

Dr. Elfreda Massie, associate superintendent, stated that over the weekend everyone was working in Personnel to make sure all classrooms were staffed. She felt that their new employees were of high caliber, and she noted that many of their new teachers were themselves graduates of MCPS. Dr. Hiawatha Fountain, associate superintendent, reported that he had visited 12 schools and centers. He, too, agreed that it had been an outstanding opening. Dr. Phinnize Fisher, associate superintendent, thanked the professional and supporting services staff including transportation, maintenance, and food services for the job they had done in opening school. She knew that staff had worked Saturdays and weekends to accomplish this. Dr. Joseph Villani, associate superintendent, reported that he had visited 10 schools. He was proud of the professionalism of teachers because everywhere he went teachers were involved in instruction.

Mrs. Brenneman stated that she had toured schools and had met with Mr. Giles Benson, and she wanted to thank Mr. Benson, Dick Hawes, Bill Wilder, and their staffs for the successful and smooth opening. Mrs. Fanconi thanked staff for their report and for another effective and efficient school opening.

Re: PUBLIC COMMENTS

The following individuals appeared before the Board of Education:

1. Nancy Bowen, Bells Mill Community
2. Brooks Bowen, Bells Mill Community
3. Judy Rodgers, Georgetown Hill Child Care Center
4. Katie Lindsey, Georgetown Hill Child Care Center
5. Ellen Cromwell, Georgetown Hill Child Care Center

RESOLUTION NO. 645-92 Re: QUESTION A, THE "FICKER AMENDMENT"

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

WHEREAS, A citizen referendum has placed the "Ficker Amendment" on the November ballot as Question A, to amend the County Charter; and

WHEREAS, The passage of Question A might force the county to rely on more regressive taxes to make up for revenue shortfalls; and

WHEREAS, The state legislature authorized all counties to raise the local income tax to 60 percent of the state income tax as a means for replacing state aid to local government; and

WHEREAS, The Montgomery County Council increased the local income tax to reduce dependency on property tax revenues and to help defray the impact of reductions in state aid; and

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

COG IFB	Heating Oil		
30000621	<u>Awardees</u>		
	BP Oil Company	\$	807,212
	Apex Oil, Inc.		399,600
	MG Refining and Marketing, Inc.		<u>20,640</u>
	Total		\$1,227,452
COG IFB	Diesel Fuel		
AB-6952/RC	<u>Awardee</u>		
	MG Refining and Marketing, Inc.		\$1,170,000
89-05	Contingency Occupational Therapy and Physical Therapy Services for Special Education Students - Extension		
	<u>Awardee</u>		
	Polcari Therapy Services, Inc.	\$	320,207*
88-3	Two-Way Radios for High School Security Programs		
	<u>Awardee</u>		
	Morton S. Gottlieb	\$	46,245
124-92	Uniforms		
	<u>Awardees</u>		
	A-1 Uniform Sales Company	\$	64,644
	Fashion Seal Uniform		<u>32,191</u>
	Total	\$	96,835
145-92	Glass and Glazing Materials		
	<u>Awardees</u>		
	S. Albert Glass Company, Inc.	\$	2,396
	Capitol City Glass Company, Inc.		11,488
	Commercial Plastics and Supply Corporation		7,624
	Glass Distributors, Inc.		31,134
	Hawkins Glass Company, Inc.		49,003
	Maryland Glass and Mirror Company		7,313
	Read Plastics, Inc.		<u>2,060*</u>
	Total	\$	111,018
146-92	Air Conditioning and Temperature Control Service Contract		
	<u>Awardees</u>		
	Carrier Building Systems and Service	\$	25,200
	Combustioneer/Division of Kirlin Enterpr.		45,888
	H.P.S. Mechanical, Inc.		32,696
	Trane Company/Div. of American Standard		<u>14,272</u>
	Total	\$	118,056

148-92	Shade and Upholstery Material	
	<u>Awardees</u>	
	Dazian, Inc.	\$ 1,872
	John Duer and Sons, Inc.	43,587
	Frankel Associates, Inc.	67,800
	Mileham and King, Inc.	25,012
	Tedco Industries	<u>2,940</u>
	Total	\$ 141,211
149-92	Step Van for Supply and Property Management	
	<u>Awardee</u>	
	District International Trucks, Inc.	\$ 47,035
5-93	Snack Cakes and Pies	
	<u>Awardee</u>	
	Continental Baking Company	\$ 200,000
11-93	Asynchronous Modem Equipment	
	<u>Awardee</u>	
	Data Connect Enterprises, Inc.	\$ 44,019
	TOTAL MORE THAN \$25,000	\$3,522,078

*Denotes MFD vendors

RESOLUTION NO. 648-92 Re: EXTENSION OF CONTRACT WITH C&P
TELEPHONE COMPANY

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Mrs. Brenneman seconded by Mr. Ewing#:

WHEREAS, The Board of Education of Montgomery County has determined that extending the current contract for telephone services from its current expiration date of June 30, 1999, to June 30, 2004, is in the best financial interest of the Montgomery County Public Schools; and

WHEREAS, Extending this contract is permitted by the current contract as modified by the Public Service Commission's "custom tariff of September 1990;" and

WHEREAS, Refinancing of the remainder of the current contract (\$3,455,823), prepayment of 500 additional centrex telephone lines from 1/1/93 through 6/30/99 (\$452,778), and prepayment of 4,000 lines from 7/1/99 through 6/30/04 (\$1,243,716), will result in a total savings of \$1,379,682 to MCPS; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Board extend its current contract with the C & P Telephone Company for an additional five years, July 1, 1999, through June 30, 2004, and alter it to provide for an increase from the minimum number of lines from 3,500 to 4,000, effective on or about January 1, 1993; and be it further

WHEREAS, H. V. Lancon Construction, Inc., successfully completed a project at Damascus High School and replaced exterior doors at various schools; and

WHEREAS, The low bid is below the budget estimate of \$120,000, and sufficient funds are available to award the contract; and

WHEREAS, The City of Gaithersburg will contribute to the cost of replacing the panels; now therefore be it

Resolved, That a \$111,000 contract be awarded to H. V. Lancon Construction, Inc., to replace the acoustic panels in the aquatic center at Gaithersburg Middle School.

RESOLUTION NO. 652-92 Re: ARCHITECTURAL APPOINTMENT FOR
PROGRAM ACCESSIBILITY MODIFICATIONS
AT VARIOUS SCHOOLS

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

WHEREAS, It is necessary to improve accessibility for the disabled at various schools as individual needs become known; and

WHEREAS, Accessibility modifications include improvements to entrances, parking, rest rooms, elevators, signage, alarm and communication systems; and

WHEREAS, It is necessary to appoint an architectural firm to provide architectural and engineering services on an as needed basis to respond to program accessibility modification requirements at various schools to meet the intent of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990; and

WHEREAS, Funds for this purpose were appropriated as part of the FY 1993 Capital Budget; and

WHEREAS, The Architectural Selection Committee, in accordance with procedures adopted by the Board of Education on May 13, 1986, identified Murray and Associates as the most qualified firm to provide the necessary professional architectural and engineering services; and

WHEREAS, Staff has negotiated fees for services to be provided; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Montgomery County Board of Education enter into a contractual agreement with the architectural firm of Murray & Associates to provide professional architectural and engineering services for accessibility modifications at various

schools, including Carderock Springs, DuFief, Cresthaven, and Darnestown elementary schools, for a fee not to exceed \$75,000.

RESOLUTION NO. 653-92 Re: FY 1992 SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION
FOR THE PROVISION FOR FUTURE
SUPPORTED PROJECTS

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

WHEREAS, The FY 1993 Operating Budget adopted by the Board of Education on June 10, 1992, included \$500,000 for the Provision for Future Supported Projects; and

WHEREAS, As of August 4, 1992, the balance in the Provision for Future Supported Projects was \$146,993; and

WHEREAS, The Board of Education will receive a number of additional projects that are eligible for funding through the Provision for Future Supported Projects during FY 1992; and

WHEREAS, A supplemental appropriation to increase the Provision for Future Supported Projects will yield the most effective way to process additional eligible projects; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the superintendent of schools be authorized to receive and expend a supplemental appropriation of \$500,000 from the County Council to increase the Provision for Future Supported Projects in the following categories:

<u>Category</u>	<u>Amount</u>
1 Administration	\$ 10,000
2 Instructional Salaries	290,000
3 Other Instructional Costs	74,500
4 Special Education	39,500
7 Student Transportation	14,000
10 Fixed Charges	<u>72,000</u>
Total	\$500,000

and be it further

Resolved, That the county executive be requested to recommend approval of this resolution to the County Council, and a copy be transmitted to the county executive and the County Council.

<u>Category</u>	<u>Amount</u>
2 Instructional Salaries	\$66,737
10 Fixed Charges	<u>25,859</u>
Total	\$92,596

and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the county executive and the County Council.

RESOLUTION NO. 658-92 Re: SUBMISSION OF AN FY 1993 GRANT
PROPOSAL TO STUDY AFTER-SCHOOL
CHILD CARE ARRANGEMENTS

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

Resolved, That the superintendent of schools be authorized to submit an FY 1993 grant proposal for \$60,000 to the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development (NICHD), in association with Westat, a research firm in the private sector, for the first year of a five-year project to study after-school child care arrangements; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the county executive and the County Council.

RESOLUTION NO. 659-92 Re: PERSONNEL APPOINTMENTS AND
TRANSFERS

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

Resolved, That the following personnel appointments and transfers be approved:

<u>Appointment</u>	<u>Present Position</u>	<u>As</u>
Lucinda Sullivan	Director Div. of Academic Skills	Director Dept. of Academic Programs Grade Q Effective: 9-1-92
John Nori	Assistant Principal Gaithersburg IS	Principal Julius West MS Effective: 9-1-92

E. Donna Kozar	Principal Intern Sequoyah ES	Principal E. Silver Spring ES Effective: 9-1-92
Kathryn F. Blumsack	Specialist School Improvement Training Unit	Coordinator School Improvement Training Unit OIPD Grade O Effective: 9-1-92
Karolyn K. Rohr	Admin. Program Coord. Dept. of Staff Dev.	Coordinator Systemwide Training Unit, Office of Personnel Services Grade O Effective: 9-1-92
James T. Terrill	Acting Asst. Principal Wootton HS	Administrative Asst. to the Deputy for Instruction/ Business Grade N Effective: 9-1-92
Verna Chiarello	Acting Transition Div. of Career and Vocational Ed.	Trans. Coordinator Div. of Career and Vocational Ed. Grade M Effective: 9-1-92
<u>Transfer</u>	<u>From</u>	<u>To</u>
James Atha	Asst. Principal Diamond ES	Asst. Principal Strawberry Knoll ES Effective: 9-1-92
Carrie Miller	Asst. Principal Quince Orchard HS	Asst. Principal M. L. King IS Effective: 9-1-92

Re: ANNUAL REPORT - MONTGOMERY COUNTY
ADVISORY COUNCIL ON VOCATIONAL-
TECHNICAL EDUCATION

Dr. Vance asked Mr. Jack Schoendorfer, director of the Division of Career and Technology Education, and Mr. Alan J. Ferraro, chairperson, to come to the table. Mr. Schoendorfer noted that they had several members of the advisory council in the audience, and also in the audience there were members of the Citizens Advisory Committee on Career and Technology Education. They were

present to answer any questions about the recommendation to combine the two committees.

Mr. Ferraro introduced Mr. Glenn Easton, Ms. Joan Stern, and Mr. Ngoc Le. Ms. Stern reported that they had had a number of subcommittees last year, and the counseling committee under Mr. Robert Lane was very active. Last year the Board had asked the council to study the career centers, and the council had found that it would take more than a year to complete this study. Some preliminary findings were that MCPS needed to develop more business partnerships, expose teachers and counselors to more business activities and exchange programs, bring more speakers into the schools, repair the computers, and purchase more sophisticated programs for the computers. They also recommended enlarging this section on the career guide that was given to students to include more information on technology programs and more information on courses for students not going into four-year academic programs. They had a graduation committee under Dr. Wayne Busbice, and they required the graduation requirements and looked at their impact on the technology education program. They had an evaluation committee with Dr. Menon, Mr. Jones, and Dr. Weiss. They continued to review and monitor the bio-technology programs at both MCPS and Montgomery College. They had looked at the existing articulation agreement, and they believed there needed to be much closer interaction at the initial stages in developing new programs. They were also concerned that student needs be considered when new programs were developed. The committee also wanted assurances that a large portion of federal funds were spent on students as opposed to buying equipment.

Ms. Stern indicated that the college committee was working on a public relations campaign on developing more business partnerships, on encouraging student participation in developing programs and in enrolling in activities. They also wanted to be sure that jobs would be available to meet student needs. They also had a program development committee which was a one-person committee headed by Mitch Carr. He had done research, conducted surveys, and completed an analysis on the need for non-credit short-term programs in the auto mechanic and home repair fields. They were also considering changing the name of the LAC's name, and they did a lot of networking last year by representing the committee in a number of state and local functions.

Mr. Ferraro thanked the members of the Board of Education for their great interest in career and technical education. He listed the following as their recommendations:

1. Recommended a flexible day adjusted to student life styles and incorporate some night school and special programs. They suggested looking at contract negotiations with the three units so this could be accomplished.

2. Broaden the vocational program under the tech/prep career path. They needed to look to an introductory course giving a wide variety of skills in the construction trade areas.
3. Maintain the seven-period day.
4. Take family values and do something with this. They suggested some family values be included in health education, home arts, or social studies.
5. Career paths - where were the students going? Were they taking up space in the program or were they going out for further study. They needed to survey students.
6. They recommended combining the citizens advisory committee with the LAC.

Mr. Ferraro stated that he had a personal thought about the new requirement for community service. He personally thought this requirement should go in the career center where it could be monitored. This would give students more contact with the career center as well.

Mrs. DiFonzo asked if the recommendation for flexible afternoon and evening classes would be more convenient for the students involved or increase the enrollment because more students could participate. Mr. Ferraro replied that it would have both effects. They would see more enrollment in this career path area, and it would enable some students to operate better and some teachers to supervise better.

Mrs. DiFonzo asked about the committee's point of view about the state graduation tracking requirements where a student must decide by ninth grade whether to pursue an academic or technology path. Mr. Ferraro replied that the committee had not discussed this, but some members had opinions. He had a very strong opinion. He thought the ninth grade tracking was abominable and was not appropriate. He did not think a youngster should decide to be an electrician in the ninth grade, but he did think they should look at tech prep as a way to go because a child could move from one area to the other and continue.

Mr. Locke commented that he shared Mr. Ferraro's views. Ninth grade was too soon to have a youngster commit to particular track and direction. He liked the community service requirement because it would help youngsters develop a sense of commitment to their fellow citizens. He was a member of the linkage subcommittee working with the college and MCPS. He commended Mr. Schoendorfer and Dr. Antoinette Hastings for their commitment to making the program work by permitting youngsters to experience academic and career experiences.

Mrs. DiFonzo pointed out that many MCPS students in the college curriculum had moved over to the Edison Center to take courses. She asked about the effect the state's new tracking requirement would have on these students and whether there would be fewer of them. Ms. Stern replied that this was a very real concern. As more and more requirements were imposed, students had less flexibility. They were also concerned about stigmatizing students when they talked about tracking. They wanted to see students able to cross over and go back and forth between the two programs. Mr. Ferraro thought that he would send his child as a ninth grader into the tech/prep program so he could go both ways.

Ms. Gutierrez said it would be valuable to have the committee's opinion on the state recommendations and see where this fit on the national proposal for an apprenticeship program. She knew that at the state it was only half a credit per semester. They needed more information about the implications of the current recommendations from the state and more information about the positive direction the whole career field could move into. She saw Maryland moving into the apprenticeship model or the dual system approach that started children looking at career choices at an earlier age. It strengthened the core curriculum for all students, but it provided choices so that students could double back and go in different directions. She did not think the overall model was as limiting as Mrs. DiFonzo had stated.

It seemed to Ms. Stern that there was a great deal of misunderstanding about the tracking. The state felt that they were really not tracking people. They wanted a student either able to go into a four-year program or have skills so that they could obtain employment when they graduated. Ms. Gutierrez thought that the committee could be instrumental in clarifying the issues and educating the Board. Mr. Ferraro suggested that they might want to look at the St. Mary's County model because it was a very good model. Ms. Gutierrez agreed that they needed to look at other models to see the directions they needed to move in. She supported the idea of a longitudinal study for their graduates, and she hoped they would be able to begin that follow up.

Ms. Gutierrez supported their looking at the role of the counselor. She suggested that they also look at it at the middle school and at the elementary school. The German model started career counseling and job awareness at a very young age so that students knew that education had an end result.

Mr. Sims reported that last year he had visited the tech/prep program in Calvert County, and he was very impressed. He planned to do as much research as possible on this topic so that he could make the right decisions. He encouraged the Board to look to other counties because there were some excellent programs in other jurisdictions throughout the state. He would welcome the

committee's thoughts on the state graduation requirements. The Board had an item under previous items of new business to look into the graduation requirements. He would also like to hear from the committee about family values.

Mrs. Fanconi thanked the committee for their presentation. She asked whether a combined committee would include the members from both committees. Mr. Ferraro indicated that this would have to be worked out without having members resign.

Re: ANNUAL REPORT OF THE
SUPERINTENDENT'S ADVISORY COMMITTEE
ON THE EDUCATION OF THE GIFTED AND
TALENTED

Dr. Vance invited Dr. Waveline Starnes; Mrs. Ethelyn Owen, co-chair; and Dr. Judy Ackerman to the table. The Board had received this report along with the staff response to their recommendations. He noted that over the years this committee had provided the Board and the superintendent with invaluable reflections. He also invited Dr. Joseph Villani, associate superintendent, to the table.

Mrs. Owen explained that this was their 1990-91 report which was submitted to Dr. Vance last fall, and it was completed before the budget changes. However, they felt that many of the recommendations were issues of emphasis rather than budget. Each year the committee studied certain issues, and this year they focused on mathematics, science programming, and grouping for instruction.

Dr. Ackerman said there were many similarities in the math and science recommendations. They had looked at the kinds of things that would be beneficial to many, many students beyond gifted and talented students. When they talked about teacher training in content and methodology, all children benefitted from that. Their first recommendation in mathematics was to have MCPS make more of conscientious effort to encourage students to take calculus before their senior year. At Montgomery College they would have 20 students from MCPS enrolled in second year calculus. They felt that a more systematic effort had to be made to let students know about this option.

Dr. Ackerman said their next two recommendations were in terms of teacher training. They were saying that they needed more than early release training for math and science instruction for elementary school teachers. This unfortunately would cost a lot of money. Staff plans went towards meeting this goal, but the intensive training could not be accomplished in a partial day program. All children in the school system would benefit from this. Another recommendation was to expand the emphasis on geometry and studying statistics, and she said that MCPS was very

forward thinking in this area. They were seeing this as curriculum changes were made, but they felt that teachers had to understand why these changes were happening.

Their seventh and eighth recommendations were not very costly because they could be accomplished with community volunteers. They needed special seminars, tutorials, and independent study for some of their profoundly gifted mathematics students. Through electronic mail these students could correspond with people in other countries or in different parts of the United States. Their other idea was to get more profoundly gifted senior high school students providing enrichment activities in elementary and middle schools. Blair had groups of students going out to different schools, and it was a very effective program.

In science, Dr. Ackerman said they had to recognize changes in science education. They had to provide some hands-on experiences in science for children. The next recommendations dealt with teacher training. They needed more opportunities to be involved in some of the exciting training programs. They had to make sure that each child in elementary school had access to the science kits and good equipment. They had to improve the quality of instruction in laboratory sciences which related to the training of teachers and improvements in curriculum. This was in process. She noted that in the staff response there was an individual who would be coordinating science in the middle schools. Overall, she thought that the school system had many of the pieces they were looking for, but it was not reaching a lot of children. With gifted and talented children, it did not help if they were in one school and the program was across the county in another school.

Dr. Ackerman stated that one recommendation in mathematics had to do with improved communication to parents about ISM. As teachers became more familiar with ISM and the revised objectives, this would be less of a problem. It was still an issue in terms of knowing what the children should be covering. They needed a way of communicating other than the checklist.

Mrs. Owen commented that their third area was grouping for instruction. The year before they had reviewed the Villani report on the middle school, and the committee had come up with a response regarding the education of the gifted in middle schools. They had discussed the need for grouping and tracking with Dr. Pitt, and the committee followed up on this. The committee reviewed extensive literature in the field. This was an issue which demanded attention from the school system because it was of concern to parents and teachers. Grouping for instructional purposes was a technique of handling the education of the gifted. It benefitted all students, but gifted students in particular needed the time spent with their intellectual peers.

Mrs. Owen remarked that they had a great resource in this county because so many students were identified as gifted. Their first recommendation was that all gifted students along with students who showed strong abilities in a given subject should be grouped regularly with their intellectual peers for planned instruction during part of each school day. The second recommendation was that each school should use a flexible approach to grouping and regrouping students based on their performance, abilities, and/or their interest instead of static, rigid tracking. The next recommendation was for cluster grouping when the number of gifted students was small. They should be provided with differentiated instruction within the academic classes. In elementary school they grouped children all the time for reading which was differentiated instruction. Their last recommendation was that appropriate attention should be given to the highly gifted in each school. There were often just a few students needing some special attention and opportunities to work together and to receive appropriate accelerated and enriched instruction.

Mrs. Brenneman asked if their identification of gifted students was different from the way other counties identified gifted students. She asked whether there was a universal way of identifying these students. Dr. Starnes replied essentially the identification process in surrounding counties was very similar to that of MCPS. She would provide the Board with a copy of the identification procedures. MCPS did not have any automatic cutoffs which would cause them to have a few more students than other places. However, MCPS had a third of the National Merit Scholars in Maryland which meant they should have more gifted.

Mrs. Brenneman pointed out that in their report they used the terms, "highly gifted," "gifted," and "profoundly gifted." She asked about the difference among those three terms. Dr. Starnes said that a few years ago Dr. Ackerman had looked at students doing mathematics in the first grade at a fifth or sixth grade level. When the committee talked about profoundly gifted, they were talking about these students.

Mrs. Brenneman stated that the policy talked about meeting the needs of gifted and talented K-12, but they did not do a formal identification until Grade 3. Dr. Starnes replied that originally they had done identification in kindergarten and first grade. Now they only did that in the Takoma Park cluster where they had a grade one gifted program; however, the superintendent put out guidelines about informal identification in grades one and two so that students would be placed at appropriate instructional levels.

Mrs. Brenneman asked about who assessed the gifted programs in schools. For example, how did they know that a school had a gifted program? To her knowledge, not all schools had these programs. Dr. Villani replied that this was one of the functions

that had been performed by the supervisors. This would be part of the program assessment done out of the office of school administration. This office would work collaboratively with OIPD to give more focused attention to programs. This would be part of the school improvement management planning process review. Mrs. Owen said this was an issue that the committee had discussed and included in their next report to Dr. Vance. It was a concern of the committee as well.

Mr. Ewing commented that there were parents who said with increasing anxiety that there were principals who did not believe they were obliged to meet the needs of gifted students in every school. He heard that from parents regularly, and he had heard it from some principals. They had some schools in that condition, and when they had more staff in the area offices, their numbers grew. Now they had less staff in the office of administration, and he did not have any expectation that these funds would fall. The Board, faced with the need to make cuts everywhere, made cuts in these programs and in the staffing of the central office program so it had less capacity to monitor. He was convinced that unless they had some strong statements from the Board and the superintendent and some clear policy about the priority of assuring that every school met the needs of every student the school system would continue to show shrinkage in the number of schools offering programs for gifted students. He was worried about this because they didn't have any fewer number of gifted and talented students. He had heard Dr. Starnes describe how they had identified gifted students, and he thought they were still under-identifying, not over-identifying. Yet he was also convinced that in many schools they were not offering programs for these students. Some schools had done a marvelous job, but it was uneven. He said they had to think again about how they were going to make sure that this happened, and he realized that they did not have extra resources to put into this. He would be interested in the superintendent's views.

Dr. Vance reported that he had met with the leadership of the G&T and advisory group. He had shared a concern of a different nature but with the same observation and result. Even in a time of diminishing resources they had to assure the parents of all gifted and talented youngsters that they, too, are included in the Success for Every Student plan. The directors and the three research assistants had to be more exacting and severe with their monitoring and supervision of the gifted and talented program. If necessary, they had to be more punitive in terms of who was doing what in providing for those students. As educators, they looked at this in terms of meeting the needs of all youngsters, but he also looked at it in terms of the future of this school system and how critical populations got redefined. They were necessary for the continued success of the school system. He believed they were at a point where these gifted and talented children had become a critical population, and their

success had to be assured to lock them into the future of the school system. He hoped to work out the resolution of this issue.

Ms. Gutierrez believed that they did have a commitment, and she saw SES as a commitment to meet the needs of students, gifted and talented and otherwise. She thought that in a time of diminishing resources the way that they implemented programs had to be done in a way that looked at meeting the needs of students at all levels. She knew that some students had greater needs than others, more basic, survival needs. She thought they had to give those students a higher priority. As she looked at the literature, she wondered whether they had found a downside of tracking and grouping. There were some very negative consequences of labeling students and of identifying students too early. As they looked at the issue, they needed to look at it with greater granularity as to what they were doing and at what point practices were creating a positive environment for all students and at what point must they check to see if they were harming other students. She agreed that it was valuable to offer a challenge to very profoundly accelerated students. As they started to differentiate, they were getting into very grey areas. They were putting children into classifications as early as third grade, and she seriously questioned the long term value of that. She asked if they had found any of this in the literature.

Mrs. Fanconi asked if this information could be shared with the Board in a written form. Mrs. Owen explained that they had very carefully tried to distinguish between grouping and tracking. Ms. Gutierrez asked where it was when they implemented the program that they differentiated. Conceptually everyone agreed there was a difference, but she wondered where they had to draw lines. For example, did they re-evaluate often? Did they regroup on a daily basis? Mrs. Fanconi stated that the Board would appreciate a white paper on tracking versus grouping. In regard to their first recommendation on the ISM objectives, she had visited Oakland Terrace. The parents had chosen to do this, and she was thrilled by what she saw in regard to parent input. As they went to site-based management, she was concerned about whether the wonderful programs in the schools were getting disseminated. She asked whether it would be possible to get a paper on plans for disseminating the kinds of things being done in Oakland Terrace with that instrument. She thought that other schools would appreciate seeing that instrument and knowing about the response of parents.

Mr. Sims stated that he was concerned about tracking and grouping. There was a study about students being placed in a class and being told they were gifted. All of the students achieved much higher than their expectations because they were given that psychological boost. He believed it was important to give that boost to all students in Montgomery County no matter

what their level of achievement was. He thought they had done that very well; however, he was concerned somewhat about the psychological impact on younger students when they were told they were on level but their brother or friend was gifted. He would be interested in seeing any literature pertaining to that.

In regard to mentoring, he would be interested in reading more about some of the projects and some of the programs working to encourage teachers and students to volunteer and to tutor other students. As they faced more budget cuts, it was important for students to help their fellow students.

Mrs. Owen thanked the Board. To increase the knowledge and awareness about gifted education, all teacher training should incorporate the needs of bright students as well as the needs of the troubled. She would like the committee to present their 1991-92 report to the Board as soon as possible. Mrs. Fanconi asked the superintendent to schedule a more timely presentation. She thanked the committee, and she remarked that there had been a number of budget cuts affecting this area, and it behooved them to be extremely vigilant to make sure they had the supports in place particularly for those gifted students isolated in individual schools. They would look to the committee to assist the Board.

Re: BRIEFING ON GEORGETOWN HILL CHILD
CARE CENTER

Dr. Vance noted that the Board had received a paper, and he had asked Dr. Rohr to review the paper with the Board.

Dr. Rohr introduced Ms. Marjorie Slater Kaplan, Planning Board; Mr. William Wilder, director of Facilities Management; Mr. Viv D'Souza, assistant in school facilities; and Mr. Pat Hanehan, real estate management specialist. Guided by the Board's child care and joint occupancy policies, staff worked closely with principals and PTAs at Cabin John MS and Bells Mills ES to facilitate continuation of child care that the Georgetown Hill Child Care Center had provided to the community for several years. The rooms previously used for child care at Cabin John would be required for MCPS instructional programs. Staff worked with state and local government officials and GHCCC in a collaborative arrangement whereby the state provided both grant and loan funding for the project to be constructed on school property. During the planning phase, several public meetings were held and attended by community representatives and school, state, and county officials. Once it became apparent that neighbors objected to items in the plan, school staff as well as representatives of GHCCC, the county Department of Transportation, and Planning Board staff tried to address those concerns. After additional consideration, based on the county Department of Transportation recommendation the staff recommended

the Bells Mill Road access as the safest. Staff and Ms. Slater Kaplan were directly involved with the project.

Mr. D'Souza reported that his involvement with the GHCCC began in October when he assumed the responsibility for joint occupancy. In November, 1991, the Planning Board took up the GHCCC project for mandatory referral. He had attended the meeting where they approved the project with a recommendation that access be made through Bells Mill Elementary and not directly onto Bells Mill Road. Later he met with GHCCC, the architect, and representatives of Park and Planning, the principal, PTA president, and the area office. They reviewed various options for an access on the Bells Mill site. The group decided that none of these options were feasible or desirable because of safety. They suggested that GHCCC request reconsideration by the Planning Board. They did so and pointed out that any access through Cabin John or Bells Mill would mean that additional trees would be cut, additional paving would be required, and off-site stormwater management would be required. In mid-December the Planning Board decided not to take up the reconsideration. Concurrently, Mr. D'Souza had been working with the attorney for GHCCC on confirming the lease. He had worked with Board counsel on the lease, and counsel suggested that the lease go to the Board. Mr. D'Souza did not want to go to the Board until the access question was settled. A meeting was requested by GHCCC to discuss ways of getting the Planning Board to approve a safe access. On January 27, 1992, a resolution was brought to the Board to confirm the lease.

Mr. D'Souza reported that in mid-April GHCCC broke ground on the project, and he received several calls from neighbors. He attended a community meeting on April 28 where he answered questions. Councilmember Dacek attempted to reconcile the two sides in the community and hosted a meeting at Cabin John in mid-May. She indicated that she had reviewed all the correspondence and thought access through Bells Mill was unsafe as recommended by the Planning Board. Mr. D'Souza held another meeting on June 1 with representatives from both groups. Some people felt that the Cabin John access had not been examined seriously; therefore, the GHCCC's engineer was asked to develop more detailed sketches showing that access. On June 9, another meeting was held. Mr. D'Souza indicated that he would recommend that the direct access remain as planned because the Transportation Department felt this was a safe access. The principal of Cabin John expressed concerns about a shared access. Additional trees would have to be removed for the Cabin John access, and extensive engineering and additional permits would be required. It would also require extensive stormwater management because of the difference in heights between the Cabin John and Bells Mill school sites. Given all of this, he recommended that the access be directly on Bells Mill Road.

Dr. Rohr stated that GHCCC had obtained the necessary permits to construct this facility. Mrs. Fanconi asked if Board members had questions.

Mr. Ewing asked whether the Planning Board had changed its position. Ms. Slater Kaplan replied that they had not. Mr. Ewing inquired about the impact of that opposition. Ms. Slater Kaplan explained that any government agency applying for a building permit went through a mandatory referral because they were exempt from development regulations binding on any private developer. Mandatory referral was required, but the decision of the Planning Board was advisory.

Mr. Ewing inquired about the basis for the Planning Board's position. Ms. Slater Kaplan replied that the Planning Board saw it as three educational facilities on a large piece of property, and in the private sector the accesses to a public road would be limited. Their decision was to hold the Board of Education to the same standards as they would to the private sector. They were also concerned about additional tree loss. It was a transitional forest from pines to very young hardwoods, and they were interested in capitalizing on the already cleared center of that property connecting directly to Bells Mill Elementary.

Mr. Ewing said that the Bells Mills community had asked that there be a commitment to replant or create screening where trees had been cut. Apart from the clear memory he had of being told that very few trees would be cut, he thought they had a commitment from Georgetown Hill to replant. He was not clear about the nature of that commitment. He read it as a commitment to landscaping which could mean trees or other things.

Mr. Wilder stated that there would be two types of planting. One had to do with landscaping around the building, and the other would be the entrance to the driveway. In addition to those requirements spelled out in the specification, GHCCC has agreed to plant screening in addition to the landscaping. It was his understanding it would include sizeable white pine trees. Mr. Ewing asked how and when they would know what GHCCC planned to do. Because the land belonged to MCPS, he felt that MCPS could influence what would be done. Mr. Wilder replied that GHCCC was in compliance with the contract and with the plans and specifications. Their legal obligation had been met. He would get the details of the additional screen planting and provide that to the Board at a later date.

Mr. Ewing commented that there was no one in the community who didn't believe that high quality child care is extremely important and that the Board has had a long-term commitment to encouraging that. They have supported building on school property and the use of school buildings for child care. It was clear that GHCCC was the provider of excellent care and excellent

programs. There was a view that what was intended was not what was constructed. He asked whether MCPS had always expected that there would be an 8,000 square foot building there. Mr. Wilder recalled that about four years ago they started with a modular at Rosemont Elementary School, and originally it was to have been the same for GHCCC. Mr. Hanehan explained that the original Board policy had been written in response to the county government's request to facilitate the placement of county government daycare modulars on school sites. As the county got some experience with those units, they discovered it would be cheaper and more cost effective to go to regular construction. In response to that, the Board amended its policy in February, 1991. Shortly thereafter, GHCCC opted to go with regular construction because it was cost effective. However, MCPS had always expected that the same number of youngsters currently being served at the Cabin John site would be in the new site.

Mr. Ewing asked whether the facility would be dedicated wholly and completely to child care programs because there was an allegation that it was to serve as a center for the arts. Mr. Wilder replied that this would be in violation of the contract; however, there might be some confusion because the child care program did have an art and humanities component.

In regard to the access, Mr. Ewing asked for an explanation of why an access through the Bells Mill site would be unsafe. Mr. D'Souza replied that the Bells Mill site was very constricted. It did not have enough room for parent traffic and buses at the same time. When buses were at the site, parents had to drop their children off on Bells Mill Road. Adding more traffic on that site would create an unsafe situation for students. The principal and PTA of Bells Mill opposed any access through the Bells Mill site. In the case of Cabin John, there was some concern expressed by the principal. Access through Cabin John would require the development of a stormwater management facility on the site when school was opening. It would require additional costs, and there were some concerns about turning angles for traffic coming onto the site and up the slope to the daycare center. The county traffic engineer believed that the access on Bells Mill Road was safe. While he said that access through Cabin John could be done, the engineer preferred an exit directly onto Bells Mill Road.

Mr. Ewing assumed that the trees were cut by the GHCCC contractor, and he wondered whether MCPS knew in advance these trees would be cut. Mr. Wilder replied that the specifications required that enough trees be cut to permit the placement of the parking, driveways, access, and the building itself. However, the specifications did not spell out which trees would be or would not be cut. Mr. Ewing recalled being told that very few trees would be removed, and it looked to him that a lot of trees were removed.

WHEREAS, The Board-adopted resolution specified that this issue be brought before the Board again when all Board members could be present; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Board of Education endorse the expansion of the all-day kindergarten program as a budget initiative in the FY 1994 Operating Budget.

RESOLUTION NO. 661-92 Re: CLOSED SESSION - SEPTEMBER 1 AND 9, 1992

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

WHEREAS, The Board of Education of Montgomery County is authorized by the Education Article of the Annotated Code of Maryland and Title 10 of the State Government Article to conduct certain meetings or portions of its meetings in closed session; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Board of Education of Montgomery County hereby conduct a portion of its meeting in closed session beginning on September 1, 1992, at 7:30 p.m. in Room 120 of the Carver Educational Services Center, 850 Hungerford Drive, Rockville, Maryland, to discuss personnel matters; and be it further

Resolved, That the Board of Education of Montgomery County hereby conduct a portion of its meeting in closed session beginning on September 9, 1992, at 9 a.m. in Room 120 of the Carver Educational Services Center, 850 Hungerford Drive, Rockville, Maryland to discuss personnel matters, pending litigation, matters protected from public disclosure by law, and other issues including consultation with counsel to obtain legal advice as permitted under Section 4-106, Education Article of the Annotated Code of Maryland and State Government Article 10-501; and that such portion of its meeting shall continue in closed session until the completion of business; and be it further

Resolved, That such portion of its meeting continue in closed session at 12:15 p.m. to discuss the matters listed above as permitted under Section 4-106 and that such portion of its meeting shall continue in closed session until the completion of business.

RESOLUTION NO. 662-92 Re: AN AMENDMENT TO RESOLUTION NO. 661-92, CLOSED MEETINGS

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

RESOLUTION NO. 668-92 Re: STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION GRADUATION
REQUIREMENTS

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education schedule time for review, discussion, and possible action on the new state Board of Education graduation requirement mandates; and be it further

Resolved, That the superintendent come forth with proposals on next steps on each of the graduation requirements and what curriculum changes needed to be made.

RESOLUTION NO. 669-92 Re: STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION "TRACKING"
REQUIREMENTS

On motion of Mr. Ewing seconded by Dr. Cheung (On August 4, 1992), the following resolution was adopted unanimously:

Resolved, That the Board of Education consider taking action to request the state Board to reverse the tracking requirements in the graduation requirements and that the Board also consider seeking, if need be, legislation to reverse that tracking requirement.

RESOLUTION NO. 670-92 Re: BOARD OF EDUCATION SUBCOMMITTEE
ORGANIZATION

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

Resolved, That the superintendent and Board staff be requested to gather information and to explore how other Boards of Education made use of and organized themselves into subcommittees for the efficient conduct of Board business.

Re: REPORT ON AUGUST 3 AND 4 CLOSED
SESSIONS

On July 20, 1992, by the unanimous vote of members present, the Board voted to conduct closed sessions on August 3 and 4 as permitted under Section 4-106, Education Article of the Annotated Code of Maryland and State Government Article 10-501.

The Montgomery County Board of Education met in closed session on Monday, August 3, 1992, from 7:30 to 9:50 p.m. The closed session took place in Room 120 of the Carver Educational Services Center, 850 Hungerford Drive, Rockville, Maryland.

The Board met to discuss the superintendent's annual performance evaluation and to consult with legal counsel of the Laytonsville suit.

In attendance at the closed session were:

Mrs. Frances Brenneman*	Dr. Alan Cheung
Mrs. Sharon DiFonzo	Mr. Blair G. Ewing
Mrs. Carol Fanconi	Ms. Ana Sol Gutierrez
Mrs. Catherine E. Hobbs	Mr. Jonathan Sims
Dr. Paul L. Vance	Ms. Judy Bresler
Mr. Thomas S. Fess	Ms. Mary Lou Wood

*by telephone

On July 20, 1992, by the unanimous vote of members present, the Board voted to conduct closed sessions on August 4 as permitted under Section 4-106, Education Article of the Annotated Code of Maryland and State Government Article 10-501.

The Montgomery County Board of Education met in closed session on Tuesday, August 4, 1992, from 9:05 a.m. to 10:15 a.m., from 1:35 p.m. to 2:20 p.m., and from 6:50 p.m. to 7:45 p.m. The closed session took place in Room 120 of the Carver Educational Services Center, 850 Hungerford Drive, Rockville, Maryland.

The Board considered the Montgomery Blair High School site and personnel issues including appointments and transfers to the position of director of the Department of School Support Operations, the principalships of Lake Seneca, Strawberry Knoll, Flower Valley, Winston Churchill, Paint Branch, Herbert Hoover, White Oak, Garrett Park, Germantown, Olney, Farmland, and Highland View, and the assistant principalships of Watkins Mill ES, Greencastle, Waters Landing, Kennedy, Briggs Chaney, Montgomery Blair, Rockville, Sherwood, and Farquhar. Personnel actions taken in closed session were confirmed in open session.

The Board also received legal advice on the recent decision of the Office of Civil Rights and discussed upcoming contract negotiations.

In attendance at the closed sessions were:

Dr. Alan Cheung	Mrs. Sharon DiFonzo
Mr. Blair G. Ewing	Mrs. Carol Fanconi
Ms. Ana Sol Gutierrez	Mrs. Catherine E. Hobbs
Mr. Jonathan Sims	Mrs. Marie Heck
Dr. Paul L. Vance	Mrs. Katheryn Gemberling
Dr. H. Philip Rohr	Mr. Thomas S. Fess
Ms. Melissa Bahr	Ms. Mary Lou Wood
Dr. Hiawatha Fountain	Dr. Phinnize Fisher
Mr. William Wilder	Ms. Ann Briggs

Dr. Elfreda Massie
Mr. Zvi Greismann

Ms. Carole Burger
Mr. Richard Ekstrand

RESOLUTION NO. 671-92 Re: BOE APPEAL NO. T-1992-10

On motion of Ms. Gutierrez seconded by Mrs. Fanconi, the following resolution was adopted with Mrs. Brenneman, Mrs. Fanconi, Ms. Gutierrez, and Mr. Sims voting in the affirmative; Mr. Ewing voting in the negative; Mrs. DiFonzo abstaining:

Resolved, That the Board of Education adopt its Decision and Order in BOE Appeal No. T-1992-10, a transfer matter.

Re: NEW BUSINESS

Mr. Ewing moved and Mrs. Brenneman seconded the following:

Resolved, That the Board of Education request the superintendent to provide information on tech-prep programs and to provide a response to the Vocational-Technical committee's recommendation on the role of the Edison Career Center, vocational minicenters, and other vocational program delivery models including apprenticeships to prepare students for employment and post-secondary education; and be it further

Resolved, That this be brought before the Board for discussion and possible action.

Re: ITEM OF INFORMATION

Board members received a memo on a work group to study the Goals of Education.

RESOLUTION NO. 672-92 Re: ADJOURNMENT

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Mrs. Brenneman seconded by Ms. Gutierrez, the following resolution was adopted unanimously:

Resolved, That the Board of Education adjourn its meeting at 11:12 p.m.

PRESIDENT PRO TEM

SECRETARY

