



WHEREAS, In 1974, the superintendent appointed the Task Force on the Instruction of the Academically Gifted which created a renewed interest in and dedication to gifted and talented education; and

WHEREAS, The Superintendent's Advisory Committee on the Education of Gifted and Talented was formed in 1976, and this committee has advised and promoted countywide direction for gifted and talented programs; and

WHEREAS, Mrs. Katherine C. Rigler served as chairperson of the Task Force on the Instruction of the Academically Gifted in 1974-75, as chairperson of the superintendent's advisory committee for five years, and as a participant on the task force and the committee for a total of ten years; and

WHEREAS, Mrs. Rigler has brought to the committee unique talents in organizing, envisioning, and critiquing in addition to a ready pen and an uncommon command of language; and

WHEREAS, Mrs. Rigler has also been an active advocate for gifted and talented education in Maryland and represented Montgomery County on the Maryland State Department of Education Task Force on Gifted Education in 1982-83; and

WHEREAS, Mrs. Rigler resigned from the superintendent's advisory committee this fall; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Montgomery County Board of Education acknowledges with grateful appreciation the noteworthy and exemplary contributions which Mrs. Rigler has made to the gifted and talented program in Montgomery County and Maryland; and be it further

Resolved, That the Montgomery County Board of Education wishes Mrs. Rigler well as she continues to pursue personal and community activities.

Resolution No. 26-85                      Re: Award of Procurement Contracts  
over \$25,000

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

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

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

	Name of Vendor(s)	Dollar Value of Contracts
60-85	Industrial Arts Automotive Supplies Bel Welding Supply Co., Inc.	\$ 334

	J & M Supply Company	17,283
	Mattos, Inc.	12,722
	Wareheim Air Brakes	903
	Zep Mfg. Company	3,539
	TOTAL	\$ 34,781
63-85	Mini Studio Color Television Communications C.T.L. Communications Televideo Limited	\$ 36,165
64-85	Laundrying of Uniforms Sketchley Services, Inc.	\$ 33,960
	GRAND TOTAL	\$104,906

Resolution No 27-85                      Re: Rebid - Boiler and Heating System  
Replacement at Fairland Elementary  
School and Boiler and Piping  
Replacement at Georgian Forest  
Elementary School

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

WHEREAS, Sealed bids were received on January 16, 1985, for boiler and heating system replacement at Fairland Elementary School (Proposal A) and boiler and piping replacement at Georgian Forest Elementary School (Proposal B) as follows:

	Proposal A Fairland	Proposal B Georg.Forest	Combined Proposals A&B
1. Charles W. Lonas and Sons, Inc.	\$208,000	\$109,000	\$317,000
2. G. W. Mechanical Cont., Inc.	260,000	116,000	376,000
3. E. J. Whelen & Company	256,203	128,860	385,063
4. Arey, Inc.	275,000	113,000	388,000
5. American Combustion, Inc.	272,431	129,432	399,480

and

WHEREAS, The low bidder, Charles W. Lonas and Sons, Inc., has successfully completed this type of work for Montgomery County Public Schools; and

WHEREAS, Recommended bid is within staff estimate and sufficient funds are available to effect award; now therefore be it

Resolved, That a contract for \$317,000 be awarded to Charles W. Lonas and Sons, Inc., for boiler and heating system replacement at Fairland Elementary School (Proposal A) and boiler and piping replacement at Georgian Forest Elementary School (Proposal B) in accordance with plans and specifications prepared by Morton Wood, Jr., Engineer.

Resolution No 28-85                      Re: Change Order - Gaithersburg High  
School Classroom Addition (Area 3)

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

WHEREAS, The construction contract approved by the Board of Education on October 1, 1984, for a classroom addition at Gaithersburg High School provided for unit prices for selected data including rock removal; and

WHEREAS, The contractor encountered large quantities of rock that had to be removed, and the rock removal has been carefully monitored by MCPS inspectors and the quantity of rock identified; and

WHEREAS, Sufficient funds exist in the Gaithersburg High School construction project to fund this change order; now therefore be it

Resolved, That change order No. 2 to the contract with Jesse Dustin & Son, Inc., in the amount of \$133,800 for rock removal at Gaithersburg High School be approved; and be it further

Resolved, That the state superintendent of schools be requested to approve this change order.

Resolution No. 29-85

Re: John F. Kennedy High School -  
Property Easement (Area 1)

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

WHEREAS, The Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission has requested a right of way and temporary construction easement across the John F. Kennedy School site for the purpose of installing water mains; and

WHEREAS, The proposed water improvements will benefit the school community and will not affect any land now utilized for school programming and recreational activities; and

WHEREAS, The WSSC will assume all liability for damages or injury resulting from the installation and future maintenance of the subject utilities; and

WHEREAS, All construction, full restoration, and any future repair activities will be performed at no cost to the Board and Education and will result in a negotiated payment to the school system in return for the subject property rights; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the president and secretary be authorized to execute a permanent right of way and temporary access easement for the Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission at the John F. Kennedy High School site, for the purpose of installing new water main services for the surrounding community; and be it further

Resolved, That a negotiated fee be paid by the WSSC for the subject right of way and easement, said funds to be deposited to the Rental of Property Account #32-108-1-13.

Resolution No. 30-85                      Re: Utilization of FY 1985 Future Supported Project Funds to Promote a Sense of Community Within Burtonsville Elementary

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

Resolved, That the superintendent of schools be authorized to receive and expend \$1,500 in Category 01, Administration, within the FY 1985 Provision for Future Supported Projects, from the Maryland State Department of Education to promote a sense of community within Burtonsville Elementary School in order to increase student achievement and to decrease disruptive behavior in youth; and be it further

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

Resolution No. 31-85                      Re: Utilization of FY 1985 Future Supported Project Funds to Improve School Discipline at Banneker Junior High School

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

Resolved, That the superintendent of schools be authorized to receive and expend \$4,167 in the following categories, within the FY 1985 Provision for Future Supported Projects, from MSDE to improve school discipline through a positive school climate at Banneker Junior High School:

Category	Amount
01 Administration	\$3,912
10 Fixed Charges	255
Total	\$4,167

and be it further

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

Resolution No. 32-85                      Re: FY 1985 Midyear Adjustment within the Provision for Future Supported Projects

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

Resolved, That the superintendent of schools be authorized, subject to County Council approval, to effect the midyear adjustment below in the FY 1985 Provision for Future Supported Projects:

Category	From	To
01 Administration	\$34,849	
02 Instructional Salaries		\$67,385
03 Instructional Other		13,508
04 Special Education	20,147	
07 Transportation	120	
08 Operation of Plant and Equipment		970
10 Fixed Charges	26,747	
Total	\$81,863	\$81,863

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 sent to the county executive and the County Council.

Resolution No. 33-85                      Re: Utilization of FY 1985 Future Supported Project Funds for the Intensive English Language Program

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

Resolved, That the superintendent of schools be authorized to receive and expend, within the FY 1985 Provision for Future Supported Projects, a \$41,259 grant award from the Montgomery County Department of Social Services, Division of Family Resources under the Refugee Act of 1980 for the Intensive English Language Program:

Category	Amount
02 Instructional Salaries	\$36,902
03 Instructional Other	1,000
08 Operation of Plant and Equipment	220
10 Fixed Charges	3,137
Total	\$41,259

and be it further

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

Resolution No. 34-85                      Re: Personnel Appointment and Reassignment

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

Resolved, That the following personnel appointment and reassignment be approved:

Appointment	Present Position	As
Daniel Shea	Administrative Intern Seneca Valley High	Assistant Principal Seneca Valley High Effective January 22, 1985

Temporary Reassignment for the 1985-1986 School Year

Name and Present Position	Position Effective July 1, 1985	Position Effective July 1, 1986
Sherri Rindler Staffing Specialist qualified Division of Staffing Department of Personnel Services	A&S Teacher	A&S Position for which

Re: Board/Press/Visitor Conference

The following individuals appeared before the Board of Education:

1. Cindy Brandt, Parents of Gifted Learning Disabled Children
2. Jane Stern, Montgomery County Education Association

Re: Annual Report of the Committee on Minority Student Education

Dr. Janice Mitchell, chairperson, explained that it was decided in keeping with the charge to the committee to concern themselves with three basic areas which paralleled those that were being looked at in the self-studies the schools were doing, they chose to look at school climate, minority academic participation and achievement, and minority participation in non-athletic activities. It was their perception that although some MCPS schools, administrators, and staff continued to provide leadership, sensitivity and awareness of the needs of minority students for whom they are educationally responsible, those who had become weary or continued to be unresponsive were often perceived to be an obstacle to further educational progress for minority students. They felt that school and classroom climate related directly, positively and negatively, to how effective the school leadership is. This suggested a need to investigate several areas: teacher/parent relationships, student/peer relationships, teacher/student relationships, understanding the role of the school in the community, and principal/teacher/parent relationships, particularly for schools

where there are problems. They looked at the level of multicultural awareness as it related to counselors and their training. They felt this information might shed some light on vandalism and suspension problems. Through personal observations and documentation, they would know they had these problems.

Dr. Mitchell stated that another area of importance was to look at what was being done in the area of intercultural awareness education. They felt it was necessary to educate non-minority staff and teachers to cultural differences in learning styles and provide strategies to help increase their skill in using alternative teaching styles. They also viewed the vignettes which were used in human relations workshops and felt an expansion of those vignettes to an in-depth, hands-on cross-cultural awareness technique system would have success in eliminating the cross-cultural misunderstandings that often occurred in classroom situations. They also felt from the standpoint of how successful intercultural awareness techniques could be would depend on whether they started with teams of volunteers or a team that would involve an administrator, faculty, staff, parents, students, and counselors. Volunteer was the key word because they would be starting with people who were willing to open their minds.

Dr. Mitchell reported that the other area of concern was the level of minority participation in nonacademic activities and the fact that this was predictable in some schools. The committee had to go back and pick up the history of the committee. They read a 1974-75 report which cited many areas of concern which the present committee found were still areas of concern in 1984. She said they had ten years of standing still in attitudes and behaviors influencing successful minority student achievement and participation in all levels of educational endeavor. The committee felt they really needed to look at school climate and forego some of the statistical data for more personal elements.

It seemed to Dr. Shoenberg that the report had a clear sense of purpose and direction. He said that it was very helpful for the Board to have the report. Dr. Cronin commented that the strength of the report was not that it came on strongly condemning the school system but that it looked at the system and said there was a possibility for success. It left lots of ways for that success to be achieved. He was unsure of the first recommendation on the first page. Dr. Mitchell replied that the committee felt there were other organizations besides those directly connected with the school system that were looking at some of the same aspects of the school system. Perhaps there were some things that one organization had seen, and the other had not.

Dr. Cronin suggested that the superintendent might pick up on a number of these recommendations. He hoped that in Recommendations 4, 5, and 7, staff would come back to them very soon with some strategies.

Mr. Ewing was concerned about the extent to which they had the

resources committed within the school system to undertake the kinds of things the committee was proposing. For example, they were recommending that the school system undertake some fairly systematic and comprehensive efforts, which he thought needed to be undertaken, but for which he did not think they had the resources. He pointed out that the people they had were committed to other things. It seemed to him that until they were able to make a commitment that involved doing some of the analysis over a fairly extensive time period, they would never have a picture of what they had done, what they were currently doing, and how well they were doing it. He said it was unfair to ask the committee to undertake to do all of that analysis. The committee had identified all of the areas where the analysis needed to be undertaken. He asked the superintendent how they were going to do this if they were going to undertake a serious effort to look at some of these issues. If they were going to do this, they should have funds in the budget to permit them to hire a contractor to get these things done or funds for staff.

Dr. Cody explained that the resources for these types of studies were in the process of being shifted and redirected. There were resources now for continuing studies, and there was value in continuing them. He would make a choice for some of the other things they had been talking about. They had the option of increasing resources in the budget or the option of making some tough decisions about scrapping some things that had been underway. He pointed out that they had been pushing DEA to do additional studies especially concerning minority achievement. There was movement in that area, but they had not begun to touch on some of the items raised by the committee.

Mr. Ewing observed that one of the things they frequently heard was that they did not need more studies. They needed action. He noted that when they started to take action and it was not based on some clear documentation, they ran into opposition from people who said there was no data available saying they needed to do that. He heard the committee saying there were actions they needed to take, but there were some things to do to be sure that they were on the right track.

Dr. Ruth Landman said that one of the areas into which some money had already gone was the self-study project as part of the first phase of the minority achievement improvement project. She said they had seen some sample reports, but there was very little attempt to disaggregate data. It was impossible to use the data that had been collected to see whether there were individuals or particular schools who were already doing all the things they were suggesting ought to happen as against some other individuals who really needed some interventions. She did not think they were talking about a great investment of money because the first phase of the self-study had already been done. She thought that until this was done, those studies would not give them the kind of help they needed.

Miss Duby found the report helpful in pulling a lot of ideas together. She had two areas of interest to her and one concern she

had had for some time. She was glad to see some reflection of the need for improving guidance services perhaps with peer counseling and student advocacy. The other topic she had been discussing with students was the self-evaluation process just discussed. She reported that since second grade students had been filling out little sheets of paper on teacher performance. A lot of students felt the forms were not productive because the questions asked could not convey the type of information students wanted to put on those forms. She agreed that this was a touchy topic, but one way of finding out what was going on in the classroom was to improve the channels they already had so that teachers were getting that feedback. She suggested that teachers could voluntarily share this information with the resource form. She suggested that this form was a vehicle they could look at to see how every student felt in the classroom. She also noted that no form like that went out to parents which might also be productive.

Miss Duby said she also wanted to address the issue of suspension. She believed the Board had discussed this in the fall, and they were concerned about the same statistics. She recalled that when they had asked for the specific offenses that had led to the suspensions they were satisfied the suspensions were justified. She thought that the suspension statistics, though important, were symptomatic. The report addressed this but said they needed to immediately bring the suspension rate to a more consistent level among racial groups. She believed they were addressing a discipline and climate problem, and she would not want to put this in terms that would make administrators feel the Board was saying they were not being fair about the way they were handling discipline problems. The problem was the reason for the acts, why they were occurring, and how they were being dealt with before they became serious enough to become suspensions. She felt it was more than just numbers.

Dr. Cody observed that it was both. They recognized there were conditions in a school that brought on student behavior that led to the need for discipline which led to suspensions. This was the type of thing they did not have the resources to analyze very carefully. On the other hand, there was evidence that some schools differ in the frequency with which they suspended any student. This year they were saying that in some schools students needed to be disciplined but in certain schools suspensions seemed to be used more frequently. They were telling these schools not to do it so much and to use something else. This was a way of dealing with the numbers but not the more fundamental issues.

Miss Duby said she would be interested in seeing where they had in-school suspension programs. Dr. Pitt replied that they did have an annual report by school.

Dr. Floyd noted that the committee was recommending a longitudinal study on the appropriateness and effectiveness of summer school program. He asked whether the committee found there was a perception that the summer school program was a minority program or a catch-up program for minority students. Dr. Mitchell replied that

there had been some discussion with the minority community as to how much progress was made in that setting. It was suggested that perhaps something could be done during the school year because students started and ended up in the same place. They suggested finding out at the elementary level if this was an appropriate and effective way to meet the needs of minority students. Dr. Floyd inquired about the enrollment in summer school and whether minority student enrollment was proportionately higher. Dr. Pitt replied that they had a couple of programs specifically for youngsters who might be underachieving and programs in schools where there were high levels of minority youngsters. Therefore, there were a number of summer programs that might have a higher proportion of minority students enrolled. Dr. Mitchell stated that there were minority parents who did not think these programs were as effective as they might be. Dr. Floyd explained that he was talking about the whole summer school program, not about given communities or schools.

Mr. Ewing recalled that when the Board had taken the action several years ago to establish extra remedial programs in the summer some Board members had said this would be a way to arrange things so that students who did not do well during the school year could make up after the end of the year. At the time he had said it was a mistake to give that reason for the programs because this conveyed to teachers that they did not need to worry about students who failed during the year because they could always be assigned to summer school. He thought they might have given some very bad messages to a lot of people in the school system. He hoped they would take a close look at what had happened in summer school and its relationship to what went on during the year.

Dr. Cronin was not sure he would agree that to say a summer school program would be there to assist students who didn't do well during the year would foster irresponsibility on the part of teachers. Mr. Ewing commented that Priority 2 was in a sense an attempt to reverse that notion that they did not have a responsibility during the year to meet children's needs. Dr. Mitchell explained that when they got in the business of offering so many programs in addition to the school year that was fine as long as what was supposed to be happening during the school year was happening. She recalled that in the first meeting of the committee with the Board, one of the messages they did get was that they would have plenty of hard data to look at, but when they were talking about school climate they were talking about breathing, feeling, warm human bodies and relationships, and in order to get at those the data could not always give them numbers and percentages. If they interviewed people and got the same threads, they felt it was important enough to present this information to the Board.

Dr. Floyd called attention to the fourth recommendation on removal of staff. He realized they used great care with language when they put forward propositions. This was advice from an advisory committee which dealt with a very substantial and yet ticklish situation. He asked whether there was some reason why the committee advised the Board to "investigate" whether a system existed for the

removal of staff. He asked whether it was their advice that the Board investigate this when they had federal laws, state laws, and Board policies which addressed equity. Mr. Timothy Shackelford replied that they were looking at reports, discussions, and investigations and they felt there was some question and this should be looked at on a continuing basis. They were not indicting anyone. They were saying they would like to have an opportunity to further investigate and look at these things. Dr. Floyd said he did not read into the recommendation a declaration that they found a certain number of instances. He explained that if he were writing this he would prefer to say "insure that if they were there, you would get them out."

Mrs. Praisner stated that she had found the report a very extensive program for the future, and she was concerned that they not burn themselves out from the standpoint of trying to do too much. She knew they had done a lot with interviews, but it seemed to her there were some areas where with DEA or staff support they might be able to get at the recommendations. She hoped they could look at some of those things before the committee gears up with activities for the next set of recommendations. She noted that the guidance study was coming out and would be helpful to them. In regard to nonacademic activities, she was not clear about their plan to monitor reports on honorees. Mr. Shackelford explained that they would go into the school and seek an audience with the principal. He hoped that the principal would designate someone to whom they could talk on a regular basis. Dr. Mitchell said they were looking to see what kind of extracurricular activities were receiving the awards, what schools, and in what areas. Mrs. Praisner was not aware of any one report that would have that kind of information. They would need to look at whatever the local school produced. Ms. Docca agreed that they would have to gather this information school by school. They still had a problem with minority student involvement on newspapers, yearbooks, and debating clubs.

Mrs. DiFonzo inquired about the sentence on physical abuse and Asian students. Dr. Mitchell explained that they were talking about students in the schools. Mrs. DiFonzo asked whether they were talking about students who were victims. Ms. Docca replied that Asian and black students were suspended for physical abuse more often than Hispanics and whites. The conjecture is that retaliatory vandalism happened after they were suspended. Mrs. DiFonzo inquired about the sentence that often the ethnic or racial group already has a discipline code within its own culture which may be effective without being exclusionary or isolationist. Dr. Mitchell explained that sometimes the majority school population and those in charge could talk to parents or someone versed in the culture to find out how they would go about taking care of disciplinary problems before they got to suspensions. For example, people often fought back when they felt isolated. Mrs. DiFonzo noted that in the preliminary recommendations they had a list of factors to consider, but one that was not included was the size of the school with regard to acting out on the part of students. She asked whether they found more of that in schools that were extremely crowded, for example.

Mrs. Slye was delighted that the emphasis of future reports, particularly participation of minority youngsters in gifted and talented programs, was intended to be positive. She thought there were a couple of issues on which the committee's input would be extremely valuable to the Board. One was for them to look at schools using minigrant funds in individualized local programs and how successful they might be. She hoped they would have the opportunity to look not only at youngsters needed admission to gifted and talented programs, but also at youngsters who were just above special education services and below the average performance.

Mr. Shackelford commented that most of these reports were negative, but there were a tremendous number of young minority people in the school system who did a great job academically and nonacademically. He would like to see an emphasis put on some kind of report that addressed the positive and some of the very good things these youngsters were doing. Dr. Mitchell added that they had 20 or 30 years of information on how youngsters failed, particularly minority youngsters. They could move forward if they found out how students got to succeed and used those strategies to help other youngsters.

Dr. Shoenberg thanked the committee for their report. He pointed out that many issues raised by the committee were for the administration to follow up on. He was particularly impressed by comments about the need to disaggregate data to look at living, breathing human beings. He thanked the committee for their efforts.

Re: Student Board Member Election

Miss Duby moved and Dr. Floyd seconded that the Board approve the student board member election process as submitted by MCR.

Resolution No. 35-85                      Re: An Amendment to the Proposed  
Resolution on Student Board Member  
Election

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

Resolved, That the proposed resolution on the student Board member election be amended to state that MCR and the Board of Education agree that these procedures would remain in place until and unless either the Board or MCR requested a modification with the exception of the annual calendar which MCR would provide to the Board for Board approval on an annual basis.

Resolution No 36-85                      Re: An Amendment to MCR's Proposal on  
the Student Board Member Election

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

Resolved, That MCR's proposal on the student Board member election process be modified under Waiver of the Election Process to read "after consultation with the local school chief election judge, the principal shall submit in writing such a request to the Special Election Committee."

Re: A Motion by Mr. Ewing to Amend the  
MCR Proposal on the Student Board  
Member Election (FAILED)

A motion by Mr. Ewing to amend the MCR proposal on the student Board member election process by adding a sentence to No. 1 under Waiver after "the request shall include a description of the local school plan" to read: ", which shall provide for the opportunity for students to vote during the school day" failed with Mr. Ewing and Dr. Floyd voting in the affirmative; Dr. Cronin voting in the negative; Mrs. DiFonzo, Mrs. Praisner, Dr. Shoenberg, and Mrs. Slye abstaining (Miss Duby abstaining).

Resolution No. 37-85                      Re: An Amendment to the MCR Proposal  
on the Student Board Member Election

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

Resolved, That the MCR proposal on the student Board member election be amended under Rules Governing the General Process to add "Any reasonable alternatives to this shall require time to be scheduled during the instructional day."

Resolution No. 38-85                      Re: Student Board Member Election

On motion of Miss Duby seconded by Dr. Floyd, the following resolution was adopted unanimously:

Resolved, That the Board of Education approve the student Board member election plan submitted by MCR with the following changes:  
under Waiver of the Election Process add "after consultation with the local school chief election judge, the principal shall submit in writing such a request to the Special Election Committee."  
under Rules Governing the General Process add "Any reasonable alternatives to this shall require time to be scheduled during the instructional day."

and be it further

Resolved, That MCR and the Board of Education agree that these procedures would remain in place until and unless either the Board or MCR requested a modification, with the exception of the annual calendar which MCR would provide to the Board for Board approval on an annual basis.

Re: Report of the Superintendent's Ad  
Hoc Committee for Planning a  
Second Career Center

Dr. Frank Carricato, director of the Department of Career and Vocational Education, introduced Mr. Michael Subin, Mr. Ronald Bryant, and Dr. Richard Dumais. He stated that historically there had been three major goals of vocational education in the United States, and these were to increase the career options available to each student, to meet the manpower needs of society, and to serve as a motivating force to enhance all types of learning. They suggested that a community's assessment of the adequacy of its delivery system should be based on looking at those goals and determining how well the community is meeting those goals. He explained that they intentionally had a very diverse committee which included PTA representatives, students, members of the business/industry community, teachers, administrators, area and central office staff, and representatives of the three foundations and the two vocational education advisory committees. He said that they did not load the committee with advocates of vocational education, but rather they had people interested in the quality of education and the impact on students and job opportunities. The committee formed five subcommittees, and he felt that the committee had done a wonderful job in an eight-week period. Dr. Dumais had conducted two surveys for the committee. One survey was of principals of the feeder high schools, and they had described in the report the support the principals had given to the concept of a second career center. The second survey was of students in each of the feeder junior and senior high schools. Dr. Carricato felt that the data were saying there was a need as perceived on the part of students, and students would be interested in attending a center. He hoped that the Board would agree that a center was needed and that planning should progress to next steps in targeting for a 1988 opening of the center.

Mr. Subin reported the committee had a relatively short timeframe within which to operate; however, in those two months, the subcommittees were able to come up with a realistic program which addressed the needs of both the up-county students and the employers in the up-county areas. He noted that the private sector in the county had been one of the greatest supporters of the school system, and they felt the program the committee had recommended was one that addressed their needs and would strengthen those ties. Because of growth in the up-county, there were space and facility constraints, and programs available to the students up-county were limited. One of the prime areas affected was vocational/technical training. He pointed out that if the space used for vocational/technical training in some schools were placed under another umbrella, this would free up that space for other classroom and academic program needs. He said that the Board over the past few years had provided a very strong base for vocational-technical training. The committee felt that the base was not offered to the up-county students as it was to the down-county students who now had the Edison Center.

Mr. Subin stated that the school system had an obligation to the over 20 percent of its students who did not go on to institutions of higher education upon graduation from high school. These people were going to be entering the work force immediately upon graduation, and they did need a head start. The work force they were going to be entering was complicated. In addition, those students entering local institutions of higher education needed to take jobs while they were in school. The committee felt that if these students had the proper training they would be able to fend for themselves. He commented that the work force in the county was rapidly changing and was becoming highly technical. The committee felt that the change in skill demands did require flexibility on the part of the school system, on the part of the students, and on the part of the facilities. He reported that the county was putting in a life sciences center and the I-270 corridor was developing as satellite alley. This required they give students the skills necessary to be able to get and maintain jobs.

Mr. Subin commented that past experiences in vocational education for the handicapped and learning disabled had not always been positive. They felt that planning for a new facility presented them with an opportunity to do the upfront planning to insure the proper vocational training for all students. He pointed out that their program recommendations were based on four major surveys since 1980. They felt the program recommendations given to the superintendent reflected where the jobs were going to be and that they were not training students for jobs that were nonexistent.

Mr. Subin said they were also extremely excited about the siting of the facility. Although much needed to be done in the way of arrangements and accommodations, they felt the best site for the new facility would be on the Germantown campus of Montgomery College. This would put students in a college environment, and the committee thought they could increase the 79% of the students they had going on to institutions of higher learning. This would also provide a shared facility because they all knew the capital improvement plans for the county would not be all that they hoped they would be. This one facility on one site would meet the needs of two different institutions. This would provide for contact between the staffs of the school system and of the college. Because 21% of the MCPS students went on to the college, they felt that needs should be better articulated between the two systems. This led to a program called "Two Plus Two" where the students would do their junior and senior years at the high school level on programs that would be tailored to continue on to the college. Preferably in the final two years the students would learn higher technical skills and entrepreneurial skills. This could have benefit in an automotive program where the students would learn the basic skills at the high school and be able to carry those on to the college level where they would learn higher levels of diagnostics and how to manage and run a shop.

Mr. Subin reported that another benefit would be, because of the

nature of the industry in the area, they could continue on and enter into a side-tech type program where students would be learning a lot of lab skills that could be applicable in the life sciences center and in other industries in the area.

Mr. Subin reported that there had been some discussion about the "ghetto-ization" of vocational students where they would be segregated from the rest of the students and would not have any contact with them and would only be exposed to technical skills. The committee felt this was not a good issue because the students would only be spending half of their time in the voc/tech center and the other half of their day in their home high schools and in an academic environment. He said that the "ghetto-ization" issue which came out of the county government was a non-issue. They felt that putting these students on the Germantown campus would expose them even more to an academic environment. In summary, the committee was excited over the possibilities that an up-county voc/tech center would present to the county. It would provide better training, better skills, and better hopes of succeeding in the future. Mr. Bryant explained that he was vice president of the Construction Trades Foundation. He was an up-county resident and a large employer within the county. He said there had been some discussion about how successful the Edison Center was, but he felt it took a long time to get a center off the ground and going full steam. They had to sell that type of a program in the feeder schools to the counselors and the principals. He was shocked to learn that some of the up-county principals did not know what went on at the Edison Center.

As an up-county resident and a construction employer, Mr. Bryant reported that most of his employees lived up-county or in Frederick County. They were not providing any facility or training center for the up-county students. He said that in the Clarksburg/Damascus area they did not have great numbers of students going to college because they were going out into the work force. These students had to learn good work ethics. In the Construction Trades Foundation, these students did learn work ethics. He said that statistics showed students were interested in having an up-county center. They had to sell the center two years prior to its opening through contacts with principals, counselors, and teachers.

Mrs. DiFonzo commented that of the reports that she had read on the Board and as a private citizen, this was one that she thoroughly enjoyed reading. She thought the report was concise, cogent, and yet very inclusive. She was struck by the idea of not treating voc/tech students as second-class citizens. She pointed out that they could have a lot of Ph.D.'s running around with no place to live if it weren't for students in the construction trades. She felt they had to emphasize that vocational skills were not secondary to a college education. They had discussed the work ethic, and Mrs. DiFonzo asked whether courses or work at the Edison Center included information on the value of the work ethic. Dr. Carricato replied that this was an integral part of all vocational education, teaching

work habits. At Edison they had developed a process to include this in the evaluation of the work of students to determine the grade they would receive in the course. He pointed out that The Unfinished Agenda spoke to the process whereby youngsters did find a meaning in their application of learning to a purpose. These students learned that they had individual responsibilities as well as team responsibility. Their attitudes toward self, peer, and superior were critical in the work force.

Mrs. DiFonzo stated that the report emphasized training students in areas where they were going to have a marketable skills when they graduated, and yet the report spoke to cosmetology. She asked why cosmetology was offered when there was no market on the outside.

Mr. Subin explained that they wanted to make sure students got all the training they needed if they wanted it. He said they were looking at a real balancing act, both in terms of what they wanted the students to do and what students wanted to do. If they had a career they wanted to pursue, the school system could give them a head start. Dr. Carricato added that it might be a tradeoff. For example, one of the principals in a school with a cosmetology course was serving so many students from out of his school that he was willing to see his cosmetology program dropped to free up space.

Dr. Shoenberg inquired about numbers of students interested in the program when they opened the Edison Center. Dr. Carricato explained that they had not done a survey specifically for Edison. They had done the career specialization feasibility study in 1976 which looked at the whole county but did not address the question of whether students would go to a center. This time they decided to ask the question in advance. Dr. Shoenberg asked whether the categories of courses students selected from corresponded to courses now offered. Dr. Dumais replied that the courses listed in the survey were the basic courses at Edison. They went into classes, showed slides of Edison, and asked students to indicate their interest level. However, they had included the bio-technical program and two others that were not at Edison. The bio-tech came in reasonably, but the major thrust was in the computer area. Dr. Carricato explained that they had added business management and television production as well.

Dr. Shoenberg asked about the level of predictability of this data. For example, the eighth grade students had picked standard courses. Dr. Dumais explained that in attempting to analyze the survey sheet they looked at where the youngster had indicated he would like to be in 30 years. They looked at this and found the programs selected by the youngster tied in to the occupation they intended to pursue. Dr. Shoenberg asked about the record of students over the years in vocational programs being employed in or going on to study in the same field. Dr. Carricato replied that they did not have good data on that; however, he believed that figure to be 50 to 60 percent. Last year Edison saw 70 to 75 percent. He commented that practically every construction trades student wanting a job was hired immediately following graduation. Dr. Cody added that there

had been a lot of studies showing that students finishing a two-year vocational high school program or completing a center program were in the field, but a substantial portion of them were not after a few years. This was disturbing until they looked at the percentages of those students who were employed, and unemployment was almost non-existent among this group.

Mr. Ewing commented that this was a very good report. He thought the need was clear and hoped the Board could do what the report recommended. He felt strongly about their emphasis on making certain they addressed the needs of handicapped students in this program. He remarked that at one point in his career with the federal government he had spent some years in charge of administrative services of an agency. He reported that there were an immense number of people doing clerical work, and a large number of them came to those jobs with zero experience and very few skills. These people had not moved very far because they did not have skills. The school system had programs dealing with office education, but there was no recommendation for doing anything about that in the new center. It was his view that it was not enough to have typing and bookkeeping skills because a whole range of skills were required. It was clear that a good many manual functions within offices would be automated in the near future, but by no means all of them. He said they did not want to prepare a lot of clerks to do things that were going to vanish. On the other hand, a lot of clerical personnel were needed. He was concerned that they had not focused on this at all. Dr. Carricato explained that one of their assumptions was not to disrupt successfully operating programs in the base schools. Business education had such large enrollments in each of the home schools that they believed it would be better to leave that program in each of the feeder schools. They would use Edison and the second center to provide more sophisticated training in word processing and data processing.

Dr. Cronin stated that at some future time he would like to hear a discussion of the general recommendations in the report on pages 22 to 24. He felt that the exciting part of the report was the connection between Montgomery College and the center. He reported that "Two Plus Two" was very much talked about in community education, and he thought this was a much better way to go than having an isolated facility. He wondered about a possible connection between the Edison Center and the Takoma Park campus of Montgomery College. He hoped that it was clear up-county that they were committed to the idea of the center. He inquired about next steps and a timeframe. Dr. Carricato explained that they were seeking Board direction. The report was premised on a September 1988 opening of a career center. The assumption was that planning money would be provided in the FY 1986 capital budget with construction commencing the following year. These were matters for the Board, County Council, and county executive to determine. Dr. Cronin asked whether this would include planning money in the College's capital budget. Dr. Carricato replied that they had not taken this to the level of a joint building project. If there were interest, staff could pursue this. Mr. Subin explained that no

thought had been given to putting in funds for the capital budget at the College. The Board of Trustees was aware of the proposal, and a lot of arrangements regarding the land and the program articulation would have to be made. Dr. Cronin remarked that if they started talking about program articulation and sharing faculty, the planning of the building itself should go hand in hand with the planning of the joint project.

Mrs. Slye commented that the report raised a lot of questions because it presented a lot of exciting possibilities. She said they could get a percentage on college graduates living in Montgomery County, but she wondered whether they could find out how many college graduates came from Montgomery County public schools. She had a concern for the youngster who attempted but did not finish college and came into the marketplace without skills. It seemed to her they might be looking at a bigger market for the program than what they had zeroed in on. She asked whether they could look at the percentage of college attendees by region and school areas. She said that in her mind they had raised the possibility of three different types of centers, science and technology, high technology, and an enhanced vocational/technical center. She pointed out that there was a growing need in service-related industries and a constant need in clerical as Mr. Ewing had pointed out. She asked where they would start given all of these possibilities and given the fact that could not begin to deliver a program touching all of these. She asked where their greatest needs were and which of the programs were compatible to be housed together. She asked about the area in which the "Two Plus Two" approach would be most valuable, most easily implemented, and most applicable to the job market. She asked if the Board could have some information on an on-going "Two Plus Two" program in northern Virginia in conjunction with the automotive trades industry. She noted the report mentioned the opportunity for students to learn at the knee of a master craftsman and asked what they had in mind. Mr. Bryant explained that this would occur in the construction trades industry and would include licensed trades.

Mrs. Slye suggested that the service boundaries might lead them to some illogical inconsistencies they would not want to live with. She said that the selling of the program was of enormous concern. She was really not certain that the problem was attitudinal on the part of the community, but within the school system, vocational education was a non-traditional pathway. She hoped that staff had specific suggestions on how to get at this issue.

Mrs. Praisner stated that she was not surprised that students were not in the jobs they had trained for originally. She hoped they could encourage students to go back for retraining because these were good habits to encourage. She, too, was excited about the prospects for a joint campus atmosphere which would go a long way in dealing with the negative connotations levied on vocational students. She wondered about Mr. Ewing's proposal to meet the needs

of another level of students, and she could see some combinations. She said there were a lot of possibilities that could be a cooperative program that they could start planning for now. She requested responses to what the possibilities of combining the two proposals would be. She was more interested in what the surveys said about jobs in the future than she was about students' desires for positions at this point. She requested a list of strategies to improve communication with principals and counselors and with parents in the community.

Dr. Shoenberg thanked members of the committee for their work and indicated that the Board would be returning to this topic.

Resolution No. 39-85                      Re: HR 87 - Cost of Education Index

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education support the concept of an education index.

Resolution No. 40-85                      Re: SB 85 - Scheduling of Athletic Events

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education oppose SB 85 - Scheduling of Athletic Events.

Re: School Calendar for 1985-86

Mrs. Praisner moved and Dr. Floyd seconded the following resolution:

WHEREAS, The establishment of school terms by the County Board of Education is required by state law; now therefore be it  
Resolved, That the proposed school calendar for 1985-86 be adopted.

Re: A Motion by Mr. Ewing to Amend the  
School Calendar for 1985-86

Mr. Ewing moved to amend the school calendar for 1985-86 by closing school on October 16 in order to permit teachers to attend the MSTA convention for professional development purposes and adding a day at the end of the school year.

Re: A Substitute Motion by Dr. Cronin  
to Amend The School Calendar for  
1985-86 (FAILED)

A substitute motion by Dr. Cronin to substitute an in-service day for all teachers on October 16 failed for lack of a second.

Re: A Motion by Mr. Ewing to Amend the  
School Calendar for 1985-86 (FAILED)

A motion by Mr. Ewing to amend the school calendar for 1985-86 by closing school on October 16 in order to permit teachers to attend the MSTA convention for professional development purposes and adding a day at the end of the school year failed with Dr. Cronin, Mrs. DiFonzo, and Mr. Ewing voting in the affirmative; Dr. Floyd, Mrs. Praisner, and Dr. Shoenberg voting in the negative; Mrs. Slye being temporarily absent (Miss DUBY voting in the negative).

Resolution No. 41-85                      Re: School Calendar for 1985-86

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

WHEREAS, The establishment of school terms by the County Board of Education is required by state law; now therefore be it Resolved, That the proposed school calendar for 1985-86 be adopted.

Re: Board Member Comments

1. Mr. Ewing asked whether the monthly financial report would be discussed, and Dr. Shoenberg replied that it was scheduled for the February all-day meeting.
2. Mr. Ewing recalled that about five or six years ago the Board held an all-day weekend meeting with the Minority Relations Monitoring Committee. It occurred to him they might want to think about the possibility of a spring conference on Priority 2 to which their Advisory Committee on Minority Student Education would be invited.
3. Mr. Ewing reported that he had prepared a paper on all-day kindergarten which would be available in the next few days. He had expanded the paper to include early childhood education.
4. Mr. Ewing said he had also written a paper on what was wrong with the First Boston Corporation's analysis of the county's bond rating. He had provided some specific suggestions on what needed to be done to get some decent data to do an analysis. He suggested that perhaps the Board and the Council could figure out a way to get that done.
5. Mrs. Praisner reported that she had asked if it would be possible to get the superintendent's reactions and cost figures on the guidance study in time for budget decisions this year. This would permit them to incorporate some of the recommendations into this year's budget if there were Board agreement.
6. In regard to the items of information on word processing and child care, Mrs. Praisner requested that additional information on

the actual program be provided to her.

Resolution No. 42-85                      Re: Executive Session - February 12,  
1985

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

WHEREAS, The Board of Education of Montgomery County is authorized by Article 76A, Section 11(a) of the Annotated Code of Maryland to conduct certain of its meetings in executive closed session; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Board of Education of Montgomery County hereby conduct its meeting in executive closed session beginning on February 12, 1985, at 9 a.m. to discuss, consider, deliberate, and/or otherwise decide the employment, assignment, appointment, promotion, demotion, compensation, discipline, removal, or resignation of employees, appointees, or officials over whom it has jurisdiction, or any other personnel matter affecting one or more particular individuals and to comply with a specific constitutional, statutory or judicially imposed requirement protecting particular proceedings or matters from public disclosure as permitted under Article 76A, Section 11(a) and that such meeting shall continue in executive closed session until the completion of business; and be it further

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

Resolution No. 43-85                      Re: Minutes of December 3, 1984

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

Resolved, That the minutes of December 3, 1984, be approved.

Resolution No. 44-85                      Re: Minutes of December 5, 1984

On motion of Mrs. Slye seconded by Dr. Cronin, the following resolution was adopted unanimously (Miss Duby abstaining):

Resolved, That the minutes of December 5, 1984, be approved.

Resolution No. 45-85                      Re: Reappointments and Appointments to  
the Advisory Committee of Minority  
Student Education

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

WHEREAS, The Advisory Committee on Minority Student Education has been active since its establishment in 1983; and

WHEREAS, Vacancies now exist on the committee due to the expiration of the terms of several members; and

WHEREAS, Members are appointed by the Board of Education through the superintendent; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Board of Education reappoint the following community members to a two-year term beginning immediately, and terminating in January, 1987:

1. Dr. Ruth Landman
2. Dr. Janice Mitchell
3. Ms. Anita Moore-Hackney
4. Mr. Timothy Shackelford
5. Ms. Josephine Jung-shan Wang
6. Mr. Carlos Anzoategui

and be it further

Resolved, That the Board of Education appoint Ms. Elizabeth Abarca, community member, to a two-year term beginning immediately, and terminating in January, 1987; and be it further

Resolved, That the Board of Education appoint Mr. Joseph Headman, staff member representing MCAASP, to a two-year term beginning immediately, and terminating in January, 1987; and be it further

Resolved, That the Board of Education appoint Ms. Wanda Means, staff member representing MCEA, to a two-year term beginning immediately, and terminating in January, 1987; and be it further

Resolved, That the Board of Education appoint the following student members to serve on the committee for the remainder of the school year:

- Ms. Krystal Hollend - 12th grader at Gaithersburg High
- Mr. Sandit Pannu - 12th grader at Wootton High

Resolution No. 46-85                      Re: Appointment to Area 2 Task Force

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

WHEREAS, On October 22, 1984, the Board of Education established an Area 2 Task Force to identify program and facility needs in Area 2 schools which should be addressed by the school system; and

WHEREAS, On December 5, 1984, the Board of Education appointed the

members to serve on the Area 2 Task Force; and

WHEREAS, Lea Berninger was appointed as the J/I/M Woodward Cluster representative; and

WHEREAS, The Board of Education has been notified that she is unable to serve; now therefore be it

Resolved, That Burl J. McDaniel be appointed to serve as the J/I/M Woodward Cluster representative on the Area 2 Task Force.

Resolution No 47-85                      Re: BOE Case No 1984-35 (Workmen's Compensation)

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education affirm the decision of the superintendent and adopt a decision and order in BOE Case No. 1984-35.

Re: New Business

Mr. Ewing asked whether they would be scheduling time on the whole issue of the capital budget including the superintendent's memo of January 18. Dr. Shoenberg replied that it would be on January 28 at 7:15 p.m. Dr. Shoenberg also reminded the Board that they had scheduled the evening of January 29 for a presentation by the Washington Area Council of Government on growth.

Re: Items of Information

Board members received the following items of information:

1. Staff Response to Board's Counseling and Guidance Committee Report (for future consideration)
2. A Study of the Guidance Program and its Management in the Montgomery County Public Schools (for future consideration)
3. Recommendations for Approval of New Curriculum -- Word Processing (for future consideration)
4. Recommendations for Approval of New Curriculum -- Human Services: Child Care/Care of the Aging Program (for future consideration)
5. Monthly Financial Report (for future consideration)
6. Response on Peer Counseling (for future consideration)

Resolution No. 48-85                      Re: Adjournment

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education adjourn its meeting at 11:40

p.m.

President

Secretary

WSC:mlw