

their annual report. He said that the 21 people on the committee had put a lot of hours into the production of that particular document. He praised Dr. Paul Scott and his staff who assisted in the preparation of the report. There had been a tremendous amount of interest in the report including calls from Baltimore County; Fairfax County; Frederick County; Dallas, Texas; and St. Louis, Missouri. People were interested in how the committee functioned to address the needs of minority students. Tonight they would hear from Keith Prouty on student achievement and participation and Edgar Gonzalez on successful practices.

Mr. Prouty stated that they planned to review their recommendations as set forth in the superintendent's response and ask each member of the Board to respond with respect to his or her views on the issue, the relevance of the issue, and how the Board proposed to move with respect to that subject matter. The first issue dealt with early childhood training and education. It was crucial to them that MCPS begin to pioneer in that area. They were aware of a number of programs already underway in early childhood education. The question to the Board was whether they believed that the parameters and the level of confidence the student brought to the educational process was developed in grades K through 3, and what was the Board willing to do to provide that focus. He stated that it was in the early years that the student's attitude toward education was shaped.

Mr. Prouty said that the second issue was the need to build a student data base that monitored students not only as statistics but as individuals. He asked the Board members if they believed that students be treated not as numbers but as individuals whose aspirations, needs, and concerns must be treated on an individual basis. The third recommendation dealt with ability grouping and their findings that too often minority students tend to be stereotyped in terms of ability grouping and treated as a minority group rather than as individual students. He asked the Board if they agreed that the message must come from the Board to the staff that teachers must adjust their processes so that each student was treated as an individual achiever.

The next issue was the need to strengthen and improve the student mentoring program. They knew there were mentoring programs underway in a number of schools and under a number of difference offices. He asked the Board if they agreed that a mentoring program was an effective adjunct to help the younger student and the mentor as well. The first issue was the need to develop leading education indicators to replace an overblown reliance on test scores. He asked the Board to address the issue of criteria they thought were important in terms of measuring progress on the part of individual students.

Mr. Prouty said the sixth issue was the question of retaining an outside expert to assess both management and structure of MCPS with respect to the minority student education program. He asked the Board if they agreed that the advisory committee ought to have an active role in selecting and monitoring the progress of this study. He also asked what measures the Board was prepared to take now to

assure implementation of the recommendations of the study. Mrs. Phyllis Feldman stated that the next issue was testing, and since they had started work on this two publications had come out. One was VISIONS OF A BETTER WAY, put out by the Center for Joint Political Studies, and the other was the report of the Sondheim Commission. Both recommended criterion-referenced tests of some kind of curriculum-linked testing rather than the norm-referenced tests presently used for accountability. The subcommittee wanted to go beyond standardized testing and look to rank in class, grade point average, and grades. After reviewing the staff response, they had questions about the feasibility of using percentile ranks for accountability and for using CRTs in the curriculum, especially math in grades 1 and 2. They would like to hear from the Board on the whole issue of testing.

In regard to issues 8, 9, and 10, Dr. Barbara Williams stated that often achievement and participation were linked. Very often minority students, especially black students, were not recognized with school-based awards. It was not just those students who were underachievers, but those students who did well. Recognizing students for their achievements was important for the students and for the community. Schools made their own decisions about who would get awards, and very often the minority community did not even know about the awards program. She had attended these ceremonies and very often the only awards received by minority children were from minority organizations. She noted that her son had just graduated and although he had the highest grade point average for any black male, he did not receive any award from Rockville High School. He did receive a scholarship from the Carl Rowan program. Giving awards to minority students provided a positive message to other minority students.

In regard to the quality integrated education program, Dr. Williams pointed out that schools made a decision as to whether or not they would have this program. She felt that it was important that the system say to principals that they would have this program. She asked how the Board felt about requiring certain programs. The last issue was greater participation of minority students in non-athletic extracurricular activities. Some principals made it clear they did not steer minority students to athletic activities, but athletic coaches were trained to recognize athletic ability. She asked why sponsors of non-athletic activities were not trained to recognize academic and other abilities as well.

Dr. Cronin stated that he found nothing in the reports that he disagreed with in any way. For example, early childhood education was critical to the way in which students learned. He asked that the Board discuss early childhood education and what they were prepared to do, how the programs would be put in place, and what successes they would be looking for. He thought that in a number of instances they did not have a choice. They had to do these. He noted that part of the superintendent's proposal in terms of administrative reorganization was an early childhood coordinated unit.

Dr. Pitt agreed that there needed to be a greater emphasis on the K-3 program, and they had appointed an early childhood coordinator. He was concerned about preschool. They needed to maintain their two-year commitment to expand Head Start. They were also focusing on parenting and trying to get parents involved with the school system so that the system could work with parents to prepare the child for school and develop a relationship with the teachers. He was recommending that they put Chapter I and Head Start in OIPD along with the early childhood program to have better coordination.

Dr. Shoenberg stated that the superintendent had made it quite clear that the early childhood initiative was an important part of his thinking about the future of the school system, and he had support from Board members. He commented that one of the major functions of the Board in the next year was to look at its six-year old priorities. He was sure the first two priorities would remain, but he thought they should look to the curriculum and improvement in academic performance. The early childhood initiative and parental involvement were key, and he felt that Board members would agree with the first recommendation of the committee.

Mr. Ewing pointed out that the Board still lacked a policy on early childhood education after many attempts in the last decade to have such a policy. He thought they needed a policy and that the committee's remarks were useful guides to such a policy statement. He said that the key was action by the Board to make possible the kinds of recommendations made by the committee. This meant substantial integration of curriculum and programs for early childhood education. This meant more all-day kindergartens so that staff could do more diagnoses of educational needs. They might want to consider an individual education plan for these children, not just minority children. He felt that class size and additional staffing were important and that ratios should be reduced. He noted that by the third grade, students were already failing because they did not have confidence to be effective learners and could not accomplish what they should. It was important to recognize that what they had done to date had not worked in the way they wanted it to. They should be prepared for fresh starts and new ideas. He also thought it was important for them to simply admit they did not know how to do this effectively yet and to gain in an orderly way solid knowledge that would help them in the future.

Mr. Prouty said that many of them were concerned with the lack of effectiveness on the part of the school system reflected in the rate of suspensions and a variety of remedial programs. He felt that many of these issues could be most effectively dealt with by a comprehensive program in the area of early childhood education. Dr. Cronin remarked that the literature showed them that early investment in a child was perhaps one of the best ways to start them off with a positive self attitude and attitude toward education. They needed to look at counseling and a variety of additional supports including early childhood education for teachers.

Dr. Pitt indicated that he wanted to put budget emphasis on early

childhood education. He agreed they did need to look at new ways of approaching this, and for that reason he had moved toward an early childhood coordinator to come up with new ideas and new approaches.

Dr. Moone was disturbed by Mr. Ewing's statement that they did not know how to approach educational issues. He asked whether Mr. Ewing was saying that all the experts in the school system did not know how to address these programs. Was the literature saying they didn't know enough about early childhood education or how children learn? He felt that they needed to know exactly what Mr. Ewing meant when he made these remarks.

Mr. Ewing replied that the evidence was that what they did was not being effective with minority students because the gap between minority and non-minority student achievement as measured on standardized tests was not closing. It was growing. He said that was evidence that they did not know how to educate all minority students. He did not know whether they lacked expertise. He looked for results, and he was delighted that they had hired a highly competent and creative coordinator of early childhood education. He thought the school system should say that it did not have the results it ought to have and, therefore, must not be doing the kinds of things it ought to be doing. The people working for the system were smart, dedicated, and hard working, but sometimes people had to admit they did not know how to do something. Therefore, they had to look for alternative ways of doing the job and measuring whether or not what they were doing was working. If they didn't measure what they were doing in a systematic way, they could not learn from what they were doing.

Dr. Pitt believed they had expertise and were doing some things. Some of the ways they measured made it difficult to judge just how well they were doing. He would be the first to say they had not succeeded totally, but nor had anyone else for all children. There was evidence that certain programs worked, but they had to try new approaches. This summer they had a creative approach to working with a group of students, and preliminary tests showed very good results. He thought they had to put more emphasis on K-3 and preschool. They needed to train people to use the best kinds of teaching approaches that they had. Last year they let principals make decisions about programs, but this year they were directing schools to pick up some of the programs. He said they had a lot of places to improve in, they did not have all the answers, and they did need different ways of teaching very young children. He believed that they had to put more emphasis on working with parents to get them to understand what the system was trying to do and to get them in partnership with the school system in those efforts.

Dr. Shoenberg remarked that 100 years ago they did not know much about how the brain worked or anything about heavier than air flight. He was mixing those things deliberately to get a sense of how human beings worked. As people went on they learned more, and they learned how to do things they didn't know how to do before. When something wasn't right, they looked for a solution. He did not think anyone

could say that as a society they were successful in helping minority students achieve in school in order to learn things that would enable them to earn a living. They needed to say they didn't know how to do it and to learn some things. They were operating in a changing social environment, and something that worked 50 years ago would not work today. What worked now might not work 50 years from now. They now agreed that in teacher education that teachers could be taught certain things. Clearly this was an area in which they had to learn a great deal more than they now knew as a teaching profession.

Dr. Vance stated that given their commitment and their high energy level they were frustrated by the lack of success of their initiatives as they looked at the data on minority youngsters, specifically African-Americans and Hispanics. In the room now were parents of children who have been very successful in MCPS. As he did, these parents taught their children to overcome the Eurocentric nature of American institutions. Their youngsters received an overdose of Western linguistic symbolization and Western logical mathematics because those were keys on short answer tests to being successful. They also knew that African-American students excelled in such things as interpersonal relationships, but there were no tests to label them genius or superior in this area. The frustration for him was how did they take what they had done individually with their children and what their parents did with them and transfer this to the school system to help the larger numbers of Hispanic or African American children.

Dr. Cronin asked if Board members would care to comment on the ways in which they could move from the CAT type of indicator to other indicators of success which might accommodate what Dr. Vance was talking about.

Dr. Shoenberg reported that last week the Board had adopted a motion which he had introduced. Mrs. Feldman was correct when she talked about the fact that this topic was now fashionable. The Sondheim Commission was only the latest of groups talking about non-test measures of success. He asked about the committee's fifth and seventh recommendations.

Mrs. Feldman explained that there was a reluctance on the part of most committee members to let go of some kind of reliable indicator, although they were not very happy with the CAT. The committee remained concerned about cultural bias on tests, but they were not calling for the abandonment of standardized testing. They did think that tests should become more sophisticated and sensitive tools for measurement. Mrs. Ingram added that the CAT gave them information about children in comparison to children all over the country. However, they needed a fuller picture of the child. In addition, they did not think the school should be held accountable for the CAT when the children might have had a bad day when they took the test. They thought that criterion-referenced tests could be adapted to show where the children were. They did want to individualize the picture of the child, but they did not believe that the CAT did this alone. Mrs. Feldman felt that tests should be diagnostic and indicators of

what the child had learned and how well the teacher had taught. They should not label the child and follow him through his school life.

Dr. Pitt thought it was difficult to equate their two recommendations. He said that normed tests gave them very minimal information about a student, and he thought they had misused them. A criterion-referenced test measured what they were trying to teach children. He did worry about labelling children. The Board was unanimous in its view that they ought to move toward other methods of measuring, and the Sondheim Commission recommended doing away with the normed reference test because of its misuse. Normed tests gave them information about a whole group of children, but it was not an individual diagnostic measure. However, the public and press expected them to provide easily understandable information about students, and the CAT did this.

Dr. Cronin pointed out that the Board had adopted a resolution charging the superintendent to look for other measures of success. He hoped that the committee would communicate with the superintendent on measures that should be used in assessing student success. Ms. Serino reported that one of her teachers was new to this country and did measure student progress, but she did not use tests. The teacher was sensitive to the abilities of her students and their progress. Ms. Serino thought that testing progress was just as important as testing ideas.

In regard to early childhood, Mr. Goldensohn was willing to put the extra resources into that program because it was an investment for the future. If they were successful with children in the early grades, they would have fewer problems with children in the upper grades. He thought that the staff had a lot of expertise, and having an early childhood coordinator would pull this all together. He agreed that mentoring was a fantastic way to educate. It helped the child who was mentored and helped the child who was doing the mentoring. Mentoring programs were very easily implemented and were very successful on the average. In regard to the committee's having a role in the selection of the consultant, he believed this was the Board's activity. However, the committee should work with the consultant because the committee was the primary resource in the community on this situation.

It seemed to Mr. Ewing that the eclectic approach taken by the committee was right because testing served a wide range of functions. He felt they needed to be clearer about what those functions were. Diagnostic tests should determine what children needed in the way of educational assistance and should gauge progress. Tests were also used for the purposes of accountability. Because MCPS was a public institution, the public had a right to know how well it was doing. One way, although not the only way, was through the reporting of test results. It was also important for the public to know how MCPS students compared with students elsewhere. Different kinds of testing were appropriate for those different functions, and they ought to have a wide range of testing devices and a mechanism that would permit them to look at the whole range of a student's

capabilities. As Dr. Vance had said, students came with different capabilities, and they were measuring only one or two. He was a great believer of student writing as a measure which was far better than multiple choice or true/false examinations. He believed there ought to be a test of student comprehension of the world around them.

Kindergarten teachers tended to do this, but after kindergarten this was not done. It wasn't that they ought to abandon the CAT; it was that they ought to use other devices in ways that were creative.

Dr. Moone was pleased to hear the discussion on testing. He was an advocate for testing, but what had happened was that testing had become devastating for the African-American student, and whether they liked it or not they were still labelling students in this school system. Unless the Board moved toward some non-testing procedures, they would continue to label. For example, ability grouping was a labeling progress for most Afro-American and Hispanic students. This summer he had talked to a number of people in Canada, and their procedures for measuring students were very different. He believed that teachers in MCPS had to look at the environment of students and realize that a student from Tobytown did not have the same supports at home as the student from Fox Hall Lane. He stressed that they had to move away from labelling and ability grouping which locked in a student and hampered the student's ability to even think about college.

Dr. Pitt stated that most teachers recognized that students did not come to school at the same level, and for this reason he had stressed the importance of helping parents develop some skills. Labelling was a real problem because test data did follow that student, not just in MCPS, but in every school system. He agreed with Mr. Ewing that they had to give some information to the public and to the parent, but he was concerned about data following the student and influencing people who worked with that child. He did believe that teachers recognized individual differences. In regard to the consultant, he had asked the Board to meet with more than one candidate and to provide input on the selection. The Board would discuss their goals as well as staff goals with the candidates. He wanted the consultant to use diverse expertise of more than one person, and the person selected would use experts from different backgrounds and different experiences in working with minority youngsters.

Mr. Gonzalez reported that in the successful practices report several of the issues coincided with issues discussed by other subcommittees. They believed that one of the key issues to the success of a school was to have strong enthusiastic and experienced principals who had a vision of what they wanted to achieve. They were suggesting there ought to be a different selection process for the principals of target schools. In the report they had a very specific definition of target schools, and they were concerned that staff had a different definition. Mr. Gonzalez felt there had to be incentives for a principal to leave an established community to go into a community with a transient population with lots of Hispanics, Asians, and

blacks. Principals were paid the same, and for the target schools there had to be incentives which could range from lower class sizes, additional staff, more computers, and even more money.

Dr. Pitt indicated that they did not pay people extra for being in a particular school. Dr. Vance commented that identifying a school as a target school had very little to do with what the principal was paid because they had a single salary scale for principals at elementary, intermediate, and senior high levels. A target school was one which had been identified because of the school's profile. The area superintendent would put in initiatives to correct the deficiencies in the program. This was done in different ways. There might be changes in the staff, additional resources, and changes in programs which might include putting in practices that had been successful in other schools. They would do closer monitoring of the program in that school, and it might be that just one portion of the

population needed that special assistance rather than the entire school. However, they did not publicly label schools as target schools.

Mr. Gonzalez was sure that they rated staff. They were suggesting that there had to be a way of attracting those super stars to these schools. It did not have to be money; it could be stipends. Dr. Shoenberg could think of a number of examples where this had been done. The original principal of Rosemary Hills was one of the very best principals in the school system. Her successor had gone from a very high achieving elementary school to take over the program at Rosemary Hills, and she had been asked to do this.

Dr. Cronin knew of individuals who saw these schools as a challenge and opportunity. Their commitment was to see that students of a different mix did succeed. He would want to avoid labelling a school as a target school because it was the same as labelling an individual student. They did recognize needs and did put in resources such as QIE, Chapter I, Head Start, and all-day kindergarten. Mrs. Praisner pointed out that the selection process for principals included community input, and if the Board mandated that a principal be assigned to a particular school this would violate community involvement.

Dr. Williams stated that in her years of looking at this situation she strongly believed that there was not a system of rewards and punishments. She had worked with an excellent principal around this issue and one who was not. However, both received the same salary. She asked why a person would put forth the intellectual and creative energy to make something happen in a school when he or she would be paid for just doing a mediocre job.

In regard to community involvement, Mrs. Ingram noted that Rosemary Hills had a very active community. She wondered what happened in a community where parents were not as active and vocal. Dr. Cronin pointed out that one of the initiatives this year was to bring parents into the schools and foster parental involvement especially

in communities with minority and non-English speaking families. Mr. Gonzalez stated that he had been involved with the HR 17 courses this year, and he had been telling teachers to realize that the Hispanic population coming into the country right now was not going to be coming to PTA meetings. They also thought that there should be some incentives for teachers in these schools, perhaps an extended contract for 11 months with additional multicultural training and some language training.

In regard to monitoring student progress, Mrs. Ingram said they had to use their computer technology and data base systems and adapt them to their use. They were not talking about just entering this information; they were talking about really using it. She cited the example of Kathy Gemberling and Kennedy High School and what she and her staff had done with this information. The committee felt there could be someone in the school responsible for directing this data to the appropriate places. For example, the school might need to work on attendance or the placement of students in honors classes.

Dr. Cronin noted that Mrs. Gemberling had just been appointed associate superintendent for instruction and program development. Mrs. Gemberling explained that the Kennedy system allowed the staff to look at the total picture in the school and also look at students as individuals. Therefore, they could provide early intervention which prevented them from having more students at risk. They could also look at the efforts they had made for the individual student. For the entire school, they could look at patterns and ask questions about the school program. She had talked to principals and had a proposal to phase in this kind of network in all three levels of schools over a three year period. They were planning for 16 secondary and 16 elementary schools in the first phase. They would have a team come in and train staff in the schools that had been identified for the pilot. One requirement was that the principal had to be trained as the lead person and had to select a guidance representative, the honors coordinator, and other key personnel as part of that team.

Dr. Shoenberg commented that there had been a number of techniques tried in schools that had been successful because of the person leading that effort. He said they had to be alert to the possibility that a program was not going to take every place they tried it because there were not people who worked well within that environment that particular strategy created or because of the leadership. His second point had to do with coordination. They had coordinators for a whole variety of things, and each of these people wanted the attention of the teachers. Teachers could not pay attention to all those agendas at the same time. It seemed to Mr. Ewing that this raised the issue of a large organization concluding that what it wanted to be accomplished could be done by allowing maximum flexibility in implementation. This meant that in many places nothing happened or something bad happened. Another way was to change the people administering the strategy in a particular school and get people to make it work. Large organizations sometimes had a need to enforce their regulations, and when an issue was important,

they ought to. He suggested that the reason for having a successful practices program was to learn from it what could be made to work so that it could be disseminated and made to work elsewhere. In some cases, it might be necessary to change the people involved.

Dr. Pitt reported that last year he had given staff the opportunity to try some things. This year where they were not having success, there was no choice. The deputy superintendent and the area superintendent would move strategies into those schools. He believed they would see some successes and some failures. In some cases they would have to change the personalities involved.

Mrs. DiFonzo thought that a successful strategy might not work in another school, not necessarily because of the principal and staff, but because of some vagaries within that community. One strategy was not necessarily going to work everywhere and for all people at all times. She asked Mrs. Gemberling to share the downside risks and upside benefits of the program at Kennedy. Mrs. Gemberling replied that they hadn't done this before in other schools because of costs. In addition, she did not think that staff members were well trained in using data and information. The proposed training program would teach people how to gather information, look at data, and use that data. At Kennedy they had done a lot of sharing of data with staff which helped them look at what students were at risk. Mrs. Gemberling said that a downside was people not being comfortable with using the information or using it improperly. The program was going to require a lot of training, but they did have more and more members of the total school community beginning to take an interest in this. She had talked with Joy Frechtling about alternative types of assessment and would continue to do so as new projects came on line. She commented that there had to be a certain element of trust among faculty members when they first looked at the data and asked hard questions among themselves. Staff had to know that the data was confidential and that they were gathering it for the purpose of better working relationships and better instruction for students. Self accountability came first, and external accountability followed.

Mrs. DiFonzo said she would be interested in knowing the school system's responsibility if someone came into a school and requested information from the data bank.

Dr. Paul Scott remarked that the concept of monitoring made the difference in the achievement of students. Good principals had been monitoring students for years long before the technology found them in the school building. The data used by these principals came from team meetings and looking at students over and over again. He hoped that when they got into the whole business of technology that they did not lose sight of the fact that it was the concept of monitoring that was critical and needed to be a regular part of the routine of every school.

Dr. Cronin knew some administrators who were extremely capable and who knew what they were looking for when they visited a school. Dr. Pitt said that the bottom line was what they did with the information

after they got it. Mrs. Gemberling had done some things with the information.

Mr. Gonzalez said that it was his view that the school system was failing Hispanics as a group. The ESOL response in the report was very well. They were not concerned about students going through the ESOL program. They were concerned once these students exited ESOL. He had heard from teachers that students were being mainstreamed too early. These students needed additional help and were not being tracked once they left ESOL. Another recommendation dealt with increased participation by parents. Mr. Gonzalez said that it was a devastating blow to new immigrants when they tried to register for adult ESOL and were turned away because of lack of space. This had happened to 400 people at Gaithersburg High School. He noted that this year the system grew by 1,740 students, and 991 were Hispanic and 605 were Asian. They had to address the needs of these students because this was a growing population in the county. Their parents did not communicate in English and might be illiterate in their own language. Yet they were expected to help their children with schooling. He believed they had to change what they had been doing in the past if they wanted to help these students and their parents.

Dr. Cronin thought that a lot of these concerns would be addressed through the operating budget this year. Dr. Pitt reported that they would have a budget increase in "same services" because of population growth. While he agreed they needed to work with parents, he thought they had to go beyond the school system in educating adults. They were not the agency that ought to be the major educational agency for adults. They had an adult education program, but the funding for that kind of training had to come from outside of the school system from the federal and state governments. He was not sure the school system ought to take on this task by itself. The school system needed to concentrate its resources on its student population, and funding for adult education ought not to come from those resources. Dr. Cronin agreed and suggested that they take a leadership role and present a plan to the county government, the Literacy Council, and Montgomery College.

Mr. Ewing remarked that the argument being made by the committee was a powerful one and could be made with regard to a good many of the problems the school system faced with minority students. There were responsibilities which presumably could be assigned to a wide variety of agencies, but the school system could only oblige the school system to deal with those issues. If the issues were not dealt with, students would not learn. Therefore, the school system had to decide whether it was going to be the agent dealing with a good many of those issues or not. He thought the school system should be the agent making sure that students received services and parents received services. This did not mean that the system would have to pay for all of it out of its budget, but they did need to be the lead agent. Dr. Pitt replied that they were the lead agent in terms of teaching, but the funding for teaching adults had to come from agencies other than the school system. Mr. Ewing explained that he was talking more broadly. He was talking about nutrition, health,

social services, psychiatric services, etc. He was not talking about coordination of services but rather MCPS as the provider being reimbursed by other agencies.

Dr. Cronin asked that the committee members make closing remarks. Mrs. Ingram thought that the outside consultant would help them broaden their base of information. She wished that they could have more of a dialogue with other school systems with successful practices. She would like the committee to have access to areas of achievement and successful practices in the literature. Dr. Cronin thought there was a considerable amount of information available and suggested that Dr. Scott work with Dr. Frechtling on this. Mr. Gonzalez reported that the committee would like some funding to be able to bring in people from other places to discuss issues with the committee. Dr. Cronin asked that the committee be kept informed and invited when the school system had presentations by consultants and others. For example, there had been two presentations on the Escalante program in California.

Dr. Moone thanked the Board for the fruitful dialogue and discussion during the two sessions. The committee had put forth its best efforts for two years and now looked to the Board to offer some positive directions in which the report should go. He pointed out that this was his twentieth year of coming before Boards of Education to talk about the issues of minority students, and he was a little tired. If the Board had solved this problem 15 years ago, they would be just looking now at the problems of Asians and Hispanics. The system was not going to change by adding a few dollars or a few programs. It was going to take Board members and educators to make it change. He said the ball was in their court and asked them not to fumble it.

Dr. Moone thanked Dr. Pitt for making the committee's report available to principals. He had been flooded with calls from principals, and many principals were holding special meetings with their staffs to implement sections of the report. He thanked the Board and the superintendent and said he hoped they would move forward. Dr. Cronin recognized the efforts of Dr. Moone and invited committee members to seek reappointment to the committee because the Board needed their expertise. Dr. Pitt thanked the committee for their help and input.

Re: ADJOURNMENT

The president adjourned the meeting at 10:50 p.m.

PRESIDENT

SECRETARY

HP:mlw