

APPROVED
23-1985

Rockville, Maryland
March 25, 1985

The Board of Education of Montgomery County met in regular session at the Carver Educational Services Center, Rockville, Maryland, on Monday, March 25, 1985, at 8:25 p.m.

ROLL CALL Present: Dr. Robert E. Shoenberg, President in
the chair
Dr. James E. Cronin
Mrs. Sharon DiFonzo*
Miss Jacquie Duby
Mr. Blair G. Ewing
Dr. Jeremiah Floyd
Mrs. Marilyn J. Praisner
Mrs. Mary Margaret Slye

Absent: None

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

Resolution No. 182-85 Re: Board Agenda - March 25, 1985

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education approve its agenda for March 25, 1985.

* Mrs. DiFonzo joined the meeting at this point.

Resolution No. 183-85 Re: Oak View Elementary School - Food Service
Equipment (Area 1)

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

WHEREAS, Sealed bids were received on March 7, for Oak View Elementary School food service equipment as indicated below:

Bidder	Base Bid
1. Regional Restaurant Equipment Company, Inc.	\$31,165*
2. Lebow	31,800
3. Gill Company, Inc.	33,194
4. Herb Littman Associates, Ltd.	35,684
5. H. A. Weiss & Sons, Inc.	35,769

* Submitted bid was for \$32,525. Bid price included Maryland sales tax, when deducted, bid was \$31,165.

WHEREAS, Sufficient funds reside in the subject project to award the contract, and the recommended bidder has satisfactorily performed similar work; now therefore be it

Resolved, That a contract for \$31,165 be awarded to Regional Restaurant Equipment Company, Inc., for furnishing materials, labor, and equipment to install food service equipment at Oak View Elementary School consistent with the plans and specifications prepared by Arley J. Koran, Inc., architect.

Resolution No. 184-85 Re: Formal Acceptance of Bradley Hills
Elementary School Modernization
Project (Area 2)

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

Resolved, That having been duly inspected on March 22, 1985, the Bradley Hills Elementary School modernization project now be formally accepted, and that the official date of completion be established as that date upon which formal notice is received from the architect that the building has been completed in accordance with plans and specifications, and all contract requirements have been met.

Resolution No. 185-85 Re: Formal Acceptance of Washington Grove
Elementary School Modernization Project
(Area 3)

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

Resolved, That having been duly inspected on March 22, 1985, the Washington Grove Elementary School modernization project now be formally accepted, and that the official date of completion be established as that date upon which formal notice is received from the architect that the building has been completed in accordance with plans and specifications, and all contract requirements have been met.

Resolution No. 186-85 Re: Change Order for the Construction
Contract - Montgomery Blair High School
(Area 1)

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

WHEREAS, It is desirable to have a security system incorporated into the modernization project at the subject project; and

WHEREAS, The general contractor, Kimmel & Kimmel, Inc., has provided a proposal of \$32,858 to furnish and install a security system in Buildings "C" and "D"; and

WHEREAS, Sufficient funds reside in the project contingency to fund this change order; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the superintendent be authorized to issue a change order for \$32,858 to Kimmel & Kimmel, Inc., general contractor, to furnish and install a security system in Buildings "C" and "D" at Montgomery Blair High School.

Resolution No. 187-85 Re: Approval of Artists for Bradley Hills,
Washington Grove, and Woodlin
Elementary Schools

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

WHEREAS, Authorization for the selection of artists to receive commissions to produce works of art is delineated in Article V, Section 1, Chapter 8, "Buildings," of the Montgomery County Code; and

WHEREAS, Staff has employed selection procedures submitted by the superintendent to the Board of Education on February 10, 1984; and
WHEREAS, Funds have been appropriated for this purpose in the FY 1985 Capital Improvements Program; and

WHEREAS, Comments on the selections have been received from the Montgomery County Arts Council as required by law; and

WHEREAS, The law also requires County Council approval of selection of the artists before the Board of Education can enter into contracts with said artists; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Board of Education enter into contractual agreements with the following artists, as indicated, subject to County Council approval:

Artist	Work	School	Commission
Ms. Marcia Billig	Sculpture	Bradley Hills	\$3,800
Mr. Jerry Carter	Relief	Bradley Hills	8,000
Mr. Terry Rodgers	Mural	Bradley Hills	8,600
Ms. Maureen Melville	Stained Glass Panel	Washington Grove	8,270
Mr. Joseph English	Mural	Washington Grove	6,000
Mr. Julio Teichberg	Sculpture	Washington Grove	3,000
Mr. Mark Anderson	Stained glass panel	Woodlin	4,382
Mr. Julio Teichberg	Circular art window	Woodlin	7,000

they concluded they needed to involve representatives from different parts of the school system in a thorough examination of what it was they were trying to accomplish. The document before the Board was a product of the groups which was broadly representative of the school system. He explained that this was not a detailed action plan which was not to say that a lot of detailed planning had not taken place.

Dr. Hiawatha Fountain, associate superintendent for special and alternative education, reported that this was a continuation of a direction they had been headed in for the past several years. It was in line with Priorities 1 and 2 and built on a lot of their past experiences. They knew that they had quite a number of successful programs. They were interested in the transition of students both from the segregated centers and from school to work. Both of these were a part of the missions paper. The paper was divided into six goals with initiatives with the direction of the paper going from the background and purpose. They had 11 assumptions, and as they went into the specifics there was an analysis under each goal. Dr. Thomas O'Toole, director of the Department of Special Education and Related Services, added that they would be pleased to respond to Board questions.

Mrs. Praisner asked about the assumption that the least restrictive environment was not necessarily a building or a type of program which was different from what they had assumed in the past. Dr. O'Toole explained that the term "least restrictive environment" was generic and depended on the individual student. They thought that in some cases for a certain student, a more restrictive setting might be the appropriate environment for that student. They tried to look at the needs of individual youngsters and continue the thrust of educating as many students in regular school sites as possible. They realized that some students would require a highly specialized setting. Mrs. Praisner assumed that when they talked about "least restrictive environment" they were not necessarily thinking about a regular school placement. She asked whether they were referring to the delivery, the organization, and the content when they talked about no one model being appropriate for all students, and Dr. O'Toole replied that they were.

Mrs. DiFonzo said she had focused on the phrase "geared to promoting student successes" and wondered about the steps they were taking to remove children out of private placement and integrate them back into the mainstream in home schools. She was troubled by students with real special therapeutic needs and bringing them back. She asked whether they would still be able to address those needs adequately in a program geared to promoting student successes or were they really not providing these students with the services. Dr. Fountain replied that their approach to bringing students back from out-of-state placements coincided with the opening of RICA and the opening of a new program for autistic students. Instead of sending large numbers of students out of the state they had been able to program for them within the state. They had not brought any students back to place in a less restrictive environment if they needed a more restrictive environment or a more therapeutic environment. He felt they had been

fortunate with the opening of RICA because of the outstanding staff and the mainstreaming. He reported that they were 87 percent successful in mainstreaming at RICA; therefore, the students leaving created slots for other students to come in. Many of the students brought from out-of-state into the residential program at RICA were in a day program within a year.

Mrs. DiFonzo asked whether they were able to provide the therapeutic support when they brought students back. Dr. O'Toole explained that they had to take this into consideration which tied into Assumption 3. He said that at a particular point in time it might be inappropriate for a youngster to come back, but six months later it might be appropriate. Mrs. DiFonzo stated that she wanted to make sure that in the process of helping students they were not hurting them. She asked about the 87 percent success rate in mainstreaming, and Dr. Fountain replied that this was the rate for mainstreaming RICA students into a school in the county. If a student had problems, the student was returned to RICA. They did have a solid base of information on the student before it was determined the student, with assistance, was ready to go out.

Dr. Cronin stated that he had an overarching question related to the reports they had received. He said that they had a limited number of staff and what appeared to be an ambitious program. Throughout the report there were comments such as "on-going support must be available, "budgetary support," etc. He asked whether staff could do the job with present resources and, if not, how many people, how much money, and how many years would this require. Dr. Fountain replied that this was the plan that would come out of the Board's acceptance of the direction in which they were heading. This could best be answered when staff came back to the Board for approval. He believed they had enough to deal with the short term in the next year or so as opposed to others that might take the next eight to ten years. As they looked at transfers of students from the centers to educate them with their peers, they should know it was not their decision that in the foreseeable future they would be closing down a number of schools. They were not recommending closure of all of the mod schools or the elementary learning centers or Rock Terrace or RICA.

They would like to give a continuum of options to both the educational side of the house as well as the parents and students. Dr. Cronin remarked that Dr. Fountain was inviting him out on a rhetorical limb and the next report would indicate how much the rhetoric would cost and the expectations they would be setting up for people. He wondered what they cut out which unraveled the fabric of all of this. He would like to see what the costs would be before he got into a discussion of programs. Dr. O'Toole replied that part of the objectives had little or no cost implications, and these could be spelled out for the Board. They would like to see some models developed and return to the Board on the general direction with cost

implications for the next five or ten years. They might propose another direction with different options.

Dr. Shoenberg called attention to Goal 3 which stated, "although some handicapped students may always need a more protected educational environment, most can be successfully educated in the regular schools if there is adequate staff support." He thought this was precisely what Dr. Cronin was talking about. He did not know what "adequate staff support" consisted of and whether it was more than the staff who might be moved out of the special needs and into the other schools. He suspected it did amount to more. He was also concerned about other kinds of adequacy. He asked whether they were providing that support in the classroom with the teacher. He noted that there were many parents who were afraid that a certain number of handicapped students in a particular class would distract teacher attention from nonhandicapped students in the class. He commented that it was not simply dollars in terms of additional staff, it was dollars in terms of space. He said they had good examples of this with a number of decisions telegraphed by the facilities plan.

Dr. O'Toole felt the need to get some resolution of the direction in which they were going. He remarked that they had a lot of experience in moving students into regular school buildings over the last eight or nine years, and most of those were moved with essentially the existing staff. They had also had a lot of success with a project they were working on with the University of Maryland where they had moved some severely and profoundly handicapped students out in regular classes. This had involved more staff, but they had also seen some real benefits to other students in the regular school program. He explained that this element represented one small part of this thrust. He said that many of the youngsters in special settings could be moved to regular settings with existing staff support. There were dollar figures if they had two centers in an area instead of one.

Dr. Shoenberg stated that he was perfectly prepared to support the successes they had already had and to move further in this direction if he knew exactly what it was they were talking about here. There were a lot of things in the report that did not have a specific reference. He was not prepared to go ahead with the plan.

Dr. Cody explained that staff was asking whether they were in the right ball park to develop the specifics they were talking about. Mr. Ewing said that he did not know, and the paper did not answer it for him. He was concerned that the paper was not posing the questions in a way that was helpful. He would like the issues sharpened. He wanted to know what the issues were and what the options were in terms of how to approach those issues. He said he was generally familiar with the reasons why they might consider closing some schools and with the reasons why one should not. He would like to know the advantages and the disadvantages of the options that were available to the Board and why they should pursue one option rather than another and in what time frame and at what cost. He was bothered by the very general statement of assumptions because they did not tell him about how people were thinking. Assumptions should be statements about the mental set with which people approached problems. The goal statements pointed directions,

but they did not tell him why those goals were chosen. Therefore, he was uncomfortable with the paper before the Board.

Dr. Fountain explained that all six of the goals stemmed from the several studies they had had over the last three years. Everything in the paper had come from some study or some direction from one task force or another in addition to discussions among staff. They had come to look at the six goals as the way they ought to go and as the things most of the people were concerned about. People were concerned about the transition from school to work and more students in the regular program. They were concerned about understanding handicapping conditions and beefing up the instructional program for handicapped youngsters. He said that community people working with them believed this was the direction in which they should be going, and he felt there was nothing new in these goals because all of these were things they had heard over several years.

Mr. Ewing said they were talking about a planning process and the development of some action plans. It was his view that they ought to have an assessment of the major issues for the future before they had action plans. He was uncomfortable with a planning process that reached conclusions before it did analysis. Dr. Cody stated that part of what was not before the Board were the documents that did identify some of the issues. Most of what was before the Board originated from analyses in other documents.

Miss Duby understood that this was supposed to be a set of directions and that action plans would follow. She was concerned that they were acting on everything at once, and she was sure that the action plans would show a span of years. She wondered whether the goals were in order for a reason because they could not do everything at once. Her second question was on page nine under Goal 5, Objective A, where they talked about clustering special education classes in regular schools. She assumed that since they were talking about directions they were not talking about all the specific issues they needed to talk about before they finished the facilities issues, and she wondered whether this was on another agenda.

Dr. Shoenberg explained that they would begin this discussion this evening, see what the questions were, and then schedule an entire evening to talk about this matter.

Mrs. Slye was concerned about the issues that other Board members had raised as well. She did not see clearly set forth a discussion of the overarching philosophy of special education that united these goals. She was concerned that they did not have a discussion of running special education programs to meet needs as identified, of trying to do some things with regard to early intervention, and of broadening regular classroom teacher training. She commented that the Board was saying they could not go ahead and approve a discussion such as this without more underlying philosophical bases, and staff was saying they could not sharpen the focus without the initial go-ahead. They needed to find a way to move the discussion into a framework they could all agree upon.

Dr. Fountain explained that the goals and philosophy of special education were the Goals of Education for MCPS. Secondly, they had P. L. 94-142 and Bylaw 13.04.01. Thirdly, they had a policy for handicapped students in the county. When they combined those three things together, they had a pretty good idea of the direction in which they wanted to go. They could provide a specific philosophy if the Board wanted it. He reported that at present they were educating 11,000 students, and they were suggesting they take another look at that and see if they could not do it in a more effective and efficient way. They had a community saying they had done a very good job with some of their students but others graduated from the program at the age of 21 and found themselves in sheltered workshops. It was suggested that, if they were to change the approach they were using, by their fourteenth birthday they could start doing some other things using the total community as the classroom. He did not think a lot of these things were going to cost a lot of money.

Dr. Fountain called attention to the last page in the report listing the participants in the development of the paper. He said that these people touched every aspect of the school system. He also noted that the paper was for students with "special needs" not just "special education." They were talking of students being served by special education when there was no other program for them, and for this reason they had Goal 1. He recalled that once upon a time Goal 1 was an assumption. They were suggesting they take another look at how they utilized the resources, and he agreed that they might need to add additional resources but to discuss budget would be premature. He believed it would take them until late summer and early fall to develop six stand-alone plans about carrying out these six goals. This needed to be considered when they were building their FY 1987 budget.

Mrs. Praisner saw this as a first step paper, and she did not see that the Board could give any kind of approval until it knew a little more. She said that while Goal 1 sounded acceptable, she had questions about how they were going to place students in appropriate services. She asked whether they were talking about individual educational plans and how they were going to evaluate whether the students were placed successfully. If this was tied to the second goal of seeing that minority students were placed appropriately, she wondered how they were going to insure that they were not creating other programs in which minority students might be placed inappropriately. She asked how they were going to build into their processes the assurances that they were building the success they wanted in the least restrictive environment definition under the assumption. She asked about how much clustering was too much clustering and how much of a balance between clustering and regular enrollment was a goal of the Montgomery County Public Schools. She inquired about the impact of clustering on the school that was not clustered. She asked whether they were moving programs to cluster them or adding programs to cluster them. She asked whether they could only cluster in a stable community. For example, Areas 1 and 3 because of changing enrollments would not be able to cluster. She

asked how they were going to tie long-range planning on facilities with cluster goals and when did cluster goals become not appropriate.

She felt that these were the questions the Board needed to discuss with the staff. She asked about how many new programs were too many new programs for staff, the area office, and the center office. She asked about additional support at the central and area office. Mrs. Praisner inquired about streamlining ACES and whether they were proposing bringing the decision down to the local school level or to move it up from the area level. She would like to see them move on streamlining procedures and on the question of the vocational program. She recalled that here they had talked about the involvement of other agencies, but she was concerned that they have continuing support from external agencies so that MCPS was not left after a year or two not being able to satisfy community needs. She asked how this related to other programs in the community and their long-range goals.

Dr. O'Toole stated that a number of questions posed by Mrs. Praisner were questions they had posed as they worked through the paper. They wanted to know whether the Board was interested in these same questions. They hoped to come back to the Board with some specific plans.

Dr. Cronin commented that what staff was attempting to do was to structure one of the least structured parts of the system in that in dealing with 11,000 students they were dealing with a multitude of programs with plans devised for each child and then a disagreement as to what was the least restrictive environment. He thought that this subject might lend itself to in-servicing for the Board in terms of what programs were offered and the nature of the variety of things they had. He thought that first they needed a theoretical framework from which they could then see the goals. Dr. Fountain explained that their reason for coming to the Board was to find out about Board views in regard to the six goals. Dr. Cronin replied that in theory he liked them. However, he needed to know whether they could deliver to the specific child the best possible program.

Dr. Fountain reported that staff would be working with Dr. Muir. He thought the Board's concerns were valid ones and had assisted them in proceeding with the paper. He indicated that staff would begin to flesh out a couple of the goals. Dr. Cronin commented that he was worried about a number of instances where in the outcome measures they stated that "students would do better...people will like the program better." He felt that there was a weakness in the specifics. In response to Miss Duby's earlier question, Dr. O'Toole explained that Goal 1 had become a focus of the steering committee and was seen as an important first goal. Before they talked about planning special education programs and better identification, they had to talk about youngsters needing special help and not qualifying for special education. While the six goals were not in any specific order, Goal 1 they saw as important and a foundation for getting into the rest of the goals.

Dr. Shoenberg remarked that Goal 1 illustrated the general problem he had of not having the specific correlative to go along with the general statement. He did not know all of the things they were talking about in the first goal. Dr. Fountain replied that when he joined MCPS six and a half years ago they had a group of staff called "alternative" staff. They were moved and nothing put in their place. Schools were saying they had to take care of some students who were not special education but were being helped by special educators because they had no one to turn to. Dr. Cody added that they had a couple of sentences alluding to the problem, and 47 percent of the principals said they placed a child in a handicapped program because they did not have any other resources to help that child.

Dr. Floyd remarked that he had listened intently for the past 45 minutes trying to grapple with the words. In his view long-range and strategic planning involved deciding where they were, where they were trying to get, and what it took to get there. If the Board were to exercise its appropriate policy option, they had to give clear and concise directions as to what they wanted. He assumed that items about cost and risk were not requested in the staff paper. He suggested that if the Board wanted a comprehensive, long-range, and strategic plan they should request this from the staff and spend the time necessary to delve into each part. He assumed that absent that kind of directive someone made the decision to lay out some goals, objectives, and assumptions. Dr. Shoenberg commented that the Board had not requested any particular approach. This came to the Board as a result of a number of studies of special education and the work that Dr. Fountain was doing. The Board planned an initial discussion with a full evening devoted to the topic afterward.

Mr. Ewing did not think there was any great difference among Board members about what they would like to see, and he believed it was along the lines described by Dr. Floyd. He thought they should have a strategic plan looking at what the options were. He said that the options were around the major issues which were implicit in all the adjectives such as "sufficient" and "appropriate." He did not think that these issues were settled by Federal law, state law, or the Board's policy. He felt that these issues were raised by these laws and policies. He said that the Board needed to consider these issues and needed a document to permit them to do that. He regarded the document in front of the Board as preliminary and suggested they needed a document focusing on the issues.

Dr. Fountain agreed and said they recognized the complexity of special education in Montgomery County. He explained that many of the statements were "soft" because they wanted to find out Board views. He did feel confident that the staff could return with a long-range plan. Dr. O'Toole hoped that staff would be able to follow up with some in-service for Board members.

Dr. Shoenberg asked whether there were specific questions from individual Board members. Several Board members indicated that they would put their questions in writing. In regard to Goal 2, Dr. Shoenberg noted that there were three functional elements: "prompt,"

"appropriate," and "minority students." He had trouble seeing the relationship among those three unless there was a specific concern they were addressing. Dr. Fountain replied that this goal had a very interesting history, and he hoped to get together soon with the Board to discuss this.

Dr. Cronin noted the DEA study on page 4 and asked for information about that design. He asked whether staff could do something about ACES, CARD, etc., as far as streamlining the process. He also asked for information about how they were planning to have in-service training for the principals and teachers. Mrs. DiFonzo commented that the general paper would allow the Board an opportunity to define their own questions.

Dr. Shoenberg stated that the superintendent and Board officers would discuss the format for "round two" of the discussion. However, he did agree that this topic should be scheduled before the end of spring.

Re: MCPS Action Plan to Increase Female
Participation in Nontraditional Jobs
and Advanced Math and Science Courses

Dr. Shoenberg introduced Mrs. Marion Bell, the newly appointed director of the Department of Human Relations. Dr. Cody reported that Ms. Judy Docca had been working for several months with different parts of MCPS to sharpen up specific objectives and the language they would apply to determine whether they were successful in meeting the objectives.

Ms. Docca explained that the grid before the Board was much larger in September and October, but they had cut it back to make it much more reasonable. They ended up working on math, science, and technology and employment areas. It was impossible to meet their goals in one year, but they would continue working on this as part of their five-year plan. They were concerned that there were still barriers to females entering certain professions and in entering higher math and science courses. They wanted to concentrate on some areas where they could disseminate information to staff about how to recruit females into advanced math and science courses and to assist them in looking at careers. They worked with several departments in the school system and the Mid-Atlantic Sex Equity Center to develop which was held last fall for about 60 schools. The second part of the program would take place next fall. The 60 schools sent principals, teachers, and media specialists. They had a panel of people who talked about opportunities for females in math, science, and technology. Schools had the opportunity to work on a plan for the school which was submitted in January. A number of schools had held interesting programs involving MCPS staff and graduates. The second part of this program would take place on April 25 when information on the "Expanding Horizons" program would be presented.

Ms. Docca reported that in the area of curriculum there was an on-going effort to choose curriculum that did reflect the

contributions of women. They were also looking at the enrollment in the career centers. They were concerned that in the nontraditional fields there were very few females although Edison had done a job of outreach and had tried to encourage females into these programs. They had redone their brochures and had changed their tours to encourage females to enroll in these programs. She reported that they had the goal of increasing enrollment which might mean one or two more students in these programs. In addition, they wanted to look at the graduates from the centers and see if they could channel some of those graduates into the school system. They also wanted to look at the applicant pool in the D.C. Metropolitan area.

Dr. Shoenberg understood that the Title IX Advisory Committee had wanted to make some comments. Ms. Docca commented that the committee had some comments relating to the report she had done, and the students members of the committee wanted to talk about what was happening in the schools.

Mrs. Praisner thought that the plans were very clear. She said under Goal 1 she would be interested in knowing what involvement there had been with the employee organizations in regard to recruitment, especially MCCSSE. Under Goal 2 she had a question about why guidance counselors were not involved in the process, especially junior high school counselors because they were involved with eighth graders in developing a four-year plan. This seemed to be the initial place for females to think about going beyond geometry into other courses. It seemed to her it was important to involve principals and teachers to encourage students to enroll in advanced courses. She had a question about the YWCA's role and why they were identified. She also had a question about outcome measures, given the fact that the strategy went into the fall of 1985. She was concerned that enrollment would not necessarily increase in the 1985-86 school year if students were now registering for those courses. She thought they might see the increase coming in the 1986-87 school year because registration was taking place now. It seemed to her that as they heightened awareness about the need to be conscious of showing instructional materials and identifying the contribution of females they might not necessarily see a decrease in complaints. They might see an increase in complaints because people's awareness was heightened, and this should not be identified as some- thing negative. She asked whether the costs identified in the action plan were now in the budget.

Ms. Docca replied that they did have a modest amount of funds in the budget. Mrs. Praisner thought it might be too optimistic to think that the results would show in the next school year. Ms. Docca said that female enrollment in advanced math courses was increasing. In terms of enrollment in the career centers, if they had one student in any of the areas that would be an increase. She explained that the YWCA had volunteered to handle the program and was working on the program now. Mrs. Praisner asked for some feedback as to what kinds of programs were presented and in what schools. Ms. Docca added that they were also working with minority science and math. In terms of guidance counselors, they were involved in 1983, but they would visit

them again. Employee organizations were going to be working with them on this project.

Mr. Ewing thought the paper was a series of steps in the right direction. He noted that earlier this evening they had agreed to support a grant to explore some of the issues related to math achievement and course enrollment for both females and minority students. He asked what they could say about strategies they employed that were useful in working with both minorities and females and strategies which were of necessity different. He asked whether they had a set of strategies which were clearly defined enough for them to say how they would apply them. It seemed important that they have the right strategy for the right set of people. Ms. Docca replied that some of the strategies they were using would be appropriate for Asians, Hispanics, and black males.

In regard to Outcome Measure 4 on page 3, Dr. Cronin remarked that when they talked about parents having a more open attitude they were talking of a major societal change. Ms. Docca replied that the research did say that they had to do that, and they were making some attempt to bring these programs to parents. She explained that the father determined what the daughter would be interested in. They knew that they had to do some outreach there to let parents know what the opportunities were. They knew they had females enrolled in higher math and science, but they needed to know whether these students studied engineering and science in college.

Dr. Cronin asked what they were doing to encourage females to enroll in the Blair magnet program. Dr. Cody agreed to check into this. Dr. Cronin noted that when they reported data they could say when they had four students and had an increase of one student they had an increase of one or a 25 percent increase. He also asked about the penalty for failure if five years from now they still had four people enrolled. Ms. Docca stated that personally she would feel it was a failure on her part. Staff was working very hard on this problem, and the superintendent had said they would hire women in certain categories and they would have certain programs. They had had a lot of cooperation among school personnel because it was a serious commitment. Dr. Cody felt that this had to do with commitment, determination, and focus. He had made the commitment which was shared by the Board and the staff; however, he did not know how fast they would succeed. He agreed that they had to keep hammering away at this problem, and he had no doubt that they would be successful. Dr. Cronin thought they need some more concrete objectives.

Dr. Shoenberg asked about the number of schools involved in Goal 2, objective A, number 3. Ms. Docca replied that it would be 60 schools from all levels. The other 60 would be done next fall. Dr. Shoenberg commented that this addressed one concern he had which was scale. He thought that the speakers from the YWCA seemed to be a very tenuous kind of activity in order to produce results on the scale they were talking about. They were talking about changes in attitudes of large numbers of people both within the school system

and within surrounding society. However, to look at the dollars they were talking about spending to do this struck him. Ms. Docca reported that she had requested extra money. Dr. Shoenberg thought if they were going to have an impact on the problems they were trying to address they had to talk about a substantially greater budget. If they didn't have much money, they could only do things that were small in scope and were likely to have a fairly small effect. He suggested that they needed to think through the strategy and look at larger scale objectives. He thought they had to have some focus on things that were likely to have significant effects.

Dr. Floyd said he would raise the rhetorical question of whether this was a serious problem or wasn't. If they wanted to get people's attention and get something done, they had to be able to report the facts and do it quantitatively. It was one thing to say they wanted an increase in the number of women in nontraditional jobs and then say going from four to five was an improvement. However, if they went from four out of a hundred to five out of a hundred this was change rather than improvement. They had to differentiate between change, which was movement, and what was progress, which was proportional. The problem he had with the paper was that he did not see anything telling him how bad the problem was. Ms. Nadine Mildice, chairperson of the Title IX Advisory Committee, replied that the committee had prepared a fact sheet.

Dr. Cronin commented that they had to consider whether there was any possibility of success. For example, in some of the trade fields there might not be any openings. They had to consider what the hires were in these fields when they did have openings.

Ms. Mildice stated that there was a misunderstanding about the committee's participation in this meeting. They were prepared with a full report to the Board with facts and figures and some strategies, and they were now requesting an agenda time when they could come to the Board and present their annual report. She explained that the committee had thought through a philosophy with some strategies on how to get the school system focused on this particular problem. For this reason they had asked to be made a Board priority. They felt that since 1977 they had been making recommendations which were piecemeal. She explained that principals paid attention when the Board requested something, and these principals would help them if women could be spelled out as a category. It was a goal of the Title IX Committee that women not go out of MCPS at the end of 12 years just able to eke out a living but to earn a living. They would talk about about this in their full report. She introduced Miss Elisa Weiss, Rockville High School, and Miss Cathy Atwell, Churchill High School.

Miss Weiss reported that she had not witnessed blatant discrimination against female students which would discourage them from following less traditional patterns in schools and careers. In fact, in many schools there was active recruitment for female enrollment in classes such as architecture, woodworking, physics, and mechanical drawing. However, the progress the programs were making to promote sex equity

was being hindered by continuous covert incidents of sex discrimination in the schools. There were sexist actions and statements made primarily by male teachers. Many male teachers put their arms around female students and initiated other forms of physical contact. Miss Weiss said that females were addressed as "honey" and "dear." They made statements such as "women should stay home with kids where they belong" and "women are like shirts, you need to change them every day." She said that these various degrees of sexual harassment were patronizing and conveyed the message that female students were to be taken less seriously than male students. These actions and sexist remarks were made by a minority of the teachers, but the fact that the numbers were small did not dilute the impact of the incidents. She felt that these teachers caused female students to have feelings of inferiority. She said that to take the initiative to go into nontraditional fields and to take classes which were predominantly male, high school girls needed encouragement not discouragement provided by many teachers. She felt that just as important was the effect these teachers were having on the male students. They showed male students it was acceptable to make such remarks and actions and were, therefore, perpetuating sexism in future generations. She said that many male students felt that they were superior to girls and were expected to go to college and to become professionals so that they would support a wife and family.

She felt that this was being encouraged by many teachers who were working against the programs of sex equity. She said that these actions and statements, pervasive as they were in the larger society, were particularly insidious in the context of education and had no place in the schools. She suggested that sex equity needed to be made a priority of the Board of Education to combat the problems that existed.

Miss Atwell said that every day in school students experienced uncalled for hugging and touching by teachers to demeaning comments by teachers and male students. For example, a history teacher would hand out covered books to girls because girls could not handle the responsibility of covering their own books. A physics teacher would say that boys will do the wiring in circuits and girls will take the notes. A student stated that there was no point in studying about women's suffrage because women should remain barefoot and pregnant, and the teacher responded by laughing. She felt that the patronizing attitudes of teachers affected her self image as a student. She urged the Board to include sex equity as a priority in the school system.

Dr. Shoenberg said they had raised the issue of the Board's placement of sex equity in its priorities. This was not an issue they could face this evening, and perhaps they could look at this in the context of their review of Board priorities which they did annually. He said that there was some sense on the part of the Board that they needed something a little more hard-edged in the way of outcomes. Mrs. Praisner requested information on what would be necessary in order to do more and what would be the implications on staff training. Ms. Mildice stated that in terms of the advisory committee more money

was very important, but she thought what the two women addressed was an attitude problem where someone needed to step in and speak to that issue as a policy statement.

Mr. Ewing recalled that for a number of years the Board paid no attention to this issue and starved the program of resources that it needed. The present Board had begun to move in the other direction, but he did not think they knew what all the things were that they had to do. For example, changing attitudes was a major thing to work on. As they looked to change attitudes, they had to be careful to take steps that did not create a backlash. They had to move sensibly and prudently. As they thought about what they wanted to do, they needed to think with some care about what they expected to accomplish. He felt that changing male views of female roles was a massive undertaking.

Dr. Shaffner reported that the Title IX Advisory Committee was scheduled to discuss its annual report with the Board on the evening of May 28. Dr. Cronin asked that the committee provide the Board with copies of their report prior to that date.

Miss Duby stated that the Board had discussed taskforces and the lack of student involvement. She said that this evening's presentation showed what some committees were missing. She commented that tonight was a prime example of why they needed to beef up the involvement of students on committees.

Re: Board Member Comments

1. Mrs. DiFonzo reported that while the Board had met with the B-CC Cluster she had been attending a meeting at Poolesville. She said that pride and feeling good about themselves were alive and well in Poolesville. She had been invited there because of an effort to formalize the positive image the community wanted Poolesville to have. The junior high school portion of Poolesville had received a charter for a national junior honor society. Over 20 youngsters were inducted into the chapter that evening, and a number of honorary adult members were initiated. She suggested that the community should be commended for their efforts. Dr. Cronin reported that Mrs. DiFonzo had been one of the adult members inducted into the honor society.

2. Miss Duby reported that the election process for the eighth student Board member was underway. Dr. Cody and Mrs. DiFonzo had attended the first candidates meeting, and the candidates would be busy visiting schools. She said that she was trying to stay one step ahead of the candidates by explaining issues before they were debated, and she asked Board members for any issues they wanted included for student comment.

3. Mrs. Praisner said that the MCPS citizen representative on the Interagency Coordinating Board, Ann Yeamans, had recently been recognized by the Greater Olney Civic Association for her efforts on behalf of the community and education. Dr. Shoenberg indicated that he had conveyed his personal congratulations to Mrs. Yeamans.

4. Mrs. Praisner said that Delegate Lucille Maurer would be completing 25 years of public service. She hoped that staff could draft a resolution honoring Delegate Maurer for Board adoption in April.

5. Mrs. Praisner asked when the Board would be discussing the MCCPTA recommendations on the planning process as well as the Sherer committee recommendations.

6. Mrs. Praisner requested periodic reports on the hiring of new teachers on the target dates mentioned in the memo received by the Board.

7. Mrs. Praisner recalled that she had raised a concern about the Price Waterhouse study on the comparative cost of Ride-On and MCPS buses. She had raised questions about how the cost would be measured since it had been deemed inappropriate to analyze cost per student or cost per mile and about the fact that Price Waterhouse had indicated before the study began that the program would produce cost savings. She knew that Price Waterhouse had since modified their letter to say that the study would focus on avoidable costs in order to reach an accurate estimate of savings. She said that staff members still had some concerns about the use of the word "avoidable" in lieu of "available," and "defensible" in lieu of "definable." She shared these concerns, and she wondered where they were on how that cost difference was going to be calculated. In the county executive's budget denials, the executive stated that MCPS had only piloted the Blair activity bus program. It seemed to her to be an implication that they were foot dragging, and they had to raise the question of how costs were going to be evaluated and what the study was going to define before they jumped to say this was going to be a viable way to proceed. Dr. Cody indicated that they would review the Price Waterhouse study. He said it was a reputable firm and he assumed they would do a responsible job.

Resolution No. 189-85

Re: Executive Session - April 9, 1985

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

WHEREAS, The Board of Education of Montgomery County is authorized by 76A, Section 11(a) of the Annotated Code of Maryland to conduct certain meetings in executive closed session; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Board of Education of Montgomery County hereby convene in executive closed session beginning on April 9, 1985, at 9 o'clock a.m. to discuss, consider, deliberate, and/or otherwise decide the employment, appointment, promotion, demotion, compensation, discipline, resignation of employees, appointees, or officials over whom it has jurisdiction, or any other personnel matter affecting one or more particu-

viduals and to comply with a specific constitutional, statutory or judicially imposed requirement protecting particular proceedings or matters from disclosure as permitted under Article 76A, Section 11(a) and that such shall continue in executive closed session until the completion of business and be it further

Resolved, That such meeting continue in executive closed session at 8:00 p.m. to discuss the matters listed above as permitted under Article 76A, Section 11(a) and that such meeting shall continue in executive closed session until completion of business.

Resolution No. 190-85 Re: Minutes of January 8 and 21, February 26, and 28, and March 4 and 5, 1985

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Dr. Cronin and Miss Duby, the following resolution was adopted unanimously:

Resolved, That the following minutes be approved:

January 8, 1985
January 21, 1985 (as corrected)
February 7, 1985
February 26, 1985
February 28, 1985 (as corrected)
March 4, 1985
March 5, 1985

Re: Items of Information

Board members received the following items of information:

1. Report on the Warehousing and Distribution Functions of the Division of Supply and Property Management
2. Monthly Financial Report

Re: Adjournment

The president adjourned the meeting at 11 p.m.

President

Secretary

WSC:mlw