

extraordinary mass demand on the part of the black laboring class for education, and it was this demand that was the effective force for the establishment of public schools in the South on a permanent basis for all people and all classes."

Mr. Smith said the book also made some mention of the border states. He explained that it was not until 1880 that the border states including Maryland put colored children on a legal footing with the other children in education. He said he would like to talk about the principles of action in terms of MRMC, what MRMC had accomplished, and the purpose for this meeting. In terms of the principles of action, he thought that a major principle of action said to the committee and to community that they were pursuing the concept of broadly expanding the learning opportunities for minority children in the school system. Secondly, they were pursuing equal educational opportunity for minority children. Thirdly, they were seeking a commitment to excellence in education for minority children by making sure that minority children received their fair share of all school resources. Fourthly, they were consistently advocating an activist position for the vigorous monitoring by MRMC of its mission. In terms of their accomplishments, Mr. Smith indicated they had targetted and reported areas of academic disabilities of minority children. Second, they targetted and reported specific areas where school resources and services were inadequate to meet the needs of minority children. Third, they kept the Board of Education and the school administration and the community informed about MRMC activities, concerns, and intentions. Fourth, they focused communitywide attention on the need for greater community knowledge about and participation in Board meetings. Fifth, they focused attention on the need for wider community knowledge and understanding about Board practices and policies. Sixth, they had raised questions about Board and administrative responsibility and accountability on matters pertaining to inadequate delivery of school services and resources to minority children. Last, they developed healthy communitywide respect for MRMC's expertise, integrity, and advocacy position.

Mr. Smith said the purpose of the meeting was to continue and conclude the April 2 dialogue on their annual report and the Board's response in a public meeting. The second was to place on the public record the position of the Board on school matters pertaining to the academic status and the quality of the academic progress of minority children in MCPS. The third was to determine whether the Board plans to address the question of the development of a comprehensive educational plan to attack the reading problems of minority students. Mrs. Wallace assumed that all of the things he had listed under the purposes of the meeting would come out in discussion of the remaining topics. Mr. James Robinson commented that it had been three and a half months since they made their first effort to begin this discussion. He wondered whether or not there had been change or additional information on some of the recommendations they covered on April 2. He inquired about the test called the System of Multicultural and Pluralistic Assessment, or SOMPA. He felt that some of the responses in the superintendent's paper were what he

considered to be fairly weak.

The superintendent reported that the Board minutes did show they did address the suspension and student discipline item. He said that Mr. Robinson was correct because there had been some things happening since their earlier discussion. He asked Dr. Johnnie Harris, coordinator of reading, to speak to the issue of test taking. Dr. Harris indicated that currently they had seven people participating in a three-week workshop to develop a handbook that teachers would use to help students regarding test taking. Secondly, they would be identifying commercial materials. They were also developing activities that teachers could use in an instructional setting as opposed to a testing setting. Mr. Robinson asked whether this was a demonstration approach or something that had been tested and validated. Dr. Harris replied that the product itself had not been validated but it was based on research that had been. Mrs. Wilma Fairley, director of the Department of Human Relations, said they were sending to most organizations a testing schedule so that parents can be informed about times of the year when students will be tested with recommendations to parents about things they can do regarding test taking. Dr. Donald Buckner inquired about which teachers would get the training for tenth, eleventh, and twelfth grades and whether administrators would get that training. Dr. Harris replied that the project dealt primarily with Grades 8 and 11. Dr. Buckner asked whether this would address the problem of principals interpreting the test to the community, and Dr. Harris replied that it would not. Dr. Lois Martin added that the summer workshop was to develop the handbook. She said that Dr. Buckner was talking about in-service training and an in-service calendar had been working out involving resource teachers, reading teachers, and principals. She said that Accountability did prepare slide tapes and had conducted meetings in all of the areas with principals on the interpretation of test data. Dr. Buckner asked whether anything was being done to assess those youngsters who did not test very well. Dr. Steven Frankel, director of the Department of Educational Accountability, replied that under the state regulations there was a procedure being established for youngsters who were unable to take a paper and pencil test. Dr. Buckner said they were told sometime ago there would be an alternative package developed. Dr. Martin replied that Dr. Harris had developed the package, and Dr. Buckner commented that this would be an interesting thing for the community to know.

Mr. Robinson asked whether they would have a fairly comprehensive approach to this problem spelled out. He was bothered because he still did not conceptualize how this effort was going to generate itself out to all parts of the system. Dr. Martin replied that this was spelled out in the handbook and in in-service training. At secondary schools all departments were involved in the departmental final exams which would increase their competencies in assessing students in different ways. She indicated that she would be pleased to share this information with the committee.

Mr. Smith said that the last paragraph under testing stated "recognizing that there are discrepancies between test results of the

racial groups, this would seem to indicate that the school system has an obligation to adjust the reading program in order to better prepare minority students to demonstrate a higher reading competency." In another section of the MRMC report it stated "resources dedicated to addressing the discrepancy between races are nonexistent or unidentifiable. Central office staff has the affective interest, but resources to address the problem are not there. The school system has little or no demonstrated commitment to improve the reading skills of minority students." He commented that if they got to a point where students really knew how to take a test what would be taking place to increase their reading capabilities. Dr. Buckner remarked that if they went into the top classes there was very little color in these classes. At the other end of the spectrum as they went up in grades the classes got darker and darker. He felt that generally the best programs and the best teachers were directed toward the classes at the top end of the spectrum.

Mr. Smith said he would like to discuss the relationship between the test taking and the reading. The superintendent said that Recommendation No. 2 dealt with a budget set aside. He said they had a program going on now which was in its second summer. They had a program dealing with MRMC's Recommendation No. 3. There was staff training for teachers and principals in the schools with large numbers of minority children. He thought that the basic approach was the new elementary K-8 reading and language arts curriculum which would enable them to get a better reading on each individual student. He felt that while they had made progress they had a lot of progress to make. Mr. Smith asked whether these students would be monitored to find out what was improving. Dr. Pitt commented that the committee had made a number of recommendations and they had initiated a number of these: the early identification program, involvement of area offices in program planning, identification of instructional staff, and included program planning time for the staff. They involved 444 junior high school and middle school youngsters. They had had an increase in parent involvement on absenteeism. In addition, Dr. Frankel's department was involved in planning an evaluation program. Dr. Frankel reported that on the summer program they were doing a very intensive monitoring and a case study evaluation of that program. The other thing they were doing was a three-year study of effective reading practices. They planned to get the practices that were producing better results into the classrooms. Dr. Frankel said they were studying all the youngsters in the summer school program and were doing a comparison of youngsters who opted not to go into that program.

Mr. Robinson asked whether anyone was going to talk to them about SOMPA. Dr. Frankel replied that there were probably 30 or 40 people trained in the use of SOMPA. He said it was important to remember that the SOMPA was an individual I.Q. test for use with minority students. Mr. Robinson asked whether it was being used in the system, and Dr. Hiawatha Fountain, associate superintendent, replied that it was not to his knowledge. The superintendent said the staff had spent a whole week looking at the SOMPA material and had decided they would not authorize this for use with MCPS students.

Mr. Braxton Boyd stated that his granddaughters had told him that schools were teaching to the test, and he wondered how they could get a real evaluation. Mrs. Wallace asked whether in test-taking skills the questions were similar to those in the tests the students were going to be receiving. Dr. Harris replied that the items were similar only in format and were not the specific questions. Mr. Smith asked the superintendent to describe the program relative to attacking the problems some students had relative to reading. The superintendent explained that it would be the early identification component based on the newly adopted instructional objectives in reading/language arts K to 8. For those youngsters identified as having problems there was remedial help built into the system both in the regular program and in the summer basic skills program. Parents would be involved so that they were aware of the progress of their youngsters. He reported that there was one other piece that they were working on, and that was the Board's interest in having a K to 8 policy companion to the senior high policy. He said they would have a more systematic look at looking at student achievement and grade level standards. All youngsters would have additional instruction in test taking skills. He remarked that he did not think this was fail safe but it would enable them to continue the reduction of the gap in student achievement.

Mrs. Wallace thought that at some time they had to discuss the aptitude/achievement gap. The Board had quite a discussion about aptitude testing because the present aptitude tests they had available were considered to be nothing more than another form of an I.Q. test. She said that staff was trying to find another means of coming up with some sort of aptitude testing so that they would know the potential of an individual child.

Mrs. Zappone asked whether if one approach to reading was not working with a particular child was there automatically a second approach or a third approach. Dr. Martin replied that each school had the services of a reading specialist, and all of the specialists were trained in various approaches. Therefore, they did use multiple approaches. One strength of the new K-8 objectives was that they were very comprehensive.

The superintendent stated that last time they were discussing the OCR analysis, the committee had said they were going to wait for the outside look from OCR on the analysis of student suspension data. The report had not come in; therefore, they had started a review process. Dr. Pitt reported that he had met with Mr. Robinson on various strategies they might use. They listed all schools with high discrepancies and schools with no discrepancies. He had written a memo to each area superintendent and asked them to sit down with the principals in these specific schools and analyze the data. On August 1 they would get the feedback data, and he would schedule another meeting with Mr. Robinson to talk about some further strategies. He added that the evaluation that had been done on the in-school suspension project looked very good. It was his intention to pursue

the possibility of increasing the project in the FY 1983 budget. Mrs. Wallace commented that at present there were a good number of jurisdictions trying this out. She said that she had visited the high school center, and they had been awaiting the results before expanding the program. She said there was a tremendous cross section among the youngsters in the center, and under no circumstances did the youngsters want to return to the detention center. Mr. Barse asked when the report would be coming to the Board, and Dr. Frankel replied that the evaluation would be completed toward the end of the summer. Dr. Buckner asked whether they had a demographic breakdown by race and sex, and Dr. Frankel replied that they did. It seemed to Dr. Buckner that youngsters who were quite often suspended might have a pattern of academic difficulties. Yet they were taking these youngsters out of the classes where the skills were taught. Dr. Frankel replied that there were few youngsters who were suspended many times. The superintendent explained that the intent was not to have a babysitting in-school suspension but to have an instructional one where work would be done. Dr. Frankel added that the aide made sure they were doing the seat work assigned by the classroom teacher. Mr. Ewing said the committee talked about the need to know whether there was anything wrong in the way the system worked and what might be needed in order to take some corrective action. It seemed to him the corrective action might be in the form of punishment modes which they have not tried before. He said that experimenting with alternative punishment modes was perhaps worthwhile, but was hardly a positive approach to this problem. He wondered what they had done to examine the characteristics of the events surrounding the suspension and what had they done to look at the characteristics of the academic performance of those suspended. He asked whether they had looked at the personal history characteristics of those who were suspended. He wondered how these things would compare with a control group of students. He felt that this might give them enough information to do something positive. He commented that negative reinforcement was the least effective kind of reinforcement. He felt that they had concentrated exclusively on the negative. The superintendent said they were looking at having conferences with principals of the schools where there was the high disparity to find out factors about the students who were suspended. This information would be compared with information provided by the schools where they did not have this disparity to then see if they could have some things in a positive sense that they could suggest systemwide. Mr. Ewing remarked that this sounded like anecdotal stuff which was not reliable and not likely to produce much in the way of information.

Mr. Boyd felt that they were playing a game here. If a classroom teacher who was highly skilled could not assist a child in staying in a classroom, why shift the child to a less qualified person. He said that no parent would want a child to remain in such a situation. Mrs. Wallace replied that they were trying to say this was one alternative to suspension. She said that she would not want her child suspended back to the home because it gave them incentive to continue the same behavior pattern to be able to get out of school. She agreed that it was not the answer for everyone. It was her understanding that there was a conference with parents when a student

was suspended. Dr. Frankel remarked that the study had shown that the thing students feared most about suspension was the notification to parents. He said they had looked at whether MCPS procedures were being followed, and in 90 to 95 percent of the cases all procedures including parental notification were being followed. He explained that most of the suspensions were one day.

Mr. Smith said he would like to go to the report of the task force. The task force had stated that the Department of Educational Accountability supported the findings of the MRMC because suspension rates differed widely school to school with significant disparities in suspension rates between black and white students. He was interested in their second comment which said that reasons for suspension differed for black and white students. He wanted to join this with the recommendation made by the task force that a joint staff and citizen committee should review the statistics and make recommendations. He said that Mrs. Fairley had made mention of a student teacher resource program which was no longer in place. He said he would like to discuss the reasons that black students got suspended. The superintendent indicated that it was their intent to focus on these concerns. He said that the data were not new, and they thought in working with the principals they would be able to follow this through. He said that he did not have any budgetary plans to reinstitute the SRT program.

Mr. Smith asked whether the Department of Human Relations was involved in school suspensions. Mrs. Fairley replied that they did get involved in many suspensions because they were reported as a result of a serious incident. They also got involved because principals had some concerns about repeated suspensions. One of the concerns that they had was that youngsters were suspended because of the same circumstances or similar ones. She had a concern about taking a student and suspending him and then putting him back in the same situation and not addressing that. Mr. Smith wondered whether there was a misunderstanding of the behavior of black youngsters. Mrs. Fairley replied that the cultural impact could be the case in some situations. However, the ironic thing about it was that both black and white parents had raised the question about suspension. Mr. Smith asked how they handled the situation when they got into a school where they suspected a lack of understanding of cultural sensitivities. Mrs. Fairley replied that there were many different ways of handling this. The teacher specialist would identify the problem and work with the teacher. They would recommend that teachers avail themselves of certain kinds of reading material or take courses. Mr. Smith asked whether her staff worked in the schools with a high incidence of suspension of black students. Mrs. Fairley explained that the teacher specialists worked with all schools. There were three specialists and one was assigned per area.

Mr. Robinson asked whether the teacher specialists were responsible for record keeping, and Mrs. Fairley explained that the schools were responsible. Mrs. Wallace inquired about the fourth teacher specialist, and Mrs. Fairley replied that this specialist worked with the alternative centers and did the in-service activities.

It seemed to Dr. Buckner that there was a retrenchment of sensitivities across racial lines in schools among students. Last year they had black students offer testimony about their problems. He wondered what was being done to address the problem of teachers who did not know how to deal with incidents in class between students. Mrs. Fairley replied that teacher specialists did a fine job of helping teachers understand the differences in culture; however, the department was not always aware of everything that happened. She explained that they were trying to deal with this whole concept in H.R. 17 and 18. She said that one area probably was the use of bad language which triggered situations.

Mrs. Wallace commented that the data on suspensions appeared to be 1979-80. She wondered what they had from the previous years and when could they expect the results of the 1980-81 school year to see if the problem was being improved or getting worse. Dr. Frankel remarked that the 1980-81 data should be available by the end of the summer. Dr. Pitt added that in previous years the computer program was poorly done; therefore, this would be the second year of solid data.

Mr. Boyd asked what they had done as a Board to help bring about changes in this particular area. He said he had been on the committee for six years, and they had cited incidents to the Board and nothing was done. The superintendent explained that the staff was making proposals and the Board was endorsing these. The Board itself was responsible for knowing what the administration was planning to do. Mrs. Wallace added that Mrs. Fairley did prepare a monthly report to the Board on the work of her department. One of the portions of that report dealt with serious incidents in the schools, but the Board did ask for follow-up on these. Mrs. Fairley reported that recently they had had a workshop with Dr. Charles King from Atlanta. These were administrators, and the primary reason for their participation was the hope that they would have an impact on larger groups of staff.

Dr. Greenblatt stated that Exhibit 1, page 5, indicated an analysis done of blacks and whites. She wondered whether another analysis had been done which included other minority groups. Dr. Pitt replied that it did. Dr. Greenblatt asked whether there was a way of plugging in socioeconomic background. The superintendent replied that youngsters in Head Start or receiving free or reduced price lunches could not be identified for other purposes. They did not have the income levels of the parents of students in the school system.

Dr. Greenblatt indicated that she was troubled by the discussion regarding different cultures and different standards for respect in the classroom. Mrs. Fairley replied that in her experience of working with both black and white parents she found that black parents were harder on their children about being disrespectful. Yet there were ways in which black people expressed themselves that many people did not understand. Dr. Greenblatt asked whether the children understood that this was not acceptable in school. Mrs. Fairley said

that this was the issue in terms of what young people had to learn in terms of what was acceptable behavior in the school. She felt that teachers had to understand until they could get a handle on that to modify those behaviors that suspension was not the only way to deal with that. She said that most of the disrespect was bad language. Mrs. Wallace felt that they had to get this at the primary level, but most of the figures they had were secondary level. Mrs. Fairley felt that society was freer in allowing children to say things at home and then in the school. Dr. Greenblatt pointed out that the distinction in language was clearly made when youngsters went to church. She felt that somewhere along the line students had to learn what was proper behavior. She noted that they were preparing children not only for school but for the job market, and those kinds of behaviors were unacceptable in the job market. Mr. Robinson commented that he hoped the time would never come in the school system when they dealt with youngsters on the basis of their economic environment or socioeconomic background.

Mr. Smith said that he wanted to get into the section on gifted and talented and the lack of understanding of another culture. He felt that people needed to be sensitized to the fact that cultural differences could mean that people acted differently. This may be taken as bad behavior because it was not understood. He said there was an inability of many of the teachers and administrators to identify minority students who were gifted. He felt that there was connection somewhere. He commented that if there was a problem in the school system with being sensitive to the cultures out of which many of the youngsters came, not only were they going to have discipline problems but also they were going to have problems identifying the gifted and talented out of those minority cultures. He felt that someone was keeping these children out of the program. He said that culture operates and was involved, and he thought there was a glossing over of that factor that was going to continually get them into trouble.

Mr. Barse remarked that while he appreciated and endorsed with Mr. Smith the value in American society of cultural pluralism he also endorsed the value of common standards to which all the cultures would look as the standards for achievement. He said that they could define these in many ways. There were standards in law. When they got to the academic level there were certain standards for measuring academic achievement which had no relation whatever to the cultural origin of the students who were involved in the educational process. Similarly there were standards of behavior to which they held all youngsters no matter what their cultural origin.

The superintendent stated that the committee was accurate in its recommendations because minority student participation in the gifted and talented program was not at the level that one would expect. He reported that they had done a number of things including changing the screening criteria. They were getting a state grant which was geared toward the development of criteria that would be totally fair. Dr. Waveline Starnes, educational planner for gifted and talented, said that they had gathered very specific data and made schools aware of

the problem and adjusted the identification procedures. She said that their long-range plans were in the Title IV-C grant. In addition, they had gathered data this spring to compare with last year's data.

Mr. Robinson stated that the basic question was whether or not there had been improvement. Dr. Starnes replied that there was improvement, but minority participation was still low. Mr. Robinson asked how the 80-81 data compared. Dr. Starnes said that this data was now being examined and keyed into the computer. They hoped the data would reflect the changes they attempted to make in January. She thought the data would be available mid fall. She said that it was important to realize they were not dealing with a small problem, and she did not think they were going to see phenomenal changes at this point.

Mr. Ewing asked about the plan for continuing to monitor the impact of the changes and how long they thought it was likely to take for them to make a determination about whether the changes were effective or not. Dr. Starnes replied that they planned to gather data yearly. Their goal was to look at the data each year and make modifications as needed. She reported that they were seeing a difference in those schools where they had been able to work for three years. The superintendent indicated that when they had the updated data they should share that as an information item to the Board. Mr. Ewing commented that there was a problem in the whole business of making change because at what point did they decide because the change had not been very significant that the changes they instituted were not very effective. Dr. Starnes replied that their project was much more significant than the adjustment in the changes in the identification process. The project was aimed at minimizing the barriers, both cultural and socioeconomic, to students getting into gifted and talented programs. Mr. Robinson stated that rather than minimizing the barriers he would like to see the goal of getting more children into the program. Dr. Starnes said that one of the measures for the project would be the number of students in the program.

Dr. Greenblatt remarked that there seemed to be two issues here. One was the screening device and the fact that there were children who had been identified by the test who never wound up in the gifted and talented program. Dr. Starnes replied that they had multiple criteria, and if the students met the list of criteria they would be in a program. Dr. Greenblatt asked whether every child who qualified was currently in a gifted and talented program. Dr. Starnes replied that there were schools that did not yet have programs. Dr. Greenblatt asked whether they had students who had been identified who were currently not being served because they were located somewhere else. Dr. Starnes did not know of anyone who was not being served. She felt that in their identification procedures they were missing many gifted students. Dr. Greenblatt asked whether all the minority children who had passed the screening process were in a gifted and talented program. Dr. Starnes replied that they were. Dr. Greenblatt pointed out that the paper before the Board stated that these children were not being served. Mr. Robinson remarked

that that was the basis of the problem. There were children who had earned test scores but were not participating. It happened to a far greater degree to black children. He felt that there was something filtering these children out. Dr. Starnes replied that this was the study that was done two years ago which looked at whether or not a youngster having a nine on a CAT was in a gifted and talented program. She explained that that kind of finding did not occur in their latest data. The superintendent said the first year the number of minority youngsters in the program was not the same percentage as the number of students by their CAT scores and that the second year the situation reversed itself. Dr. Greenblatt asked whether there was any reason why a student should not be in a gifted and talented program if he had all nines, and Dr. Starnes said she did not think so.

Mrs. Wallace remarked that since there was some bias in some of the tests the nominations were being made of different youngsters even if they had not scored eights and nines on the CAT. These youngsters were getting into the programs via other avenues. Mr. Robinson asked that the committee be provided with information with the test scores not filtered out. Dr. Starnes said the March 1980 data showed that 8 percent of the students got into the program without the test scores. Mr. Ewing asked whether there were data that every child with these scores was being served. Dr. Starnes explained that she was talking about the data from the 40 schools where there were programs. Mr. Ewing commented that, therefore, there were a lot of black and white children not being served although their scores might entitle them to be served.

Mrs. Young asked about the number of schools which did not have gifted and talented programs. Dr. Starnes replied that the 1981 data indicated that all but a handful of schools had gifted and talented programs. Mrs. Young requested the identity of these schools by name.

Mr. Smith said he was going to ask about the level of the global screening and what was the second level of specific screening. He did want to know about the statement that it appeared that schools were not using the professional decision-making process as planned. He asked who in the schools were not using the professional decision-making process because someone was seeing to it that minority children did not participate. The superintendent explained that this really got to the training of staff to use the procedures that they had put in place and then changed. Mr. Smith did not agree and said there were people in the schools not using that decision-making process. Dr. Martin explained that part of the screening criteria was professional judgment. She thought they were making progress because they had a number of youngsters in gifted and talented programs who did not have the test scores. They had an in-service type activity to give teachers confidence in their own judgment and not to rely too much on test scores. This amounted to looking at multiple criteria and saying even though the test scores were not at eight or nine, the child should be nominated.

Mr. Barse commented that he had heard some evidence that in a prior year there may have been a filter mechanism which filtered out some minority students from the gifted and talented programs. However, he had heard that this had been substantially corrected. Mr. Robinson remarked that they had not seen any evidence of this, and Mr. Barse indicated that he had not seen any evidence that there was a filter. Mr. Robinson pointed out that the school administration's data was the evidence. Mr. Barse said that that was his interpretation. Mrs. Wallace said that the assessment of where they were today would be before the Board during the fall. The superintendent felt that they should amplify those points in writing that Mr. Smith was talking to. The superintendent remarked that there had been a lot of comments about the dissatisfaction of guidance and counseling services as they related to minority students. The basic recommendation was that they survey students after graduation, and it was his understanding that this would be done this fall. Dr. Pitt said there were funds in the budget for a general survey of all student graduates and a part of that survey would include the recommendation in the report. Staff was in the process of developing this survey, and it was his understanding that for the first year it probably would not get out until January. Mrs. Zappone asked whether this would be restricted to minority students. Dr. Pitt replied that it would not; however, it would not cover every student who graduated from the school system.

Dr. Frankel indicated that for this survey they would put together a special committee. He explained that the plan called for surveying youngsters one, three, and five years out of school. He said that they would be over-representing for minority students. Mr. Robinson asked whether they would do a sample from all of the schools. Dr. Frankel indicated that it would be a countywide sample, and they would follow up on those students for five years. Mr. Robinson thought it was good to get that kind of longitudinal look at those youngsters. Mrs. Zappone asked whether the people participating in the survey be identified by the individual high schools. Dr. Frankel replied that they would have confidential records in order to track these students. He did not know whether they would release this information by high school. Mrs. Zappone thought that the comparison information would be valuable. Mrs. Wallace remarked that unless they could have a study that could show them areas where they needed improvement she thought they were going to have to have schools. She thought they were going to have to look at programs and programs meant schools. Dr. Frankel indicated that he would try to do it the way they were recommending, but he would have to remind them at budget time.

In regard to curriculum development, the superintendent explained that the development and revision of curriculum was not done simply by the staff in Dr. Martin's department because many teachers were employed during the summer. He said that the staffing table in the department itself was another issue that was raised. He indicated that they were not adding positions and had not made major improvements in the balanced staffing. Dr. Martin stated that they would like to see a better balance of minority representation in the

department staff. She pointed out that curriculum development was done in the summer workshops where they had a far stronger minority representation. The superintendent noted that one of the two supervisors in social studies was black. They felt that they had made minimal but rather substantial progress here; however, they were not having a lot of turnover and were not adding positions. He said that as they got openings they would attempt to make inroads into the balanced staffing there.

Mr. Robinson inquired about the rotating positions. The superintendent replied that there were a number of teacher level positions budgeted for the central office and they were assigned based on cyclical priorities. These positions rotated every two to three years. Mr. Robinson asked whether the individuals were selected to getting a diverse range of people and a broad range of background. Dr. Martin indicated that they were very conscious of the need to have a better balance. Mr. Robinson asked whether they were getting the better balance, and Dr. Martin replied that they had not so far but they did have one vacancy.

In regard to extracurricular activities, the superintendent said that with the possible exception of student government participation he would agree with the point of view of the MRMC. He said that the committee had suggested the establishment of a group to offer specific recommendations, and a committee had been set up by Dr. Pitt. He explained that part of this had to do with activity buses and part of it had to do with affirmative outreach in some high schools. He hoped that the committee would be able to suggest additional things that they could do to get a better balance. Dr. Pitt said the committee would report to him, and he had asked Darius Brown to chair the committee.

Mrs. Wallace suggested that they move to the general recommendations. The superintendent said that the committee had come to the conclusion that the multiethnic convention was an inadequate instrument for providing staff with the indepth cross-cultural experiences. He said that he did not share all the points of view about the convention because there were many good things that came from the convention. However, he thought it was something they ought not to continue; therefore, they were not going to continue it this year. Each school was going to analyze its own needs based on its own student situation and develop a local program to address this. These programs will require the approval of the area superintendent so the schools would not be totally on their own. The programs would be tailored much more to the needs of the youngsters in a given school. While they did not get a grant, they did have some consultant money available. Mr. Robinson asked whether something else would happen in addition to each school's developing its own approach. The superintendent replied that each school would have a day to do this, and there would be one half day during the school year for follow-up. It was their thinking that they could get better mileage by having each school analyze its own special needs.

Mrs. Fairley explained that schools had been provided some resource

materials for implementing the one-day program. They had given packets of materials to all principals, directors of alternative centers, and all central and area offices. She said that many schools had requested some information on the profile data about their school. Mr. Robinson remarked that he could see some value in having each school do its own thing, but he felt very uneasy about this direction. He said that he did not know about a system of oversight and evaluation. Mrs. Fairley said that she could not answer his question about evaluation. Each school would be submitting its plan to the area associate superintendent to make sure they were in keeping with the Board's resolution. She said that the human relations specialists would be coordinating and making sure that materials were available.

Mr. Ewing remarked that the language of the response suggested to him that there was some fairly fundamental change in purpose between this plan and what may have been the purpose in the past. He said that some of the purposes of previous activities were to improve understanding and appreciation of cultural differences. He did not see that here. His other question was what happened to a school that did not prepare a plan or prepared an unacceptable plan. Mrs. Fairley replied that the objectives that had been designed were directly lifted from the Board resolution 60-79. She said that the plans would be submitted to the area associate superintendent who would make a determination as to whether the plans were appropriate or not. If they were not appropriate, the area associate superintendent would ask the human relations specialist and other people on the area staff to work with the school.

Mr. Ewing remarked that they had situations in the past where individual principals had not done what was intended to be done. Dr. Pitt said there were three area associate superintendents and they would be reviewing the plans for each of these schools. It seemed to

Mr. Robinson that there was an awful lot of dependence on someone in each school setting to bring this thing off. He asked whether people in each one of the schools had the capacity to do this. Dr. Pitt replied that they felt some schools were and some schools were not. They would be putting monetary supports there, and the area associate superintendent was also going to make this effort. Mrs. Fairley's staff was committed to putting the resources where she thought they were needed most.

Mrs. Wallace commented that Mr. Ewing had mentioned that the thrust was different, but she thought that there was one reason why the thrust needed to be a little different. She said that most of the teachers had gone through the multiethnic convention. On the other hand, new teachers coming into the system had to have proof of some sort of human relations course or take one of the three-credit human relations courses prior to tenure being granted. She said that a number of people were being uneasy about the thrust, but this was staff's best thinking. She pointed out that this was not in concrete and was a one year thing which would have to be evaluated at the end of the one year.

Mr. Robinson asked whether the design for the evaluation had been worked out. The superintendent said they had talked briefly about it, but it had not been developed.

Mrs. Wallace asked that they turn to the second general recommendation on funding. The superintendent explained that last February the Board approved a budget for Head Start and Title I. However, to date they did not know how much money they were going to be getting this year. Last year they had put in \$2.6 million for Title I and received \$2.3 million. This year they put \$2.3 million in the budget which was the same dollar level as the previous year. In regard to Head Start in the 1981 budget they had \$2.4 million and received \$2.4 million. This year they had \$2.5 million budgeted, and they did not know what they would receive.

Mrs. Wallace commented that they had raised this issue in front of the County Council of what would happen if the federal dollars do not come through. She said they would have to go back to the funding authority. She said they had put the Council on notice that should the federal dollars not be forthcoming, the Board might be coming back to them for a supplemental appropriation. The superintendent reported that they had tried to get the Council to fund this in their appropriation resolution so that they would fund it locally if there were a failure of federal resources; however, they had received a negative response. They did say to the Council that if they did not get these levels of appropriation they would consider the possibility of coming back to the Council for the supplemental for these programs. He thought the Council was supportive of this. Mrs. Wallace recalled that the Council had told them that money was short. The superintendent stated that if they were going to continue to mount these services they would have to find local funding to supplement these programs. He pointed out that they had always supplemented Head Start and said that there was more local money in Head Start than there was federal money. Mrs. Wallace commented that not only the block grants were of concern but they had to consider the results of the Somerset case and its effect on Montgomery County. Mr. Ewing stated that it was important that the committee know that the Board of Education itself last winter did cut the budget for Head Start below the level of the previous year. He said that was a fact. Therefore in the sense of the recommendation the committee made, the Board did not follow that recommendation. Similarly they had before them the reduction by about 50 percent of the ESAA money, and so far he had not heard from any Board member about a proposal to go to the County Council for that money. Mrs. Wallace pointed out that the Board did not count on getting the ESAA money. She said that for Head Start in FY 1981 there was \$2.4 million, and in FY 1981 the actual amount they received was \$2,445,365. In FY 1982 it was \$2,503,033.

Mr. Ewing stated that the Board voted last winter to cut the Montgomery County contribution.. He said that he did not vote to cut the budget, but the Board majority did. Mrs. Wallace pointed out that there were more dollars budgeted in this particular area in FY

1982 than there was in FY 1981. Mr. Ewing said that the committee had to know that its recommendation was not followed by the Board. He said that the superintendent and staff people were deeply concerned about the issues that the committee had brought before the Board, but they had a Board that really was not.

The superintendent noted that in terms of educational programs for students there was no question that this was going to be a difficult area in the future. He said that the total federal money was going to drop and the part that they got through the state was going to be cut again. He said that if they were going to serve students it would require a higher percentage of local money in Head Start and it was going to cost local money in Title I. Mr. Smith thought that the fact that they got more federal dollars had to do with the superintendent and staff. He did think there was a point here that they had to be aware of which was that Head Start was just what it said and was especially important in the minority community. If there were going to be a 25 percent cut in federal funds, they would have to be concerned about the position the Board took on programs that were important to minority youngsters. Mrs. Wallace stated that she was being labeled as part of the Board majority and she was part of the Board majority, but she did not support the cut in local funds. Secondly, the cuts that did occur were general cuts in federal dollars.

Mrs. Wallace asked that they turn to the third recommendation. The superintendent said that when they wrote the paper they had not had final action on the budget. The MRMC had recommended that funds for the training of staff who work closely with minority students not be reduced. The budget was approved without reduction in those areas. Mr. Robinson asked whether the dollar level was the same, and the superintendent replied that it was up slightly.

The superintendent commented that one of the over-arching issues the committee referred to was the whole business of expectations of youngsters. If they had low expectations for youngsters this was communicated at an early age. He said they had a staff group working on specific things they could recommend to all teachers so that low expectations are not conveyed to any youngsters. He felt that this was more important than any other issue because so many of them had prejudged feelings about what others could do and could not do. He reported that they would be working on this in their A&S annual meeting.

Dr. Buckner said there was mention of the Board's looking at aptitude tests, and he had yet to see aptitude tests which were highly correlated with intelligence tests. He felt that this was influencing on the attitudes and expectations that teachers set for youngsters. If this was something that they were looking at, he would like them to put those resources into Title I. Mrs. Wallace said they had discussed the feasibility of individual I.Q. tests. She said that this was a topic that the Board would get back to. She believed that there had to be something better than a group test.

She agreed that aptitude testing was not the answer. They needed some means of determining what the capability of that youngster was. Mrs. Wallace indicated that when the Board had this discussion the committee would be invited.

Mr. Smith thanked the Board for the opportunity to come forward and express the committee's concerns. On July 23 they would be all off the committee because of the action taken by the Board. He would continue his commitment to do the best for minority students in the county. Mrs. Young stated that all of them would continue to work together and inform the community to see that these needs are met. Mrs. Wallace thanked the members of the committee for meeting with the Board. She said that the Board did create another committee, and she hoped that the committee would pick up with what the MRMC had done in the past. She also hoped there would be some continuity of members. She stated that there did need to be open communication between the Board and staff and members of the minority community.

Re: Adjournment

The president adjourned the meeting at 11:45 p.m.

President

Secretary

EA:ml