

APPROVED  
38-1988

Rockville, Maryland  
October 24, 1988

The Board of Education of Montgomery County met in regular session at the Carver Educational Services Center, Rockville, Maryland, on Monday, October 24, 1988, at 8:40 p.m.

ROLL CALL Present: Mrs. Sharon DiFonzo, President  
in the Chair  
Dr. James E. Cronin  
Mr. Blair G. Ewing  
Mr. Bruce A. Goldensohn  
Mr. Chan Park  
Mrs. Marilyn J. Praisner  
Mrs. Vicki Rafel  
Dr. Robert E. Shoenberg

Absent: None

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

RESOLUTION NO. 540-88 Re: BOARD AGENDA - OCTOBER 24, 1988

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

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education approve its agenda for October 24, 1988.

RESOLUTION NO. 541-88 Re: COMMENDATION OF LESLIE J. ROCHE

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

WHEREAS, Each year the Maryland State Department of Education and the Maryland Chamber Foundation of the state chambers of commerce honor one educator as the Maryland teacher of the year; and

WHEREAS, On October 19, 1988, Leslie J. Roche, social studies teacher at Parkland Junior High School, was named 1988 Maryland Teacher of the Year; and

WHEREAS, Mrs. Roche's outstanding teaching abilities and skill in motivating students have been recognized by her principal and the Montgomery County Public Schools and have now also been recognized at the state level; and

WHEREAS, Through her commitment to public school education, Mrs. Roche serves as a role model for other Maryland teachers; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That on behalf of the superintendent of schools, staff, and students of the Montgomery County Public Schools, the Board of Education extends congratulations to Leslie J. Roche, 1988 Maryland Teacher of the Year.

Re: BOARD/PRESS/VISITOR CONFERENCE

The following individuals appeared before the Board of Education:

1. Martin Schaffer, Tri-Services
2. Pete Galvin, North Chevy Chase ES PTA
3. Roscoe Nix, NAACP

RESOLUTION NO. 542-88 Re: PROCUREMENT CONTRACTS OVER \$25,000

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Dr. Cronin seconded by Mrs. Praisner, the following resolution was adopted with Dr. Cronin, Mrs. DiFonzo, Mr. Ewing, Mr. Goldensohn, (Mr. Park), Mrs. Praisner, and Dr. Shoenberg voting in the affirmative; Mrs. Rafel being temporarily absent:

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

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

BID	AWARDEE(S)	
40-87	Laundering of Uniforms -- Contract Extension Coyne Textile Services	\$ 33,724
3-89	Instructional Microcomputer Equipment	
	Apple Computer, Inc.	\$1,045,224
	F. C. Business Systems-Family Computer Ctr.	7,029*
	Clinton Computer	3,405
	Landon Systems Corporation	531
	Major Educational Resources Corporation	5,550
	Powell-Pendergraph, Inc.	3,700
	Thirdware Computer Products	1,137*
	TOTAL	----- \$1,066,576
12-89	Early Childhood and Kindergarten Equipment and Supplies	
	ABC School Supply	\$ 2,323
	Chaselle, Inc.	2,228
	Childcraft Education Corporation	19,651
	Community Playthings	28,223
	Constructive Playthings	992*
	Creative Publications	261
	Educational Teaching Aids	8,162

	J. L. Hammett Company	189
	I. E. S. S.	900*
	Kaplan School Supply	5,354
	Learning Ideas	1,802*
	Nasco	2,523
	S & S Arts and Crafts	478
	Sportmaster	6,435
		-----
	TOTAL	\$ 79,521
15-89	Science Equipment for Quince Orchard High School	
	American Scale and Equipment Company, Inc.	\$ 12,060
	Baxter Scientific Products	7,560
	Carolina Biological Supply Company	6,929
	Central Scientific Company	24,451
	CT. Valley Biological Supply Company	535*
	Curtin Matheson	4,045
	Edmund Scientific Company	243*
	Fisher Scientific Company	9,025
	Frey Scientific Company	14,284
	Macalaster Bicknell Company of N.J., Inc.	21,344
	McKilligan Supply Corporation	140
	Nasco	165
	Nystrom Division of Herff Jones, Inc.	2,255
	Sargent-Welch Scientific	34,785
	Science Kit & Boreal Laboratories	3,203
	Southern Biological Supply Company	114
	Ward's Natural Science Est., Inc.	20,997
		-----
	TOTAL	\$ 162,135
19-89	Custodial Equipment	
	Airchem/Capitol Supply, Inc.	\$ 6,313
	The Baer Group, Inc.	13,888
	W. W. Grainger	468
	INDCO, Inc. - Independence Chemical	4,996
	Maryland Products Company, Inc.	10,580*
		-----
	TOTAL	\$ 36,245
23-89	Filtration System	
	Air-Tech Products	\$ 105,423*
29-89	Elevator and Stage Lift Maintenance	
	Barbee Curran Elevator Company, Inc.	\$ 34,560*
30-89	Ice Cream and Novelties	
	Briggs Ice Cream Company	\$ 658,799
	TOTAL OVER \$25,000	\$2,176,983

\*Denotes MFD vendors

RESOLUTION NO. 543-88 Re: CHANGE ORDERS OVER \$25,000

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

WHEREAS, A change order proposal of \$58,976 has been received from the general contractor for Richard Montgomery High School, The Gassman Corporation, through the project architect, Grimm & Parker Architects, and acceptance of this proposal is recommended; and

WHEREAS, Sufficient funds reside in the project account to fund this increase in scope; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That change order number one for \$58,976 be approved and the contract with The Gassman Corporation be amended.

RESOLUTION NO. 544-88 Re: LAYTONSVILLE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL  
MODERNIZATION

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

WHEREAS, The following sealed bids were received on October 11, 1988, for the Laytonsville Elementary School modernization:

BIDDER	BID
1. Kimmel & Kimmel, Inc.	\$3,646,200
2. McAlister-Schwartz	3,679,316
3. Doyle, Inc.	3,681,543
4. Dustin Construction	3,773,000
5. Gassman Corporation	3,774,000
6. Edmar Corporation	3,826,800

and

WHEREAS, Kimmel and Kimmel, Inc., has satisfactorily completed numerous capital projects for MCPS; and

WHEREAS, The rebid represents a considerable savings over the initial bid of May 26, 1988, (\$4,090,000); and

WHEREAS, Although this represents excellent bid activity, additional funding is required to award this low bid and provide a modest contingency; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That a \$3,646,200 contract be awarded to Kimmel and Kimmel, Inc., for the Laytonsville Elementary School modernization in accordance with the plans and specifications prepared by Victor Smolen and Associates, Architects, contingent upon the County Council's approval of a \$970,000 emergency supplemental appropriation; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the county executive be requested to recommend to the

County Council that an FY89 emergency supplemental appropriation of \$970,000 be approved to fund the Laytonsville Elementary School modernization.

RESOLUTION NO. 545-88 Re: ACCEPTANCE OF CLEARSPRING ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

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

RESOLVED, That having been duly inspected on October 18, 1988, Clearspring 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.

RESOLUTION NO. 546-88 Re: UTILIZATION OF FY 1989 FUTURE SUPPORTED PROJECT FUNDS TO ESTABLISH COMPETENCY-BASED ADULT EDUCATION PROGRAM (PROJECT MAPP)

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Dr. Cronin seconded by Mr. Goldensohn, 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 a grant award of \$34,780 from MSDE under the Adult Education Act to continue development of the competency-based adult education instructional program in the following categories:

CATEGORY	AMOUNT
01 Administration	\$32,400
10 Fixed Charges	2,380
	-----
TOTAL	\$34,780

and be it further

RESOLVED, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the county executive and the County Council.

RESOLUTION NO. 547-88 Re: PERSONNEL APPOINTMENT

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

APPOINTMENT	PRESENT POSITION	AS
Lillian Biladeau	Admin. Secretary II	Editor

Dept. of Instructional      Div. of Media  
Resources                      Tech. & Production  
Effective: 10-25-88

Re: A MOTION ON MC 912-89 - MONTGOMERY  
COUNTY BOARD OF EDUCATION - COMPOSITION  
AND ELECTION (FAILED)

A motion on the portion of MC 912-89 to add one new elective member to the Board of Education failed with Dr. Cronin voting in the affirmative; Mrs. DiFonzo, Mr. Ewing, Mrs. Praisner, Mrs. Rafel, and Dr. Shoenberg voting in the negative; Mr. Goldensohn and (Mr. Park) abstaining.

Re: A MOTION ON MC 912-89 - MONTGOMERY  
COUNTY BOARD OF EDUCATION - COMPOSITION  
AND ELECTION (FAILED)

A motion on the portion of MC 912-89 to give a vote to the student Board member failed with Dr. Cronin, Mr. Goldensohn, (Mr. Park), and Dr. Shoenberg voting in the affirmative; Mrs. DiFonzo, Mr. Ewing, Mrs. Praisner, and Mrs. Rafel voting in the negative.

Re: A MOTION OF MC 915-89 - MONTGOMERY  
COUNTY - NONCERTIFICATED PUBLIC SCHOOL  
EMPLOYEES - STRIKES

Mrs. Rafel moved that the Board oppose MC 915-89 - Montgomery County - Noncertificated Public School Employees - Strikes.

Re: A SUBSTITUTE MOTION BY MR. EWING ON  
MC 915-89 (FAILED)

A substitution motion by Mr. Ewing that the Board support MC 915-89 - Montgomery County - Noncertificated Public School Employees - Strikes failed with Dr. Cronin, Mr. Ewing, Mr. Goldensohn, and (Mr. Park) voting in the affirmative; Mrs. DiFonzo, Mrs. Praisner, Mrs. Rafel, and Dr. Shoenberg voting in the negative.

Re: A SUBSTITUTE MOTION BY DR. CRONIN ON  
MC 915-89 (FAILED)

A substitute motion by Dr. Cronin that the Board of Education take no position on MC 915-89 - Montgomery County - Noncertificated Public School Employees - Strikes failed with Dr. Cronin, Mr. Ewing, Mr. Goldensohn, and (Mr. Park) voting in the affirmative; Mrs. DiFonzo, Mrs. Praisner, Mrs. Rafel, and Dr. Shoenberg voting in the negative.

RESOLUTION NO. 548-88      Re: MC 915-89 - MONTGOMERY COUNTY -  
NONCERTIFICATED PUBLIC SCHOOL EMPLOYEES  
- STRIKES

On motion of Mrs. Rafel seconded by Mrs. Praisner, the following resolution was adopted with Mrs. DiFonzo, Mrs. Praisner, Mrs. Rafel, and Dr. Shoenberg voting in the affirmative; Dr. Cronin, Mr. Ewing, Mr. Goldensohn, and (Mr. Park) voting in the negative:

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education oppose MC 915-89 - Montgomery County - Noncertificated Public School Employees - Strikes, for the reasons articulated during Board discussion.

Re: ESOL/BILINGUAL PROGRAMS IN MCPS

Dr. Pitt recalled that last year they had talked about the ESOL high school centers, especially about the impact of the number of ESOL students on Wheaton High School. He reported that the other centers at Blair, Einstein, B-CC, Richard Montgomery, Walter Johnson, and Quince Orchard had an ESOL population of between 6 and 15 percent. Wheaton's ESOL population was 21 percent of the student body, or 50 percent more than the other schools. He would be recommending they move about 60 youngsters which would bring Wheaton to about 15 percent. They would look at the 60 youngsters who were most able to move to a location in the northern part of Area 1. He indicated that he would have more information when the Board discussed the capital budget.

Dr. Vance introduced Mrs. Maria Schaub, director of the Division of ESOL/Bilingual Programs; Dr. Hiawatha Fountain, associate superintendent; and Dr. Richard Towers, director of the Department of Alternative and Supplementary Education. They would discuss the history of the program, the current status, and future projections. Board members viewed the English version of a video for new ESOL parents and students. MCPS had produced the video in nine different languages.

Mrs. Schaub invited Board members to visit the ESOL Center at Rockinghorse Road. She said that their student body had changed over the last five years. They used to have a large international student population whose parents were in the county with international organizations and embassies. While those students were still here, the significant growth had been in refugees and immigrants. They now made up over 70 percent of the ESOL population. She felt that the school system had responded to those changing needs in an excellent manner. They were called upon to make presentations about the MCPS ESOL program in the state and across the country. Their BiCEP, METS, and bilingual counseling programs were unique. She praised their parent outreach program and the ESOL staff who gave their home telephone numbers to parents.

Mrs. Schaub reported that it was helpful that the entire staff was at Rockinghorse now and no longer at five different sites. She thought that the intensive English language centers (IELCs) at the high schools were very effective, and they were looking at future needs in this area. They would be also focusing on more in-service training with schools having large numbers of limited English proficient (LEP) students. Teachers needed help in working with these students and in

minimizing the impact of this help on other students in the classroom.

Dr. Cronin asked about supports for former ESOL students in the regular classroom. Mrs. Schaub replied that the regular teachers would have a training program. Research now indicated that it could take up to seven years to become very proficient in a language, but students could function successfully after a shorter period of time.

Dr. Cronin asked if these students went back to their home high school. Mrs. Schaub replied that some did, but a lot of them did not because they identified with the high school where they had attended the ESOL center. If they returned to their home school and exited the ESOL program, no services followed them. However, ESOL did provide assistance to the mainstream teachers.

Mrs. Praisner reported that when she had been in Korea this summer she had shared information about the bilingual counseling program with her colleagues from other Boards of Education. It was clear to her that the MCPS ESOL program was way ahead of programs in other school districts. She commended the staff for the range of languages they covered and their commitment to ESOL. She asked about the computerized proficiency tests and the local tests. Mrs. Schaub replied that the high school test was complete and was being used. They were now developing the elementary version of the test. Students did very well using the computer and using the machine was not a problem. In addition, the computer tests were more accurate in determining the student's level than the paper and pencil test. In the high school, the paper and pencil test could take up to two or three hours. The computer test took 15 minutes. There had been a lot of interest in the computer test, and they had received letters from as far as Australia.

Dr. Cronin inquired about the time discrepancy. Mr. Rich Meagher, teacher specialist, explained that the test was a multiple choice test with four choices. It used 500 items that students had taken previously, and staff determined a difficulty factor for each item. The test started out at a middle level of difficulty, and if the student answered correctly, the next item was slightly more difficult and so on. If they failed with the second question, the student received an item which was less difficult but more difficult than the first item. The results corresponded to the proficiency level. He reported that at two of the centers last year they had used the test as an exit test.

Mrs. Praisner asked if they were able to do any projections about long-term ESOL needs despite volatile situations in the world. Dr. Fountain felt they had been relatively good at projections in the last five years. They had been very fortunate that they hadn't a lot of world crises that had affected their budget projections. He did not think they would have much of a problem in the future about making recommendations this year. Basically their increases would come with the expansion of the high school centers. The increases might also come in the counselor area because they had proven to be



so valuable to the program. There might be something in the parent area. Dr. Towers added that training was very important, especially in helping them make accommodations for ESOL students. Dr. Fountain thought they were making headway with Stan Fagan in considering alternative education as well as special education.

Mr. Ewing asked about the success of former ESOL students in secondary programs. He wondered what they knew about the extent to which students were successful in academic and vocational programs and in staying in school and completing their high school education. He noted that the dropout rate was increasing in Montgomery County, and there might or not might be an association with students coming from other countries. He asked whether anyone was keeping track of these students. Mrs. Schaub replied that the last study had been done in 1985, and it showed that students who completed all five levels did as well as their English-speaking peers. They were also finding that students in BiCEPS were staying in school, and getting a high school diploma was becoming important to them.

Mrs. DiFonzo asked what was causing that attitude change, and Mrs. Schaub replied that students now had the feeling that someone cared for them. In addition, these students were receiving vocational training. One area they were going to have to work on was helping students pass the functional tests, particularly writing and citizenship. During the last two summers, they had held noncredit classes to help students with the functional tests. This was a big stumbling block for students coming to MCPS with limited schooling or coming into school in the eleventh grade and having to pass all four tests.

Mr. Ewing asked if they had an on-going assessment of the students going through the program in terms of subsequent success. If not, were there plans to do so? Mrs. Schaub replied that they had not done a follow-up exit study, but it was worth looking into. Mr. Park asked if they made any records of the intentions of students toward higher level education or vocational schools. Mrs. Schaub replied that they did not have that information.

Mr. Park stated that in his contacts with ESOL students they had told him that the bilingual counselor was the most important person to them. The counselor was the link to the real world. ESOL students thinking about going on to higher education wanted to know whether these bilingual counselors were familiar with SATs, ACTs, etc., or was this left up to the regular counselor in the school. He noted that a lot of information about college came out in parent newsletters, but he wondered whether they had any contact with the students themselves. Mrs. Schaub replied that besides doing crisis intervention and individual counseling, the counselors had a series of units they addressed with the students, and one of them was on getting into college. This was generally done in grades 10, 11, and 12. Mr. Park suggested that they consider doing this with ninth graders when they were planning their programs for the next four years. Mrs. Schaub added that the ESOL/bilingual counselors did work with the school counselors on the courses that these students could

take because of their language ability. One advantage of having an ESOL/bilingual counselor at Richard Montgomery was that she knew the needs and abilities of the ESOL students.

Dr. Fountain commented that the key to the success of the program was using the regular counselors to multiply the effect of the expertise of the ESOL/bilingual counselors. They had to make sure that the regular counselors gained enough understanding to call on the bilingual counselors when they had questions.

Mrs. DiFonzo thanked staff for their efforts for ESOL students.

Re: GIFTED AND TALENTED PROGRAM ISSUES

Dr. Pitt stated that he had provided the Board with a memo on gifted and talented issues. He called attention to three sections. The first was that there was a management plan for each school which included long-range plans and objectives related to the improvement of gifted and talented programs as a part of the priorities. They were talking about giving some training to administrators, supervisors, and staff regarding gifted and talented programs and differentiated instruction. In addition, they had teacher training to help teachers acquire knowledge about the needs of gifted children. He recognized that there were differences among schools, and they needed to work toward that. It was their policy to have differentiation. The principal did not have the option of not having differentiated programs. It was one thing not to have a program because it was not the principal's philosophy. In that case, they needed to know about this and work with the area superintendent to let that person know this was not an acceptable approach.

Dr. Vance introduced Dr. Joy Frechtling, acting director of the Department of Educational Accountability; Dr. Leroy Tompkins, quality assurance specialist; and Dr. Waveline Starnes, educational planner for the gifted and talented. The executive staff had a series of meetings on the DEA study and continued to discuss the implications of the findings and the observations of that study. One of the questions posed was the sufficiency of the level of differentiation in the elementary programs and what was adequate. If the conclusion was that this differentiation was not sufficient, they had to look at the implications of that conclusion in terms of staff training and resource level.

Dr. Frechtling reported that this study was a replication of one they had done a couple of years earlier. It looked at what was actually happening in classrooms as far as the delivery of gifted and talented instruction. They looked at three kinds of situations. One was the instruction given to students who were placed in the centers for the highly gifted. The second was the instruction given in regular school-based programs to students who had been found to be gifted. In the same schools, they also looked at the kind of instruction received by students in the classrooms with gifted students, but who had not been labelled gifted. They also did a brief comparison with what they had observed two years earlier.

Dr. Frechtling reported that in the centers for the highly gifted there were many more of the things that comprised gifted instruction than what they saw in the regular schools. In general, they found there was little difference in what gifted students were receiving in the regular schools and what students were receiving who had not been so identified. In both cases these students were getting less of differentiated instruction than what was found in the centers. However, even among the regular schools themselves, they found a great deal of variation. Some schools were like the gifted center, and in some schools very little was going on that looked like differentiated instruction. They noticed that there had been a movement away from differentiated instruction for the gifted students in the regular school programs compared to what they had observed two years earlier.

Mr. Goldensohn said that the Board had received a copy of the 1978 policy on the education of gifted and talented students. He quoted, "appropriate differentiated programs and/or services are not currently available for all Montgomery County public schools gifted and talented students." The October 1987 report of the advisory committee stated that most elementary schools were making progress toward the goal of providing fully developed programs of appropriate differentiated instruction for their gifted and talented students. He asked how far they had come in the ten years since the policy statement had been written. The use of "most...are making progress" implied that some were making no progress. He had a problem with how they could expect schools to make good progress in differentiated education for G&T students. To his knowledge, the average incoming teacher did not take any undergraduate work in educating a gifted and talented student. They might take some in-service courses, or they might be assisted by one of the area-based teacher specialists. The specialists had a lot of schools to cover and could not train teachers to handle the gifted. He was concerned that the G&T program was not making the progress it should. It might be that total differentiation in the classroom was not the best way to go. It might be that homogeneous classes in a given school was the way to go. He did not think that MCPS was capable of training all their teachers. One other suggestion was to have one teacher in each school with a half-time time responsibility with their own class and half-time to support the G&T effort. However, this did cost money.

Dr. Starnes commented that the study was discouraging to her in many ways but not surprising. One of the studies clearly showed that four schools without additional staff in very diverse parts of the county were able to have quite effective programs. Therefore, she was not sure that simply adding additional staff was the crux of the problem. They did have a variety of modes of service, but every school had to have grouping, differentiated instruction, and train teachers. She pointed out that if every teacher in the building had six to ten gifted students they should be trained, but principals were reporting that about one-third of the teachers had little or no training. She also noted that many of the current supervisors in other fields had been trained in gifted and talented instruction and had moved on.

This was now happening with PADI teachers who were moving on to leadership roles.

Mr. Ewing remarked that the DEA study was dismaying, even bordering on shocking. It said that there had been a decline in differentiated instruction, and students were less likely to have that differentiation in the regular classroom programs than they were as recently as two years earlier. The superintendent had recognized that by saying that would be dealt with through school management plans and training. Mr. Ewing thought those were appropriate tools, but he did not understand what had been going on. The Board had not changed its policy or leadership positions. Dr. Starnes was still there and doing a good job, but clearly the schools were not following the policy. As a Board member with some years of experience, he knew the Board could pass policies which didn't always get implemented. However, when they had concrete evidence showing the policy was not being implemented, he got very upset. He said they needed to be clear about when they were going to deal with this. He needed to know if there were dollar implications in the budget so that the Board could deal with this. It was his sense that a principal determined to have a good program could do so without the application of additional funds or staff, but that might not be true in some circumstances. This was true of teacher training needs. He felt that if they had a commitment to the policy, they had to have a commitment to put the resources there if needed. He hoped the superintendent would tell them what resources were required. He asked if they were going to do something this year about this situation.

Dr. Vance reported that they had been discussing the implications of the report and talking with the researchers about their observations. They had asked principals, area superintendents, and area-based staff to go into the schools and see what was going on there. They were being asked to make a determination of where the program was sufficient and where it wasn't. If the programs were not adequate, they were to do what was necessary to make it adequate. He assumed this would be done. He remarked that the discussions on this were far-ranging, and the question of differentiation went beyond the question of gifted and talented children. Differentiation applied to all children. The study posed some bigger questions in terms of how the curriculum was being implemented.

Dr. Cronin asked if the adequacy of programs would be translated into a price tag for the coming budget, if need be. Dr. Pitt commented that they had been talking about differentiated instruction for 50 years. They had emphasis on achieving a great number of objectives. One problem with the study was that it was hard to tell when some of this was going on and when it wasn't. They did have training for teaching gifted and talented students and for identifying them. He thought they could improve the program they had, and a lot of schools were doing an effective job in this area.

Dr. Pitt said that the study revealed that some schools were not putting as much effort into this as they had in the past. He was not

sure that they had been pushing it that much because they had placed their emphasis on a lot of different things in the last year or so. They had talked about improving test scores and other things which put tremendous pressure on a school. They also had some schools with a large number of gifted students, and he did not know what the differentiation should be there. He agreed that they needed to remind principals and work with principals.

Dr. Vance reported that he had asked Dr. Frechtling to consider the unusually large number of new teachers they had brought in at the elementary level in the past four years and what had happened to their training. The other factor was that 44 percent of the elementary school principals had three or fewer years of experience. He was not suggesting those as excuses, but he thought those conditions had had an impact on the delivery of services to gifted students.

Mrs. DiFonzo said she would be interested in knowing whether there was a substantial difference between schools with G&T programs or differentiated instruction in those schools with new principals versus those schools with veteran principals. Before they drew conclusions about new principals, she would like to see more information.

Dr. Shoenberg commented that if they looked at any one school they would find variation from one school to another. It could be done if it corresponded to someone's interest to see that it was done. He agreed with Dr. Pitt that there were a lot of things they asked schools to do, and there was a limit to how much any one teacher or any one school could pay attention to at the same time. It had been several years since the Board had addressed this issue in any concerted way. Several years ago, the Board had provided a lot of resources. He agreed that at the least they should be maintaining the program as it existed, but they had found it was deteriorating. This might mean that the Board had to pay more attention to it. The policy should be followed. While a lot of things were going on, the students were still there and they only went through the school system once.

Dr. Shoenberg stated that gifted and talented programs illustrated the problem they had in translating programming from the Office of Instruction and Program Development to the schools and the lack of a nexus there. All of this had to go through the deputy to the area associates to the supervisors of elementary education to the principals. Dr. Starnes and her staff had no ability to ensure that the policies for which they were charged for providing the support could be implemented.

Dr. Pitt explained that OIPD was not there to enforce program. The principal and the area superintendent had to do that. Dr. Starnes could give them indications of what was happening and make recommendations for training. He was interested in coordinating the work of OIPD with the deputy. This was the principal's responsibility, and they had to provide resources and support. He

thought that part of it might be the lack of emphasis from the top in this area. They had to make sure they were emphasizing this. He thought they could do more than they were now doing with what they had.

Dr. Shoenberg noted that the Board could not pay attention to everything, and yet they expected everything to go on. The superintendent could not pay attention to everything, but some things should happen without their being directed from the top. Dr. Pitt said that the Board set policy, and it was his responsibility to monitor the implementation of the policy. For this reason, they asked DEA to look at some of these things and do these studies. Part of it was to emphasize to the principals that this was important.

Dr. Shoenberg reported that one clue was the success of the two-tenths of a gifted and talented coordinator in the secondary schools. He thought they might look at something similar for the elementary schools. Dr. Pitt said they had focused in on providing differentiation at the secondary level in honors programs and in a variety of other programs, and they had put a lot of emphasis there. Mrs. Rafel reported that she, Mr. Ewing, and Mr. Goldensohn had met with representatives of gifted and talented organizations. They had said they were not asking for resources. They were asking for a commitment to gifted and talented education. It was her perception this was the feeling in the community because the Board had not talked about its commitment. The study had come out, and the report from last year's committee had been produced; therefore, it appeared that the Board had lessened its commitment. Dr. Vance's suggestion about looking at what was going on in the schools was the first and most important step. This would reassure the community that the commitment was still there and still strong. The Board might have to change how it went about doing things as well as the demonstration to that commitment.

Dr. Cronin said they were talking about the ability of the Board to focus on particular issues and then go on to other issues. This did not mean that those issues went away. Their fundamental objective was to educate each child to the best of his or her ability. Therefore, they were talking here about gifted and talented. They had not talked about gifted and talented/learning disabled. This evening they had talked about ESOL, and then they had heard about special education needs. They had also talked about the achievements of black students, and then there was the average student. By the time they finished they were saying to the system that they were responsible for the education of each child to their highest level. The Board had to keep multiple focuses.

Dr. Pitt remarked that they were doing many things for a lot of youngsters. DEA had looked at this issue, and he was glad they had done the study because it pointed out need for improvement. But at the same time, he did not want to leave the impression that they had blown the whole thing. Dr. Starnes added that the advisory committee had stated there had been progress, but the progress made the gaps more evident. Dr. Frechtling noted that one of the messages that

came across in the study was the high quality of instruction going on in the centers.

Mr. Ewing thought the Board would be well advised to consider a statement at a subsequent meeting reaffirming its commitment to the Board policy and confirming the steps Dr. Pitt had planned to make that reaffirmation effective. This would be helpful in terms of the public's understanding of where the Board stood and helpful to the superintendent in terms of the endorsement of the directions he had proposed. This would also recognize the need to take some steps of a positive kind. He asked the superintendent to develop a resolution for the next meeting reaffirming the policy and developing a plan of action. Dr. Pitt replied that he had no problem with a reaffirmation, but he had problem with coming up with more than he had already developed. Mr. Ewing said that the superintendent's plan would be useful in itself, and if the Board wanted to add something, it could. Mrs. DiFonzo said it was the consensus of the Board to schedule this on the next agenda.

Mr. Goldensohn stated that as a separate item he would like to know from the superintendent and staff what the needs were and what the feasibility was of expanding the existing G&T centers. He pointed out that applications to the centers were up, and some grades were experiencing heavier pressure than others. It might be that they could add another class to a grade at a center. Dr. Pitt replied that he was not in favor of increasing the G&T centers, and Mr. Goldensohn explained that he was talking about additional classes within the existing three centers. Dr. Shoenberg pointed out that this meant more students and more transportation. Mr. Goldensohn asked the superintendent to look into this and give his reaction to this proposal.

Re: SECTION B OF THE POLICIES AND  
REGULATIONS HANDBOOK

Dr. Cronin moved and Mrs. Praisner seconded the following:

WHEREAS, Resolution NO. 316-82 authorized the superintendent to publish a POLICIES AND REGULATIONS HANDBOOK containing certain selected policy statements; and

WHEREAS, Resolution No. 655-83 established a review process for all policies contained in the handbook; and

WHEREAS, Resolution Nos. 425-84 and 458-86 established a standard format for policy statements; and

WHEREAS, Resolution No. 333-86 directed the superintendent to reformat existing policy statements to the standard as they are reviewed; and

WHEREAS, The Board of Education has previously reviewed the policy statements in Section B and determined which of them should remain in the section and which should be removed for inclusion in a Board

handbook; and

WHEREAS, Ten of the 12 policies remaining in Section B have been reformatted without significant content change; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the 10 reformatted policies be accepted; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the 12 policies listed as follows be included in Section B of the POLICIES AND REGULATIONS HANDBOOK:

- BBB Ethics Policy
- BCB Student Board Member Election
- BFA Policy on Policysetting
- BLA Policy on Public Hearings
- BLB Rules of Procedure in Appeals and Hearings (Other than Special Education)
- BLC Rules of Procedure for Impartial Due Process Hearings (Special Education)
- BMA Board of Education Policy on Committees
- BMB Guidelines for Board of Education Advisory Committees
- BMG Guidelines for Committee Operation
- BNA Ombudsman/Staff Assistant to the Board of Education
- BNB Guidelines for the Work of the Ombudsman/Staff Assistant
- BOA Policy on Legal Services

and be it further

RESOLVED, That the superintendent publish the reformatted Section B as soon as possible.

RESOLUTION NO. 549-88 Re: AN AMENDMENT TO THE PROPOSED RESOLUTION ON SECTION B OF POLICIES

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

RESOLVED, That the proposed resolution on Section B of the Policies be amended as follows:

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education Handbook be included as part of the POLICY AND REGULATION handbook.

RESOLUTION NO. 550-88 Re: SECTION B OF THE POLICIES AND REGULATIONS HANDBOOK

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

WHEREAS, Resolution NO. 316-82 authorized the superintendent to publish a POLICIES AND REGULATIONS HANDBOOK containing certain selected policy statements; and



WHEREAS, Resolution No. 655-83 established a review process for all policies contained in the handbook; and

WHEREAS, Resolution Nos. 425-84 and 458-86 established a standard format for policy statements; and

WHEREAS, Resolution No. 333-86 directed the superintendent to reformat existing policy statements to the standard as they are reviewed; and

WHEREAS, The Board of Education has previously reviewed the policy statements in Section B and determined which of them should remain in the section and which should be removed for inclusion in a Board handbook; and

WHEREAS, Ten of the 12 policies remaining in Section B have been reformatted without significant content change; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the 10 reformatted policies be accepted; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the 12 policies listed as follows be included in Section B of the POLICIES AND REGULATIONS HANDBOOK:

- BBB Ethics Policy
- BCB Student Board Member Election
- BFA Policy on Policysetting
- BLA Policy on Public Hearings
- BLB Rules of Procedure in Appeals and Hearings (Other than Special Education)
- BLC Rules of Procedure for Impartial Due Process Hearings (Special Education)
- BMA Board of Education Policy on Committees
- BMB Guidelines for Board of Education Advisory Committees
- BMG Guidelines for Committee Operation
- BNA Ombudsman/Staff Assistant to the Board of Education
- BNB Guidelines for the Work of the Ombudsman/Staff Assistant
- BOA Policy on Legal Services

and be it further

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education Handbook be included as part of the POLICY AND REGULATION handbook; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the superintendent publish the reformatted Section B as soon as possible.

Re: BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS

1. Mr. Goldensohn explained that his request for Dr. Pitt to look at the feasibility of additional classes at gifted and talented centers had nothing to with the reaffirmation of the policy on the education of the gifted and talented or the plan submitted by the superintendent. This was a totally separate issue, and he did not want the two connected.

2. Mrs. Rafel stated that she was pleased to see the proposed fund-raising policy as an item of information. She suggested they consider sponsoring a seminar on funding-raising activities within the confines of the policy. Mrs. Praisner asked if the Board would discuss the policy prior to sending it out for comment, and Dr. Pitt agreed that it would be discussed on November 21.
3. Mrs. DiFonzo reported that she and Mr. Park had attended the NFUSSD fall conference in DeKalb County, Georgia. She had attended the Fernbank Science Center with its \$2,000,000 telescope. The center was open seven days a week for citizens, students, and teachers. This was not to be confused with an outdoor education program. Students could attend the Fernbank Center for nine weeks. The school system had a full-time ornithologist and a full-time taxidermist on its payroll. She said that when people said that Montgomery County had everything she would point them to DeKalb County. Dr. Pitt reported that the program had originally been funded by federal dollars and private funds, and it was a wonderful program. Mrs. DiFonzo added that the budget for that one center consumed 1 percent of their entire county budget.
4. Dr. Pitt noted that 22 principals and the superintendent from Talbot County had visited the outdoor education center. They appreciated their visit, and he was interested in having MCPS provide support to other counties to get them more involved.

RESOLUTION NO. 551-88 Re: EXECUTIVE SESSION - NOVEMBER 10, 1988

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Dr. Cronin seconded by Mrs. Praisner, 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 November 10, 1988, at 9 a.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; and be it further

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

RESOLUTION NO. 552-88 Re: MINUTES OF SEPTEMBER 14 AND 26 AND  
OCTOBER 6, 1988

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

RESOLVED, That the minutes of September 14, September 26, and October  
6, 1988, be approved.

RESOLUTION NO. 553-88 Re: DISCUSSION OF DEA DROPOUT STUDY

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

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education discuss the issue of dropouts  
and programs and efforts being made currently to deal with that  
issue.

RESOLUTION NO. 554-88 Re: DISCUSSION OF SUSPENSION PROJECT

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

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education review the MCPS Suspension  
Project with a view to both learning what needs to be done and  
discussing the suggestions for directions for future efforts.

Mrs. Praisner suggested that the two items be discussed at the same  
time.

Re: ITEMS OF INFORMATION

Board members received the following items of information:

1. Staff Response/Family Life and Human Development Report
2. Residence and Tuition Review Committee Annual Report
3. Fund Raising Policy (for future consideration)

Re: ADJOURNMENT

The president adjourned the meeting at 11:20 p.m.

-----  
PRESIDENT

-----  
SECRETARY

HP:mlw