The Board of Education of Montgomery County met in regular session at the Carver Educational Services Center, Rockville, Maryland, on Tuesday, September 14, 1999, at 10:15 a.m.

ROLL CALL Present: Mr. Reginald M. Felton, President
in the Chair
Mr. Stephen Abrams
Mr. Kermit V. Burnett
Mrs. Beatrice B. Gordon
Mrs. Nancy J. King
Mrs. Patricia O’Neill
Laura Sampedro, Student Board Member
Ms. Mona M. Signer
Dr. Jerry Weast, Secretary/Treasurer

Absent: None

# or ( ) indicates student vote does not count. Four votes needed for adoption.

RESOLUTION NO. 553-99 Re: CLOSED SESSION

On recommendation of the Superintendent and on motion of Ms. Signer seconded by Mrs. O’Neill, the following resolution was adopted unanimously:

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education of Montgomery County conduct portions of its closed sessions on September 14, 1999, in Room 120 from 8:30 to 10:00 a.m. and 12:00 to 1:30 p.m. to discuss the personnel appointments and the personnel monthly report, as permitted under Section 10-508(a)(1) of the State Government Article; and be it further

Resolved, That the Board of Education consult with counsel to receive legal advice as permitted under Section 10-508(a)(7) of the State Government Article; and be it further

Resolved, That the Board of Education of Montgomery County dedicate part of the closed session on September 14, 1999, to acquit its executive functions and to adjudicate and review appeals, which is a quasi-judicial function outside the purview of the Open Meetings Act under Section 10-503(a) of the State Government Article; and be it further
Resolved, That these portions of the meeting continue in closed session until the completion of business.

RESOLUTION NO. 554-99  Re:  APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

On recommendation of the Superintendent and on motion of Mrs. O’Neill seconded by Ms. Signer, the following resolution was adopted unanimously by members present (Mr. Abrams was temporarily out of the room):

Resolved, That the Board of Education approve its agenda and move the Consent Items to the morning session.

RESOLUTION NO. 555-99  Re:  HISPANIC HERITAGE MONTH

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

WHEREAS, On August 17, 1988, the United States Congress by joint resolution authorized the President to proclaim annually the 31-day period beginning September 15 and ending on October 15 as National Hispanic Heritage Month; and

WHEREAS, The purpose of this month is to commemorate the invaluable past and present contributions of people of Hispanic descent to our nation; and

WHEREAS, Hispanic Americans greatly enhance the richness of our national character by contributing their unique blend of African, European, and North and South Native American ethnic and cultural traditions; and

WHEREAS, Population census projections predict that by the year 2050, Hispanic Americans will comprise 25 percent of the total population of the United States and, therefore, be the largest ethnic group in the nation; and

WHEREAS, Hispanic labor has helped to build this country into one of the greatest economies on earth and will continue to do so into the new millennium, as Hispanics comprise almost 40 percent of new labor force entrants; and

WHEREAS, The continued successful educational efforts of Hispanic students and partnerships with Hispanic parents, staff, and community members contribute to the present and future success of Montgomery County, the state of Maryland, and our nation as a whole; now therefore be it

Resolved, That on behalf of the superintendent, students, parents, and staff of
Montgomery County Public Schools, the members of the Board of Education hereby declare the period of September 15 to October 15, 1999, to be observed as Hispanic Heritage Month.

Re: ORAL PRESENTATION ON THE OPENING OF SCHOOLS

Mrs. King toured eight schools with Dr. Weast on the first day of school. In every school, everything was operating smoothly, and the school system is off to a great start.

Ms. Signer acknowledged the outstanding work that school-based and central office staff did to prepare for the opening of schools. This year there were some unique challenges, and she was impressed with the dedication and commitment of all staff. She especially wanted to commend those who opened North Bethesda Middle School and Winston Churchill High School.

Mr. Burnett thanked the teachers and staff who did an outstanding job of moving into the new year. He especially thanked the support staff -- bus drivers, cafeteria workers, secretaries, and building service workers -- who play an important role and integral part in education.

Mrs. O’Neill noticed that the energy of the students affected staff and that the teachers and principals were as excited as the children. She commended staff who made the extra effort to open schools, especially North Bethesda Middle School. She thanked guidance counselors and their staffs for preparing students’ schedules. It was a time of frustration, but staff demonstrated their concern for students. She noted that it was a new beginning with the Reading Initiative in all elementary schools.

Mr. Felton congratulated staff on the opening of schools and their tremendous commitment.

Dr. Weast reported that staff considered everything, and he was very pleased with the opening of schools. The student’s day starts with the support staff, when the bus driver opens the bus door and greets the student, and ends with the same driver.

Mr. Hacker noted that there had been numerous capital projects this year, several with abbreviated construction and maintenance schedules. This was a record year for new schools, modernizations, and the placement of relocatables. MCPS staff did a wonderful job. The Department of Personnel Services set a record by hiring 1,127 new teachers.

Dr. Fountain thought the counselors and support staff did an outstanding job in getting students registered. The building services staff worked around the clock to open some schools.
Dr. Statham thought the opening of schools went smoothly. She acknowledged staff for working many long hours for the benefit of students. Ten new buildings were fully staffed and everything was operating normally. At the present time, enrollment exceeded projections by about 1,100 students in elementary schools, 800 students in middle schools, and 700 students in high schools. She would monitored these numbers to make sure staff is available.

Ms. Marks thought that the Student Information System (SIS) had improved since the beginning of school and the number of calls to the Help Desk had returned to normal. She thanked staff who worked to correct the problems.

Dr. Smith thought the good humor of MCPS staff helped get things done, especially with the SIS problems.

Dr. Seleznov had visited several schools. He also noted that there had been no compliments about special education transportation. He thanked the secretaries, registrars, and counselors for their efforts. Most staff stayed late to get things ready for the students. The balancing of class size will be done during September. It was not the smoothest opening ever, but next year will be better.

Dr. Weast noted that people make a difference with a smile on their face and welcoming students. There were some difficult issues, but he was proud that staff dealt with those issues to minimize the impact on students.

RESOLUTION NO. 556-99 Re: RESOLUTION ON SCHOOL SAFETY

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

WHEREAS, The Maryland Association of Boards of Education (MABE) will hold its annual conference in September; and

WHEREAS, During the business meeting there will be an opportunity to vote on resolutions by the general membership; and

WHEREAS, The following resolution supports student safety; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Montgomery County Board of Education supports the following resolution; and be it further

Resolved, That the resolution be forwarded to MABE for consideration during the annual business meeting.
Handguns and Student Safety

WHEREAS, local boards of education are concerned about the safety of all children, both on and off school grounds; and

WHEREAS, it is reported that gun violence is the leading cause of injury-related death in Maryland, particularly for children between the ages of 10 and 14; and

WHEREAS, the Governor has created a Task Force on Childproof Handguns to study technological advances in the design of guns which can potentially restrict the use of handguns to responsible, authorized adults;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Maryland Association of Boards of Education supports (1) strict enforcement of current laws and strategies and (2) efforts to develop and promote effective strategies to reduce handgun violence and deaths, especially involving children; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Maryland Association of Boards of Education urges the Governor’s Task Force to propose the most effective and practical ways to ensure that handguns sold in Maryland can only be fired by responsible, authorized adults.

Re: BOARD/SUPERINTENDENT COMMENTS

Mr. Abrams clarified that, at the July 28, 1999, meeting during the Board/Superintendent Comments, there was a conversation to delete the teacher evaluation item. He had expressed concern but agreed since the teacher evaluation was of importance to all Board members. It was his understanding that there would be no further committee action until the Board had discussed and taken action on this item. Nonetheless, there was a subsequent meeting of the Research and Evaluation Subcommittee. He raised this issue for comment since the Board might want to abolish the subcommittee since it works outside the body’s desires.

Mr. Felton stated that since the Dr. Weast had wanted more time for consideration of the teacher evaluation item, the Superintendent called a meeting of the members of the subcommittee.

Mr. Abrams thought that was reasonable since Dr. Weast was not present in July; however, he was not informed of the meeting nor invited to it. He was concerned about the participation of several Board members, and said that in the future, the subcommittee should give notice of a meeting to the remainder of the Board members.

Mr. Felton agreed to take Mr. Abrams’ concerns under advisement.
Mr. Abrams thought it was important when there were more than three Board members at a meeting to provide notice.

Mrs. Gordon stated that it was a meeting of the Superintendent and not subject to the Open Meetings Act. Furthermore, there were no decisions made at the meeting.

Mr. Abrams pointed out that the meeting was comprised of the members of the Research and Evaluation Subcommittee.

Mrs. O’Neill stated that there would be a discussion of the full Board; however, the teacher evaluation item should proceed in a systematic and timely fashion.

Mrs. Gordon hoped that the Board was not suggesting that, when the Superintendent had a meeting with some Board members, he must notify other Board members.

Mr. Abrams agreed and said his comments were not meant for the Superintendent. However, there were Board members who were interested in a meeting and they should have been contacted. He suggested that notification should have taken place with no hard-and-fast rule.

Dr. Weast reported that he had had the opportunity to meet with the County Council prior to the meeting. He stated that all elements of the school system must work together to deliver education to children. Staff has met with principals, teacher representatives, and other groups and listened to their ideas. They have been encouraged to collaborate and compromise in working together. These meetings have been for information gathering and no decisions have been made. All elements must work together – curriculum and assessment.

Ms. Signer noted that a local newspaper had reported that the school system was not willing to release math data in the past. She applauded the fact that MCPS had released the data and hoped that MCPS would make public all data without identification of students. It is the public’s business.

RESOLUTION NO. 557-99    Re:   CONTRACTS FOR MORE THAN $25,000

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

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

WHEREAS, It is recommended that RFP No. 1092.1, Professional Program Integration
Resolved, That RFP 1092.1, be rejected due to cost; and be it further

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

SA1497 Uniforms for Supporting Services Staff - Extension

Nick Bloom Uniform Company, Inc. $ 78,277

41-97 Occupational and Physical Therapy Services for Students with Disabilities - Extension

Awardees
Care Rehab, Inc.*
Henning & Cole Therapy Associates Ltd.
Tri-Rehab of Germantown*
Total $ 600,000

213-97 Novell Software License Agreement

Awardee
Novell, Inc. $ 80,000

1062.1 Software Training Services - Extension

Awardees
Bell Education
Delta Micro System, Inc.*
Computer Technology Services, Inc.*
Gestalt Systems, Inc.
Orange Technologies, Inc.
Personalized Computer Training*
Total $ 45,000

1093.1 Propane Gas

Awardee
Suburban Propane Gas Corporation $ 37,530

4006.1 Roofing Supplies - Extension
Awardee
Roof Center $  190,199

4013.1  After-market Automotive Parts - Extension

Awardees
Arrow Auto Parts
Century Ford, Inc.
District International Trucks, Inc.
Total $   95,000

4042.1  Boiler Supplies - Extension

Awardees
Aireco Supply, Inc. $    2,588
Capp, Inc. 67,847
Complete Boiler System 91,804
Hughes Supply, Inc. 54,740
National Energy Control Corporation 4,144
National Supply of Springfield 16,357
Noland Company 45,256
Northeastern Supply 12,780
R & J Supply* 27,535
Dan Rainville and Associates, Inc. 5,000
Southern Utilities Company, Inc. 33,999
Thomas Somerville Company 23,126
Superior Specialty Company 6,500
Total $  391,676

4044.1  Security System Supplies and Equipment - Extension

Awardees
ADI $  55,295
Alarm It Distributors, Inc. 77,375
Capitol Cable & Tech, Inc. 4,921
Granite Security* 1,427
Tristate Electrical & Electronics Supply Company, Inc.* 13,332
Total $  152,350

4045.2  Telephone Equipment
Awardees
Alltel Supply, Inc. $ 323,980
Arcade Electronics, Inc.* 2,426
Cabling System Supply, Inc. 3,610
Capitol Cable & Tech, Inc. 9,735
Cumberland Electronics, Inc. 4,766
Dauphin Associates/Mid Atlantic CBL Connector 1,607
Gaylon Distributors, Inc.* 3,080
Graybar Electric Company, Inc. 80,969
Washington Cable Supply, Inc.* 13,203
WESCO 70,437
Total $ 513,813

4046.1 Automotive Batteries - Extension

Awardee
East Penn Manufacturing Company, Inc. $ 40,911

4075.1 Plumbing Supplies

Awardees
Best Plumbing Specialties, Inc. $ 12,208
Colt Plumbing Company 11,851
Hughes Supply, Inc. 13,596
Noland Company 151,576
Share Corporation 1,650
Superior Specialty Company 27,186
Thomas Somerville Company 121,301
Wolverine Brass Works 2,334
Woodward Wanger Company 472
Total $ 342,174

7004.3 Audio Visual Equipment and Supplies

Awardees
Advanced Computer Concepts* $ 330
B & H Photo Video 2,780
Boise Technology 2,800
Bradley Broadcast Sales 269
BW Color Prints and Presentations 1,750
Century Magnetics, Inc.* 37,272
Crest Audio, Video and Electronics, Inc.*  
CTL Communications Televideo*  
Demco, Inc.  
Lee Hartman and Sons, Inc.  
Herman Electronics  
Kipp Visual/Security System  
Kunz, Inc.  
Landon Systems Corporation  
Longs Electronics  
Metropolitan Audio Visual Corporation  
Peirce Phelps, Inc.  
Nicholas P. Pipino Associates  
Pyramid School Products  
Schoolmart, Inc.  
Total Audiovisual System, Inc.*  
Total $ 504,116

7050.2Photographic Supplies and Equipment

Awardees
B & H Photo Video $2,153
HPI International, Inc. 5,410
Kunz, Inc. 819
Penn Camera Exchange, Inc. 18,732
Ritz Camera 2,271
Service Photo Supply, Inc. 219
Unique Photo, Inc. 3,941
Valley Litho Supply 7,643
Total $41,188

9175.1Latex Running Track Renovations and Repairs

Awardee
American Tennis Courts, Inc.* $198,158

9177.1Resilient Synthetic Surface Tiles for Tennis Courts and Gymnasium Flooring
Awardee
Sport Court of Washington DC $ 574,460

9202.1 Early Childhood Equipment and Supplies

Awardees
ABC School Supply, Inc. $ 8,299
AFP School Supply* 28,209
Childcraft Education Corporation 24,242
Community Playthings 23,900
Demco, Inc. 1,610
Discount School Supply 357
Early Childhood Direct 3,380
Greeting Tree* 4,798
J.L. Hammett Company, Inc. 13,720
Kaplan School Supply Corporation 2,802
Lakeshore Learning Materials 691
Total $ 112,008

MORE THAN $25,000 $4,288,052

* Denotes MFD Vendor

RESOLUTION NO. 558-99 Re: AWARD OF CONTRACTS – BETHESDA-CHEVY CHASE HIGH SCHOOL

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

WHEREAS, On December 8, 1998, the Board of Education authorized staff to utilize a construction management process for the Bethesda-Chevy Chase High School modernization project with work to begin July 1, 1999, and be completed by June 2001; and

WHEREAS, The following sealed bids represent the seventh in a series of subcontracts that were bid as a part of a construction management process for the Bethesda-Chevy Chase High School modernization project:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Low Bids</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Consultant’s Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Building Concrete</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pioneer Contracting, Inc.</td>
<td>$2,150,000</td>
<td>$1,941,003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Asian-American owned, MDOT certified)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Exterior Fencing and Athletic Equipment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Fence Company</td>
<td>$186,776</td>
<td>$131,595</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fire Sprinklers</strong></td>
<td>$633,000</td>
<td>$455,817</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire-Mak, Inc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Submitted 14 percent, female owned, MDOT certified)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fireproofing</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diamond Engineering Corporation</td>
<td>$575,000</td>
<td>$390,314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Historic Preservation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worcester Eisenbrandt, Inc.</td>
<td>$1,382,000</td>
<td>$426,553</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lockers</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steel Products, Inc.</td>
<td>$298,765</td>
<td>$230,189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Miscellaneous Metals</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. A. Halac Iron Works, Inc.</td>
<td>$1,150,000</td>
<td>$570,424</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Painting and Caulking</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Precision Wall Tech, Inc.</td>
<td>$269,296</td>
<td>$306,634</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Female owned, MDOT certified)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Roofing, Buildings A and C</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orndorff &amp; Spaid, Inc.</td>
<td>$498,947</td>
<td>$115,772</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Roofing, Buildings B, D, E, and F</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orndorff &amp; Spaid, Inc.</td>
<td>$596,811</td>
<td>$430,768</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Windows - Aluminum and Greenhouse</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineered Construction Products, Ltd.</td>
<td>$724,000</td>
<td>$673,189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Submitted 15.8 percent, Hispanic participation)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
WHEREAS, The aggregate minority business participation for the subcontracts bid to date is 45.7 percent; and

WHEREAS, All bids received were over the consultant’s estimate; and

WHEREAS, Staff has apprised Board of Education members that a request for a supplemental appropriation will be sent to the County Council when all work has been completed; now therefore be it

Resolved, That contracts be awarded for the above-referenced subcontractors meeting specifications for the Bethesda-Chevy Chase High School modernization project, for the amounts listed, in accordance with plans and specifications prepared by Dewberry Design Group, Inc.

RESOLUTION NO. 559-99 Re: AWARD OF CONTRACTS – WINSTON CHURCHILL HIGH SCHOOL

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

WHEREAS, On December 8, 1998, the Board of Education authorized staff to utilize a construction management process for the Winston Churchill High School modernization project, with work to begin July 1, 1999, and be completed by November 2001; and

WHEREAS, The following sealed bids represent the seventh in a series of subcontracts that were bid as a part of a construction management process for the Winston Churchill High School modernization project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Low Bidders</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Consultant’s Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ceramic Tile</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELT Contractors, Inc.</td>
<td>$139,000</td>
<td>$85,018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(African American, MDOT certified, minority firm)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elevator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trinity Elevator Corporation</td>
<td>$65,680</td>
<td>$55,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(African American, MDOT certified, minority firm)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
WHEREAS, The aggregate of the bids slightly exceeds the consultant’s overall estimate; and

WHEREAS, The aggregate minority business participation for the subcontracts bid to date is 30.14 percent; now therefore be it

Resolved, That contracts be awarded for the above-referenced subcontractors meeting specifications for the Winston Churchill High School modernization project, for the amounts listed, in accordance with plans and specifications prepared by Duane, Cahill, Mullineaux and Mullineaux.

RESOLUTION NO. 560-99 Re: AWARD OF CONTRACTS – THOMAS S. WOOTTON HIGH SCHOOL - PHASE II

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

WHEREAS, On November 10, 1998, the Board of Education authorized staff to utilize a construction management process for the Thomas S. Wootton High School addition project, with work to begin July 1, 1999, and be completed by August 2000; and

WHEREAS, The following sealed bid represents the seventh in a series of subcontracts that were bid as part of a construction management process for the Thomas S. Wootton High School addition project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bidder</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Consultant’s Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Drywall</td>
<td>$650,000</td>
<td>$394,493</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

and

WHEREAS, The aggregate of the bids exceeds the consultant’s estimate; however, contingency funds are available to cover the overage; and
WHEREAS, The aggregate minority business participation for the subcontracts bid to date is 18.2 percent; now therefore be it

Resolved, That a contract for $650,000 be awarded to Tri-State Drywall, Inc., for the Thomas S. Wootton High School addition project, in accordance with plans and specifications prepared by Samaha Associates.

RESOLUTION NO. 561-99 Re: ARCHITECTURAL FEE INCREASE – THOMAS S. WOOTTON HIGH SCHOOL – PHASE II

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

WHEREAS, Funds were appropriated in the FY 1999 Capital Budget to increase the current Thomas S. Wootton High School addition project by eight classrooms; and

WHEREAS, Staff has negotiated an equitable fee increase with the architect for the additional architectural/engineering services to make design modifications for the addition; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the architectural services contract with Samaha Associates be increased by $209,256 for additional professional architectural/engineering services for the Thomas S. Wootton High School addition project.

RESOLUTION NO. 562-99 Re: ARCHITECTURAL APPOINTMENT – OAK VIEW ELEMENTARY SCHOOL ADDITION FEASIBILITY STUDY

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

WHEREAS, It is necessary to appoint an architectural firm to provide professional and technical services to conduct a design feasibility study of alternatives for the addition to Oak View Elementary School; and

WHEREAS, Funds for feasibility planning have been programmed as part of the FY 2000 Capital Budget; and

WHEREAS, An Architect Selection Committee, in accordance with procedures adopted by the Board of Education on July 14, 1998, identified Robert J. Glaser & Associates, P.A., Architects, as the most qualified firm to provide the necessary professional architectural and engineering services; and
WHEREAS, Staff has negotiated a fee for 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 Robert J. Glaser & Associates, P.A., Architects, to provide professional architectural services for the Oak View Elementary School addition feasibility study project for a fee of $15,000.

RESOLUTION NO. 563-99 Re: ARCHITECTURAL APPOINTMENT – LONGVIEW SCHOOL MODERNIZATION FEASIBILITY STUDY

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

WHEREAS, It is necessary to appoint an architectural firm to provide professional and technical services to conduct a design feasibility study of alternatives for the modernization of Longview School; and

WHEREAS, Funds for feasibility planning have been programmed as part of the FY 2000 Capital Budget; and

WHEREAS, An Architect Selection Committee, in accordance with procedures adopted by the Board of Education on July 14, 1998, identified Burt Hill Kosar Rittelmann Associates, Architects, as the most qualified firm to provide the necessary professional architectural and engineering services; and

WHEREAS, Staff has negotiated a fee for 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 Burt Hill Kosar Rittelmann Associates, Architects, to provide professional architectural services for the Longview School modernization feasibility study project for a fee of $28,000.

RESOLUTION NO. 564-99 Re: ARCHITECTURAL APPOINTMENT – STEPHEN KNOLLS SCHOOL MODERNIZATION FEASIBILITY STUDY

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

WHEREAS, It is necessary to appoint an architectural firm to provide professional and technical services to conduct a design feasibility study of alternatives for the modernization
of Stephen Knolls School; and

WHEREAS, Funds for feasibility planning have been programmed as part of the FY 2000 Capital Budget; and

WHEREAS, An Architect Selection Committee, in accordance with procedures adopted by the Board of Education on July 14, 1998, identified Burt Hill Kosar Rittelmann Associates, Architects, as the most qualified firm to provide the necessary professional architectural and engineering services; and

WHEREAS, Staff has negotiated a fee for 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 Burt Hill Kosar Rittelmann Associates, Architects, to provide professional architectural services for the Stephen Knolls School modernization feasibility study project for a fee of $28,000.

RESOLUTION NO. 565-99 Re: ARCHITECTURAL APPOINTMENT – GLEN HAVEN ELEMENTARY SCHOOL/STEPHEN KNOLLS SCHOOL COMBINATION MODERNIZATION FEASIBILITY STUDY

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

WHEREAS, It is necessary to appoint an architectural firm to provide professional and technical services to conduct a design feasibility study of alternatives for the modernization of the Glen Haven Elementary School/Stephen Knolls School combination; and

WHEREAS, Funds for feasibility planning have been programmed as part of the FY 2000 Capital Budget; and

WHEREAS, An Architect Selection Committee, in accordance with procedures adopted by the Board of Education on July 14, 1998, identified Burt Hill Kosar Rittelmann Associates, Architects, as the most qualified firm to provide the necessary professional architectural and engineering services; and

WHEREAS, Staff has negotiated a fee for 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 Burt Hill Kosar Rittelmann Associates, Architects,
to provide professional architectural services for the Glen Haven Elementary School/Stephen Knolls School combination modernization feasibility study project for a fee of $30,000.

RESOLUTION NO. 566-99 Re: ARCHITECTURAL APPOINTMENT – MONTGOMERY BLAIR COMMUNITY THEATER AT SILVER SPRING INTERNATIONAL MIDDLE SCHOOL FEASIBILITY STUDY

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

WHEREAS, It is necessary to appoint an architectural firm to provide professional and technical services to conduct a feasibility study of alternatives for a proposed community theater at the facility that houses Silver Spring International Middle and Sligo Creek Elementary schools; and

WHEREAS, The Montgomery County Department of Recreation has allocated funds in the support for the arts program for the feasibility study; and

WHEREAS, An Architect Selection Committee, in accordance with procedures adopted by the Board of Education on July 14, 1998, identified Quinn Evans Architects, Inc. as the most qualified firm to provide the necessary professional architectural and engineering services; and

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

Resolved, That the Montgomery County Board of Education, acting as an agent for the Montgomery County Department of Recreation, enter into a contractual agreement with the architectural firm of Quinn Evans Architects, Inc., to provide professional architectural services for the proposed Wayne Avenue community theater feasibility study for a fee of $102,000, contingent upon the receipt of funds to complete this work from the Montgomery County Department of Recreation.

RESOLUTION NO. 567-99 Re: ARCHITECTURAL APPOINTMENT – WALTER JOHNSON HIGH SCHOOL

On recommendation of the Superintendent and on motion of Mrs. Gordon seconded by Ms. Signer, 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 addition to Walter
Johnson High School; and

WHEREAS, Funds for architectural planning were programmed as part of the FY 1999 Capital Budget; and

WHEREAS, An Architect Selection Committee, in accordance with procedures adopted by the Board of Education on July 14, 1998, identified Samaha Associates, Architects, as the most qualified firm to provide the necessary professional architectural and engineering services; and

WHEREAS, Staff has negotiated a fee for 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 Samaha Associates, Architects, to provide professional architectural services for the Walter Johnson High School addition project for a fee of $667,614.

RESOLUTION NO. 568-99  Re:  ARCHITECTURAL APPOINTMENT – NORTHWEST HIGH SCHOOL ADDITION

On recommendation of the Superintendent and on motion of Mrs. Gordon seconded by Ms. Signer, 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 addition to Northwest High School; and

WHEREAS, Funds for architectural planning were programmed as part of the FY 1999 Capital Budget; and

WHEREAS, An Architect Selection Committee, in accordance with procedures adopted by the Board of Education on July 14, 1998, identified Samaha Associates, Architects, as the most qualified firm to provide the necessary professional architectural and engineering services; and

WHEREAS, Staff has negotiated a fee for 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 Samaha Associates, Architects, to provide professional architectural services for the Northwest High School addition project for a fee of $490,600.
RESOLUTION NO. 569-99  Re:  STADIUM LIGHTING - JAMES HUBERT BLAKE HIGH SCHOOL

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

WHEREAS, Funds were appropriated in the FY 2000 Capital Budget to install stadium lights at John F. Kennedy and James Hubert Blake high schools; and

WHEREAS, A contract was awarded to install the lights at John F. Kennedy High School on August 24, 1999; and

WHEREAS, The contractor that installed the lights at John F. Kennedy High School has submitted a price to add the lights for James Hubert Blake High School to the current contract; and

WHEREAS, The cost to install the lights at James Hubert Blake High School, as part of the John F. Kennedy High School contract, is $96,000, which is significantly below the estimate of $130,000; and

WHEREAS, Staff has recommended that the stadium lights for James Hubert Blake High School be added to the current contract for John F. Kennedy High School because the cost is significantly less than the estimate, and this will enable the installation work to be completed in time to use the lights for certain fall events; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the contract with S. Rock/Estabrook Corporation for the installation of stadium lights at John F. Kennedy High School be increased by $96,000 to include the installation of stadium lights at James Hubert Blake High School.

RESOLUTION NO. 570-99  Re:  PARTIAL CAPITALIZATION OF SELECTED CAPITAL PROJECTS

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

WHEREAS, The Montgomery County Office of Management and Budget has recommended the capitalization of countywide capital expenditures incurred as of June 30, 1999; and

WHEREAS, Montgomery County Public Schools’ external auditors, Arthur Andersen, LLP, concur with this recommendation; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the following projects be partially capitalized in FY 2000:
(Amounts in Thousands)

Partial Capitalization of Expended Funds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project No.</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9963</td>
<td>ADA Compliance</td>
<td>$783</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9928</td>
<td>Asbestos Abatement</td>
<td>750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9921</td>
<td>Current Modernizations</td>
<td>13,153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9902</td>
<td>Design and Construction Management</td>
<td>2,467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9903</td>
<td>Educational Technology - Global Access</td>
<td>4,175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9959</td>
<td>Energy Conservation</td>
<td>747</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9926</td>
<td>Facility Planning</td>
<td>452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9997</td>
<td>Facility Wiring</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9918</td>
<td>Fuel Tank Management</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9916</td>
<td>HVAC Replacement/FACE Program</td>
<td>3,595</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9915</td>
<td>PLAR</td>
<td>2,912</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9968</td>
<td>Relocatable Classrooms</td>
<td>2,539</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9942</td>
<td>Roof Replacement</td>
<td>2,481</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9943</td>
<td>School Gymnasiums</td>
<td>3,172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9920</td>
<td>School Security</td>
<td>2,691</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9919</td>
<td>Stadium Lighting</td>
<td>1,102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9925</td>
<td>Transportation/Maintenance Depots</td>
<td>9,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RESOLUTION NO. 571-99  Re:  COOPERATION WITH THE COUNTY ON USE OF THE MONTROSE CENTER

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

WHEREAS, The county asked the Board of Education to locate space for the Lourie Center and Grafton School, which serve youngsters with special needs; and

WHEREAS, The Montrose Center is available for use; and

WHEREAS, The Lourie Center and the Grafton School obtained a package of federal, state, and local government funding for the project; and

WHEREAS, A lease was developed in accordance with terms outlined in a June 1998 memorandum and signed by the president of the Board of Education and the superintendent of schools to enable the tenants to satisfy government funding requirements and begin construction; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Board of Education confirm the lease signed by the tenants and the
president of the Board of Education and the superintendent of schools; and be it further

Resolved, That the Board of Education approve the first amendment to that lease, as requested by the tenants.

RESOLUTION NO. 572-99 Re: NORTHWEST ELEMENTARY SCHOOL #6 – PRECONSTRUCTION/CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT SERVICES

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

WHEREAS, The FY 2000 Capital Budget request includes planning funds to build Northwest Elementary School #6; and
WHEREAS, The design phase of this project is scheduled to start immediately with the construction scheduled to be completed August 2001; and

WHEREAS, Staff has recommended that this project be completed using a construction management delivery system due to its complexities and abbreviated completion schedule; and

WHEREAS, A Consultant Selection Committee, in accordance with procedures adopted by the Board of Education on July 14, 1998, identified Bovis Construction Corp. as the most qualified firm to provide the necessary management services; and

WHEREAS, The management services will be implemented in two phases; and

WHEREAS, The initial phase will consist of preconstruction services for cost estimating, value engineering, and constructability planning; and

WHEREAS, Staff has negotiated a fee for the preconstruction services, and

WHEREAS, The second phase will consist of general construction management services, and a fee for this phase will be negotiated once the construction funding for the project has been approved by the County Council; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Montgomery County Board of Education enter into a contractual agreement with the firm of Bovis Construction Corp. to provide phase one preconstruction services for cost estimating, value engineering, and constructability planning services for the Northwest Elementary School #6 facility for a fee of $55,000.
RESOLUTION NO. 573-99  Re:  ROCKVILLE HIGH SCHOOL – PRECONSTRUCTION/ CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT SERVICES

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

WHEREAS, The FY 2000 Capital Budget request includes planning funds to modernize Rockville High School; and

WHEREAS, The design phase of this project is scheduled to start immediately with the construction scheduled to be completed August 2003; and

WHEREAS, Staff has recommended that this project be completed using a construction management delivery system due to its complexities and abbreviated completion schedule; and

WHEREAS, A Consultant Selection Committee, in accordance with procedures adopted by the Board of Education on July 14, 1998, identified Oak Contracting Corporation as the most qualified firm to provide the necessary management services; and

WHEREAS, The management services will be implemented in two phases; and

WHEREAS, The initial phase will consist of preconstruction services for cost estimating, value engineering, and constructability planning; and

WHEREAS, Staff has negotiated a fee for the preconstruction services; and

WHEREAS, The second phase will consist of general construction management services, and a fee for this phase will be negotiated once the construction funding for the project has been approved by the County Council; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Montgomery County Board of Education enter into a contractual agreement with the firm of Oak Contracting Corporation to provide phase one preconstruction services for cost estimating, value engineering and constructability planning services for the Rockville High School facility for a fee of $145,000.

RESOLUTION NO. 574-99  Re:  MODIFICATIONS TO MINORITY BUSINESS ENTERPRISE PROCEDURES

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

WHEREAS, On July 14, 1998, the Board of Education adopted Minority Business Enterprise (MBE) procedures for state-funded projects; and
WHEREAS, Based on an opinion from the Maryland State Attorney General's office, staff has recommended that these procedures be modified to include a ten-day submission requirement for minority business participation supporting documentation and related information; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the July 14, 1998, procedures for MBE participation adopted by the Board of Education be modified to include a requirement that the low bidder on state-funded projects be given ten days after the receipt of bids to submit the contract information for minority business participation.

RESOLUTION NO. 575-99 Re: UTILIZATION OF FY 2000 PROVISION FOR FUTURE SUPPORTED PROJECTS FOR THE EMOTIONAL DISABILITIES CLUSTER MODEL PROGRAM

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

Resolved, That the superintendent of schools be authorized to receive and expend within the FY 2000 provision for future supported projects a grant award of $65,000 from the Montgomery County Department of Health and Human Services for the Emotional Disabilities Cluster Model Program in the following categories:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Position*</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6 Special Education</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>$54,167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Fixed Charges</td>
<td></td>
<td>10,833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>$65,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* 1.4 emotional disabilities specialists (12-month)

and be it further

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

RESOLUTION NO. 576-99 Re: FY 2000 SPECIAL EDUCATION BUDGET AMENDMENTS

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

Resolved, That the superintendent of schools be authorized to establish 52.0 positions
within the FY 2000 operating budget of the Department of Special Education in accordance with Attachment 1; and be it further

**Resolved.** That the superintendent of schools be authorized to transfer $1,183,000 within the FY 2000 operating budget of the Department of Special Education, including a transfer of $290,000 within the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act grant, to fund these 52.0 positions as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Object of Expenditure</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>To</th>
<th>From</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Wages and Salaries</td>
<td>$1,107,815</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,183,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>75,185</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,183,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,183,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

and be it further

**Resolved.** That the superintendent of schools be authorized to establish 6.0 physical therapist and 13.2 occupational therapist positions within the FY 2000 operating budget of the Department of Special Education; and be it further

**Resolved.** That the superintendent of schools be authorized to transfer $790,900 within the FY 2000 operating budget of the Department of Special Education’s Individuals with Disabilities Program to fund these 19.2 positions as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Object of Expenditure</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>To</th>
<th>From</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Wages and Salaries</td>
<td>$ 660,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>130,900</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Contractual Services</td>
<td></td>
<td>$790,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$790,900</strong></td>
<td><strong>$790,900</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

and be it further

**Resolved.** That based on the authority given to the superintendent of schools to reassign funds within objects of expenditure, the superintendent has reassigned 74.43 positions within the FY 2000 operating budget of the Department of Special Education; and be it further
Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the county executive and County Council.

Re: READING INITIATIVE STUDY, YEAR 1 REPORT

Dr. Weast invited the following people to the table: Dr. Mary Helen Smith, associate superintendent for instruction and program development; Dr. Marlene Hartzman, director of educational accountability; Ms. Suzanne Raber, project manager; Ms. Pamela Prue, director of early childhood services; and Mrs. Margaret Yates, principal at Bel Pre Elementary School.

The Reading Initiative provides an opportunity to improve student achievement by addressing quality of instruction, class size, and time-on-task. Teachers in Reading Initiative schools receive intensive, high-quality staff development that trains them to deliver a balanced literacy program in first and second grade classrooms with a 15-to-1 student/teacher ratio, for 90 continuous minutes of instruction. The goal is to ensure that all students read independently and on-grade level by the end of Grade 2. The comprehensive nature of the Reading Initiative and the attendant resources necessary for its maintenance and support require a comparably comprehensive evaluation to determine program effectiveness. Therefore, the ongoing evaluation examines four critical aspects of the Reading Initiative: (1) development and planning; (2) implementation; (3) school-based factors influencing implementation; and (4) program outcomes. The Year I Report of the Reading Initiative Study focused on the program's development and planning processes, implementation issues, and establishment of appropriate measures to identify baseline reading performance levels of student participants. Despite the fact that this report, the first in a three-year study, examined a single year's implementation of the program, some very important initial findings emerged from the analysis of data.

- Between February and June of Year 1, students showed a significant increase in reading fluency and comprehension.

- Grade 2 students from all racial/ethnic groups showed reading gains, with African American and Hispanic students demonstrating the most improvement in percentages of students reading at the fluent level. However, higher percentages of Asian and White students were reading at the fluent level in June compared to African American and Hispanic students. Therefore, the gap in student achievement that appears on national, state, and local measures of student performance emerges at an early age. This finding is especially important helping to determine when to implement instructional interventions to close the achievement gap.
• Although English Language Learners (ELL) showed improvements in their reading levels from February to June, their end-of-year performance was not comparable to the fluency levels demonstrated by non-ELL students in June.

• After only one year of the implementation, it appears that the Reading Initiative has generated tremendous interest and enthusiasm across the school system. Despite areas in need of improvement, particularly monitoring program implementation and helping teachers sustain this effort, the evidence suggests that the Reading Initiative has provided a strategic and comprehensive way to help schools and teachers make systemic changes in the organization and delivery of high-quality reading instruction for all students. Further, the research on which the initiative is based suggests that the commitment of resources and supports at the earliest levels of schooling may improve educational opportunities for all students for the remainder of their school careers.

In addition to gathering baseline outcome data, the first year of the study examined program implementation. The findings make it clear that program implementation is uneven, that additional training is needed for new teachers, and continued training is necessary for staff in the first-year schools. Sustaining the initiative over time will depend on continued systematic training of all elementary teachers in the fundamentals of balanced literacy instruction.

Re: DISCUSSION

Mr. Felton noted that in some areas the Reading Initiative was making a real difference. However, there were still students who did not meet the objective. He asked what happened to students who had not become fluent readers by the third grade. Mrs. Yates replied that students may be close to fluency and will achieve that goal in the first semester of the third grade. However, some students may need further assessment to ascertain any learning difficulties. Dr. Weast thought it was intriguing that, in the sample, a third of the students were not ready for the third grade based on their fluency and comprehension in reading. Furthermore, the school system had no mechanism to assess fluency in reading prior to the Reading Initiative. Therefore, the study apprises staff more of what they do not know rather than what they know. As more information becomes available, staff must rush in and expand both ways with programs for three- and four-year olds, and a program that links with the third and fourth graders. When students reach high school without proficiency in some of the skills, this shows up in the gap in test scores. The initiatives show great promise in reading and math and can address deficiencies that appear later in the students’ schooling.

Mr. Felton asked about Reading Initiative training and whether or not colleges and universities educate teachers on how to teach reading to elementary students. Dr. Smith
replied that the State Board had changed certification requirements to include 12 credits in the teaching of reading. MCPS was working with the state’s certification personnel and MCPS teachers would get credit for the training they had received for the MCPS Reading Initiative.

Mrs. O’Neill thought the school system was taking a wonderful first step, although there were issues that continually needed to be addressed, such as training. In addition, one of the staff issues was the need for more planning time. An issue for the third grade is the mobility rate in MCPS and the ability to address the needs of children who move in and out of the school system. Other concerns include English language learners, the essential need for consistency throughout MCPS, and the involvement of parents.

Mr. Burnett considered the parent component critical since children receive supplemental support at home, and parents must be aware of what they can do to assist with the teachers’ goals and objectives. The use of best practices and lessons learned must be encouraged throughout the school system to ensure consistency and a comprehensive program. The instructional assistants (IA) should not be forgotten in training for reading proficiency. Dr. Smith assured Mr. Burnett that there was a commitment to train IAs in the Reading Initiative.

Dr. Weast asked if anyone had an idea on how to help parents, and if there were any organizations that could help. He said that having parents work with literacy is a key factor. Ms. Sampedro suggested the PTA. She thought that parents should know MCPS statistics, and what was going on the in the school, and said some parents are very unaware of what is being taught to their children. Mrs. King suggested there should be more classes for adults to learn English so they could help their children with reading. Dr. Weast asked who the school system could partner with to help adult English language learners. Mrs. O’Neill suggested the PTA and the Hispanic parent education group.

Mrs. Gordon thought the school system could work with day-care centers and preschools regarding language acquisition for children, who need communication with other children and adults, not formal reading, but to build vocabulary.

Mr. Felton pointed out that there is a push for new federal legislation to provide funding for licensing day-care providers. This could be replicated at the local and state levels by local leaders. The Reading Initiative needs the collaboration between the county, state, parents and the school system.
Mrs. Gordon and Dr. Carl Smith, executive director of MABE, gave a presentation on MABE. The Maryland Association of Boards of Education is a private, nonprofit organization to which all school boards in the state voluntarily belong. MABE sponsors in-service activities for board members through an annual conference, orientation programs for new board members, and workshops on key topics. MABE’s elected Executive Committee holds regular informal meetings with the State Board of Education. MABE represents the school board point of view with the Maryland General Assembly and the United States Congress through the MABE Legislative Committee and Federal Relations Network. MABE monitors and reports to its members and the public about current education issues through its publications: The Monitor, School Board News, MABE Brief, Directory, and School Board Manual. MABE maintains a collection of current policy manuals from the local boards of education, as well as a reference library of education governance materials. MABE is an active member of the National School Boards Association (NSBA). MABE maintains close contact with other organizations interested in public education.

The mission of the Maryland Association of Boards of Education, which acts as a catalyst for positive change, is to ensure the highest quality of school board performance through training, service, and advocacy for children and public education. MABE serves students by being advocates for public schools, for local control of education, and for the leadership and legal authority of school boards by:

- monitoring issues of state and local governance of education.
- maintaining open communication with the Maryland State Board of Education, the Maryland State Department of Education, and state government.
- taking positions on issues of statewide importance.
- providing national representation through the National School Boards Association (NSBA) Federal Relations Network.
- supporting NSBA in regional and national activities.
- aligning with other advocacy organizations to support the needs of children and youth.

MABE strives to serve the students of Maryland by ensuring that all school board members possess the knowledge and skills to govern their school systems effectively by:

- providing orientation sessions for all new school board members.
- holding an annual conference.
- providing programs to keep school board members informed on educational issues and trends.
identifying and developing intensive leadership training that will provide continuing education to school board members.

- encouraging school board members to attend training opportunities, including those offered by NSBA.

MABE provides services that meet the needs of the public school systems of Maryland, their school board members and their students by:

- producing and distributing publications that are available to school systems, member boards and the general public.
- maintaining and publicizing a policy data bank.
- providing information and referral services.
- offering insurance programs to member boards, including the Group Insurance Pool, the Worker’s Compensation Group Self-insurance Fund, and Student Accident Insurance.
- offering resources through the Legal Services Association.

In support of these goals and strategies, MABE believes it is essential to be on the cutting edge of technology to enhance the effectiveness of the Association.

Mrs. O’Neill commended Mrs. Gordon for her outstanding year as the president of MABE.

RESOLUTION NO. 577-99 Re: PERSONNEL APPOINTMENT

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

Resolved, That the following personnel appointment be approved effective September 15, 1999:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appointment</th>
<th>Present Position</th>
<th>As</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Patricia A. Kelly</td>
<td>Assistant Principal, Judith A. Resnik ES</td>
<td>Principal, Greenwood ES</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Re: LUNCH AND CLOSED SESSION

The Board of Education recessed for lunch and closed session from 12:40 to 1:50 p.m.
The following people testified before the Board of Education:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Person</th>
<th>Topic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Mark Simon</td>
<td>Reading Initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. William Smeltzer</td>
<td>Glen Haven Issue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Daniel Perlin</td>
<td>Glen Haven Issue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Charles Frye</td>
<td>Glen Haven Issue</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RESOLUTION NO. 578-99

Re: DEATH OF ROBERT L. TURNER, CLASSROOM TEACHER, CLARKSBURG ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

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

WHEREAS, The death on August 21, 1999, of Robert L. Turner, classroom teacher at Clarksburg Elementary School, has deeply saddened the staff, students, and members of the Board of Education; and

WHEREAS, Mr. Turner had been a part of the foundation of Clarksburg Elementary School for 27 years and had provided stability and tradition to students, staff, and parents; and

WHEREAS, Mr. Turner was a veteran teacher who was dedicated and caring for the children’s total welfare and was an essential member of the Clarksburg community; now therefore be it

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

Resolved, That this resolution be made a part of the minutes of this meeting and a copy be forwarded to Mr. Turner’s family.

RESOLUTION NO. 579-99

Re: PERSONNEL MONTHLY REPORT

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education approve the Personnel Monthly Report dated September 14, 1999.
RESOLUTION NO. 580-99  Re:  PRELIMINARY PLANS – NORTHWEST ELEMENTARY SCHOOL #6

On recommendation of the Superintendent and on motion of Mr. Abrams seconded by Mrs. King, the following resolution was adopted Mr. Abrams, Mr. Felton, Mrs. Gordon, Mrs. King, Mrs. O’Neill, Ms. Sampedro, and Ms. Signer voting in the affirmative:

WHEREAS, The architect for the new Northwest Elementary School #6, SHW Group, Inc., Architects, has prepared a schematic design in accordance with the educational specifications; and

WHEREAS, The Northwest Elementary School #6 Facilities Advisory Committee has approved the proposed schematic design; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Board of Education approve the preliminary plan report for the new Northwest Elementary School #6 developed by SHW Group, Inc., Architects.

Re:  DISCUSSION

Ms. Signer asked for the cost of adding a gymnasium.

Re:  COUNTYWIDE FINAL EXAMS

Dr. Weast invited the following people to the table: Dr. Mary Helen Smith, associate superintendent for instruction and program development; Dr. Patricia B. Flynn, director of academic programs; Dr. Marlene Hartzman, acting director of educational accountability; and Mr. Dale Fulton, acting coordinator, Department of Academic Programs.

Background
On February 12, 1980, the Montgomery County Board of Education adopted a policy statement on The Senior High School. In addition to providing staffing guidelines regarding the school system’s responsibilities in educating high school students, the Board specifically provided for the development and administration of two kinds of final examinations in all major high school subjects: school-based departmental examinations and uniform countywide examinations. Because of questions raised about these uniform countywide examinations, the 1980 resolution established a three-year pilot during which the new examination procedures would be developed, refined, and evaluated for English and mathematics. The pilot called for one hour of the uniform examination to be developed by the school department and the second hour to be developed by the Department of Academic Skills. In November 1983, the Board rescinded its approval for the pilot that authorized the development of uniform final examinations in English and mathematics and voted instead to continue with two-hour, end-of-semester departmental final examinations.
Mathematics teachers continued to administer a final examination developed at the county level, but no systemwide student performance standards were established.

**Variability of School-by-School Scores**
The common mathematics final examinations developed at the county level and implemented prior to January 1999 were never designed to be used as a systemwide performance measure. The purpose of these examinations was to provide high schools with a common assessment instrument that could be adapted to the needs of the local school. It was administered and scored in the same manner as department final examinations in other content areas: teachers within a department used the same assessment instrument and the same grading scale. School-by-school grading scales were not maintained since schools were permitted to change or delete items and eliminate sections of the examinations. The January 1999 Algebra 1A and the June 1999 Algebra 1B final examinations were the first algebra assessments that will be used as standardized countywide final examinations with systemwide performance standards and consistent school scores.

**Relationship to the High School Assessment**
The renewed interest in developing standardized countywide finals came about when the Maryland State Board of Education (MSDE) voted to proceed with the High School Improvement Program (HSIP) and the assessment component of this initiative, known as the High School Assessment (HSA). MCPS standardized final examinations will provide students with opportunities to experience the types of assessments contained in the HSA. Curriculum coordinators currently are developing prototype final examinations that assess mastery of the MSDE Core Learning Goals (CLGs). Tests developed to mirror the content and format of the state assessments serve as tools to benchmark student progress and inform instruction. The Department of Academic Programs, with support from the Department of Educational Accountability, is moving forward with the development of countywide final examinations for all Phase One subjects of the HSA (English 9; National, State, and Local Government; Algebra 1; Geometry; and Biology).

**Practice of Local Schools Substituting and Deleting of Items**
In the examination development process followed by MCPS, schools have latitude in determining the grade equivalents of test scores and passing score cutoffs for the first no-fault administration of the examinations. Teachers are required to administer the examinations in their original format and changes to the tests are not permitted. However, the January 1999 administration of the algebra examination presented a unique set of circumstances that resulted in schools being granted permission to modify or change specific questions on the examination provided that the changes did not affect the outcomes being tested. This latitude was in response to the HSA prototype items released by the state. After the algebra final examinations were constructed in the Summer Supplemental Employment workshops in July 1998. The algebra examination was revised
to reflect the newly released items. When the examinations arrived in schools, teachers were concerned that the revisions included items that assessed content in a different way than what was expected. As a result, it was agreed that schools could replace up to five questions with different questions as long as the questions tested the same outcomes. Changes were permitted on a one-time basis. Schools reported which questions they had revised or replaced and this information was taken into account in the item analysis that took place.

In the June 1999 administration of the algebra, geometry, and foreign language countywide final examinations, there was no need for schools to change or delete any items. Thus, schools did not have those options, and gave the examinations in their original form. Teachers were expected to administer items or sections of tests without any changes in Biology; National, State, and Local Government; and English.

**Foreign Language Final Examinations**
The recent development of countywide final examinations in foreign language was in response to Board action in 1996 permitting middle school students to earn credit for high school courses successfully completed in middle school. Since French, Spanish, and Spanish for Spanish Speakers are the only languages currently offered in both middle and high schools, end-of-semester final examinations were developed for three levels of these languages, for a total of 18 examinations.

**Process for Determining Item Validity**
The countywide final examinations that are under development mirror both the content and the format of the MSDE assessments. They will include the same test item types found on the state assessments: selected response, brief constructed response, extended constructed response, and grid-in. The process for developing of systemwide final examinations reflects the process being used by MSDE in developing the HSA: the development of items, no-fault administration of tests, analysis of student results, involvement of stakeholders in the analysis of test results, use of teacher feedback, standard setting, and operational implementation.

**School-By-School Data**
The school-by-school grading scales on the algebra final examination administered in June 1999 indicated that the lowest passing scores ranged from 60 to 50 percent with a median passing score of 56 percent. On the January 1999 examination, the lowest passing scores ranged from 58 to 33 percent with a median passing score of 48 percent.

A review of the data on the school-by-school end-of-course final grade distribution in Algebra 1 in January and June 1999 and the school-by-school final examination grade distributions in Algebra 1 for the same period indicated that as the passing standard was raised in June 1999, the number of students failing the final examination increased from
29.2 percent in January to 42.2 percent in June. The impact on the countywide failure rate for the course, however, was minimal, with an overall increased failure rate of .7 percent.

Next Steps
Using the data collected and analyzed from the June administration of countywide final examinations, DAP and DEA staff will continue to work with all stakeholders to establish standards on the examinations and to institute consistent school scores on countywide final examinations. The standard-setting process also will involve the Committee on Assessment Design and Implementation. In addition, work will begin on the development of final examinations for Phase Two subjects of the HSA. The experience gained from the development of final examinations in mathematics and foreign language will provide valuable lessons in the development of all future assessments.

Re: DISCUSSION

Mrs. O’Neill noted that the report contained foreign language scores for middle schools, but not algebra scores. Mr. Fulton replied that there was no algebra report because all middle schools used the same standard.

Ms. Signer thanked staff for the report, which addressed many of the questions posed by Board members. She noted that the Board did not get the school-by-school scales for math courses other than Geometry and Algebra 1. Mr. Fulton stated that those scales were prepared and would be provided to the Board.

Ms. Signer quoted the following: “Review of the data indicated that as the passing standard was raised in June 1999, there was a significant increase in the number of students failing the final examination from 29.2 percent in January to 42.2 percent in June. The impact on the countywide failure rate for the course, however, was minimal with an overall increased failure rate of .7 percent.” She asked staff to interpreted what that meant. Dr. Smith stated that the weight of the final examinations as part of the semester grade is not much of a factor in terms of the overall grade. In the grading policy, the final exam is 25 percent of the entire semester grade. Ms. Signer was concerned about such a high failure rate on the final exam, which is the only uniform measure across schools. She asked if there was there a problem with grade inflation throughout the rest of the courses and if the students understood the material. Dr. Smith replied that there were many factors involved, such as a student not taking the final exam, departmental exams not covering the same content, etc. With true countywide exams, these issues will be addressed.

Ms. Signer had a concern regarding the distribution of final exam grades. In some schools, more than half of the students failed the exam in Algebra 1. Dr. Flynn responded that a large number of students had not mastered that course content, as evidenced by the
final exam. However, there were other factors such as the student’s approach, attitude toward the test, and calculation to determine if the final exam would affect the student’s grade on the report card. Mr. Felton thought it was hard to accept that a student who had mastered the material could not pass a final exam. Ms. Sampedro mentioned there were different reasons for getting an A in a course, but it did not mean that the material had been completely mastered.

Mrs. O’Neill thought that the real pitfall would be the HSA, which would be required for graduation. Mr. Fulton pointed out that MCPS must work with the students in testing taking and impress upon them the importance of those tests.

Ms. Signer suggested that the school system rethink the grading scale to determine if letter or numerical grades would better reflect a student’s mastery of the material.

In Algebra 1, Ms. Signer wanted the students to master the material and hoped that the system would not lower the bar to the meet the standards.

Mrs. King reported that students think that if they have an “A” going into the final exam, they do not need to take the test. The system must address that situation. Mrs. King asked if a student who fails a course and goes to summer school, would take the same exam. Dr. Flynn replied that summer school students are held to the same standards.

** Ms. Sampedro left the meeting at this point.

Mrs. Gordon asked about the possibility of using countywide exams as a substitute for the HSA. If the school system could demonstrate that its tests were valid, then the system would ask for a waiver and substitute the countywide exam. Dr. Smith said there would be no exemptions from the HSA in the initial phase. Dr. Weast noted he was not impressed with the consistency and variability from school to school within MCPS’s testing. For example, a wide variance existed in the implementation and understanding of the Reading Initiative. It would be helpful to take the Maryland exam to ascertain how the school system compares and contrasts with other Maryland school systems, as well as school systems throughout the country. The system must work on high and comparable standards applicable across the state. Until the HSA is in place, he wanted a fair and consistent high standard in MCPS that was equally applied. If children do not pass the test, he would ask staff to find out why.

Mrs. Gordon pointed out that the core learning goals and the HSA are not designed to be the entire program. MCPS did not just want to rely on students passing the HSA and give up the individual system’s instructional program. Therefore, MCPS needs a test to assess its curriculum, not just the core learning goals. She was pleased the school system was not going to ask for an exception to the HSA.
Mrs. O’Neill thought the value of the countywide tests was for the teacher to ascertain what the student was not mastering and to receive data to guide instruction.

Mr. Burnett was disturbed that 75 percent of the students in one school did not take the test and said MCPS was failing students. Either the test means something or not. The school system is missing something, and children are being lost. He could not interpret the report any other way. He could not accept that a child chose not to do well in the course because that student did not want to take a final exam. If the school system did not address that issue, MCPS students will not pass the HSA, he said.

Mr. Felton noted that with on-line courses and distance learning, multiple assessments would be available.

Mrs. Gordon asked that MCPS consider establishing a countywide grading standard when the Policy on Grading and Reporting came to the Board.

Re: BOUNDARY CHANGE PROCESS AND POLICY FAA, LONG-RANGE EDUCATIONAL FACILITIES PLANNING

On recommendation of the Superintendent and on motion of Ms. Signer seconded by Mrs. King, the following resolution was placed on the table:

WHEREAS, On June 11, 1997, the Board of Education requested a study be undertaken of the Montgomery County Public Schools' boundary change process; and

WHEREAS, A survey was conducted of nearby school systems' boundary change processes and other county planning agencies' community involvement processes; and

WHEREAS, The Montgomery County Council of Parent Teacher Associations (MCCPTA) formed a subcommittee to assess the boundary change process and made recommendations for modifications that were adopted on October 28, 1997, by the MCCPTA Delegate Assembly; and

WHEREAS, The input from other school systems, other planning agencies, and the MCCPTA report was carefully considered in the development of a pilot process to be used in Montgomery County for boundary processes conducted during the 1997-98 school year; and

WHEREAS, The Board of Education took action to pilot the recommended boundary change process on November 11, 1997; and

WHEREAS, During the 1997-98 school year, four boundary advisory committees used the pilot process successfully; and
WHEREAS, At the conclusion of the pilot period a survey was conducted of participants of the four pilot boundary processes and the results showed support for the new process; and

WHEREAS, On April 14, 1999, the Board of Education discussed a policy analysis of FAA, Policy on Long-Range Educational Facilities Planning, and took tentative action on proposed revisions; and

WHEREAS, The tentatively adopted draft policy was sent out for public review, and comments received have been considered by the Board of Education; now therefore be it

Resolved, The Board of Education direct the superintendent to continue the process used during the pilot year in any future boundary committee studies for community notification and committee responsibility; and be it further

Resolved, That the Board of Education takes final action to adopt revisions to Policy FAA, Long-Range Educational Facilities Planning, as shown on the attached draft and amended.

Re: AN AMENDMENT TO BOUNDARY CHANGE PROCESS AND POLICY FAA, LONG-RANGE EDUCATIONAL FACILITIES PLANNING

On recommendation of the Superintendent and on motion of Mrs. Gordon seconded by Ms. Signer, the following amendment was added by consensus:

The paragraph at C.4.a) should read:

Some special programs and class-size-reduction initiatives require classroom ratios different from those listed.

Re: AN AMENDMENT TO BOUNDARY CHANGE PROCESS AND POLICY FAA, LONG-RANGE EDUCATIONAL FACILITIES PLANNING

On recommendation of the Superintendent and on motion of Mr. Abrams seconded by Mrs. O’Neill, the following amendment was added by consensus:

The paragraph at E.4.e)(1)(a) should read:

The PTA cluster coordinators and/or area coordinators in consultation with the PTA president(s) will coordinate testimony at the hearing on behalf of cluster
schools and are encouraged to ensure that diversity of opinions are accommodated when scheduling testimony.

Re: AN AMENDMENT TO BOUNDARY CHANGE PROCESS AND POLICY FAA, LONG-RANGE EDUCATIONAL FACILITIES PLANNING

On motion of Mrs. Gordon seconded by Ms. Signer, the following amendment failed, with Mrs. Gordon and Ms. Signer voting in the affirmative; Mr. Abrams, Mr. Burnett, Mr. Felton, Mrs. King, and Mrs. O’Neill voting in the negative:

Resolved, That the policy be consistent throughout in defining civic or community groups.

RESOLUTION NO. 581-99 Re: BOUNDARY CHANGE PROCESS AND POLICY FAA, LONG-RANGE EDUCATIONAL FACILITIES PLANNING

On recommendation of the Superintendent and on motion of Ms. Signer seconded by Mrs. King, the following resolution, as amended, was adopted unanimously by members present:

WHEREAS, On June 11, 1997, the Board of Education requested a study be undertaken of the Montgomery County Public Schools' boundary change process; and

WHEREAS, A survey was conducted of nearby school systems' boundary change processes and other county planning agencies' community involvement processes; and

WHEREAS, The Montgomery County Council of Parent Teacher Associations (MCCPTA) formed a subcommittee to assess the boundary change process and made recommendations for modifications that were adopted on October 28, 1997, by the MCCPTA Delegate Assembly; and

WHEREAS, The input from other school systems, other planning agencies, and the MCCPTA report was carefully considered in the development of a pilot process to be used in Montgomery County for boundary processes conducted during the 1997-98 school year; and

WHEREAS, The Board of Education took action to pilot the recommended boundary change process on November 11, 1997; and

WHEREAS, During the 1997-98 school year, four boundary advisory committees used the pilot process successfully; and
WHEREAS, At the conclusion of the pilot period a survey was conducted of participants of the four pilot boundary processes and the results showed support for the new process; and

WHEREAS, On April 14, 1999, the Board of Education discussed a policy analysis of FAA, Policy on Long-Range Educational Facilities Planning, and took tentative action on proposed revisions; and

WHEREAS, The tentatively adopted draft policy was sent out for public review, and comments received have been considered by the Board of Education; now therefore be it

Resolved, The Board of Education direct the superintendent to continue the process used during the pilot year in any future boundary committee studies for community notification and committee responsibility; and be it further

Resolved, That the Board of Education takes final action to adopt revisions to Policy FAA, Long-Range Educational Facilities Planning, as shown below.

Long-Range Educational Facilities Planning

A. PURPOSE

1. The Board of Education has a primary responsibility to provide school facilities that address changing enrollment patterns and that sustain high quality educational programs in a way that meets its policies. The Board of Education fulfills this responsibility through the facilities planning process. The achievement of Success for Every Student through the delivery and execution of an excellent educational program is of primary importance to students and parents in Montgomery County.

2. The Long-Range Educational Facilities Planning (LREFP) policy provides direction on how the planning process should be conducted and prescribes criteria and standards to guide planning. This process is designed to promote public understanding of planning for Montgomery County Public Schools (MCPS) and to encourage community members, local government agencies and municipalities to identify and communicate their priorities and concerns to the superintendent and Board.
3. The Board recognizes the interrelationship of its facilities planning policy with other policies such as those on educational programs, quality integrated education, and capital modernization/renovation projects.

4. The Long-Range Educational Facilities Planning policy also describes the ways in which facilities planning for school sites and school service areas supports the Quality Integrated Education (QIE) policy.

B. ISSUE

Enrollment in MCPS is never static. The fundamental goal of facilities planning is to provide a sound educational environment for a changing enrollment. The number of students, their geographic distribution, and the demographic characteristics of this population all concern facilities planning. Enrollment changes are driven by factors including birth rates, movement within the school system and into the school system from other parts of the United States and from other parts of the world.

Enrollment changes in MCPS do not occur at a uniform rate throughout the county. The MCPS system is among the twenty largest in the country in terms of enrollment and serves a county of approximately 500 square miles. The full range of population density, from rural to urban, is present in the county. Where new communities are forming, enrollment has been growing faster than in established areas of the county. In areas with affordable housing, there is often greater diversity in enrollment caused by immigration from outside the country.

MCPS is challenged continually to anticipate and provide facilities in an efficient and fiscally responsible way to meet the varied educational needs of students. The Long-Range Educational Facilities Planning policy describes how the school system responds to educational and enrollment change, the rate of change, its geographic distribution, and the racial, ethnic and socioeconomic diversification of enrollment.

School facilities also change. Aging of the physical plant requires a program of maintenance, renovation, and modernization. Acquiring new sites, designing new facilities, and modifying existing ones so that they keep current with program needs are essential. This policy provides the framework for coordinating planning for these capital improvements.
C. POSITION

The following procedures, criteria, and standards apply to the facilities planning process.

1. *Capital Improvements Program (CIP)* – On or about November 1, the superintendent will publish recommendations for a capital budget and improvements program. Boundary change recommendations, if any, will be released by mid-October. The Capital Improvements Program schedules needed changes to the MCPS physical inventory for the coming six fiscal years.

   a) After review of the superintendent’s recommendations for a capital budget and six-year CIP, the Board will adopt a capital budget and a six-year CIP and submit them to the county executive for review and recommendations to the County Council for inclusion in the county CIP and for funding of upcoming fiscal year projects. The superintendent will notify PTA/PTSAs, municipalities, civic groups registered with the Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission, student government associations, and other interested groups of its publication and availability in public libraries. The proposed CIP will be sent for review and comment to the Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission, State Board of Education, State Interagency Committee on Public School Construction, county government, municipalities, MCCPTA, Montgomery County Region of the Maryland Association of Student Councils, and Montgomery County Junior Council. The six-year CIP will include:

   1. Background information on the enrollment forecasting methodology
   2. Current enrollment figures and demographic profiles of all schools including racial/ethnic composition, Free and Reduced Meals program participation, English for Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL) enrollment, and school mobility rate
   3. Enrollment forecasts for the next six years by year, and longer term cluster, consortium, and base area forecasts for a period approximately ten and fifteen years into the future
(4) A profile of all school facilities showing physical and program characteristics, such as Head Start, kindergarten and prekindergarten, ESOL, and special education centers

(5) A summary of any capital requests by the Board of Education that would change the facility, as well as Board actions affecting programs at the facility or the service area of the facility. (When necessary, supplements to the CIP may be published to provide more information on issues.)

(6) Montgomery County Project Description Forms for all requested capital projects. (A project description form describes the needs for a particular facility or for several facilities with similar requirements and contains the project budget.)

b) The county executive and County Council are required to adopt a six-year capital improvements program (CIP) which includes MCPS projects, reporting construction schedules, and anticipated costs. This document includes:

(1) A statement of the objectives of MCPS capital programs and the relationship of these programs to the long-range development plans adopted by the county

(2) Recommended capital projects and a proposed construction schedule for schools and other educational facilities

(3) An estimate of cost and a statement of all funding sources

(4) All anticipated capital projects and programs of the Board including substantial improvements and extensions of projects previously authorized

2. Master Plan

a) On or about June 15 of each year the superintendent will publish a summary of all Board-adopted capital and non-capital facilities plans. This document, called the Master Plan for Educational Facilities, is required under the rules and regulations of the State Public School Construction Program.
(1) This comprehensive plan will incorporate the impact of all capital projects approved for funding by the County Council and any non-capital facilities plans approved by the Board of Education.

(2) The Master Plan for Educational Facilities will show projected enrollment and utilization for facilities for the next six years and for a period approximately 10 and 15 years in the future. This information will reflect projections made the previous fall as updated in spring, and any changes in enrollment or capacity projected to result from capital projects, boundary adjustments or other changes authorized by the Board prior to the date of the plan's publication.

(3) The plan will include demographic profiles of school enrollments and physical and program profiles of school facilities.

b) Schools that fail to meet one or more of the facility standards for enrollment and utilization based on projections will be identified in the Master Plan. The Master Plan for Educational Facilities serves as the review and reporting mechanism required by this policy.

3. Enrollment Forecasts

a) Each fall, enrollment forecasts for all schools will be developed for a six-year period. In addition, longer term forecasts for a period of approximately ten and fifteen years in the future also will be developed. These forecasts will be the basis for evaluating facility space and initiating planning activities. The forecasts should be developed in coordination with the Montgomery County Planning Department's county population forecast and any other relevant planning sources.

b) On or about April 1, a revision to the enrollment forecast for the next school year will be developed to refine the forecast for all schools and to reflect any change in service areas or programs.

4. Capacity Calculations

a) The capacity of a facility is determined by the space needs of educational programs. The capacity ratios shown in the following
table should not be confused with staffing ratios as determined through the operating budget process. Program capacity is calculated as the product of the number of teaching stations at a school according to the following ratios:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Capacity Ratings Per Room</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Head Start &amp; Pre-K</td>
<td>36:1 (2 sessions per day)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade K 1/2 day</td>
<td>44:1 (2 sessions per day)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade K all day</td>
<td>22:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grades 1-6 Elementary</td>
<td>25:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grades 6-12 Secondary</td>
<td>25:1*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Ed. Intensity 4</td>
<td>13:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Ed. Intensity 5</td>
<td>10:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESOL/SPARC/BASIC</td>
<td>15:1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(4) Program capacity differs at the secondary level in that the regular calculated capacity of 25 is multiplied by .9 to reflect the optimal utilization of a secondary facility.

Some special programs and class-size-reduction initiatives require classroom ratios different from those listed.

Maximum class size for preschool and special education programs is mandated by state and federal regulations.

b) Elementary, middle, and high schools should operate in an efficient utilization range of 80 to 100 percent of program capacity. If a school is projected to be underutilized (less than 80%) or overutilized (over 100%), facilities planning to address these utilization levels may be undertaken. In the case of overutilization, an effort to judge the long-term needs for permanent space should be made prior to planning for new construction. Temporary measures such as the use of relocatable classrooms may be appropriate. Underutilization of facilities also should be evaluated in the context of short-term and long-term enrollment forecasts.
5. Preferred Range of Enrollment

The description of preferred ranges of enrollment for schools refers to all students, except those special education students receiving instruction in self-contained classrooms, whose numbers are added to these ranges.

a) A preferred range of enrollment for schools, provided they have program capacity, is:

(1) Two to four classes per grade of students in an elementary school

(2) Two to three teams per grade in middle schools with team size averaging between 100 to 125 students

(3) 250 to 450 students per grade in high schools

(4) Enrollment as set forth in applicable education policies for the K-12 program

b) The preferred range of enrollment will be considered when planning new schools or changes to existing facilities. Departures from the preferred range may occur if the educational program justifies or requires it. Larger enrollments for high schools may be justified for those schools in which students are academically very diverse in order to meet the programmatic needs of all students. Fiscal constraints may also require MCPS to build schools of other sizes. If larger or smaller schools are built or created, alternative approaches to school construction, management, organization, or staffing will be considered to facilitate effective delivery of educational programs.

6. School Site Size

Size for school sites are:

a) 12 usable acres for elementary schools

b) 20 usable acres for middle schools

c) 30 usable acres for high schools
Sites of these approximate sizes accommodate the instructional program including related outdoor activities. In some circumstances it may be necessary to use smaller or larger sites. In these circumstances special efforts to accommodate outdoor activities are necessary such as use of adjacent or nearby park properties or shared use of school fields. It may be necessary to acquire more than the standard acreage to accommodate environmental concerns, unusual topography, or surrounding street patterns.

7. Community Representation

Members of the community have several opportunities for direct input into the facilities decision-making process including: actual participation as voting or non-voting members of advisory committees, submission of letters, alternatives, or other written material for consideration by the superintendent and staff; and testimony in written or oral form before the Board of Education. In addition, the views of the members of the community are solicited through:

- the Montgomery County Council of PTAs, which is the largest group seeking views of school communities affected by facility planning activities
- cluster coordinators
- local PTAs
- student advocacy groups
- other organizations

a) PTA or other parent and student representatives along with appropriate MCPS facility and program staff should be involved in the facility planning process for site selection, school boundary studies, school closings and consolidations, and aspects of facility design (including modernization planning, new school planning, and architect selection).

b) In addition to parent and student representation, MCPS employees, municipalities, local government agencies, civic and homeowner associations, and countywide organizations contribute to the facilities planning process. A civic or homeowner association must
be registered with the Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission. Countywide organizations are those with members throughout the county, including organizations such as the League of Women Voters, and federations of civic groups.

c) The Board will conduct public hearings for potentially affected school communities prior to any action affecting attendance areas and the closure or consolidation of schools.

(1) Public hearings will be conducted following publication of the superintendent's recommended budget and six-year capital improvements program.

(2) Public hearings also may be held in March for any capital budget recommendations deferred from the fall or in cases where capital decisions must be made in March.

(3) Written comments from interested parties will be accepted at any point, but in order to be considered, comments must reach the Board 24 hours before the time scheduled for action by the Board.

D. DESIRED OUTCOMES

This policy is intended to achieve the following outcomes:

1. Provide the facilities and future school sites necessary to sustain high quality educational programs at reasonable cost, including non-traditional facilities that provide needed educational programs

2. Utilize schools in ways that are consistent with sound educational practice. Consider the impact of facility changes on educational program and related operating budget requirements and on the community

3. Provide opportunities for all students in accordance with the Board policy on Quality Integrated Education

4. Provide space to accommodate all students, where feasible, in their home schools

5. Provide a schedule to maintain and modernize older school buildings in order to continue their use on a cost-effective basis, and to keep facilities
current with educational program needs

6. Provide a capital program and master plan that consider long-term enrollment trends, educational program needs, and capacity available over a broad region in determining:

a) Where and when new schools and additions will be constructed

b) Where and when school closures and consolidations are appropriate

7. Provide a meaningful role for the community in facilities planning

8. Provide as much stability in school assignments as possible

a) Provide high schools for Grades 9-12 and, where possible, create clusters composed of one high school, and a sufficient number of elementary and middle schools, each of which send all students including special education and ESOL students, to the next higher level school in the cluster.

b) Efficient utilization of resources and facilities may require shared use of facilities by more than one cluster.

E. IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGIES

1. Evaluating Utilization of Facilities

a) In the fall of every year after new enrollment forecasts are developed, utilization of all school facilities will be evaluated. The effect of any proposed educational program changes or grade level reorganizations also will be evaluated. For schools that are projected to have insufficient capacity, excess capacity or other facility issues in the future, the superintendent will recommend:

(1) A capital project in the six-year CIP

(2) A solution such as a boundary change, school pairing, facility sharing, closing/consolidation, or any other similar solution that does not necessarily involve a capital project

(3) No action or deferral pending further study of enrollment or other factors
b) Facility recommendations made by the superintendent will incorporate consideration of educational program impacts. As part of the process of developing facility plans, facilities planning staff will work closely with appropriate program staff to identify program requirements for facility plans.

c) Recommendations that relate to school boundary changes will be made after the superintendent receives advice from a school boundary advisory committee.

d) The superintendent also may request advice from the school community for other types of facility recommendations, such as school closures and consolidations, grade-level reorganizations, pairings and program moves.

2. Guidelines for Development of Facilities Recommendations

In cases where enrollment change requires the opening of additional facilities, or any other change in student assignments, a number of factors are to be taken into consideration by the Board of Education, the superintendent, and any advisory committee.

a) Area of Focus: Facility

   (1) Facilities proposals should result in school utilizations in the 80% to 100% efficient range whenever possible.

   (2) Proposals should be fiscally responsible and consider ways to minimize capital and operating costs whenever feasible. The geographic scope of facility studies should be broad enough to realize economies in costs and comprehensive long-range solutions to facility issues while preserving as much stability in school assignments as possible.

   (3) When the Board of Education moves special education programs, physical modifications to the facility will be made in accordance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA).

   (4) Shared use of a facility by more than one cluster may be the most feasible facility solution in some cases. In these cases, not less than 25 percent of the shared school's enrollment
should come from each cluster.

b) Area of Focus: Population

(1) New school openings and boundary adjustments demand that consideration be given to the impact of various proposals on the affected school populations. A school population consists of students assigned from a specific geographic attendance area regardless of the location of the school building itself.

(2) Where reasonable, school service area boundaries should be established to promote creation of a diverse student body in each of the affected schools considering the county's different racial/ethnic groups in accordance with the Quality Integrated Education policy; the socioeconomic background of students as measured by participation in the Free and Reduced Meals Programs (FARMS), U.S. Census information, and other reliable indicators; the inclusion of special education programs and students; mobility rates at schools; and the mix of single-family and multiple-family dwellings within each service area. Data showing the impact of proposals on applicable factors shall be developed.

c) Area of Focus: Geography

(1) In most cases, the geographic scope of elementary school boundary studies should be limited to the high school cluster area. For secondary schools, one or more clusters of schools may be studied.

(2) Consistent with the school system policy on Site-Based Participatory Management, with its emphasis on community involvement in schools, boundary proposals should result in service areas that are, as much as practical, made up of contiguous communities surrounding the school. Walking access to the school should be maximized and transportation distances minimized when other priorities do not require otherwise.

d) Area of Focus: Stability

(1) Recognizing that at times changes to facilities and boundaries
may occur, plans should result in as long a period as possible of stable assignment patterns.

(2) Recommendations for aggregate student reassignments should consider recent boundary changes and/or school closings and consolidations that may have affected the same communities.

3. **Calendar**

The long-range facilities planning process will be conducted according to an annual calendar that will adhere to the following calendar adjusted annually to account for holidays and other anomalies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event Description</th>
<th>Date/Time Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School principals, cluster coordinators, and PTA representatives meet with facilities planning and other appropriate staff and exchange information about facilities issues requiring consideration in upcoming CIPs</td>
<td>Late May</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superintendent publishes a summary of all actions to date affecting schools (Comprehensive Master Plan) and identifies future needs</td>
<td>June 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cluster PTA representatives submit comments and proposals about issues affecting their schools to superintendent</td>
<td>July 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff presents enrollment trends and planning issues for Board of Education information</td>
<td>September 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Council passes spending affordability guidelines that set limits on bonding debt the county can undertake</td>
<td>Early October</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superintendent publishes and sends to Board of Education any recommendations for boundary changes</td>
<td>Mid-October</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superintendent publishes and sends to the Board of Education and county executive Capital Budget and Six-Year Capital Improvements Program (CIP) with recommendations for capital projects. Any reorganizations or other facility plans as appropriate for changing enrollments, programs, and policies</td>
<td>Early November or first business day of November</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board of Education holds worksession on CIP recommendations. Alternatives to recommendations may be requested by Board of Education at this time</td>
<td>Early November</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board holds public hearings on recommendations and any Board adopted alternatives</td>
<td>Mid-November</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board of Education acts on CIP and any related facility planning recommendations</td>
<td>End of November</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Executive and Montgomery County Planning Board receive Board of Education adopted CIP for review</td>
<td>December 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Executive transmits recommended CIP to County Council</td>
<td>January 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event</td>
<td>Timeframe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Board reviews County Executive's recommended CIP</td>
<td>February 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Council holds public hearings on CIP</td>
<td>February - March</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Council reviews Board of Education requested and County Executive recommended CIPs</td>
<td>March - April</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deferred facility planning issues and boundary recommendations, if any, published with superintendent's recommended amendment(s) to CIP for Board of Education review</td>
<td>mid-February</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board holds worksession, requests any alternatives</td>
<td>early-March</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board holds public hearings</td>
<td>mid-March</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board acts on deferred recommendations</td>
<td>late-March</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Council approves CIP</td>
<td>June</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the event the Board of Education determines that an unusual circumstance exists, the superintendent will establish a different and/or condensed time schedule for making recommendations to the Board, for scheduling public hearings on recommendations for alternatives not previously subject to public hearing and for Board action.

4. Community Involvement Process

School and community involvement in MCPS facilities plans is important to the success of the plans. Parents, staff, and students are primary constituents in the facilities planning process. The county network of Parent Teacher Associations (PTAs), organized in each high school area by cluster coordinators, is the focus for involvement of the school communities. Coordination with municipalities and local government agencies also is appropriate. Information from other community organizations, civic associations registered with the Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission, and individuals also is important.

The following sections describe the community involvement process in site selection, boundary changes, and in planning and design of new and modernized facilities. These sections refer to formation and operation of advisory groups. In addition to these activities all community members have opportunities to advise the superintendent and Board annually through cluster reports, written correspondence, and public testimony.

a) Site Selection
(1) MCPS staff will work with the Montgomery County Planning Board during the development of master plans to identify future school site requirements based on existing and proposed residential development. General or floating locations of sites are identified on master plan maps. As subdivision occurs, site dedications may be requested.

(2) Specific site selection begins when MCPS projections indicate a new facility is required. The facility in most cases will be programmed in the six-year CIP before a site selection committee is formed.

(3) The MCPS site administrator works with the cluster coordinators in consultation with PTA presidents to form site selection committees composed of MCPS staff, PTA representatives, and appropriate municipal and county government agency officials. In cases of secondary school sites, representatives of more than one cluster may be involved in the committee.

(a) The MCPS site administrator and planning staff work with the committee reviewing alternative site options from the MCPS inventory, and in some cases study potential purchase of properties.

(b) The committee considers the geographic location, its relation to future student populations, the appropriateness of potential sites and makes a recommendation to the superintendent.

(4) The superintendent evaluates this recommendation and then makes his/her recommendation to the Board.

(5) The Board considers the committee and superintendent's recommendation before officially adopting a site.

b) Facility Design

(1) Parent and student representatives will serve with MCPS staff on planning advisory committees to modify, modernize, or construct new facilities.
(a) Parent representatives will be identified by cluster coordinators, in consultation with PTA presidents in coordination with school principals.

(b) Student representatives at the secondary level will be identified by the principal or chair of the committee.

(c) Representatives of adjacent homeowner, civic association, or other neighborhood groups also may serve on the advisory committee.

(2) Activities incorporating community viewpoints include development of educational specifications for schools, architect selection, and review of architectural plans.

(a) Architectural plans should be available for review by homeowner and civic associations adjacent to the school site.

(b) Whenever possible, concerns of these groups should be addressed at the design stage before architectural plans are finalized.

c) School Boundary Changes

(1) In cases where MCPS facilities planning staff identify the need for possible changes in school service areas, an advisory committee will be formed to assist in the development of those changes. MCPS facilities planning staff and program staff will organize and work directly with this group.

(a) The cluster coordinator(s) in consultation with the school principal(s) and PTA presidents will identify parent representation from areas potentially affected by boundary changes.

(b) At the secondary level, the school principal(s) will identify interested students to serve on the committee.

(c) The cluster coordinator(s) in consultation with the school principal(s) and PTA presidents also will
identify any additional representatives from organized parent or student organizations who have knowledge of the schools involved.

(2) At the outset of meetings, the committee will provide guidelines, criteria, or priorities based on the factors outlined in the section of this policy titled "Guidelines for Development of Facilities Recommendations" (Section E.2) to planning staff for consideration in developing options. The superintendent and Board of Education also will consider factors outlined in Section E.2 in their review of boundary proposals.

(3) Staff will then develop and present approximately 3-5 viable options for the advisory committee to consider. Members of the advisory committee may request development of additional options; however, the total number of options developed for the committee shall not exceed ten.

(4) Official membership on school boundary advisory committees will consist of individuals who are familiar with the affected school communities.

(5) Advisory committees may call on other community resources such as civic and homeowner associations.

(6) Membership on advisory committees should reflect the racial/ethnic and socioeconomic diversity of the area.

(7) MCPS staff will notify civic and homeowner associations in the potentially affected communities of proposed boundary changes being discussed in an area. Cluster coordinators and PTAs may also assist in notification of planning activities through their individual communication mechanism.

(8) An advisory committee report including evaluation of the options by committee representatives, and any individual PTA position paper on the options, will be forwarded to the superintendent.

(9) The superintendent will develop recommendations after considering staff advice, the advisory committee report, if any, and input from other organizations and individuals who have
provided comments. The superintendent will publish his/her recommendations in mid-October, with the CIP.

(10) Copies of the recommendations distributed to the affected communities.

(11) The Board of Education will hold a worksession and may request by majority vote that alternatives to the superintendent's recommendations be developed for official review. Any significant modification to the superintendent’s recommendation requires an alternative. Any modification that impacts any or all of the school community that has not previously been included in the superintendent’s recommendation should be considered a significant modification.

(12) Recommendations from the superintendent and Board-adopted alternatives will be the subject of public hearings prior to final Board action.

(13) Upon taking action on a boundary proposal, the Board has the discretion to adopt minor modifications to the superintendent’s recommendation or Board-adopted alternatives if it has been determined by a majority vote of the Board that this action will not have a significant impact on a plan that has received public review. To the greatest extent possible, alternatives will not be considered after the Board of Education alternatives worksession without adequate notification to and opportunity for comment by the affected communities.

d) Cluster Reports

(1) By July 15, cluster representatives should state in writing to the superintendent any proposals, priorities, or concerns that have been identified for its schools.

(2) The views may be amended by September 15 in cases where fall enrollments or other events may change the comments.

(3) Cluster reports are to be considered in facilities recommendations made by the superintendent in the
subsequent capital improvements program.

e) Public Hearing Process

(1) Public hearings are open to the potentially affected public and are held annually following publication of the superintendent's recommended CIP. This document incorporates any boundary changes and school closure/consolidations that may also be recommended.

(a) The PTA cluster coordinator and/or PTA area coordinator in consultation with the PTA president will coordinate testimony at the hearing on behalf of cluster schools and are encouraged to ensure that diversity of opinions are accommodated when scheduling testimony.

(b) Civic groups, municipalities and countywide organizations should contact the Board of Education office to schedule testimony.

(c) Public comments from individuals not represented by school or civic groups will be heard by the Board of Education at an appropriate place in the public hearing. Individuals should contact the Board Office to schedule testimony.

(2) Written comments from any interested parties will be accepted at any point, but in order to be considered comments must reach the Board 48 hours before the time scheduled for action by the Board.

(3) Public hearings also may be held on any CIP or facilities planning issues deferred from the fall. These usually would occur in late February or early March. In unusual circumstances public hearings may be called at other times to consider facility issues that do not fit into the fall or spring timetables.

5. School Closures and Consolidations

The Maryland State Board of Education requires all school systems to
consider certain factors and follow set procedures in cases where a school closure is contemplated. The procedures described below are in accordance with those requirements and the guidelines as outlined in this Board of Education policy.

a) The following information on each school that may be affected by a proposed closing shall be prepared and analyzed:

(1) Student enrollment trends
(2) Number of transfers into school from outside attendance area
(3) Racial/ethnic composition of student body
(4) Educational programs at schools
(5) Age or condition of building
(6) Review of school's location and site characteristics
(7) Building characteristics, including any modifications for special programs
(8) Physical condition
(9) Financial considerations including operating costs
(10) Feeder pattern
(11) Percentage of students transported
(12) Potential of the facility for alternate use
(13) Student relocation
(14) Impact on community in geographic attendance area for school proposed to be closed and school, or schools, to which students will be relocating

Copies of the data are also to be sent to affected schools’ principals and community representatives.
b) In conjunction with requirements, the superintendent shall provide an analysis of each school's current and projected enrollment given the enrollment and facility standards described in this policy and an analysis of the impact of closure/consolidation options on objectives of the QIE policy.

c) Recommendations for closure or consolidation should move schools toward standards for enrollment and facility utilization and should represent fiscally responsible and educationally sound responses to changing enrollment. Recommendations should be consistent with the Board’s policy on Quality Integrated Education. They should enable as many students to walk to school as possible, and minimize transportation distances except when transportation or longer distances are required to address racial and ethnic isolation.

d) The community’s role in the process shall be as follows:

(1) The superintendent shall request the formation of a community advisory committee to provide input prior to making any recommendations. Procedures for the operation of an advisory committee found in Section E.4c (on boundary changes) shall be followed in instances where school closures/consolidations are being considered.

(2) The superintendent shall publish recommendations for school closures and consolidations by mid-October or mid-February. After providing recommendations to the Board of Education, copies are to be sent for review and comment to the MCNCPPC, State Board of Education, State Interagency Committee, County Council, municipalities, county government, MCCPTA, and all affected school PTAs and cluster coordinators.

(3) Individuals, schools, and/or community organizations may react to the recommendations for their school within two months after they are distributed. All reactions and community-developed proposals will be shared with the Board.

(4) If the Board chooses to request alternatives to the superintendent’s formal recommendations, affected communities will be informed about them promptly.
Subsequent to these steps, the Board's prescribed process for public hearing shall be followed (see Section E.4e). In addition, state requirements for adequate notice to parents and guardians of students in attendance at all schools being considered for closure by the local board of education will be followed. In addition to any regular means of notification, written notification of all schools that are under consideration for closing shall be advertised in at least two newspapers having general circulation in the geographic attendance area for the school or schools proposed to be closed, and the school or schools to which students will be relocating.

The newspaper notification shall include the procedures that will be followed by the local board of education in making its final decision. Time limits on the submission of oral or written testimony and data shall be clearly defined in the notification of the public meeting. The newspaper notification shall appear at least two weeks in advance of any public hearings on a proposed school closing. The Board reserves the right to solicit further input or to conduct further hearings if it considers them desirable.

In making its decision, the Board shall take into account the superintendent's recommendations and the criteria outlined in this policy.

The final decision of the Board of Education to close a school shall be announced at a public session and shall be in writing. The final decision shall include the rationale for the school closing and address the impact of the proposed closing on the factors set forth above in this policy. There shall be notification of the final decision of the local board of education to the community in the geographic attendance area of the school proposed to be closed and school or schools to which students will be relocating. The final decision shall include notification of the right to appeal to the State Board of Education.

Except in emergency circumstances, the decision to close a school shall be announced at least 90 days before the date the school is scheduled to be closed but not later than April
30 of any school year. An emergency circumstance is one where the decision to close a school because of unforeseen circumstances cannot be announced at least 90 days before the date a school is scheduled to close or before April 30 of any school year.

F. REVIEW AND REPORTING

1. The annual June publication of the Master Plan will constitute the official reporting on facility planning. This document will reflect all facilities actions taken during the year by the Board of Education and approved by the County Council, project the enrollment and utilization of each school, and identify schools that may be involved in future planning activities.

2. This policy will be reviewed on an on-going basis in accordance with the Board of Education's policy review process.

RESOLUTION NO. 582-99 Re: CLOSED SESSION RESOLUTION

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

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education of Montgomery County conduct portions of its meeting on Thursday, October 14, 1999, in Room 120 of the Carver Educational Services Center from 8:30 to 10:00 a.m. and noon to 1:30 p.m. to discuss personnel matters, as permitted under Section 10-508(a)(1) of the State Government Article, consult with counsel to obtain legal advice, as permitted by Section 10-508(a)(7) of the State Government Article; and to review and adjudicate appeals in its quasi-judicial capacity and to discuss matters of an executive function outside the purview of the Open Meetings Act (Section 10-503(a) of the State Government Article); and be it further

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

Re: REPORT OF CLOSED SESSION

On August 24, 1999, by unanimous vote, the Board of Education voted to conduct a closed session as permitted under the Education Article § 4-107 and State Government Article
The Montgomery County Board of Education met in closed session on August 24, 1999, from 9:10 to 11:30 a.m. in Room 120, Carver Educational Services Center, Rockville, Maryland, and


2. Reviewed the Superintendent’s recommendations for the appointments of principal of Kemp Mill Elementary School, executive assistant in the Office of the Superintendent of Schools, Assistant to the Deputy Superintendent of Schools, and director of the Department of Facilities Management, subsequent to which the vote to approve the appointments was taken in open session.

3. Discussed and reviewed the Personnel Monthly Report, subsequent to which the vote to approve the report was taken in open session.

4. Discussed a settlement of a special education lawsuit.

5. Conferred on local bills for the General Assembly Session.

6. Considered salary schedules for the Board Office.

In attendance at part or all of the above closed sessions were: Steve Abrams, Ariana Arnold, Elizabeth Arons, Larry Bowers, Fran Brenneman, Ray Bryant, Reggie Felton, Roland Ikheloa, Bob Hacker, Nancy King, George Margolies, Patricia O’Neill, Brian Porter, Glenda Rose, Laura Sampedro, Steve Seleznow, Mona Signer, Mary Helen Smith, Roger Titus, Jerry Weast.

RESOLUTION NO. 583-99 Re: BOARD APPEAL 1998-21

On motion of Mrs. O’Neill and seconded by Ms. Signer, the following resolution was adopted:

Resolved, That the Board of Education adopts its Decision and Order in Appeal 1998-21, bus driver dismissal matter, reflective of the following vote: Mr. Abrams, Mrs. King, Ms. Sampedro, and Ms. Signer voting to affirm; Mr. Felton and Mrs. O’Neill voting to
reverse; Mr. Burnett and Mrs. Gordon were absent.

RESOLUTION NO. 584-99  Re:  BOARD APPEAL 1999-31

On motion of Mrs. O’Neill and seconded by Mrs. King, the following resolution was adopted:

Resolved, That the Board of Education adopts its Decision and Order in Appeal 1999-31, a media center book, reflective of the following vote: Mr. Abrams, Mr. Felton, Mrs. King, Mrs. O’Neill, Ms. Sampedro, and Ms. Signer voting to dismiss; Mr. Burnett and Mrs. Gordon were absent.

RESOLUTION NO. 585-99  Re:  BOARD APPEAL 1999-32

On motion of Mrs. O’Neill and seconded by Mr. Abrams, the following resolution was adopted:

Resolved, That the Board of Education adopts its Decision and Order in Appeal 1999-32, a media center book, reflective of the following vote: Mr. Abrams, Mr. Felton, Mrs. King, Mrs. O’Neill, Ms. Sampedro, and Ms. Signer voting to affirm; Mr. Burnett and Mrs. Gordon were absent.

RESOLUTION NO. 586-99  Re:  BOARD APPEAL T-1999-79

On motion of Mrs. O’Neill and seconded by Mrs. King, the following resolution was adopted:

Resolved, That the Board of Education adopts its Order in Appeal T-1999-79, a student transfer matter, reflective of the following vote: Mr. Burnett, Mr. Felton, Mrs. Gordon, Mrs. King, Mrs. O’Neill, and Ms. Sampedro voting to affirm; Mr. Abrams and Ms. Signer voting to reverse.

RESOLUTION NO. 587-99  Re:  BOARD APPEAL T-1999-87

On motion of Mrs. O’Neill and seconded by Mrs. Gordon, the following resolution was adopted:

Resolved, That the Board of Education adopts its Order in Appeal T-1999-87, a student transfer matter, reflective of the following vote: Mr. Abrams, Mr. Burnett, Mr. Felton, Mrs. Gordon, Mrs. King, Mrs. O’Neill, Ms. Sampedro, and Ms. Signer voting to affirm.
RESOLUTION NO. 588-99 Re:  BOARD APPEAL T-1999-90

On motion of Mrs. O’Neill and seconded by Mrs. Gordon, the following resolution was adopted:

Resolved, That the Board of Education adopts its Order in Appeal T-1999-90, a student transfer matter, reflective of the following vote: Mr. Abrams, Mr. Burnett, Mr. Felton, Mrs. Gordon, Mrs. King, Mrs. O’Neill, Ms. Sampedro, and Ms. Signer voting to affirm.

RESOLUTION NO. 589-99 Re:  BOARD APPEAL T-1999-95

On motion of Mrs. O’Neill and seconded by Mrs. Gordon, the following resolution was adopted:

Resolved, That the Board of Education adopts its Order in Appeal T-1999-95, a student transfer matter, reflective of the following vote: Mrs. Gordon, Mrs. King, Mrs. O’Neill, and Ms. Sampedro voting to affirm; Mr. Abrams, Mr. Burnett, Mr. Felton, and Ms. Signer voting to reverse.

RESOLUTION NO. 590-99 Re:  BOARD APPEAL T-1999-96

On motion of Mrs. O’Neill and seconded by Mrs. Gordon, the following resolution was adopted:

Resolved, That the Board of Education adopts its Order in Appeal T-1999-96, a student transfer matter, reflective of the following vote: Mr. Abrams, Mr. Burnett, Mr. Felton, Mrs. Gordon, Mrs. King, Mrs. O’Neill, Ms. Sampedro, and Ms. Signer voting to affirm.

RESOLUTION NO. 591-99 Re:  NAMING OF SCHOOLS

On motion of Mr. Felton and seconded by Mr. Abrams, the following resolution was adopted with Mr. Abrams, Mr. Burnett, Mr. Felton, Mrs. King, and Mrs. O’Neill voting in the affirmative; Mrs. Gordon voting in the negative; Ms. Signer abstaining:

WHEREAS, It is the responsibility of the Board of Education to make the final decision on naming of schools; and

WHEREAS, Board Policy FFA (“Naming Schools”) authorizes the superintendent of schools to establish a process for the community to recommend to the Board the name of the new school; and

WHEREAS, The number of schools scheduled for construction in future years is very
limited; now therefore be it

Resolved, That, prior to the convening of any name-recognition committee hereafter established pursuant to Regulation FFA-RA, the Board shall develop a listing of up to four names to be submitted to the committee for its consideration, and that such committee shall be charged with the responsibility of recommending, in priority order, its preference from among the listing of names provided by the Board of Education; and be it further

Resolved, That, Policy FFA and Regulation FFA-RA be revised to conform to this resolution.

Re: NEW BUSINESS

Mrs. Gordon moved and Mr. Abrams seconded the following:

Resolved, That the Board of Education rescind Policy BFA, Policysetting.

Re: ITEMS OF INFORMATION

The following items were available for information:
1. Items in Process
2. Legal Fees Report
3. Construction Progress Report
4. Quarterly Change Order Report - under $25,000

RESOLUTION NO. 592-99 Re: ADJOURNMENT

On recommendation of the Superintendent and on motion of Ms. Signer seconded by Mrs. King, the following resolution was adopted unanimously by members present:

Resolved, That the Board of Education adjourn its meeting of September 14, 1999, at 3:40 p.m.
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