

**MONTGOMERY COUNTY BOARD OF EDUCATION
POLICY COMMITTEE**

April 9, 2008

The meeting was called to order at 2:00 p.m. with the following committee members and Board staff present: Sharon Cox (chair), Shirley Brandman, Ben Moskowitz, Pat O'Neill, Suzann King (staff assistant), and Glenda Rose (recorder).

Other staff present: Stephanie Williams, Harriet Potosky, Brian Edwards, Holli Swann, Lori-Christina Webb, Robin Confino, Kathy Lazor, Betsy Brown, Shahpar Modarresi, Suzanne Merchlinsky, and Steven Fink.

Others present: Jane deWinter.

Committee Minutes

Action: The minutes of the March 12, 2008, meeting were approved, as presented.

State Audit on Wellness Policy

Ms. Kathy Lazor, director of Division of Food and Nutrition Services, reported that the Maryland State Department of Education is working on a draft rubric for measuring the implementation of wellness policies of the local education agencies (LEAs). After April 21, 2008, the final draft will be presented to five counties that will test the design. The rubric is scheduled to be rolled out to all LEAs in 2009.

The committee chair asked if that process would affect MCPS' ability to move forward on its internal review of Policy JPG. Ms. Lazor and staff thought that MCPS evaluation of the policy and the state's rubric would work well together. All agreed that the state's scope was broader than MCPS, but the two would dovetail and support any evaluation effort.

Action: Staff will begin the internal evaluation of Policy JPG: Wellness: *Physical and Nutritional Health*.

Evaluation Briefs Regarding Grading and Reporting

The Policy Committee has received regular updates on the implementation of Policy IKA, *Grading and Reporting*. Since several evaluation briefs had been completed on the implementation of Policy IKA, the chair requested an opportunity for the committee to review and ask questions about the evaluation briefs and implementation of Policy IKA.

Staff reported on the evaluation methodology, including the schools and stakeholders that participated in the following evaluation briefs:

- < *Findings from the Spring 2007 Elementary School Parent Survey*
- < *Findings from the Elementary-level Interviews and Teacher Web Survey*
- < *Findings from the 2007 Secondary Teacher Survey on Consistency of Implementation*
- < *Comparison of Findings from the Spring 2007 Secondary Student, Parent, and Teacher Surveys on Consistency of Implementation*

Discussion focused on what was learned over the past two years and whether:

- < new teachers understood the policy
- < veteran teachers are implementing the policy
- < procedures are readily available to teachers
- < parents understood the grading and reporting procedures
- < the review was limited to the elementary pilot schools
- < there was improvement in consistency of implementation over two years
- < special education and ESOL students and parents were included in the web survey
- < there is a plan for assessing writing
- < reteach/reassess is being implemented consistently
- < stakeholder satisfaction level is low, and what is being done to increase it

It was suggested that this discussion could be instructive to staff about the type of information Board members seek in policy evaluation documents.

Non-Substantive Changes to Policy BCB: *Student Board Member Election*

During the audit process in the Department of Reporting and Regulatory Accountability, Policy BCB was determined to need non-substantive changes. These included: capitalizing Board of Education; changing “videotape” to “television programs”; and using “voting equipment” rather than “Datavote” and “ballot card reader.” The non-substantive changes were approved by the Policy Committee.

Action: On approval of the committee, the non-substantive changes will be made and the policy will be reissued.

Rescission of Policy DJB, *Bid Awards*

Through the audit process in the Department of Reporting and Regulatory Accountability, Policy DJB was recommended for rescission. Staff explained that this was a restatement of law and was contained in the Procurement Manual. Discussion focused on the fact that Policy DJB appears to be the only avenue by which the superintendent is authorized to award contracts up to a limit of \$25,000 and the process by which changes are made to the Procurement Manual.

Action: Staff will research whether any sources (other than Policy DJB) authorize the superintendent to award contracts up to a limit of \$25,000, as well as the authority needed and process utilized to make changes to the MCPS Procurement Manual.

Next Meeting and Adjournment

The next committee meeting is scheduled for May 14, 2008, at 2:30 p.m. in Room 120.

Agenda items may include:

1. Timeline for Policy ACD, *Quality Integrated Education*
2. Policy EEA, *Student Transportation*
3. Policy DJB, *Bid Awards*
4. Honors Level in Core Courses
5. Update on Policy IEB, *Middle School Education*
6. Policy Audit

The meeting adjourned at 3:00 p.m.