

of people of Hispanic descent to this country; and

WHEREAS, Hispanic American students and staff contribute to the success of the Montgomery County Public Schools through their participation in all aspects of education; and

WHEREAS, The growing Hispanic community has enriched our county in many ways; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That on behalf of the superintendent and staff of the Montgomery County Public Schools, the Board of Education hereby declares the week of September 11-17, 1988, to be observed in MCPS as "Hispanic Heritage Week."

Re: SECONDARY ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS
CURRICULUM

Ms. Sally Walsh, coordinator of secondary English/language arts, thanked the Board for the opportunity to explain something about the English curriculum. She said that she and other teachers were frequently asked why schools taught and students studied English. Her answer was that they needed to study English to develop passionate readers and competent writers. Language arts included listening, speaking, reading, and writing, and students attained mastery of these skills through the content of language and literature. She showed Board members overheads illustrating the MCPS program which followed the state framework, and she indicated that she would be sending the Board copies of the framework.

Ms. Walsh described the curriculum as being divided into reading and listening and speaking and writing for Grades 7 and 8. There were four writing intents: expressing thoughts and feelings, writing and telling stories and poems, informing an audience, and persuading an audience. As an example of the writing process, a student would have an idea, brainstorm with friends, and talk, which would be considered prewriting. The student would write a draft and exchange that draft with other friends, which constituted drafting and revision. After that they would go into another revision or go back and get more information. This advanced them to the stage where the writer was ready to publish. In speaking, they asked that each teacher help students to prepare a talk in each of the four intents. Language and vocabulary were throughout the curriculum, and the goal was to make students understand what they were doing when they used language. In reading and listening they looked at narration, exposition, persuasion, and procedure which had to do with the state-mandated tests.

Ms. Walsh reported that the senior high school curriculum was adopted in part in 1981 by the Board of Education and included the oral communications course which was the thread between the writing courses. In addition, they had literature courses and electives which were offered when they had sufficient enrollment.

Ms. Rose Sage, English resource teacher from Poolesville Junior/Senior High School, stated that teachers invited students to commit themselves through the acts of writing and speaking. The four discourses of writing included expressive, narrative, informative, and persuasive. In addition, they provided students with informal opportunities such as journal writing. Students were asked to write for varying audiences, purposes, and topics and to use critical thinking skills including imagining, thinking, recalling, and evaluating. English instruction also involved formal and informal speaking. They asked students to pause and take thought, evaluate, reevaluate, and edit their own thoughts and ideas. In this way students were taught to be critical thinkers.

Ms. Sage indicated that as more computers were installed, all students benefitted. With computers, students could see instantly their thoughts in that printed form, and the computers saved time and opened doors for language instruction. Computers were excellent in assisting with remediation for the state writing test. She commented that the Maryland writing test required MCPS to reexamine what they had been asking their students to learn; however, she thought that the writing test had had a good effect on instruction. It provided an opportunity for students to understand the purpose of their writing and understand their audience. In many schools, it caused the institution of a writing-across-the curriculum program.

Mr. Alan Goodwin, English resource teacher at Rockville High School, reported that English was a continuum in grades 7 through 12. The four intents started in the elementary school and continued to the twelfth grade. He felt that it was artificial to separate the intents because a classroom discussion of literature would include evaluation, recalling certain details, critical thinking, and in-class compositions. In the seventh and eighth grades, their main emphasis was on narration. The books used were for young adults, and in the ninth grades they moved into adult fiction. They had a myriad of titles to use because reading was an exploratory and very personal experience. In addition, they required outside reading. While oral communication was often thought of as a course in speech, outside readings were required. Mr. Goodwin noted that the continuum was very evident in the literature courses but other classes required the reading of essays, book reviews, etc. As far as an expected outcome, teachers hoped a graduate of MCPS would understand the process of an analytical approach to reading and to express his or her understanding orally and in writing. Teachers had made an effort to expand reading lists to include women and minority authors.

Ms. Jeanne Klugel, teacher specialist, stated that as she looked over the priorities and initiatives established by the Board, she had a concern about special needs students including both gifted and talented and special education. They had as much in common as they were different. They wanted these students to be independent thinkers and learners so that they could be successful in their lives according to their potential. They had tried to arrange the curriculum so that these students could be successful. The program had to be differentiated to allow them to reach their potential and

fulfill their unique emotional needs. One of the best ways to meet needs was through a holistic approach to instruction, teaching students on a continuum. Early activities were teacher-directed, and as students gained independence there was a gradual release of responsibilities by the teacher. Hopefully by the end of high school, students would have moved to independent use of materials. Ms. Klugel pointed out that students were rarely gifted or handicapped in a general pattern. By modifying instruction, teachers accommodated the needs of students. She cited the example of a class at Mark Twain when a student had told her that her teaching was different. She said, "You don't do it for us, you show us we can do it ourselves."

Mrs. Nancy Powell, principal of B-CC High School, pointed out that cocurricular activities were very important and very enriching. These included the performance areas of drama, forensics, and debate. In a number of schools, the senior high school drama students were taking their children's programs into the elementary schools as well as improvisational programs on drug abuse. In addition, they had yearbook, literary magazine, and newspaper. While the yearbook was the least literacy oriented, it involved writing and graphics, management skills, developing a budget, managing accounts, and securing advertising. The literary magazines were also a showcase for art and photography. The drama program involved an opportunity to experience many behind-the-stage careers from scenic design to costume design to woodworking. At her former high school, more students received major scholarships for drama than for football when they had a championship team.

Ms. Powell said she was concerned about the availability of funding for publications, particularly newspapers and magazines. She also thought they needed to move more in the direction of desktop publishing which would reduce costs for the literary magazines and would bring together the graphics, layout, and design at the school. Mrs. Rafel commented that she did not hear much discussion about grammar, punctuation, and spelling. Ms. Walsh replied that this was addressed in the curriculum. Teachers taught grammar and mechanics of punctuation at the last stage of the writing process. The goal was to make this connection through the student's own writing. Dr. Shoenberg noted that the seventh and eighth grade curriculum did not include drama. Ms. Walsh replied that when the curriculum was first designed, the thought was to include drama and poetry at another time. They did encourage teachers to include these, and teachers did cover two or three plays in the course of a year. Ms. Sage reported that at Poolesville the teachers used Shakespeare, and Dr. Shoenberg asked why other dramatists were not used. Ms. Walsh replied that teachers felt that by using Shakespeare they were giving something of substance. However, they did cover Greek playwrights and modern English and American dramatists.

Dr. Shoenberg asked about what use they expected students to make of literature. Ms. Klugel replied that people read books to gain information or to draw some connection with their own lives. Dr.

Shoenberg hoped that they would help students understand lives that were not their own. Mrs. DiFonzo asked about reading for the sheer enjoyment of reading or as an escape, and Ms. Klugel replied that Ms. Walsh had made a comment about the "passionate" reader. Ms. Walsh added that the goal was not to train symbol hunters, and for that reason that had established a program of outside reading and the use of young adult fiction. Mr. Goodwin added that he had provided a summer reading list for students, and Mrs. Powell indicated that B-CC had a reading list of staff members' favorite books.

Dr. Shoenberg asked if they were finding that English teachers were coming to the classroom prepared to deal with the curriculum as a result of their prior training. Ms. Walsh replied that they had only hired five new teachers in the last two or three years, and it was her observation that some were prepared and some were not. Mr. Goodwin added that he had observed two student teachers and generally they were well prepared. If he had a suggestion about university training, it would be to expand the methods course. One of the strengths of the student teachers was that they brought new ideas to the classroom and to the experienced teachers.

Dr. Shoenberg asked about finding ways to make the high school curriculum become more integrated. Ms. Sage replied that the curriculum could be integrated, but there were problems when teachers had been in a building for a long time. If administrators did a lot of preparatory work, writing-across-the-curriculum became a successful program. This had been done at Kennedy High School several years ago when they addressed the Writing Test, and it was successful in improving test scores. Mrs. Powell commented that in the past several years, the quality of in-service instruction had improved which was a help.

Dr. Shoenberg inquired about the degree to which English teachers were prepared or given help in relating what they taught to historical context and the other arts. Ms. Walsh felt that almost every English teacher was equipped to put a work of literature into an historical context, and many teachers did extend this to the other arts. A teacher at Seneca Valley had done an excellent job in integrating arts and music into a study of essay lyric. Other teachers made use of art galleries and the resources of the metropolitan area. When they had a successful program, they did disseminate this information to other teachers. In fact, they had had a recent workshop on Asian literature as a result of the work of a teacher at Springbrook. Dr. Pitt hoped that the flexibility project would cause some movement in integrating curriculum. Mr. Ewing suggested a statement about the use of literature. He said that the use of literature, particularly good literature, helped them to know about, understand, and appreciate the depth and complexity of the human experience, emotions, ideas, triumphs, and failures. He said that this got over the concern raised by Mrs. DiFonzo because the human experience could be exciting in a murder mystery. He commented that Shakespeare was regarded as great because he did reveal these great passions and concerns for the range of human behavior in ways that other authors did not seem to do. However, it

was appropriate to be concerned for making sure students sampled other great works of literature. He did not think they ought to be apologetic about that.

It seemed to Mr. Ewing that they were focusing on process, and he was interested in substance and outcomes. He asked about the extent to which they concerned themselves with outcomes and whether there was any body of knowledge that they were interested in students' having when they graduated. Ms. Walsh replied that they did not have time to get into specific objectives for the high school courses. In the seventh and eighth grades they did emphasize process, but in each high school literature course they would find specific requirements. In the ninth grade they focused on the epic and used the ODYSSEY because they did not use the Bible as literature any more although it was the best source of literary allusions. They also dealt with the ballad as a literary structure. In the sophomore year they had a requirement for one classic novel and one contemporary novel as well as two plays and many short stories. Generally before graduation, a student would have studied HAMLET and MACBETH. They also covered "A Modest Proposal," as satire and poetry including Emily Dickinson, Shakespearean sonnets, and T. S. Eliot. As far as outcomes, students were given departmental finals to measure what they knew. The students also covered Thoreau, Emerson, as well as 18th and 19th century English writers. The study of modern Americans included E. B. White and Loren Eiseley. At the end of the twelfth grade, they expected a student would be able to pick up a piece of literature comfortably and have some kind of understanding of it. In writing, they recognized that students needed a vocabulary of forms and exposure to generalizations, comparisons, contrasts, and analogies. In the junior year, students were required to write a research paper.

Mr. Park commented that he realized they needed structure and writing polish, and with the Maryland Functional Writing Test, everything was focused towards the test. He asked about an effort towards creative writing because the majority of students in his Advanced Composition class thought they needed more time to develop their own style. Ms. Walsh replied that he was lucky to be in the Advanced Composition class that focused on creative writing. They had a very full curriculum and had to make decisions about which things they would study and teach. They did encourage creative writing outside of class, and they could not do much to address this in the classroom. Dr. Pitt explained that this related to the business of priorities, and while he hoped they could have flexibility, the Maryland Writing Test was a requirement.

Mrs. DiFonzo reported that some people had argued that Oral Communications in the tenth grade destroyed the self esteem of youngsters and would be better placed in the senior year. Ms. Walsh replied that the oral communications course was one where students succeeded very well. They had fewer failures in this course because students could see some purpose to the course. She saw it as a necessary part of instruction, particularly in Grade 10. She had long thought that the degree to which a person was able to speak empowered that person, and she was overjoyed to see Oral

Communications in the curriculum. They had devoted a fair amount of time to speaking in the K-8 curriculum as well. Business men and women would agreed they needed good skills in oral communication for success.

Mrs. DiFonzo asked about the impact of computers on writing. Ms. Sage responded that with students having problems with written and oral expression, the computer was an exciting tool which enabled students to express their thoughts immediately which improved the quality of their writing. She noted that many students were already computer literate, and more and more colleges were requiring computer experience. Ms. Klugel noted that special education students had a higher rate of success when they had access to computers. Mrs. DiFonzo inquired about programs for dyslexic children who had problems with the printed page and comprehension, and Ms. Klugel replied that at Mark Twain they focused on exploring the classics through oral presentations including the use of tapes. In some cases, the child would dictate a story to the teacher.

Mr. Goodwin commented that there was one problem with using computers because they did malfunction. It would be helpful if a school had computer assistants who could repair the computers and permit instruction to move on.

Mrs. DiFonzo thanked that staff for their presentation and discussion and requested that the Board be provided with hard copies of the transparencies used in the presentation.

Re: REPORT ON THE OPENING OF SCHOOL

Dr. Vance asked that associate superintendents speak because they had made the successful opening of school possible.

Dr. H. Philip Rohr reported that thanks to Dick Hawes and his staff they opened seven new schools, two replacement schools, and two major modernizations. This translated into 275 new classrooms which were equivalent to 7,000 seats and 1,000,000 square feet of space. This was about twice the average size of a school system. He also thanked Mason Nelson who got all of the schools equipped and furnished. They had sufficient drivers for buses this year, and it went well with regular education although there were some problems with special education. In regard to enrollment, it appeared that on September 30 they would be fairly close to the projections made by Bruce Crispell. Ms. Ann Meyer stated that all 54 of the Area 3 schools opened with the buildings clean, the administrative work completed, students assigned to teachers, and the preparation work in the classrooms completed. When the students walked in on September 6, they began working immediately. She congratulated the principals of new schools and their teachers who had spent Labor Day weekend getting ready. The portables had been relocated, and the modulares were on location with some work still to be done in some cases.

Dr. Carl W. Smith reported that the substitute calling system was on line with only minor problems. They had received outstanding

cooperation from the principals, substitute teachers, and teachers. Jim Shinn and Nancy Perkins deserved a lot of the credit. With very few exceptions, they had all the classroom assignments staffed on the opening. They were still trying to fill a few positions in special education.

Dr. Lois Martin thanked Mrs. Powell for her commercial about in-service training which she felt continued to go very well. The good news was that they had stopped the decline in enrollment at Edison and had turned it around. In addition, they had 10 students enrolled in Principles of Technology which was to start the new 2+2 program with Montgomery College. However, they still had room in Edison and the Foundation programs were also underenrolled. She thanked Ed Clements, Ted Rybka and his staff, and Dr. Pitt who signed personal letters going to targeted groups of students.

Dr. Hiawatha Fountain said that they did start a few special education satellite programs at capacity. He felt that the Board policy on special and alternative education space was beginning to pay off. They had excellent space and programs in the new schools including ESOL at Quince Orchard, PEP at Strawberry Knoll, and the elementary learning center at Clearspring. Staff had also moved out of the Lincoln Center into the Rockinghorse Road Center.

*Mrs. Praisner joined the meeting at this point.

Dr. Robert Shekletski noted that in Area 2, Rosemary Hills opened with 512 students K-2 with a minority percentage down to 42 percent. They were not only getting transfers, but they had parents coming back from private schools. Dr. Cornell Lewis reported that at New Hampshire Estates they had a little trouble when the fire marshal put people out of the school during an open house the day before school opened. However, people were in the parking lots and on the lawn registering students. They had reopened Burnt Mills, and the maintenance people had done an extraordinary job of getting the school in shape. It was now housing 217 K-Grade 1 students, and he invited the Board to visit.

Dr. Pitt commented that it was remarkable to see as much done as was done. He was truly amazed that they built elementary schools in 12 months, and he was glad that this had been advanced to 18 months. He was glad they were able to hire elementary school principals early because of all they had to do to open a new school.

Dr. Shoenberg remarked that this was sixth time he had gone through this process, and this was the first time there had not been some major problem that dominated this discussion. He thought there was some justification in saying this was the best opening ever. He thanked Dr. Maxine Counihan of the county executive's staff who had provided considerable assistance to the school system. Dr. Pitt added that Dr. Counihan headed a committee to make sure the roads and sidewalks were ready at the new schools, and he expressed his appreciation for her efforts. Mrs. DiFonzo indicated that she had not received any negative phone calls this year. This was the first time this had happened to her.

Re: EXECUTIVE SESSION

The Board of Education met in executive session from noon to 1:35 p.m. to discuss personnel and legal issues. Dr. Cronin and Mr. Goldensohn joined the Board during executive session.

Re: BOARD/PRESS/VISITOR CONFERENCE

The following individuals appeared before the Board:

1. Catherine Hobbs, School Board Candidate
2. Roscoe Nix, NAACP

RESOLUTION NO. 471-88 Re: PRESENTATION OF PRELIMINARY PLANS
WHETSTONE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL (ADDITION)

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

WHEREAS, The architect for the Whetstone Elementary School addition project has prepared a schematic design in accordance with the educational specifications; and

WHEREAS, The Whetstone Elementary School 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 Whetstone Elementary School addition prepared by Grimm and Parker, Architects.

RESOLUTION NO. 472-88 Re: PRESENTATION OF PRELIMINARY PLANS
OLNEY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL (MODERNIZATION
ADDITION)

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

WHEREAS, The architect for the Olney Elementary School addition has prepared a schematic design in accordance with the educational specifications; and

WHEREAS, The Olney Elementary School 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 Olney Elementary School addition, prepared by Duane, Elliott, Cahill, Mullineaux and Mullineaux, Architects.

RESOLUTION NO. 473-88 Re: UTILIZATION OF FY 1989 FUTURE SUPPORTED
PROJECT FUNDS AND FY 1989 CATEGORICAL

TRANSFER WITHIN THE PRESCHOOL EVALUATION
PROJECT

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

RESOLVED, That the superintendent of schools be authorized to receive and expend within the FY 1989 Provision for Future Supported Projects an FY 1989 additional appropriation of \$4,574 in the Preschool Evaluation Project from the U.S. Department of Education and to establish a .5 Office Assistant I position in Category 4; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the superintendent of schools be authorized to effect within the FY 1989 Preschool Evaluation Program, the following categorical transfer in accordance with the County Council provision for transfers:

CATEGORY	FROM	TO
10 Fixed Charges	\$1,392	
04 Special Education		\$1,392
	-----	-----
TOTAL	\$1,392	\$1,392

and be it further

RESOLVED, That copies of these resolutions be transmitted to the county executive and the County Council.

RESOLUTION NO. 474-88 Re: PROCUREMENT CONTRACTS OVER \$25,000

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

WHEREAS, Funds have been budgeted to purchase equipment, supplies, and contractual services; and

WHEREAS, It is recommended that Bid No. 2-89, 386 Personal Computer, be rejected because none of the offered machines meet MCPS requirements; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That Bid No. 2-89, 386 Personal Computer, be rejected; and be it further

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

AWARDEE(S)

COG NO.

90016620	Heating Oil Steuart Petroleum Company	\$1,564,625
COG NO. C89-013	Antifreeze Multi-Development Janitorial Supply Co.	\$ 87,395
177-88	Art Equipment Adcom, Inc. L. A. Benson Company Chaselle, Inc. Colonial Woodworkers Cutter Ceramics	\$ 24,664* 1,988 41,055 26,136 20,987
	TOTAL	\$ 114,830
179-88	Administrative Microcomputers II CIS Corporation Clockwork Computers, Inc. Copley Systems International Data Products Corp. PR Associates SSI, Inc.	\$ 6,846 72,100 7,631 142,496* 10,963 215,750*
	TOTAL	\$ 455,786
6-89	Van, 10 Passenger Lanham Ford, Inc.	\$ 33,690
11-89	Frozen Pizza Colebrook Farms/B & H Pizza	\$ 806,060
13-89	Glass and Glazing Materials Beltsville Glass Commercial Plastics Hawkins Glass Company, Inc. Miles Glass Company, Inc. Walsh & Koehler Glass Company, Inc.	\$ 704* 15,891 4,114 8,589 40,422
	TOTAL	\$ 69,720
17-89	Vehicle Maintenance and Service Fleetpro, Inc.	\$ 115,207
89-02	Diagnostic Study of Position Classification Plan for Supporting Service Employees Cary A. Craver & Associates, Inc.	\$ 48,875
89-05	Occupational Therapy and Physical Therapy Services Polcari Therapy Services, Inc.	\$ 245,000
	TOTAL OVER \$25,000	\$3,541,188

*Denotes MFD vendors

RESOLUTION NO. 475-88 Re: CHANGE ORDERS OVER \$25,000

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

WHEREAS, Change order proposals have been received from various contractors that exceed \$25,000; and

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

RESOLVED, That the Board approve the following change orders for the amounts and contracts indicated:

PROJECT: Watkins Mill High School

Change Order in the amount of \$1,474,804 to L. F. Jennings, Incorporated, for fixed equipment identified in the original bid proposal.

PROJECT: Highland Elementary School

Change Order in the amount of \$66,332 to Doyle Construction Company for installation of a computerized energy management system.

PROJECT: Cloverly Elementary School

Change Order in the amount of \$44,933 to Columbia Construction Company for installation of a computerized energy management system.

RESOLUTION NO. 476-88 Re: TRANSFER OF CAPITAL FUNDS

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

WHEREAS, There is a need to replenish the Future School Sites Revolving Account to fund future sites and related activities; and

WHEREAS, The county executive's staff has recommended that surplus capital funds be used for this purpose; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That \$77,500 be transferred from Maryvale Elementary School to the Local Unliquidated Surplus Account; and be it further

RESOLVED, That \$77,500 be transferred from the Local Unliquidated Surplus Account to the Future School Sites Revolving Account; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the county executive be requested to recommend that the County Council approve these transfers.

RESOLUTION NO. 477-88 Re: REDUCTION IN RETAINAGE - WATERS
LANDING ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

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

WHEREAS, Waynesboro Construction Company, general contractor for Waters Landing Elementary School, completed 99 percent of all specified requirements as of June 21, 1988, and has requested that the 5 percent retainage, which is based on the completed work to date, be reduced to 2 percent; and

WHEREAS, The project bonding company, Federal Insurance Company, consented to this reduction; and

WHEREAS, The project architect, Thomas Clark Associates, in a letter dated July 27, 1988, recommended that this request for reduction be approved; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the contract's specified retainage withheld from periodic payments from Waynesboro Construction Company, general contractor for Waters Landing Elementary School, currently amounting to 5 percent of the company's request for payment to date, be reduced to 2 percent, which will become payable after completion of all remaining requirements and acceptance of the completed project.

RESOLUTION NO. 478-88 Re: REDUCTION OF RETAINAGE - STRAWBERRY
KNOLL ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

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

WHEREAS, Commercial Modular Systems, Inc., general contractor for Strawberry Knoll Elementary School (modular classroom portion), has completed 98 percent of all specified requirements as of August 10, 1988, and requested that the 10 percent retainage that is based on the completed work to date be reduced to 5 percent; and

WHEREAS, The project bonding company has consented to this reduction; and

WHEREAS, The project architect, Thomas Clark Associates, in a letter dated August 22, 1988, recommended that this request for reduction be approved; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the contract's specified retainage withheld from periodic payments to Commercial Modular Systems, Inc., general contractor for Strawberry Knoll Elementary School (modular classroom

portion), currently amounting to 10 percent of the company's request for payment to date, be reduced to 5 percent, with the remaining 5 percent to become payable after completion of all remaining requirements and formal acceptance of the completed project.

RESOLUTION NO. 479-88 Re: REDUCTION OF RETAINAGE - PAINT BRANCH HIGH SCHOOL

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

WHEREAS, Kimmel & Kimmel, Inc., general contractor for Paint Branch High School, completed 99 percent of all specified requirements as of June 22, 1988, and has requested that the 5 percent retainage, which is based on the completed work to date, be reduced to 2 percent; and

WHEREAS, The project bonding company, The Aetna Casualty and Surety Company, consented to this reduction; and

WHEREAS, The project architect Duane, Elliott, Cahill, Mullineaux & Mullineaux, in a letter dated August 26, 1988, recommended that the request for reduction be approved; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the contract's specified retainage withheld from periodic payments to Kimmel & Kimmel, Inc., general contractor for Paint Branch High School, currently amounting to 5 percent of the company's request for payment to date, be reduced to 2 percent which will become payable after completion of all remaining requirements and formal acceptance of the completed report.

RESOLUTION NO. 480-88 Re: WALTER JOHNSON HIGH SCHOOL - REROOFING

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

WHEREAS, The following sealed bids were received on August 23, 1988, for the reroofing of Walter Johnson High School:

BIDDER	BASE BID
1. Orndorff & Spaid, Inc.	\$702,876
2. J. E. Wood & Sons Co., Inc.	799,113

and

WHEREAS, Orndorff & Spaid, Inc., has performed similar work for MCPS in a satisfactory manner and its bid is within staff estimates and funds are available; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That a \$702,876 contract be awarded to Orndorff & Spaid, Inc., for the reroofing of Walter Johnson High School in accordance with plans and specifications prepared by the Department of School

Facilities.

RESOLUTION NO. 481-88 Re: LUXMANOR ELEMENTARY SCHOOL ADDITION

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

WHEREAS, The following sealed bids were received on September 1, 1988, for the addition and alterations to Luxmanor Elementary School:

BIDDER	BASE BID AND DEDUCTION ALTERNATES
1. Keller Brothers, Inc.	\$1,630,000; \$75,600(1); \$27,500(2); \$44,200(3); \$96,800(4); \$154,000(5); and \$46,200(6)
2. Columbia Construction Co.	\$1,729,000; \$84,000(1); \$29,800(2); \$49,600(3); \$124,00(4); \$149,700(5); and (40,000(6)
3. Dustin Construction, Inc.	\$1,746,000; \$73,000(1); \$26,000(2); \$34,500(3); \$94,00(4); \$150,000(5); and \$40,000(6)
4. Hess Construction Co., Inc.	\$1,765,482; \$86,434(1); \$37,156(2); \$51,570(3); \$132,109(4); \$147,556(5); and \$50,948(6)
5. Caldwell and Santmyer, Inc.	\$1,794,000; \$86,000(1); \$124,000(2); \$148,000(3); \$86,700(4); \$141,745(5); and \$61,950(6)
6. Kimmel & Kimmel, Inc.	\$1,798,000; \$70,000(1); \$27,000(2); \$40,000(3); \$126,000(4); \$159,000(5); and \$45,000(6)
7. Doyle, Inc.	\$1,798,500; \$77,800(1); \$24,700(2); \$41,600(3); \$110,000(4); \$144,800(5); and \$41,000(6)
8. Edmar Construction Co., Inc.	\$1,860,000; \$79,000(1); \$34,000(2); \$51,000(3); \$121,000(4); \$142,000(5); and \$31,000(6)
9. Patrick Quinn, Inc.	\$1,868,000; \$75,000(1); \$25,000(2); \$5,000(3); \$54,000(4); -0-(5); and \$30,000(6)
10. Northwood Contractors, Inc.	\$1,947,000; \$70,000(1); \$34,000(2); \$49,000(3); \$105,000(4); \$150,000(5); and \$57,000(6)
11. N.S. Stavrou Const. Co.	\$1,966,000; \$96,000(1); \$131,500(2); \$177,500(3); \$110,400(4); \$88,600(5); and \$37,000(6)

Description of Alternatives:

- Deduct Alternate 1: Additional instructional support areas
- Deduct Alternate 2: One additional classroom
- Deduct Alternate 3: One additional classroom
- Deduct Alternate 4: Renovation of the administrative area

Deduct Alternate 5: Roof replacement
Deduct Alternate 6: Handicapped modifications

and

WHEREAS, The low bidder, Keller Brothers, Inc., has met our qualifications and has performed similar projects in other metropolitan jurisdictions; and

WHEREAS, Sufficient funds are available in the Luxmanor school construction account to award the base bid; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That a \$1,630,000 contract be awarded to Keller Brothers, Inc., for the addition and alterations to Luxmanor Elementary School in accordance with plans and specifications prepared by Garrison Associates, Architects.

RESOLUTION NO. 482-88 Re: GRANT OF RIGHT-OF-WAY TO THE WASHINGTON
GAS LIGHT COMPANY AT THE FUTURE SOUTH
GERMANTOWN HIGH SCHOOL SITE

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

WHEREAS, The Washington Gas Light Company has requested a grant of perpetual easement and right-of-way, 10-feet wide, along the Clopper Road frontage of the future South Germantown High School site, to install a gas pipeline; and

WHEREAS, This grant of right-of-way comprising 710,80 square feet of land for the installation of a gas pipeline, and an adjacent temporary construction strip, will not affect any future school programming; and

WHEREAS, All construction, restoration, and future maintenance will be performed at no cost to the Board of Education with the Washington Gas Light Company and contractors assuming liability for all damages or injury; and

WHEREAS, This grant of perpetual easement and right-of-way will benefit the surrounding community and the future school site; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the president and secretary be authorized to execute an easement for the additional land required to install a gas pipeline at the future South Germantown High School site; and be it further

RESOLVED, That a negotiated fee be paid by the Washington Gas Light Company for the perpetual easement and right-of-way, and the funds be deposited to the Rental of Property Account No. 32-108-1-13.

RESOLUTION NO. 483-88 Re: ACCEPTANCE OF BANNOCKBURN ELEMENTARY

SCHOOL

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 August 25, 1988, Bannockburn Elementary School 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 the plans and specifications, and all contract requirements have been met.

Re: SCHOOL INSPECTIONS

The following dates were established for school inspections:

Waters Landing Elementary School, September 21, 1988, 9 a.m.
Mrs. DiFonzo will attend.
Goshen Elementary School, October 5, 1988, 10 a.m. Mrs.
DiFonzo will attend.
Paint Branch High School, September 19, 1988, 8:30 a.m.
Mrs. Praisner will attend.
Rolling Terrace Elementary School, September 22, 1988, 8:30 a.m.
Dr. Shoenberg will attend.
Greencastle Elementary School, September 26, 1988, 8:30 a.m.
Dr. Shoenberg will attend.

RESOLUTION NO. 484-88 Re: MONTHLY PERSONNEL REPORT

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

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

RESOLUTION NO. 485-88 Re: PERSONNEL REASSIGNMENT

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

RESOLVED, That the following personnel reassignment be approved:

NAME	FROM	TO
Irene Margolin	Administrative Secretary Robert Frost IS	Clerk-Typist II Assignment to be determined Will maintain salary status. To retire July 1, 1989

RESOLUTION NO. 486-88 Re: DEATH OF MRS. NIHAL ENDER, SPECIAL
EDUCATION BUS ATTENDANT, AREA 1
TRANSPORTATION

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

WHEREAS, The death on August 31, 1988, of Mrs. Nihal Ender, a special education bus attendant in Area 1, has deeply saddened the staff and members of the Board of Education; and

WHEREAS, In the short time Mrs. Ender was employed with Montgomery County Public Schools, she was a reliable and competent employee; and

WHEREAS, Her concern for her passengers was a credit to the entire pupil transportation program; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the members of the Board of Education express their sorrow at the death of Mrs. Nihal Ender and extend deepest sympathy to her family; and be it further

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

RESOLUTION NO. 487-88 Re: PERSONNEL APPOINTMENTS

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

RESOLVED, That the following personnel appointments be approved:

APPOINTMENT	PRESENT POSITION	AS
Joseph I. Headman	Assistant Principal B-CC High School	Principal Julius West MS Effective: 9-15-88
Gerard F. Consuegra	Teacher Specialist Area 2 Admin. Office	Area Admin. Asst. Area Admin. Office Effective: 9-15-88
Judith Bluefeld Amick	School Psychologist Prince George's County Public Schools Upper Marlboro, MD	School Psychologist Area Admin. Office Effective: 9-15-88

Re: POLICIES NOT COVERED BY NEW PREK-GRADE
12 POLICY

Board members reviewed 10 selected policy items which were not specifically covered by the newly adopted Pre-K to Grade 12 Policies. The Board asked staff to return to the following issues:

Standardized Test Scores, Sharing Successes, Promotion, Retention, Teacher-Advisors, and Incentives, Rewards, and Recognition.

Re: SUPERINTENDENT'S REPORT ON MINORITY
ACHIEVEMENT

Dr. Pitt reported that a year ago last July the staff came in with recommendations and goals for minority achievement. The plan had three parts. One was identification of the goals for minority achievement, the second was an accountability and management plan, and the third was to identify successful practices to help increase black and Hispanic achievement. Another consideration was an affirmative action policy to provide minority role models. In regard to the accountability goals, Dr. Pitt said they were still looking at dropouts, suspensions, and participation in non-athletic activities. However, a year ago they decided that the major focus was student achievement. They looked at the California Achievement Tests, the Maryland Functional Tests, and gifted and talented identification. They had talked about moving 50 percent of the low achieving students into a middle group and moving 15 percent of the middle achieving students to the highest group. They also assumed that they were going to maintain this movement into the upper grades. He pointed out that children tended to score as a group a little higher at the lower grades than they did at the upper grades.

Dr. Pitt observed that about 80 percent of their students passed the Maryland Functional Tests at the end of the ninth grade, 90 percent at the end of tenth grade, and they had the ultimate goal of 100 percent passing. In regard to gifted and talented identification, the idea was that the average portion identified as gifted and talented be approximately equal to the county average by looking at students in stanines 6 through 9. He explained that this was a composite of stanines from the last three years. He further explained that he and Dr. Vance had taken office last July 1, and the date presented represented what had happened in the past. Dr. Pitt stated that the data showed that countywide they had done well in coming close to achieving these goals. They had done well in terms of moving students in the low achieving group, in terms of three of the four competency tests, and in the gifted and talented area. Countywide, they had not succeeded in moving 15 percent of the youngsters from the middle group to the higher group, but they had come fairly close.

Dr. Pitt stated that they had taken another very important step. They had set the same goal they had set countywide for each school. They were looking at minority achievement in terms of every school. They then took the three-year data, published it school by school, and showed how the school related to achieving the total goal. However, the data was based on what happened last November and December. He did not know of any other school system doing this by minority students school by school. Most efforts around the country had been to move very low scoring students into a middle group. That was not the issue in Montgomery County because Hispanic and black youngsters were already scoring in the middle to upper group. The

point was to move more of them from the middle group to the upper group. Black and Hispanic youngsters in MCPS were achieving, but they needed to improve that achievement. He did not want black and Hispanic youngsters in MCPS to feel they could not succeed because they were not doing as well. Many of them were doing well. The focus had to be on the individual school. They now had baseline data, and plans would be developed for each school.

In regard to successful practices, Dr. Pitt said they had tried to make an educational judgment about the validity of identified successful practices. As for a scientific validation, he was not sure how long it would take to do that, and he was not prepared to wait. Therefore, they had identified 10 elementary schools where they had about 18 successful strategies. Next year they would attempt to move some of these strategies into schools where there hadn't been a great deal of success. In addition, he was interested in moving toward a summer school program to improve the achievement of this middle group of students.

Dr. Pitt thought they could be successful in their endeavors. He believed they had to start someplace and move in some direction. He also believed that when the scores were released that every person in that school was going to want to be successful. This would be a great motivation and incentive. He further believed that they had to help people be successful.

Dr. Pitt explained that there were problems with the data. In some schools there were only a few minority students; therefore, it was impossible to use the data in a comprehensive way. He also pointed out that the middle group ranged from the fourth stanine to the seventh stanine which was a wide range, and they were going to have to look at progress.

Dr. Pitt stated that system-wide he was encouraged by what he had seen. Secondly, he had made a commitment to look at individual schools and put the records right out there for everyone to see. They now had baseline data, and a year from now they would have to take another look to see what progress had been made as well as examine progress as they went along. The suggestion had been made that they ought to look at what caused success or failure in some kind of organized study. He had sent a memo to Dr. Cronin who is the chairperson of the research and evaluation committee with the idea of discussing this issue.

Dr. Paul Scott, director of minority education, explained that following the introductory section of the report included the accountability goals, a description of the monitoring component, and a summary of the findings, the system-wide data were presented. They had also included a number of exhibits. Exhibit 1 focused on the percentage of students meeting Priority 2 goals for the CAT by race and grade from 1985 to 1987. This was computed on an average of the three years, and the asterisks indicated whether or not the goals had been met. Exhibit 2 highlighted the percentage of schools meeting Priority 2 goals for the CAT. He pointed out that not all MCPS

schools had students in every group. For example, if they looked at stanine group 1-3, 54 schools had at least one student in that stanine range, and of those 54 schools, 54 percent of them met the goal. Exhibit 3 was on Project Basic and showed ninth grade students who had been in the school system for at least two or more years, and the asterisks identified whether or not the county goal had been equaled or exceeded. Exhibit 4 covered tenth grade students. Exhibit 5 was the percentage of junior high schools achieving the Grade 9 Priority 2 goal for each Project Basic Test, and Exhibit 6 looked at senior high schools. Exhibit 7 focused on the change in the passing rate on the Project Basic test from Grade 7 when students took a predictor test to Grade 9 when they took the actual test. Exhibit 8 covered Grade 10 students.

Dr. Scott pointed out that Exhibit 9 focused on gifted and talented. The goal at the elementary level focused on identification and at the J/I/M level it focused on participation. Exhibit 10 showed the percentage of schools meeting the Priority 2 goal for gifted and talented identification. Only 59 percent of elementary schools met the goal for black students and 32 percent for Hispanic. However, there was a variation from school to school on which they would focus.

Dr. Scott noted that Section 2 of the report consisted of the elementary school data listed alphabetically. He said the first page showed the countywide data for elementary schools and the movement in the CATs. He pointed out that looking at stanine group 4-6 reinforced the challenge for MCPS. He indicated that 1,020 black students were scoring in that range and 571 were scoring in the 7-9 range. This was three-year data, and the same was true for Hispanic students.

Dr. Scott called attention to the first school Ashburton and noted that the gifted and talented information was there as well. Mrs. Praisner asked about the determination of minority percentages in the schools, and Dr. Scott explained that the percentage was of the most recent year. Dr. Shoenberg asked if the average proportion identified as gifted and talented in a school be compared to the average proportion of that school who were minorities rather than the county average. Dr. Scott replied that he felt the school proportion ought to reflect the county proportion. The county goal reflected all students. Dr. Joy Frechtling added that staff had spent a lot of time trying to figure out what the right comparison group should be. They had decided that instead of comparing against some sort of individual school standard that it made more sense to compare against a county standard. Dr. Pitt explained that, for example, 35 percent of the white students in stanines 6 to 9 were in gifted and talented programs. Therefore, there ought to be at least 35 percent of the Hispanic and black students there. One assumption was that blacks and Hispanics in those stanines did not get identified as gifted and talented while white students did.

Dr. Cronin asked about schools coming in with a limited number of a particular minority group. Dr. Pitt replied that they did not have a

good solution to this problem. For example, if they had a school with one or two Hispanic or black youngsters they would have to make some judgments, but where they had a reasonable number, five or more, they assumed there ought to be the same proportion as compared to the county average of students getting into gifted and talented programs. Dr. Scott noted that the next section was on J/I/M schools in the same format as the elementary schools. Here they were showing the results of the Project Basic tests. This showed the change in the passing rate for reading and math which was based on predictor test information. The final section on senior high schools was in the same format.

Dr. Vance asked the executive staff to come to the table because these were the folk responsible to see that goals were being met. He noted that to many of them these were personal goals because they had children in the public schools. He called the Board's attention to the section on planning and management. He felt that they had finally developed a planning and management process which included all the offices in the school system to focus on schools to help them meet the goals. For example, DEA would work with OIPD and the area offices to look at what had been successful strategies, practices, and effective schools. They would try to find out why the schools were successful and why other schools had not been successful. They needed to know what was necessary to move those successful practices and effective school strategies into those schools. Given their pilot projects on school flexibility, in many instances the effort would be driven by school-based staff. They intended to make every effort to meet the goals. There would be accountability and it would be done periodically. In mid-year they would make assessments of how their plans were being followed, and they intended periodic reports to the superintendent and the Board of Education. He did not think anyone in the room would be as overjoyed as they would be when they had closed the gap and realized their goal. Until that time, he did not think there were any persons in the room who would be as disappointed as they would be if they did not reach the goal.

Dr. Cronin thanked Dr. Scott for the report. The setting of the goals, the programs, and the monitoring revealed the level of Board commitment to the improvement of minority student success. He agreed there was a risk in publishing this data because it showed where they had successes and where they did not. However, he thought it was a risk, and he applauded the publication of the data, school by school. This gave them an opportunity through the associate superintendents, the PTAs, and the staff to begin to address the particular needs of the particular communities. He suggested they needed to resist implying that schools were racist or not paying attention to the needs of minority students because the schools were not doing well. Dr. Cronin said he would like to see a comparison with the white children in the same stanines. He wanted to see if there was going to be a dramatic improvement for the white children which would give him a baseline of comparison. He wanted to know how difficult it would be to raise the scores of the average child whether black, white, Hispanic, or Asian. He noted that they now had a snapshot of schools, and he asked about what would happen if a school did not

begin to reach these goals. He also asked about the role of the Board's committee in assisting in the monitoring process.

Dr. Pitt replied that Dr. Vance had talked about midyear corrections. He was starting out with the idea that it was going to be very difficult not to have some commitment to the goals. If he felt that people did not have a real commitment, he would not have any problem in taking action. If he thought people were trying, they had to help them. Dr. Vance added that they would have to look at teaching, learning, conferencing, administrative leadership, supporting assistance, and the school population. He would consult with the area superintendents and give the superintendent their recommendations as to what changes or adjustments had to be made.

Dr. Cronin asked whether the suspension or dropout rate was part of their discussions as well as how the principal, staff, teachers, parents, and students in the school were going to be partners to improve education. Dr. Pitt replied that they had not eliminated those considerations but, after discussions with community groups, they decided to focus on academic achievement above all else. They did look at the other data as part of the school climate. Dr. Shekletski explained that these elements were part of the management plan, and the expectation was that these would be examined because they affected the achievement in that particular school. For example, if suspensions had increased and the school did not address this with an objective, there would be an expectation on the part of the associate superintendent that next year there would be an objective. This would be a requirement rather than an option for the local school, and it would be included in the principal's evaluation.

Dr. Cronin asked about the role of the Board's committee. Dr. Scott replied that the committee had been charged with reacting to staff plans, and as staff liaison it was his expectation the committee would have reactions to the plan.

Dr. Cronin was concerned that in schools with one minority student, the reporting method would single out that student. Dr. Scott replied that it was for this reason they went to a three-year average because that did protect the student and did give them a more stable number on which to make judgments.

Mrs. Praisner remarked that this was a very complex document, but the goals and objectives they were talking about were also complex. She asked about plans to ensure that at the local school level everyone understood the data and the goals of the school system as they related to the school. She also wanted to know about the area plans for working with the schools and the community. She wanted more clarification on what they meant by mid-course corrections and how the budget and staffing process related to the objectives.

Dr. Pitt reported that he as superintendent had taken a leadership role, and he had met with principals on three different occasions. Mrs. Praisner explained that she was concerned about an understanding

and acceptance of the data so that local schools and communities could use the material the way they needed to. Dr. Scott replied that schools had had the data since last September with the exception of the gifted and talented information. At mid-year, schools received additional data in the same format.

Ms. Ann Meyer reported that in Area 3 she had held a meeting of principals about the data and additional information. Principals were asked to spend time working with their staffs and with the PTA executive committee. They were also in the process of doing follow-up meetings in each school with principals and in some cases with the supervisor, the area director, and the associate superintendent. They planned to talk about the challenge for each school and the specific plans to give support to teachers and students. She emphasized that they were not limiting their focus to the results on the tests. They were working on the overall progress of all students, particularly minority students. They were looking at ISM data and report cards, and in schools with large minority populations they had delegated this responsibility to several staff members. She felt that principals did have in-depth knowledge of the data and what the expectations were.

Mr. Goldensohn was worried about misinterpretation of the statistics. He pointed out that in a school with 10 minority students, five could be identified as gifted which would give them a 50 percent figure. But if two of those students left the school, that number would drop to 30 percent through no fault of the school. He was worried about the size of samples in some schools, but he didn't have a suggestion as to how to avoid that. In one case black and Hispanic students were well over the county average by a number of percentage points, but he had no idea what the white population was doing. He did not have a point of comparison. Mr. Goldensohn pointed out that the identification of gifted students was not an exact science. The identification varied from school to school based on who was doing it and the level of training involved. He thought that perhaps gifted might not be a good thing to have as one of their measures. For example, every one took the CAT and it was scored by the same computer. With gifted comparisons they were taking a chance. Dr. Pitt stated that they believed their responsibility was to help improve school achievement. He was concerned about the very small numbers, but he didn't know how to deal with this except to have Dr. Vance and the area associates consider each of those cases individually and make some judgments about it. Mr. Goldensohn replied that this would be fine. He indicated that he would like to see information on majority population as well because there should be a relationship between the county average, the majority average, and the minority average. He had trouble making an analysis with only two of those numbers.

Dr. Pitt explained that one of the problems was in a school where they might have a lot of achieving kids in the eighth and ninth stanines, and in another school they might not have that many achieving students and would work with students in the seventh or sixth stanine. They were suggesting that schools look hard at all

these students because there were students who could be extended beyond what they were doing now.

Mr. Goldensohn commented that just by sensitizing people to the numbers was good in itself. He hoped they could get the numbers to be more accurate so that they would not be misinterpreted. He suggested adding a clarification statement cautioning about the use of these numbers and about taking them out of context. Dr. Shekletski remarked that they worked with principals and students. If the score falls off, the principals could tell them what the issues were around those particular students which led to those lower scores. They could then explain what had happened. Mr. Goldensohn expected they would be doing that. He was concerned that everybody be sensitized to that and understand what the numbers meant. Dr. Shekletski explained that they accepted where the school was and then the issue became what they were going to do about it. Ms. Meyer added that every year they received information showing the California mean score for five years, and this was used to get a picture of how the school was doing. She explained that they had to look at three different kinds of data.

Dr. Pitt noted that executive staff members were talking about individual students. The whole focus of the idea was to look at individual students in the individual schools and work with those students. If this worked, it was a model that would help across the board with all youngsters.

Mr. Ewing said that related to something Ms. Meyer had said he wondered when, if ever, the Board and the public would get a comprehensive picture of where they were and where they were headed. He asked when, if ever, they were going to know why black and Hispanic students seemed not to achieve as well as white students. He asked when, if ever, would they have reasonable certainty about what the strategies were that worked with minority students. His chief problem with the report was that it was not designed to answer those questions by itself. What they had here was a piece of the data, but it was a piece that was very difficult to comprehend. He was not suggesting it was wrongly devised, useless, or that it didn't show progress. It did show progress. He was not suggesting anybody's lack of commitment or dedication. The school system as a whole showed a very commendable level of dedication to the effort to improve minority student achievement. The trouble was that they did not have a comprehensive picture before the Board and that they did not have other data in front of them. Several Board members had commented that they did not have data about white student performance. He had asked for that and had received some. It showed that 51 percent of the black students in stanines 1 through 3 in grades 3 and 5 are achieving the goal, 80 percent of Hispanics were achieving that goal, and 68 percent of white students were achieving the goal. He did not think it was wrong to make those comparisons.

Mr. Ewing stated that he was shocked by the statement in the report that said minority students in Montgomery County did very well when compared with their peers in other school systems, i.e., other

minority students. It seemed to him the important point was what were the expectations that they ought to have for all students in MCPS. He asked if they thought somehow that white students were not the peers of black students in Montgomery County. He thought this statement should not have been made in the report. He felt that this lacked trend data and historical data. He was encouraged by what Dr. Vance had said about what individual schools were going to be doing, but they only had one piece of the data.

As a Board member, Mr. Ewing did not feel he had been helped at all in responding to the questions of his constituents about how well they were doing with respect to this set of data. Although the Board had agreed to the goals, he did not know whether they were reasonable. He was deeply concerned that they should get a comprehensive picture. The press release did not provide that picture and did not even relate very well to the report.

Mr. Ewing commented that for the last five years some people on the Board, on the staff, and in the community had been asking why MCPS had not done some analyses of the factors that seemed to contribute to or be the cause of minority student achievement rates as compared to those of others in the school system. They had never done that. He was delighted that Dr. Pitt had said he intended to pursue that, but he wished this had started sooner. He wondered whether they would ever have recommendations that gave them reasonable certainty about the right strategies. He thought they had a good identification process, but he did not think they had a validation process. He agreed with Dr. Pitt when he said he didn't want to wait for the information, but he did not know when they would be starting on the validation. He wondered how they could be sure over time that what they were doing was working. He asked how they knew that the results they got in terms of progress were not accidental. He thought the question was too serious for them to wait forever and simply go on trying things without knowing their impact.

While Mr. Ewing was pleased they were making progress, he did not know where they were five years after they had adopted Priority 2. He did not have a comprehensive picture, and he asked where were the data that dealt with school climate, teacher training, affirmative action, attendance, suspensions, community outreach, and parental involvement? He did not think they had a comprehensive picture of minority student education in the county today and over the past five years and plans for the future. He realized that Dr. Pitt had only been superintendent for a year, but he did not regard the school system as something that was just created a year ago. He reiterated his three questions.

Dr. Pitt replied that these were important questions. As to the first one, they had published all kinds of data and had given a comprehensive picture of the last five years. As the new superintendent, he had the responsibility for trying to steer the school system in some direction. It was his best judgment that they now had baseline data that seemed to make sense, and they were moving from this point toward a goal. He thought the goals were

comprehensive, exciting, and far-reaching. As they moved toward that goal, they did need to supply more data, but they had to have a starting place.

Dr. Pitt agreed that they needed to look at factors causing success or failure. He could not say why they had not done this before. He did disagree with the third point. He thought this had to do with a definition of validation. If they were talking about scientific validation, Mr. Ewing was probably right. He thought they had done more than identification in terms of successful practices, and he asked Dr. Frechtling to take a few minutes on that issue. He pointed out that it did take a long time to validate, and if they had started five years ago, they might have had that data. They did not have all of the data, and he did not want to wait that long to try some things.

Dr. Frechtling reported that they had looked at test scores and other data, focusing on schools making progress with students in the 4 through 6 stanines and on schools with substantial numbers of minority students. A group of professionals looked at the data and other demographics and selected 10 schools for further study. Two teams went into the schools. The first was a DEA team with two retired principals. They talked to staff about students who had succeeded and the kinds of activities the school had engaged in that might have contributed to success. The second group contained program people and went back to look at gifted and talented programs, reading, mentoring, etc. She thought that the process had established some good correlations between success and the practices to which the students were exposed. It was not a controlled experimental study where some students got services and other students did not. She did not think any of them would want to be in a position to do that; however, they were able to draw some causal inferences. They planned to disseminate these strategies to schools with similar populations or with populations that they could define in some precise ways as to their differences. They would validate the extent to which there was more of a causal relationship rather than a correlational relationship. This was not a perfect science, but Dr. Frechtling felt it was the way to go when they were dealing with living, breathing students, programs, and people.

Mr. Ewing did not object to this as a device to make progress, but he felt they would never know for sure whether what they were doing worked. Dr. Frechtling did not think they would ever know whether what they were doing worked. Mr. Ewing felt they would know with a great deal more certainty if they did this systematically. Dr. Pitt thought that the movement of those programs to other schools would give them an opportunity to look at some data and validate it a little better. He wanted to make the point that they did more than identification. He said they could argue about how well they did it, but they certainly tried to do it in a reasonably scientific way on a shortened time frame.

Dr. Shoenberg remarked that Mr. Ewing was a very thoughtful critic of the school system and the way it did business. He hoped he was an

equally thoughtful defender of the school system and the way it did business. He was going to come to this issue in another way, using the three questions raised by Mr. Ewing. He agreed it would be a good thing to have in one place the data they had on the relative situation of majority and minority students in the school system; however, this was not the report that was designed to do that. It was a report designed to give them a picture with regard to a certain set of criteria they expected to use in making judgments. It was not the report that Mr. Ewing was looking for. The report was complex because they set up a set of criteria that were complex because they were trying to do a more sophisticated job of measuring minority student achievement and progress than just about anybody he knew of. He hoped that people would understand they were trying to do something that was more finegrained and more likely to identify factors that were at the heart of the problem.

In regard to the second question, Dr. Shoenberg did not think they were ever going to know why minority students did less well than majority students. He did not want to get into an epistemological discussion on this matter, but he had a lot less confidence in social scientific research particularly if it was numerically based and involved something as complex as this particular issue. He suspected that knowing a lot of those reasons would depend on data to which the school system did not have access nor should it seek access. At some point they might have some better knowledge of why the particular piece of the problem that they were trying to deal with remained a problem. He thought that Dr. Pitt and Dr. Frechtling had addressed the validation issue. He questioned whether an effort to validate beyond the kind of thing they were now doing was worth the effort in terms of other kinds of demands on the school system. It was his experience with social science research that it was enormously time-consuming. He did not think it was necessary to assume that because a particular school was not doing well that the problem was based on either incompetence or racism. The effort needed to be to work with the schools and find ways to bring about the improvement that was necessary in terms of the particular circumstances that prevailed at that school. If one got the sense that people were not doing things competently or with the right attitude, then something had to happen of a more serious and public and negative nature.

Dr. Shoenberg noted that the Board had received a statement from Leroy Warren. His particular rhetorical strategies were not those with which Dr. Shoenberg generally found himself in sympathy. He found himself distinctly out of sympathy with his attack on two particular individuals, and he thought that attack represented a total lack of awareness of what, in fact, those people had been doing in the school system and how they stood with relation to it. It was not necessary to proceed to do one's job of jumping up and down and screaming and yelling. He did not suppose that one put in a 16-hour or 18-hour day on a regular basis because one did not care about how one was doing. He thought those comments were directed at the comments about Dr. Scott's work, and he would say the same of Dr. Martin in many ways. He added that there was a serious lack of

understanding about the administrative relationship between her office and the implementation of the instructional program in the schools which generally invalidated much of what was said in Mr. Warren's statement. Her leadership effort in trying to address this very problem over many years made the attack particularly objectionable. He thought that the statement was a totally inappropriate judgment of the work of those particular people.

Mrs. Rafel said that Dr. Shoenberg had said a lot of it very well. As she had read through the report, she thought that occurred to her was it was good they were talking about students, what was happening to them, and what the outcomes would be in the long run for those students. It would be very unfortunate if they got themselves sidetracked into studying the subject to death and turning themselves into a giant think tank to figure out how this was all going to work forever. The objective was to educate children and do the best they could for them.

In regard to Mr. Ewing's comment about learning strategies, Dr. Cronin pointed out that the Board did receive the most current literature on minority student education. He cited the report of the 1988 Aspen Institute Conference on Hispanic Americans which the Board had just received. He thought they did have a good amount of information about why students were not doing well. He suggested they get on with improving the situation and using whatever information they had available to them.

Mrs. DiFonzo thought that the cogent questions had been asked. She said that to think that a Board member functioned in isolation was certainly not the case. She had discussed the report and questions with other Board members, and many of her thoughts had already been incorporated into other Board member comments.

Mrs. DiFonzo stated that what they had here was not the be-all or end-all. What they had was a baseline, and they would move forward with their Priority 2 commitment. Hopefully their youngsters would respond to the efforts being made, and they would have a better sense of whether what they were doing was working, how it could be finetuned, and what they might need to do as the months went by. It was unfortunate that it took time for these things to happen. She wished they had the answers to the questions being asked, and she wished they had a perfect strategy that they all knew would work, because she didn't think there was a soul in the room who would not charge out the door and into the schools if they had the answers. They did not. They were struggling, they were groping, but they were trying. That was what she asked of all of them as parents, community leaders, elected officials, superintendents, principals, and teachers. They had to continue to try and not give up on this even though they didn't have all the answers to all the questions.

Dr. Pitt stated that there were questions raised that they did not have the answers to, and they needed to get some of these answers, but in the meantime they needed to move forward. He was absolutely convinced that the effort was going to be made, and while he could

not predict success, he could predict effort. He believed that the motivation was there and people were making the effort. They needed to continue to try and add data to what they knew and to learn from other people.

Re: REPORT OF WORK GROUP ON STAFF
DEVELOPMENT

Dr. Pitt invited the members of the group to come to the table. He explained that the only concern he had was whether they would have an area staff development center ready by July 1, 1989, but that concern had to do with space. He commented that a lot of work had gone into the report, and it was an example of collegial relationships. They had started a process whereby teachers, administrators, and parents were working together. He liked the idea of a coordinating committee which was long overdue. The second was that in the pilot program the teacher had the responsibility for developing improvement plans related to the goals of the school. This was a real commitment on the part of the teacher.

Mrs. Marie Heck, area 1 elementary supervisor, thanked the committee. Present from the committee were Karen Craney, area 3 office; Ron Rubini, Glenallan ES; Kathryn Blumsack, staff development; Bill Romack, Gaithersburg HS; Dr. Margery Auerbach, Rock View ES; and Holly Geddes, MCCPTA.

Dr. Shoenberg shared the superintendent's enthusiasm for the report. It seemed to him there were two things about the staff training program they now had. The first was an increased mastery of subject matter. For example, they had a new credit requirement for fine arts. He wondered if the training envisioned in the report would allow for the county to run a substantive workshop for teachers of fine arts. Mrs. Heck replied that one of the strengths of their report was in the areas of needs assessment. She hoped that they would identify efforts needed to be made in the area of fine arts. Then they would look at county resources available to provide that training and see whether it would be done countywide, areawide, or locally.

Dr. Shoenberg said the superintendent and the committee had expressed enthusiasm for the notion of individual teacher development plans, and he agreed that was important. He could see developing out of a plan like this, some kind of contest for whose concerns drove the system. It might be the individual teacher versus the needs of the system to address countywide objectives versus the needs of a particular school cluster. Dr. Auerbach replied that they had discussed this. They were all aware that there had to be a balance, and the system could not just look at its own needs and ignore what teachers perceived to be their needs, but the teachers could not ignore what the county had committed to or what the school or the cluster was committed to. They talked about the development plan being jointly determined by the teacher and the administrator. There might be some heated discussions, but everyone's agenda should be on the table.

Dr. Shoenberg asked about the responsibility of the individual teacher to find the resources to fulfill those plans as opposed to the role of the system identifying and making those resources available. Dr. Pitt replied that the plan was focused primarily on the needs to do a better job in that school. He felt that the school system, staff development, had a major responsibility here as opposed to the teacher's going out and paying for a course.

Dr. Auerbach explained that each school would have a staff development coordinator. They were still in the process of looking at whether this would be a stipend activity or a reduced teaching activity because it would be a large responsibility to assist teachers in locating resources. The committee had discussed the idea of a computerized resource bank of information that would help teachers who had a certain need. Dr. Shoenberg commented that this was one of the items he had noted as "a good idea." He suggested the idea of directing their efforts as a system to create a critical mass of people who were capable of doing this or that or the other. One of the things that happened was they had people going to in-service programs, but when they went back to their own school there was no one to work with them to implement what they had learned.

Mrs. Praisner commented that Dr. Shoenberg's first questions had been on her list as well. She was concerned about differences that might develop within a school when they had a range of staff needs based on the experiences of that staff. For example, they might have three teachers new to the system versus 20-year senior individuals. They could look at this when they worked through the pilots. There might be some negotiation discussion within the school.

Mrs. Praisner wondered about how they would measure the success of the projects. One could measure success by numbers of courses taken. It seemed to her that the overall committee was going to have to look beyond that to more sophisticated measures of assessing the effectiveness of these pilots. In regard to the committee organization, she had been on many committees and had a concern about asking people to serve and telling them they would not vote. She was concerned about the area office representatives being nonvoting members. She asked about the two principals on the committee and suggested they needed the perspective of the middle level. She assumed their desire to have a corporative representative was to have someone dealing with staff development and professional development.

Mrs. Praisner hoped that Dr. Pitt and the committee might consider expanding the concept of staff development and not just teacher development. She hoped they would encourage other staff at the school including principals to have individual professional development plans. This recommendation came out of the Commission on School-based Administration. They now had a new state superintendent who was the chair of that commission and a champion of that recommendation. She suggested they look at ways the state department might want to work with them on the pilots. Dr. Pitt thought it was an excellent idea. He wanted to see participatory management here.

He thought the group might want to pass on this idea to the management review committee. It seemed to him they might want to talk about the total school and not just the teaching staff. Mrs. Praisner said she was referred to the individual professional development plan component because this did come out as a state recommendation, and they might go back to the MSDE to find out if they might be willing to support or assist MCPS in this process.

Dr. Cronin stated that he would support the report, and the key element was the budget process which would begin to move this along. He noted that this came from the Commission on Excellence and in it he was reading "teacher" and principal," but he never got to the level of the other half of the school population, namely the other part of staff. The assumption in reading this was that the important staff was faculty, and then there was the rest. In just one place was there a suggestion on support services. He would like to see this become an equal paper of staff development for nonteaching staff or change "staff" development to "teaching" development. This left the impression there was a first class citizen and a second class citizen. Mrs. Heck replied that Ms. Geddes had reminded them of this in their discussions; however, they had followed the charge which was to focus on teachers. In their discussions they had stated that this was as appropriate for administrative and support staff as it was for teachers.

Mr. Ewing called attention to a statement on page 9 which stated that each teacher would develop a plan that would include school-related objectives and personal objectives. On page 10, it stated that the plan would list staff development goals for the teacher for one or two years. With respect to the school training plan it was the school objectives that were contained in the school training plan that needed to be reflected in the individual plan. This was not clear to him. Mrs. Heck explained that they saw the individual teacher plan reflecting the support for the local school objectives but also the teacher's having an individual professional development plan that that individual might want to follow.

Mr. Ewing noted that the language on page 10 was very careful to avoid saying anything about the school administrator's role other than the role of reviewer and suggester. He asked if the administrator had the authority to approve or disapprove. Mr. Romack explained that they had tried to develop a proposal that would allow staff development, at least in part, to begin with the individual and allowing the individual to identify his or her needs. If they allowed an administrator to determine what those needs would be if they were not a part of an evaluation, they would be taking away the essence of this report which was that the staff development should be based on individual needs. For years and years, staff development had been dictated to the individual teacher. Mr. Ewing pointed out that they might have large cost items such as academic leave, and it seemed to him in that case individual teachers could not just say they were going to do this regardless of cost. Mr. Romack explained that a lot of these things were requests, and although a teacher might indicate a goal, it was not an automatic given that they would

get this. Ms. Craney suggested that the individual needs were within budget and did not violate Board priorities, then the individual teacher could move toward these goals.

Dr. Pitt reported that they were really talking about true pilots here. This was a new concept to MCPS because usually when they had a pilot they also had a plan. In this case, they didn't know whether this was going to work. He agreed that it was important to have some kind of an evaluation. To him, the interesting part was it would be a test of whether collegial relationships worked. He was convinced it would work.

Ms. Blumsack felt that this would legitimize things that teachers and staff had been doing for years. Teachers were already going to universities and taking extra courses. Fine arts teachers were already going to theatre, dance, and concerts. This was a way to take what was happening and let everyone know that it was going on. Mrs. DiFonzo asked about whether secondary coordinators would receive stipends and reduced workloads. Mr. Romack replied that it would be a choice in that situation. Mrs. Heck said that at the elementary level it would be a stipend because they could not reduce scheduling. Dr. Pitt felt it would be a stipend at the elementary level and have flexibility at the secondary level. Mr. Cooney would have to be involved here.

Mrs. DiFonzo and Dr. Pitt thanked the committee for their report.

Re: BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS

1. In regard to the Construction Progress Report, Mr. Goldensohn asked that staff change the name of the future Clearspring Elementary School in Germantown because they now had an actual Clearspring Elementary School near Damascus.
2. Mr. Goldensohn complimented Quince Orchard High School on their opening football game including their team, the cheerleaders, the poms, the band, and the athletic director. He asked staff to look into providing another speaker for the center of the bleachers.
3. Mr. Goldensohn pointed out that the safety of football players was heavily dependent upon the status of the field and how well the grass was rooted. It appeared that Quince Orchard had a reasonable field although the grass was late going in. He hoped that the grass at Watkins Mill would be put in this fall. Dr. Pitt replied that Watkins Mill was ahead of schedule, and they would not have the same kind of problems.
4. Mr. Goldensohn said he was aware of the process they went through in hiring new teachers each year and the restrictions put on them by the Council regarding average hiring levels. He thought they had a balance problem that potentially shortchanged children by bringing in too many brand new, inexperienced teachers. He wondered if they should strive not to hire more than 50 percent brand new. There were a number of highly qualified former MCPS teachers who wanted to come back and could not because of the hiring restrictions. Dr. Pitt did not agree that they hurt the school system by hiring new teachers. They had the best group of new teachers he had ever seen, and many of

them were MCPS graduates. They were careful in distributing these teachers so that a staff would not have half its teachers new. He added that if there were excellent experienced teachers out there, they could be and should be hired. Mr. Ewing expressed his agreement with Mr. Goldensohn. He thought it was important for them to have new teachers in the school system, and for four years they had had a policy of hiring the best person and that they would ask the Council for more funds if they needed to. He noted that thus far 75 percent of the new teachers had no experience. Dr. Pitt explained that they would hire about 60 more teachers this year and most of them would be experienced.

5. Mr. Ewing said he was curious as to why the discussion on the up-county special program had been scheduled in mid-November. He thought this issue should be scheduled promptly. Mrs. DiFonzo replied that the "plate" was becoming more and more crowded because Board members were adding three or four items of new business per meeting to the plate. Looking at what was on the plate, November was the first available time they felt it should be scheduled. Dr. Cronin pointed out that the superintendent's recommendation could not go into effect for two or three years and was not as important as more immediate issues. Mr. Ewing remarked that it looked as if the Board officers were proposing to schedule this item at a time after the Board member election. It was Mr. Goldensohn's impression that this issue would only take a few minutes to say they endorsed the superintendent's plan.
6. Mr. Ewing remarked that he was still concerned about the issue of moving staff, particularly the Division of Construction, out of the central office. He realized that it was the superintendent's decision, but he wondered why they couldn't renovate the space they were moving to rather than moving staff twice.
7. In regard to the asbestos management plan, Mrs. Praisner said the final paragraph made reference to a sizeable financial commitment. She assumed they were talking about briefing the county executive and County Council, but she wasn't sure whether the Board was involved. Dr. Pitt replied that they were talking about asking for a delay and would have to involve the Council. Secondly, when they got a detailed plan, there did need to be some kind of briefing of the Council education committee and the Board or the Board first.
8. In regard to the special education transportation study, Dr. Cronin understood they would have a staff response. Dr. Pitt explained that they had already taken some steps on this and had sent the Board a memo. While it was a management study, he felt they should discuss this with the Board.
9. Mrs. DiFonzo reported that she had attended the in-service human relations training at Pyle and in the Watkins Mill cluster. She had also visited the alternative education in-service at Phoenix II. The alternative education folks had admired the new building and wanted their own sites for their programs. The Watkins Mill cluster had brought in Chuck Jackson and other people with whom the staff had responded positively.
10. Mrs. DiFonzo stated that a parent had called her about the cards parents had to fill out on each of their children. It used to be that parents filled out one card. Now they were asked to fill out four cards per child with 19 separate items per card. The parent had

asked why they could not add this information into computers as opposed to having all of these cards. If the parent changed the family doctor, all of the cards would have to be redone. She asked if there was a more efficient way of handling this. Dr. Pitt agreed to refer this to the paperwork committee.

RESOLUTION NO. 488-88 Re: EXECUTIVE SESSION - SEPTEMBER 26, 1988

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

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

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education of Montgomery County hereby conduct its meeting in executive closed session beginning on September 26, 1988, at 7:30 p.m. to discuss, consider, deliberate, and/or otherwise decide the employment, assignment, appointment, promotion, demotion, compensation, discipline, removal, or resignation of employees, appointees, or officials over whom it has jurisdiction, or any other personnel matter affecting one or more particular individuals and to comply with a specific constitutional, statutory or judicially imposed requirement that prevents public disclosures about a particular proceeding or matter as permitted under the State Government Article, Section 10-508; and that such meeting shall continue in executive closed session until the completion of business.

RESOLUTION NO. 489-88 Re: MINUTES OF JULY 25, 1988

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

RESOLVED, That the minutes of July 25, 1988, be adopted as corrected.

RESOLUTION NO. 490-88 Re: BOE APPEAL NO. 1988-13

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

RESOLVED, That BOE Appeal No. 1988-13 (student transfer) be withdrawn at the request of the appellants.

RESOLUTION NO. 491-88 Re: BOE APPEAL NO. 1988-36

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

RESOLVED, That Board grant an extension of time for BOE Appeal No. 1988-36 (transfer of students).

Re: ITEMS OF INFORMATION

Board members received the following items of information:

1. Items in Process
2. Construction Progress Report
3. Special Education Transportation Report
4. Asbestos Management Plan

Re: ADJOURNMENT

The president adjourned the meeting at 5:40 p.m.

PRESIDENT

SECRETARY

HP:mlw