cable TV/telecommunications network installations were received on July 12, 1990, for Ronald McNair (Hopkins Road) and Olney elementary schools and Francis Scott Key Middle School:

SCHOOL	BIDDER	BID
Ronald McNair ES	B & L Services, Inc.	\$ 7,800.00
	B & W Communications	10,500.00
	Harbei Communications Corp.	10,559.28
	E.C. Decker Service, Inc.	10,975.00
	Beltway Cable Services, Inc.	18,970.65
Olney Es	B & L Services	14,900.00
	Harbei Communications Corp.	18,000.00
	E.C. Decker Service, Inc.	18,500.00
	Beltway Cable Services, Inc.	18,605.20
	B & W Communications	20,250.00

July 23, 1990

Burning Tree ES	Contractor:	Donohoe Construction Co.
	Subcontractor:	Robertshaw Controls Co.
	Change Order:	\$40,378
Springbrook ES #8 (North springbrook)	Contractor:	Donohoe Construction Co.
	Subcontractor:	Barber-Colman Pritchett, Inc.
	Change Order:	\$45,818
Viers Mill ES	Contractor:	Columbia Construction Co., Inc.
	Subcontractor:	Barber-Colman Pritchett, Inc.
	Change Order:	\$37,966

RESOLUTION NO. 456-90 Re: QUINCE ORCHARD HIGH SCHOOL -
ADDITION

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

WHEREAS, On July 10, 1990, the following bids were received for the construction of an addition to Quince Orchard High School:

BIDDER	BID AMOUNT
1. The McAlister-Schwartz Company	\$ 1,899,144
2. Columbia Construction Company, Inc.	1,944,000
3. Henley Construction Co., Inc.	1,951,758
4. Caldwell and Santmyer, Inc.	1,986,000
5. Kimmel & Kimmel, Inc.	2,001,400
6. Dustin Construction, Inc.	2,002,800
7. C.M. Parker & Co., Inc.	2,014,400
8. Northwood Contractors, Inc.	2,018,000
9. Thurman Company	2,024,948
10. The Gassman Corp.	2,033,000
11. Hess Construction Company	2,042,400
12. Bildon, Inc.	2,050,000
13. Ronald Hsu Construction Co., Inc.	2,137,800
14. H.V. Lancon Construction Co.	2,138,243
15. Regina Construction Corporation	2,160,800

and

WHEREAS, The low bid is below the staff estimate of \$2,200,000;
and

WHEREAS, The McAlister-Schwartz Company has completed capital projects satisfactorily for Montgomery County Public Schools; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That a \$1,899,144 contract be awarded to The McAlister-Schwartz Company for the construction of the addition at Quince Orchard High School in accordance with plans and specifications prepared by Grimm & Parker Architects.

RESOLUTION NO. 457-90 Re: TELECOMMUNICATIONS NETWORK
INSTALLATIONS AT VARIOUS SCHOOLS

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

WHEREAS, Installation services are needed to provide telecommunications networking at new and modernized schools; and
WHEREAS, Our engineering consultants and facilities staff have determined that cost, quality, and schedules can be maintained best through contracts based on an hourly rate structure; and

WHEREAS, Sealed bids were received on July 12, 1990, from firms that provide telecommunications network installation services; and

WHEREAS, Our consultant determined that the low bidder met the specification requirements and the lowest unit prices are reasonable, and sufficient funds are available to award the contract; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That B & W Communications be awarded a contract based on an hourly rate structure for a total of \$100,000 for the installation of telecommunications networks and associated work at new and modernized schools.

RESOLUTION NO. 458-90 Re: ARCHITECTURAL APPOINTMENT - ROBERT
E. PEARY CENTER RESTORATION

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

WHEREAS, It is necessary to appoint an architectural firm to provide professional and technical services during the design and construction phases of the proposed Robert E. Peary Center restoration; and

WHEREAS, Funds for architectural planning were appropriated as part of the FY 1991 Capital Budget; and

WHEREAS, The architect currently under contract with the Montgomery County Department of Facilities and Services to restore the Robert E. Peary Center as a community center has agreed to transfer their contract to perform the architectural and engineering services for the conversion of the building to a holding school facility; and

WHEREAS, Staff has negotiated a fee for the necessary architectural services; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the Montgomery County Board of Education enter into a contractual agreement with the architectural firm of Duane, Elliott, Cahill, Mullineaux and Mullineaux, to provide professional services for the Robert E. Peary Center conversion project for a fee of \$570,000, which is 6.2 percent of the estimated construction cost.

RESOLUTION NO. 459-90 Re: GRANT OF UTILITY EASEMENT TO THE
 POTOMAC ELECTRIC POWER COMPANY AND
 THE CHESAPEAKE AND POTOMAC
 TELEPHONE COMPANY AT SPRINGBROOK HS

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

WHEREAS, The Potomac Electric Power Company (PEPCO) and the Chesapeake and Potomac Telephone Company (C&P) have requested a public utility easement for the placement and maintenance of underground electrical power and ancillary energy transmission and distribution facilities; and

WHEREAS, This utility easement consists of a 10-foot wide easement running along a portion of the abandoned rights-of-way of Meadowbrook and Valley Brook Drives adjacent to Springbrook High School; and

WHEREAS, All construction, restoration, and maintenance will be performed at no cost to the Board of Education with PEPCO, C&P and their contractors assuming liability for all damages or injury; and

WHEREAS, The proposed utility easement will not affect any land anticipated to be utilized for additional school parking; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the president and secretary be authorized to execute a utility easement to the benefit of the PEPCO and C&P for the land required to place and maintain underground electrical power and ancillary energy transmission and

distribution facilities on abandoned rights-of-way adjacent to Springbrook High School.

RESOLUTION NO. 460-90 Re: FY 1991 SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION TO DEVELOP A PROGRAM FOR TEACHING CHINESE AND JAPANESE IN THE UPPER ELEMENTARY GRADES

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Mrs. Praisner 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 in the following categories an FY 1991 supplemental appropriation of \$123,105 from the USDE under Title VI of the Higher Education Act of 1965, as amended, International Research and Studies Program, to develop a program for teaching Chinese and Japanese in the upper elementary grades:

CATEGORY	POSITIONS*	AMOUNT
2 Instructional Salaries	1.8	\$ 82,302
3 Other Instructional Costs		16,056
10 Fixed Charges		24,747
	---	-----
Total	1.8	\$ 123,105
	---	-----

* 1.0 Teacher A-D (10 month)
.8 Secretary, Grade 10

and be it further

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

RESOLUTION NO. 461-90 Re: FY 1991 SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION FOR A FAMILY TRANSITION STUDY

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Mrs. Praisner 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 in the following categories an FY 1991 supplemental appropriation of \$74,969 to conduct a family transition study:

CATEGORY	POSITIONS*	AMOUNT
4 Special Education	1.0	\$ 60,919
10 Fixed Charges		14,050
	---	-----
Total	1.0	\$ 74,969
	---	-----

* .5 Testing & evaluation assistant (12 month), Grade 18
 .5 Model development specialist (12 month), Grade 23

and be it further

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

RESOLUTION NO. 462-90 Re: TUITION FOR OUT-OF-COUNTY AND OUT-OF-STATE PUPILS FOR FY 91

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

WHEREAS, Resolution 364-77 that established the basis for nonresident tuition charges provides that the per pupil cost shall be based on the current year's estimated operating cost, including debt service; and

WHEREAS, The basis for the calculation of cost per pupil for tuition purposes in FY 91 is as follows:

	Kdg.	Elementary	Middle Int. Senior	Special Education
Est. Num. of Pupils	8,749	44,410	43,622	4,505
Out-of-County Maryland Pupils				
Cost:				
Reg. Pgm.	\$32,545,738	\$252,075,914	\$297,278,447	\$60,987,134
Dbt. Svs.	1,944,465	15,068,983	14,801,603	1,528,614
	-----	-----	-----	-----
Total	\$34,490,203	267,144,897	312,080,050	62,515,748
	-----	-----	-----	-----

Cost P/P:				
Reg. Pgm.	2,838	5,676	6,815	13,538
Dbt. Svs.	170	339	339	339
	-----	-----	-----	-----
Total	3,008	6,015	7,154	13,877
	-----	-----	-----	-----

Full Day Kg.:	
Reg. Pgm.	5,676
Dbt. Svs.	339

Total	6,015

	Kdg.	Elementary	Middle Int. Senior	Special Education
Out-of-State Pupils*				
Cost:				
Reg. Pgm.	\$32,545,738	\$252,075,914	\$297,278,447	\$60,987,134
Dbt. Svs.	1,974,015	15,297,980	15,026,537	1,551,844
	-----	-----	-----	-----
Total	34,519,753	267,373,894	312,304,984	62,538,978
	-----	-----	-----	-----

Cost P/P:				
Reg. Pgm.	2,838	5,676	6,815	13,538
Dbt. Svs.	172	344	344	344
	-----	-----	-----	-----
Total	3,010	6,020	7,159	13,882
	-----	-----	-----	-----

Full Day Kg.:	
Reg. Pgm.	5,676
Dbt. Svs.	344

Total	6,020

now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the tuition rates for out-of-county Maryland pupils and out-of-state pupils for the 1990-91 school year shall be:

	Out-of-County	Out-of-State*
Kindergarten		
Half Day	\$ 3,008	\$ 3,010
Full Day	6,015	6,020
Elementary	6,015	6,020
Secondary	7,154	7,159
Special Education	13,877	13,882

* Out-of-state students are charged slightly more because the amount of debt service reimbursed to Montgomery County by the State of Maryland is included in the calculation of out-of-state tuition. In FY 91, the total projected debt service to be paid by the county is \$33,850,390, of which \$506,710 will be reimbursed by the State of Maryland. This is only one percent of the total cost of debt service, and is equal to approximately \$5 per pupil.

RESOLUTION NO. 463-90 Re: BUS ROUTE SUPERVISOR POSITIONS

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

WHEREAS, Bus route supervisors have worked during the summer for the past several years to review and modify routes and supervise 300 bus operators and attendants who work during the summer; and

WHEREAS, The Board's request in the FY 91 Operating Budget to change the 12 bus route supervisor positions from 10- to 12-month status was not approved by the County Council; and

WHEREAS, The restoration of this cut should have been included in the Board's June 19, 1990, final action on the FY 91 Operating Budget; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the 12 bus route supervisor positions in the Division of Transportation be converted from 10- to 12-month status.

RESOLUTION NO. 464-90 Re: PERSONNEL APPOINTMENT

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

RESOLVED, That the following personnel appointment be approved:

July 23, 1990

APPOINTMENT	PRESENT POSITION	AS
William D. Monie, Jr.	Specialist, Personnel Info. Services Dept. of Personnel Services	Staffing Specialist Div. of Staffing, Dept. of Personnel Services Grade N Effective: 7-24-90

Re: ANNOUNCEMENT

Dr. Pitt noted the death of Dr. Joseph Tarallo, former associate superintendent for administration, who had retired about 15 years ago after a long career with MCPS.

Re: INTERIM REPORT OF THE MENTAL HEALTH
ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Dr. Lee Haller, chair of the Mental Health Advisory Committee, stated that the paper sent to the Board outlined what the new committee had accomplished so far. He commented that the Board had created this committee which consisted of almost 30 people and asked that the Board use this committee. He suggested that Board and staff call him directly about mental health issues. Mental health problems included suicide, substance abuse, truancy, vandalism, gangs, physical and sexual abuse, and staff morale and mental health. He introduced Dr. Joseph Ridky, Dr. Diane Powell, Dr. Joan Dodge, Mr. Arthur Nimitz, Ms. Judith Madden, Ms. Marge Samels, and Dr. Phillip Bashook.

Dr. Haller remarked that while MCPS was a productive and successful school system it was not successful in identifying emotionally impaired students. At any given point in time in the United States, there were approximately 10 to 15 percent of youth having a diagnosable mental illness. In MCPS, they had identified less than 1 percent. Theoretically Levels 1 to 6 in special education should be a pyramid with the vast majority of people in Level 1 and fewer and fewer people as the level of service increased. Mental health services were practically non-existent in Levels 1, 2, and 3, but Levels 4, 5, and 6 had waiting lists lots of times. They would like to find a way to see that more students were identified which would be a prevention of the use of more expensive services at Levels 4, 5, and 6.

Dr. Haller stated that to the extent that they could identify students earlier it served two purposes. It served students with the problem, and it served the rest of the students in the class because the time of the teacher and counselor would not be taken up by the student with the problem. To the extent they could get

these students identified, properly placed and treated, it freed the people in the regular classroom to do their job. Once students were identified, they needed to be diagnosed. Emotional illness was an illness needing treatment. Treatment without diagnosis was not good treatment. MCPS was not in the position of diagnosing people. The job of the school system was to identify these children and make appropriate referrals. It was important that MCPS make use of all the county agencies. He said that every time he talked to staff about mental health services he was told they could not refer students out. This limited the use of available mental health services. They had a regulation which told people how to make the referrals, but he had been told that the regulation was not to be utilized and that they could not refer to anyone but PACT. The committee would continue to work on this issue to see that children were properly diagnosed.

Dr. Pitt said he would like to meet with Dr. Haller to discuss this concern. They did have a regulation and, if the regulation wasn't working right, he would like to know why and what they could do about it.

Mr. Goldensohn asked whether parental resistance to having their children identified was part of the reason for the low number of children in Levels 1, 2, and 3. Dr. Haller replied that while there was parental resistance it was not a major problem. One of the problems they had was definition. The definition was seriously emotionally disturbed, but they said they would give consultation on an "as needed" basis. In the past they had not had the staff, but now they had counselors serving all elementary schools and that should make a big difference. He pointed out that neurological hyperactivity affected 3 to 5 percent of the population, which meant one student in every classroom. If those students were identified, it would help everyone.

Mr. Ewing noted that there was a recommendation that an interagency data collection and reporting system be established to help determine baseline data on actual numbers of students. He understood that very little progress had been made on this issue. The suggestion had been made that the forum for this was Child and Adolescent Service System Program (CASSP) and that this group would address this in September. It seemed to him that it was critical that they be able to determine the nature and extent of the problem. He asked whether it was Dr. Haller's view that CASSP was the right forum or whether it might be the mental health committee. He asked whether there was a need for additional funding.

Dr. Dodge replied that she was the coordinator for the CASSP program which was started about a year and a half ago as an interagency effort to coordinate and plan for mental health services for children and adolescents. Their committee met

monthly and addressed interagency issues. They had found that many children with mental health problems were also involved with Social Services, Juvenile Services, and the schools. It was thought that CASSP should be the forum because it represented the different agencies as well as parents.

Dr. Bashook stated that one aspect of this was how they labelled the children in order to provide the services. Currently if a child was labelled SED with the secondary category being learning disabled or physically handicapped, they kept track of these as SED. If SED was the second or third label, the students were not included in the statistics on SED. The school system could change this and keep count of all SED students. If they did this, they would identify a greater number of children. They also had to look at whether or not these children received SED services.

Dr. Bashook said that the second part was a little more difficult and that was identification and early intervention. Normally the children were identified by a teacher in the classroom as not fitting into the structure. The staff had a team meeting to look at the child's progress and decide whether further services were needed and whether the child should be identified as SED. That process currently had some obstacles to it. The counselors were a major step in dealing with that. As a parent, he felt that it was not that the parents were resistant but rather that they were not sure how to proceed. Parents had spent a year or two insisting that there was something wrong with the child's progress. He thought that somehow they needed to get those children identified in a more efficient way. He suggested that both pieces could be addressed through the school system directly, not necessarily going to CASSP. This would help them get track of the children being brought through the first step even if they were not classified. Then the committee would be in a position to recommend different strategies that had been successful in other settings. Those two pieces would give the data base within the school system and combining that with information from CASSP would give them a broader picture of the number of children being identified and the appropriate level of service.

It seemed to Mr. Ewing that what the task force and the committee were recommending was a comprehensive and systematic approach to the identification of the population in need of service. He wondered if there were mechanisms in addition to the ones described that ought to be used in order to do this. Dr. Haller replied that another approach could be one of education. The primary people dealing with these youngsters were the counselors, and the counselors were not all trained mental health people. Some of them were very, very good in identifying and helping children with lower level problems. Other counselors saw their

jobs differently. He suggested adding this to in-service programs for counselors.

Mrs. Hobbs noted that several months ago members of the Mental Health Advisory Committee had communicated some concerns about the number of meetings, when they were scheduled, and how people were notified. Dr. Haller thought that all of this had been worked out. Mrs. Hobbs said they had been told that the need for home instruction had decreased. She asked whether Dr. Haller was aware of children needing home instruction. Dr. Haller replied that from his personal standpoint the only SED children needing home instruction were those children coming out of a private psychiatric hospital and awaiting a CARD process. These children needed a CARD hearing more quickly rather than home instruction.

Dr. Ridky commented that there were a number of SED students who did require home instruction. He had a recent report on home instruction, and he would provide copies to the Board. He reported that MCPS had been working very closely with CASSP, and they recognized the need for the multi-agency involvement. They were working to overcome obstacles, and one of the biggest ones was legal issues over confidentiality. Gathering data would be a problem and would be done in consultation with the attorneys.

Mrs. Praisner asked whether they had used EYE days for training sessions for counselors on these mental health issues. Mr. Nimitz replied that they were planning a program which would involve psychologists, counselors, and pupil personnel workers. The program was being worked through with county agencies to make all MCPS personnel aware of the mental health services in the county as well as making county agencies aware of MCPS services. Dr. Dodge added that this mental health resource fair would be held on November 29 and would bring a lot of private and public agencies together and would have a training component.

Mrs. DiFonzo requested a breakdown of numbers of youngsters receiving Level 1 to 6 services. Dr. Shoenberg thanked the committee for their report.

Re: ALTERNATIVE ASSESSMENTS

Dr. Shoenberg thanked staff for the two consultant reports on performance assessment and the use of educational indicators for accountability. These were fine reports that were helpful to him.

Dr. Joy Frechtling, director of the Department of Educational Accountability, introduced Dr. Donna Stephens, principal of Hoover MS; Dr. Linda Weber, principal of Rosemary Hills ES; Mrs. Katheryn Gemberling, associate superintendent; Dr. James Myerberg, and Dr. Leroy Tompkins. She reported that there was

interest in performance assessment from Montgomery County and from the state with the Maryland School Performance Program. In addition, the federal government was completing 18 research centers and had put in a center on testing and evaluation with emphasis on performance assessment.

As she looked at education and performance assessment, Dr. Frechtling thought that while there was a lot of potential, she found it frustrating. It did have the potential for providing much better assessment of what children knew. It was exciting because it linked curriculum and instruction and testing and could have a major impact on instruction. She was frustrated because the educational community was at a much more primitive state as far as performance assessment than they would like to be. There were many places developing performance assessment and trying it out, but it was no way near having an off-the-shelf capability. The packages were not there. In addition, performance assessment was very expensive. Developing the assessments and doing the training to help teachers understand how to use them was a resource-intensive process. She estimated that to do performance assessments in a single grade in a single subject matter would cost between \$100,000 and \$200,000 a year and would take several years to get a program.

Dr. Frechtling explained that the other source of frustration was that the utility of performance assessments as an accountability tool had yet to be looked at very closely. For the most part, they had been used by teachers for classroom input. In a meeting in Colorado, some of the leading advocates of performance assessment had stated that it had taken a long time to establish the ways of using paper and pencil tests. It would take a long time for performance assessments as well.

Dr. Frechtling stated that performance assessments duplicated the tasks facing professionals in the field and was a real life task. It realistically simulated the ecology of authentic tasks. The criteria used were similar to criteria used to judge adult performance on similar tasks. For example, there was no right or wrong answer. A student might get an assessment that looked at processes used and at the quality of the answer. The standards corresponded to standards in the larger world. Performance assessments matched curricular goals, current school structure, and the age or developmental skills of students.

In regard to the contrast between alternative assessments and standard paper and pencil tests, Dr. Frechtling explained that performance assessments provided in-depth assessments of selected goals and objectives, but the number of goals and objectives might be limited. For example, this would give them a complex look at a few skill levels as opposed to a quick survey in standardized tests. Performance assessments involved multi-

dimensional and varied responses to a given problem or task rather than simple right or wrong answers. While performance assessment was a task, the responses could range all the way from multiple choice to one where a student would construct something or present a research proposal. Performance assessments could include group as well as individual responses. Performance assessments frequently took place in real time rather than artificially constrained test time. The teacher became the observer or the facilitator of the assessment team or task rather than as a mechanical adjunct. The teacher might be actively assessing students and their skills as the performance assessment took place. This was a different mode of operation and required teacher training.

Dr. Frechtling explained that performance assessments were an integral part of instruction rather than being distinct from instruction. Reports on performance assessments provided indicator and proficiency levels which might include narratives or profiles. Students did not receive a single number. She cited a couple of examples of performance assessment measures.

Having looked at where the state was regarding performance assessment, Dr. Frechtling said they had come up with several suggestions that would allow MCPS to become more familiar with performance assessment. One would be to build into the new science curriculum performance assessments on a gradual basis. Another would be to begin to look at their own CRTs and see where they might be able to expand them to have more performance assessments, especially cross-discipline performance assessments. They were also talking with test publishers so that MCPS could volunteer to do piloting of performance assessments as they were developed. In addition, they wanted to keep looking at what other people were doing especially the federal effort and state efforts.

Mrs. Gemberling pointed out that the state would be doing the CRTs at grades 3, 5, and 8. She had met with the elementary and secondary coordinators and had talked with principals and DEA. It was their recommendation that MCPS focus on constructing its own CRTs around the curriculum with an emphasis on performance assessment particularly with an interdisciplinary approach and try to produce field tests for grades 4, 6, and 7 for the coming year. That would give them three grades tested by the state as well as three grades tested by MCPS. They would look at the field tests to see what kind of correlation they did have between the two. If the correlation appeared to be good, their next priority would be to move into the second grades so that they could have some predicting done to enable them to be better prepared for the first round of state testing at the third grade level.

Mrs. Gemberling said that the only way they would be able to control their own curriculum and mandate student outcomes was to be able to control the assessment component. If they went to a fixed test of any other type, that would become the curriculum. They felt they had to have a way to have their curriculum adaptable at all times in response to Board priorities. If they were geared to a fixed test, they had no way to shift those outcomes. Having the CRTs and making them more of a performance assessment would allow them to get a range of student abilities. This would be critical for them as they moved to a more heterogenous classroom situation. It would be critical for them as they worked with gifted and talented students in the elementary school to enable those students to demonstrate their range of growth. In addition, the new science curriculum was a hands-on approach as opposed to a straight content approach. In order to measure the range here, they would have to use a performance type activity.

In discussions with elementary coordinators, Mrs. Gemberling felt that performance assessment lent itself to interdisciplinary assessment. If they continued to assess contents in separate modes, teachers would continue to teach that way. If they wanted more cross-content instruction, they needed to be doing cross-content assessment.

Dr. Pitt remarked that what they were talking about and what the state was talking about wasn't what a lot of people were doing. He had heard that 19 of the 24 jurisdictions were going to use the new standardized test in almost the same way the CAT had been used. He thought they might have a public relations problem because they were talking about reporting about youngsters based on what they were expected to learn rather than measuring a youngster against some other youngster on a normed basis.

Dr. Shoenberg commented that the discussion had been cast in terms of a testing situation. There were performance assessments that one could use that were not involved in a testing situation. For example, they asked students to write essays. The Sondheim report looked at assessment which relied on the judgment of experienced school people to evaluate the products. A social studies expert would walk into an American history classroom and look at the products that students had produced. He wondered whether it made sense for them to try to talk about performance assessment in this way rather than going immediately to a testing situation that would produce something that was quantifiable.

Dr. Frechtling remarked that at the heart of Dr. Shoenberg's question was the issue of why they were assessing. Some people were trying to use performance assessment to substitute for the purposes that normed referenced testing had been used for. She thought they had to have quasi-testing situations. However,

people wanted each student to have a score. If they were using performance assessment in a softer mode and not going for accountability reporting, then there were all kinds of different ways that performance assessments had been and could be used. They had to think through the questions they were trying to answer.

Dr. Shoenberg said he would take issue that what he had described was not used for accountability. For example, they would want to know if students in an AP English class were doing advanced placement work. Someone could look at the papers written by students and at answers on essay examinations. This did not measure individual student performance, but that kind of judgment when made by professionals was a reasonable measure of accountability and probably interfered less with the educational process the teacher was trying to carry on than anything else. Dr. Frechtling agreed that there was no reason why performance assessment could not be done in that way, but they did have to have certain standardized conditions.

Dr. Shoenberg noted that they talked about goals and outcomes. They could say to the teacher, "You choose any reasonable way to identify that your students have achieved that outcome and show us the products on which you base your claim to have produced that outcome." This did not require a standardization of the question. It required a standardization of goals and some agreement as to what kind of a performance represented achievement of that outcome. Dr. Frechtling would disagree. Most of what they did was high stakes testing because very important decisions were made both by institutions and individuals. When they were in that kind of a situation, they needed to make sure that everyone was on an even playing field. They needed to have certain standards in the tasks given and in the way they were scored. Otherwise, there would be a possibility for misuse and teaching to the test.

Mrs. Gemberling stated that in fairness to teachers and students they had to be careful that they not give a different kind of assessment at the end of the year from what they told teachers and students they wanted them to be doing throughout the year. If they wanted ongoing formative evaluation on the part of the teacher and if they wanted students to stretch, they were going to have to have that kind of test at the end rather than the efficient multi-choice or scantron.

Dr. Shoenberg explained that he was trying to find some way of giving validity to the effective and conscientious teacher who tested his or her students in a variety of ways. He wanted to give some legitimacy to that process by having some outside scrutiny of what it was that the effective teacher did with students. This would not involve standardized questions but

rather standardization of goals. It would allow any reasonable test of that outcome. Dr. Frechtling had talked about a level playing field and equal conditions, and Dr. Shoenberg asked, "Equal conditions for whom?" It sounded to him like it was equal conditions for the teacher. The teacher was the one whose performance was at stake. In a norm referenced test, it was the student and the system but not the individual teacher.

Dr. Frechtling commented that when people talked about performance assessment they used writing as an example. From her point of view, writing was illustrative of a level playing field for the student as much as the teacher. One of the issues involved with writing was the prompt. They had to look at things like the familiarity with the prompt and the wording of the prompt. They now had a situation whether passing the test meant a student received a diploma. Therefore, they had to have a situation where passing a test one year was the same as passing the test the next year. The higher the stakes they attached to the decisions made as a result of a test, the more important standardization became. This circled back to the issues of what the testing was for, the kinds of decisions that would be made from the test, and the kind of use they would make of the information.

Mr. Ewing remarked that he was unhappy with the discussion and was in general agreement with Dr. Shoenberg. He recalled that the resolution approved by the Board asked staff to explore means of evaluating the system and individual school teaching performance. He took as a given that they were stuck with standardized tests. He wanted them to have ways of assessing student performance that were apart from that, not instead of that. He wanted to be able to look at school performance and system performance. It seemed to him that the educational indicator material provided by staff did that. However, he saw them focusing on one form of standardized test for another form of standardized tests. He did not think this produced what he thought they were voting for. He thought they were going to look for some alternative ways beyond standardized tests to look at school performance and student performance.

Mr. Ewing said that if they were developing sets of questions that were the same for everyone in every circumstance he was not interested in pursuing that. He did not want them to spend any more time on that, and he thought they needed alternatives to that. It was his judgment that the state CRT was just another standardized test. He did not feel that MCPS should develop another set of standardized tests.

Dr. Shoenberg indicated that standardized tests meant asking everyone to answer the same questions or it might mean asking everyone to do the same thing. The functional writing test was a

standardized test because everyone had the same prompts, but it did not produce a product where there was a right or wrong answer but rather a better or worse one. One of the examples provided by Dr. Frechtling was a group laboratory exercise which was standardized because various groups of students would be asked to do the same thing; however, they would judge the exercise on imagination and scientific knowledge. This was standardized, but it was of a different nature.

Mr. Ewing stated that there were aspects of performance assessments that were very attractive and useful, and the laboratory example was an interesting one. He thought they needed to go beyond this and writing portfolio exercises. He wanted them to be able to assess schools and to assess the school system. They did not have any way of doing that now. He wanted teachers to have the opportunity to utilize methods for assessing student progress that were tied to goals. He wanted to focus on outputs and results. He did not object to what they all had to do, but he was concerned that they look at other measures and assessments. This required them to do some things they had never done. They had not set statements of what they expected students to know; therefore, it was hard to measure outputs.

Mrs. Praisner wondered how one would report those outputs if they didn't have some way of measuring that had some consistency from school to school. It seemed to Mr. Ewing that if they had some clarity about what they expected the school system to produce, then they could say that in their judgment they had educated the student to X-level in terms of the goals set for students. Now they were using artificial measures of what students knew on a specific test.

Dr. Shoenberg thought they relied too much on artificially constructed measures of student performance which short answer norm referenced tests and criterion referenced tests did. He wanted to do something that would take it to the other extreme which was to validate by external, professional judgment what teachers now did as a way of testing students. He was not sure it was reportable except as the judgment of an expert. Mrs. Praisner said he was saying that the school system would state they had found this school to be meeting the goals set for students. She wondered what the community would say to this. Dr. Shoenberg replied that it was their job to suggest that professional judgment was an appropriate judgment.

Mrs. Praisner pointed out that they had the state process which was being standardized by the state and reported by the state. However, in Montgomery County they would be saying, "trust me despite what you may be seeing about the school based on the state report, the school has been certified by experts as meeting school system goals." Dr. Shoenberg recognized what Mrs.

Praisner was saying, but he did not know of any other way to get away from the box they were in now. Mr. Ewing thought it was up to them to educate the public about what they ought to look for in a good school.

Mrs. Praisner said that the third track would have to be education and faith in that education and information process. That had to be parallel to whatever else they were doing. They would have to educate about what MCPS was doing and educate people at the same time about state efforts.

Dr. Shoenberg commented that all elementary schools displayed art on their walls. They could walk into an elementary school and see where they had a creative art teacher working and where they had an ordinary art teacher working. It had nothing to do with the quality of the products. It had to do with the kind of perception of the world and an imaginative identification with the world that the teacher was trying to produce in the students. He was sure that there were good art teachers who could walk into an elementary school and tell them who was doing a good job of achieving the art goals for elementary school students and who was not. He did not know why this would be different from an assessment of advanced placement essays and literary criticism.

Dr. Pitt pointed out that they had a curriculum that said students were supposed to learn certain things. Once they decided what students should learn, they needed some measure to determine whether students had learned it or not. He would argue that this measure had to apply equally or some way across the board. Board members would want to know whether a school was doing the job, and to get there they would have to use some measures. They had to use some standards for measuring what they saw as the outcomes they wanted in certain areas. They would have to measure this in some way to show where the youngster was. This was different from a standardized norm referenced test which measured where someone was in relation to where other students were, not in relation to where they wanted the student to be. They could use creative forms of assessment in the classroom, and they could have a group of people coming in and making some judgment about the school and the teachers in the school.

Dr. Pitt said they had to make a basic judgment across the board. He suggested a way to pursue that basic judgment was to measure what students had learned against what they wanted them to learn. He said that what Dr. Shoenberg was talking about was part of the teaching process. Dr. Shoenberg said he wanted to use the word "measure" less frequently and use the word "judge" more frequently. Dr. Pitt thought they could do both things. The problem was that the state was also moving in this area. The paper before the Board was only one small step in this process.

Dr. Stephens reported that for the last few years she had worked on improving instruction at the middle level schools. She saw performance assessment as a wonderful tool for them to use for team planning but not to replace all of their testing. She thought it was a way to help teachers make judgments about students and having students involved in making decisions about the kinds of assessments they thought were appropriate. They had considered having a team look at students and do some assessing about where the students were and the progress they had made. She said that the examples cited by Dr. Frechtling would be helpful to them as they tried to make curriculum connections and help teachers work with heterogeneous classes. This would assist students in mastering objectives in a more creative way.

Mr. Ewing said that lately they had taken pride in the designation of a number of schools in the county as schools meeting the objectives and tests of the National School Recognition Program. He had been a school site visitor for this program. It was a very intensive and judgmental process, but it also rested on a variety of indicators related to a set of goals. It seemed to him there was some value in that. They were talking about individual student assessment and school assessment. If there were multiple ways of looking at school performance, they would get some perspectives on multiple dimensions of what was going on in the school or multiple perspectives on the same dimension. This was what he would like to see them work toward. He wanted to be able to look at schools in the richest possible way, and he felt it was important for them to make a series of judgments. They also had alternative ways of getting more quantitative information, and it was his view that the quantitative information was just as suspect as the judgmental information. Most of the data they received did not tell them anything very useful. He did think the goal-oriented statements and the judgments about how far a school had gone toward achieving those goals were very valuable.

Mrs. Gemberling reported that she had been through the national school assessment process. It was very intense, and to have a quality visit and judgment was time consuming. Realistically that could not be an annual assessment in a system as large as Montgomery County. It would have to be in addition to some sort of annual and on-going measure as well because they would not be able to do that every June.

Dr. Shoenberg stated that Board members would like to have some idea of where they were going from here. There was some sense that some of these different kinds of performance assessments were useful but so too was the development of some kind of process for making some judgments about performance as well as testing. He thought they needed to spend some time on that. Dr. Pitt agreed that staff would review this discussion. They needed

to be clear about what they wanted people to learn which was part of the Board's responsibility. He suggested that staff continue with their work. The idea of a variety of assessments where judgment was used was not foreign to them. They might want to pursue this and come up with some models or some ways they might try this out. Dr. Shoenberg thanked staff for the report.

RESOLUTION NO. 465-90 Re: IN-HOUSE LEGAL SUPPORT

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

WHEREAS, The Montgomery County Public School system each year requires significant and costly legal services; and

WHEREAS, An evaluation of a one-year pilot project in which an acting assistant to the superintendent for legal services provided legal support has shown that savings can be made by providing some legal services in-house; and

WHEREAS, Interviews with MCPS legal services users indicated that many recurrent and routine legal matters exist that could be handled by an in-house attorney; and

WHEREAS, The Board of Education is empowered by state law to retain attorneys for advice and representation in legal matters that affect the school system; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education approve the creation of an MCPS Legal Services Unit; and be it further

RESOLVED, That in accordance with MCPS Regulation BOA-RA, the superintendent's designee, in consultation with the ombudsman/staff assistant, shall be responsible for coordinating quality control of legal services; fiscal management; records management; and annual review on behalf of the Board of Education and at the direction of the superintendent; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education approve the creation of two unclassified attorney positions (MCPS attorney and MCPS assistant attorney) and a grade 13 legal secretary position to staff the Legal Services Unit; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education and the superintendent of schools screen and interview applicants for the MCPS attorney; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the superintendent provide the Board with a report after the first full year of implementation of the Legal Services Unit.

Re: BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS

1. Mrs. DiFonzo asked that the Board president send a letter of congratulations to Cory and Ralph Moore. They were recently cited by the state because of their tremendous background, support, commitment, and dedication to working with handicapped youngsters at the local, state, and national levels.
2. Mr. Chang recognized two student activists from MCR, John Sims and Shevin Phishevar.
3. Mr. Ewing reported that the Board had had a memo from the superintendent on the issue of additional space at Oak View to accommodate an expansion of the French and English programs. The Board probably needed to take some action to agree or not agree to expand the availability of space at Oak View immediately. Dr. Shoenberg agreed that the Board officers would schedule this discussion when they met for agenda-setting.

RESOLUTION NO. 466-90 Re: EXECUTIVE SESSION - AUGUST 7, 1990

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Mrs. Praisner 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 August 7, 1990, at 7:30 p.m. to discuss, consider, deliberate, and/or otherwise decide the employment, assignment, appointment, promotion, demotion, compensation, discipline, removal, or resignation of employees, appointees, or officials over whom it has jurisdiction, or any other personnel matter affecting one or more particular individuals and to comply with a specific constitutional, statutory or judicially imposed requirement that prevents public disclosures about a particular proceeding or matter as permitted under the State Government Article, Section 10-508; and that such meeting shall continue in executive closed session until the completion of business.

RESOLUTION NO. 467-90 Re: MINUTES OF JUNE 12, 1990

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Mr. Goldensohn seconded by Dr. Shoenberg, the following resolution was adopted with Mr. Ewing, Mr. Goldensohn, Mrs. Hobbs, Mrs. Praisner, and Dr. Shoenberg voting in the affirmative; Mr. Chang and Mrs. DiFonzo abstaining:

RESOLVED, That the minutes of June 12, 1990, be approved.

RESOLUTION NO. 468-90 Re: MINUTES OF JUNE 19, 1990

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Mrs. Hobbs seconded by Dr. Shoenberg, the following resolution was adopted with Mrs. DiFonzo, Mr. Ewing, Mr. Goldensohn, Mrs. Hobbs, Mrs. Praisner, and Dr. Shoenberg voting in the affirmative; Mr. Chang abstaining:

RESOLVED, That the minutes of June 19, 1990, be approved.

RESOLUTION NO. 469-90 Re: MINUTES OF JUNE 25, 1990

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Mr. Ewing seconded by Dr. Shoenberg, the following resolution was adopted with Mrs. DiFonzo, Mr. Ewing, Mr. Goldensohn, Mrs. Hobbs, Mrs. Praisner, and Dr. Shoenberg voting in the affirmative; Mr. Chang abstaining:

RESOLVED, That the minutes of June 25, 1990, be approved.

RESOLUTION NO. 470-90 Re: MINUTES OF JULY 2, 1990

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

RESOLVED, That the minutes of July 2, 1990, be approved.

Re: DEVELOPMENT OF A POLICY ON
PLAGIARISM

On July 10, 1990, Mr. Ewing moved and Mr. Goldensohn seconded the following:

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education directs the superintendent to develop for Board consideration a policy on plagiarism that covers both students and employees (teachers, principals, administrators, and so forth); and be it further

RESOLVED, That such policy would define plagiarism, give guidance on how to avoid it, and provide serious penalties for it.

RESOLUTION NO. 471-90 Re: POSTPONEMENT OF PROPOSED RESOLUTION
TO DEVELOP A POLICY ON PLAGIARISM

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

RESOLVED, That the proposed resolution to develop a policy on plagiarism be postponed until the Board meeting of August 27, 1990.

Re: A MOTION BY MR. EWING TO SCHEDULE A
DISCUSSION OF THE RICHARD
MONTGOMERY CLASS RANK REPORT

On July 10, 1990, Mr. Ewing moved and Mr. Goldensohn seconded the following:

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education schedule a discussion of the Richard Montgomery High School class rank report and the issues involved; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the superintendent's pilot not go into effect until after the discussion is held, and that the superintendent be asked to spell out precisely what the pilot entails, e.g., how it would work, how long it would last, and what it would mean for students and teachers, among other questions.

RESOLUTION NO. 472-90 Re: AN AMENDMENT TO THE PROPOSED
RESOLUTION TO DISCUSS THE RICHARD
MONTGOMERY CLASS RANK REPORT

On motion of Mr. Goldensohn seconded by Dr. Shoenberg, the following resolution was adopted with Mrs. DiFonzo, Mr. Goldensohn, Mrs. Hobbs, Mrs. Praisner, and Dr. Shoenberg voting in the affirmative; Mr. Ewing voting in the negative; Mr. Chang abstaining:

RESOLVED, That the proposed resolution to discuss the Richard Montgomery class rank report be amended by deleting "That the superintendent's pilot not go into effect until after the discussion is held, and" from the second Resolved clause.

Re: A MOTION BY MR. EWING TO DISCUSS
THE RICHARD MONTGOMERY CLASS RANK
REPORT (FAILED)

The following motion by Mr. Ewing failed of adoption with Mr. Ewing, Mr. Goldensohn, and Dr. Shoenberg voting in the affirmative; Mr. Chang, Mrs. DiFonzo, Mrs. Hobbs, and Mrs. Praisner voting in the negative:

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education schedule a discussion of the Richard Montgomery High School class rank report and the issues involved; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the superintendent be asked to spell out precisely what the pilot entails, e.g., how it would work, how long it

would last, and what it would mean for students and teachers, among other questions.

For the record, Mrs. Praisner asked that the superintendent provide the Board with a memo answering the questions that had been a part of the resolution as he developed the pilot.

RESOLUTION NO. 473-90 Re: DISCUSSION OF MORAL AND ETHICAL
VALUES IN EDUCATION

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

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education schedule a discussion of moral and ethical values and issues in education, and a review of the options for teaching moral and ethical values and issues successfully in Montgomery County schools.

Re: BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS (CONTINUED)

4. Mrs. DiFonzo reported that last fall shortly after the Board had adopted the policy on school-related fund raising she had five youngsters from five different elementary schools who came to her house selling things. Not one of them was from her local elementary school.

Re: A MOTION BY MRS. PRAISNER REGARDING
PRACTICAL ARTS AND THE COMMUNITY
SERVICE COURSE

Mrs. Praisner moved and Mrs. DiFonzo seconded the following:

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education cease reviewing the practical arts credit; and be it further

RESOLVED, That in the interim the Community Service course continue to be a practical arts credit.

Mr. Goldensohn assumed the chair.

Re: A MOTION BY DR. SHOENBERG TO AMEND
MRS. PRAISNER'S PROPOSED RESOLUTION
ON PRACTICAL ARTS (FAILED)

A motion by Dr. Shoenberg to delete the second Resolved clause from Mrs. Praisner's proposed resolution on practical arts failed with Mrs. DiFonzo, Mrs. Hobbs, and Dr. Shoenberg voting in the affirmative; Mr. Chang, Mr. Ewing, Mr. Goldensohn, and Mrs. Praisner voting in the negative:

Dr. Shoenberg assumed the chair.

Re: NEW BUSINESS

Mrs. Hobbs moved and Mr. Goldensohn seconded the following:

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education schedule a discussion of home instruction.

Re: ITEMS OF INFORMATION

Board members received the following items of information:

1. Staff Response to Dropout Study
2. One Year Review - Policy on School-related Fund Raising
3. Quarterly Change Order Report at Various Schools

Re: ADJOURNMENT

The Board president adjourned the meeting to an executive session at 10:55 p.m.

PRESIDENT

SECRETARY

HP:mlw