

Fifty-five percent of the students planned to work part-time.

Dr. Martin commented that she wished they had a different name for "vocational education" because this seemed to conjure up the idea of smokestacks and industry which was not what occupational training was. They would like to give their students an opportunity to explore occupations and develop a marketable occupational skill. Dr. Ted Rybka, director of the Department of Career and Vocational Education, commented that there were three purposes of vocational education. It increased career options for students, to five relevance to general education, and to meet work force needs of the community. By increasing student options they were talking about giving students an opportunity to prepare themselves for a career or a world of work that was ever changing so that students did not have to be channeled into a single occupation but had available to them a number of opportunities from which to choose. They felt that in their vocational programs they did a considerable amount of supporting the math, English, science, and social studies areas of the curriculum.

Dr. Rybka reported that over the years the Board of Education had supported the concept of career and vocational education by adopting a number of policies including the Goals of Education. In Montgomery County most of their programs were reflective of programs they would find around the state including programs in agriculture, home economics, trades, and industry. In Montgomery County they wanted to move beyond that and help students to prepare for life in the year 2000 and beyond. In the up-county center, they intended to use the latest technologies and present vocational education, career education, and occupational preparation in a different way. They would utilize occupational programs by teaming courses together rather than having a single program. For example, the automotive program would be made up of a series of courses so that students would have an opportunity to elect some courses outside of their area such as electricity.

Dr. Rybka reported that they were working with Montgomery College in developing a 2+2 curriculum. He said that 20 percent of MCPS graduates immediately entered the College full-time. They felt that they were really missing this group of students in their occupational preparation because many of these students did enroll in the technology programs at the College.

Dr. Cody thought they needed to have a lengthy discussion on the purposes of career and vocational education. He said that one of the purposes of education was to facilitate the transition of young people from school and its dependency to independence and self-reliance and work. The traditional function of schools was that some students would go on to college and college would deal with that, and high schools would deal with those going to work. This did not hold up, and if they persisted in this perspective they would be doing students a disservice.

Dr. Cody pointed out that one of the most popular courses in college

was business administration, and one of the popular programs in MCPS was marketing. Marketing was for students interested in studying business and planning to go to four-year colleges. The question was whether that interest should be served, and he thought they should. He said that the world of work was changing and what they provided youngsters needed to change with that. They had to look at whether what they were offering to young people was appropriate for the future. Another issue about the up-county center was equity because most programs were more accessible to youngsters in the down-county area.

Dr. Martin reported that the courses in terms of program specifications would come to the Board preliminary to developing architectural plans. In terms of new courses, the Council on Instruction would be asked to consider the detailed substance of the course and to develop the course for pilot testing. After the course was pilot tested, the superintendent would submit it to the Board for action. She said that the first step in this whole process was the ad hoc committee cochaired by Councilman Subin. Those recommendations for program were very broad. The next step would be to have one or more community meetings to discuss the planned program offerings.

Mrs. Praisner assumed that the first step was when the Board determined that it would have an Edison Career Center and other centers available elsewhere in the county at some point. The desire of up-county students for the Board to move on that was in parallel to those issues coming before that. The question was when, how, what the delivery would be, and what the course content would be. It seemed to her this morning that they should concentrate on the paper before them regarding the up-county center. She thought the Board did need to have the discussion that Dr. Cody was recommending, but now was the time to ask questions about the up-county center. In light of Mr. Kramer's position, Dr. Cronin asked if it were feasible to talk of a 1990 opening. He asked if it would be possible to open the center at the start of the second semester. He wondered if there had been coordination with the high schools having significant programs and agreement about pooling these programs into one center. He also requested information about the state of their relationship with Montgomery College.

Dr. Rybka replied that a spring opening would make it difficult for the comprehensive high schools to reschedule their programs to accommodate the opening of a career center. He said that two years ago the task force had surveyed high school principals regarding the need for the center and a reduction in some of their programs. In regard to Montgomery College, they already had articulation agreements in typing, shorthand, and food services. A joint committee had been established to develop the 2+2 concept. Dr. Cronin recalled that the Board had received a letter from the chair of that committee suggesting that everything be squared away before they considered a site.

Mr. Ewing agreed that they should take time to discuss the direction

of vocational programs in general in the county. He said that the decision to depart from the comprehensive high school came with the adoption of the senior high school policy, and that was not a universally popular decision. As he looked at the timeline for the up-county center, there was provision for the Board to review the concept paper, but he did not note any subsequent time for Board involvement. Dr. Martin had said the Board would be involved when courses were approved, but he thought there should be a time sooner than that. He suggested setting a time for this after the discussion on the direction of vocational education. He asked if he misread the timeline. Dr. Martin replied that he did not. She said that this was the same timeline they had used for Edison. They would need to address this.

Mr. Ewing understood there were two program options. One would be the 2+2 technical and business preparation program, and the other would be the approach to career options. In the light of career options, there was something called construction technology. He asked if this was the same as the Construction Trades Program or something different. Dr. Rybka replied that five different students could take construction technology in five different ways. Some students might determine they wanted to become carpenters and would stay with carpentry, and others might elect courses in areas related to construction trades. Mr. Ewing noted that in the Construction Trades Program in the process of building houses a number of programs for students were drawn into that including architectural drafting and marketing. It seemed to him that this was a narrower approach than Construction Trades. Dr. Rybka replied that all of the components necessary for participation in the construction technology program operating out of Edison would be available in the up-county center. For example, the drafting programs would be there and the marketing programs at the comprehensive high school. Dr. Cody added that it was their intent to have market reality drive the content of the program. Because the Foundation was essentially composed of businessmen, their program was a step ahead of the traditional cooperative program. He did not think they wanted to do anything to diminish the impact of the real market on their vocational programs. In regard to the 2+2 program, Mr. Ewing noted that in a lot of these areas there were professions and trades with well established standards and regulations governing entry into the profession. He wondered if they ran across these requirements. Dr. Rybka replied that they were running into this situation with the 2+2 curricula. They were going to become dependent upon Montgomery College to provide them with the assistance in making sure the design of the secondary program was compatible with their programs which did have advisory committees made up of persons hiring their graduates. Dr. Martin added that licensing would probably not be an issue so much as professional standards.

Dr. Shoenberg said there was mention in the paper that 37 percent of MCPS students were enrolled in a vocational education program. He asked if they were enrolled in a program or a course which was part of a program. Dr. Rybka replied that these students were enrolled from one to three periods a day. This technically meant that they

were enrolled in a vocational program. Dr. Cody asked how this differed from a course. Dr. Rybka replied that the only place where they had course structure was in business education. Dr. Shoenberg asked if the 37 percent include the students enrolled in a typing course, and Dr. Rybka replied that it did not. Dr. Shoenberg asked if this might be a senior taking an automechanics course, and Dr. Rybka replied that this was possible. Dr. Rybka added that all the students were averaging at least two periods a day in the vocational programs reported.

Dr. Shoenberg noted that at the new center they would offer a series of courses that students could mix or match in various ways. However, the transportation issue would suggest that a senior could not take auto mechanics unless the course happened to be in that student's home school. He assumed they were talking about mixing and matching among students spending half a day at the center. Dr. Rybka replied that this would have to be determined on the basis of whether or not transportation could be provided on a course basis. They were also looking at the possibility of reorganizing the courses so that they would be for three hours for nine weeks. Dr. Cronin pointed out that this would restructure the program at the other schools, and Dr. Rybka replied that it did.

Dr. Shoenberg reported that he had asked for some statistics which showed an increase in enrollment at the Edison Center which was operating at two-thirds of capacity. He had asked what the 630 represented as a percentage of the potential. This was about 50 percent of potential. He was concerned about the cost effectiveness of building a school that was the analog of the Edison Center. He thought his uneasiness might get reduced as they started to look at programming. He was concerned that they build a school that had some flexibility to change with the changing trends in the job market. He liked the idea of the flexibility they were going to build into the program. However, he still had the concern as to whether they could convince enough students that this was the way to go.

Mrs. DiFonzo asked about the numbers of courses at Edison that were at capacity. Dr. Rybka replied that forty would be at capacity. Mrs. Praisner asked that this information be provided in writing to the Board. Dr. Pitt thought they had to talk about the concept of capacity in the future. Mrs. Praisner thought this should be part of the overall discussion they were going to have about program capacity and professional and career education in Montgomery County. Mrs. DiFonzo asked if the course, Principles of Technology, was one course or one course taken twice. Dr. Rybka replied that this was a two-year course and could be used for one science credit and one elective in vocational education if taken for the two years. If taken for one year, it would be half a credit in science and half a credit for an elective.

In regard to a potential midyear opening, Mrs. DiFonzo asked about the number of courses that would be self-contained semester long courses that would not be predicted on the course following it. For example, if the school opened the second semester, how many second

semester courses would have to be offered first semester of the next year. Dr. Rybka replied that there would be a two-year sequence to the courses, and the first year sequence would be offered each year. He noted that with the competency-based curriculum they could teach several groups of students simultaneously. Dr. Shoenberg thought they still had a problem in starting students in the second semester. Mr. Goldensohn said they had talked about an approximate four-year timetable with a potential opening in 1990. The county executive's proposal was to delay this until beyond 1994. He would like to think they could convince the executive and the Council not to go that far into the future. He reminded the audience of the need to testify for that 1990 opening, and he personally would work for 1990.

Dr. Cronin stated that he was still not sure that he accepted that the minicenters had come to a complete agreement on a single center. He would like to see a better reasoned argument there. They seemed to be saying that 64 percent of the students in business education would be available to go over into the center, and he would like a better argument there. In regard to the 37 percent enrolled in vocational education, Dr. Shoenberg asked about the number who appeared to be enrolled in a full program of vocation education as opposed to those who were taking a course.

Mrs. Praisner suggested that Board members submit additional questions in writing. It seemed to her they were talking about a review of where they were philosophically and what had been the school system's commitment to this area from the standpoint of programs and delivery of programs. In addition, it would be useful to review for Board members when the Board took actions and what the actions had been both for the career center and these kinds of programs. She asked for the major benchmarks. She said there were specific issues about the Edison Center, how they counted programs and capacity, and whether the center was meeting the needs of students and was being fully utilized. There was the issue of the 2+2 program, and Board questions about how that would operate from the specific standpoint of how courses would function and how students would be involved. There were transportation issues there as well as the site question. She asked that Board members get their questions in by the end of the month. This would be discussed during agenda-setting.

Dr. Martin thanked the Board for the thoughtful way they had approached this significant issue.

Re: STATUS AND PROGRAMS FOR HISPANIC
STUDENTS

Dr. Cody explained that this was not a proposal. The Board had requested information on the status of their work on the education of Hispanic students in Montgomery County and information about the programs offered. At the next business meeting, there would be a series of proposals concerning the education of minority students in Montgomery County.

Dr. Cody showed a series of transparencies. The first was the Maryland Functional Reading Test which showed that overtime the pass rate had been increasing for all students including Hispanic students. The writing test showed a steady trend of increase for all students, and the pass rate for Hispanic students was between 60 and 70 percent which was the lowest of the groups of students in Montgomery County but not much different from the pass rate for other students. He explained that there was a problem with the writing test, and the State Board of Education had put off the requirement for this test for one to two years. In mathematics there was an increase in the percentage of pass rates for Hispanics and black students and Asian and white students which was the widest of any measure they had. He explained that the Project Basic tests were tests of essential skills required for graduation and were benchmark tests with a pass grade.

Dr. Cody stated that the California Achievement Tests were norm-referenced tests, looking at the average that students as groups were doing. From 1980 to 1985 there was a general increase for all students with a drop for Hispanics last year in Grade 3. Dr. Cody said that another way of looking at these tests was how long the students had been in Montgomery County. He reported that a student could be excused from Project Basic tests for one year because of language problems. The charts showed that by the time the students had been in Montgomery County for five years there was virtually no difference in the pass rate. He indicated that for the California Achievement Test, any student not passing the proficiency examination in English did not have to take the test.

Dr. Cody reported that participation in honor courses at the secondary level showed that in 1983, 16 percent of Hispanic students were enrolled, and last year that number of 21 percent. In terms of the elementary gifted and talented programs, in 1982 the rate was 6 percent and last year it was 10 percent. He was puzzled by participation in higher level math which showed a decline for the last three years. He had asked Dr. Martin and the Department of Educational Accountability to help them understand the problem. He noted that participation for every group had declined. In regard to non-athletic extracurricular activities, Dr. Cody said the difference between Hispanics and other students was about 10 percent less. This was a problem area, and last year there was a slight decrease. He reported that the percent of students dropping out by group dropped down last year, but the drop out rate for blacks and Hispanics constituted a major problem. The suspension rate for Hispanics was down, but blacks still had the highest rate although there was a decrease in this number.

Dr. Cody reported that they had increased the percentage of new teachers who were minority. During the last year they had made a special effort in this area. The year before last of the total number of teachers hired the percentage was less than one, and this year it was closer to 6 percent.

Dr. Hiawatha Fountain, associate superintendent, stated that they had

10,000 international students in Montgomery County, 25 percent of which were Hispanic. Of that 25 percent, 31 percent or about 1,600 of those students were in the ESOL program. The largest growth was taking place in Area 3, and the Hispanic population was also growing in Area 3. The largest number of Hispanic students came from Central America at this time.

Mrs. Maria Schaub, director of ESOL program, commented that the Hispanic students not in ESOL had the same opportunity for preparation and remediation for tests as did other students in MCPS. Those students in ESOL had some additional supports. Of the 5,845 Hispanic students in MCPS, about 29 percent were in ESOL classes. They received basic English language instruction, and the goal of the program was to get them to speak, read, write, and understand English as quickly as possible. At the high school level they had intensive English language centers which include bilingual or alternative classes in social studies. The bilingual classes were offered in Spanish, Korean, and Vietnamese for beginning students. The social studies classes were critical for passing the functional citizenship tests. In addition, they had basic skills classes for the youngsters coming in with little schooling. Mrs. Schaub explained that it was a problem when they had an illiterate 17 year old who was expected to pass functional tests.

Mrs. Schaub said that at the junior high level they had the METS program. Students with limited schooling were in the METS program which provided basic skills instruction. In addition, they had counseling, but unfortunately much of that counseling dealt with crisis situations. They had parent services because they felt they had to involve parents so that they could support the children at home.

Mrs. Praisner asked that Dr. Fountain and Mrs. Schaub provide their statistics in writing as well as the lists of programs and services. Dr. Cody stated that he was concerned about mathematics, especially for Hispanic students. There were a variety of things in the budget to attack this problem including a request for funds for additional resource teacher time to work on identification and recruitment of students into advanced classes. BICEPS was a program to respond to dropout rates which was one of the goals of the METS program. He remarked that they were well served by picking the most serious things and concentrating on them.

Mrs. DiFonzo asked if they had ever noticed a difference in the way Hispanic youngsters achieved depending on the reason why they came to this country. For example, was there a difference among children who had fled from war and among those who came for a different reason. Dr. Steve Frankel, director of DEA, replied that they did not have any way of capturing the reasons for immigration to the United States.

Dr. Cronin commented that he would like to bridge between what was being presented to the Board now and what Dr. Scott would be presenting later. He thought they would be devising a strategy for

student success, and in order to do that they had to know why students were not succeeding. They had an excellent set of successful programs, but they needed to know why these students were not succeeding in order to develop the programs which would guarantee their success. He thought they were coming to an understanding of the "why" for Hispanic students which included language, background, and educational levels. If language and background were an impact for the Hispanic student, he wondered what happened to the Asian student and why was the black level so low. In some instances black students were below language-impacted students. He wanted to hear from Dr. Scott the factors inhibiting their major groups of students from success and how these would be addressed.

Dr. Fountain stated that for each group there were different answers. The Hispanic student might be in school worrying about the job he or she needed. Dr. Cronin thought that Dr. Scott's report would be the opening wedge in providing the answers. Dr. Fountain commented that there was a small group of Asians who were not successful in this county, and they would exhibit the same kinds of needs as the Hispanics.

It seemed to Dr. Cody that they might be perpetuating a myth here. The problem of Hispanics not having much schooling was not the whole Hispanic population, but the numbers were going up and they needed a special program for those few students. In addition, there were some Asian students in academic difficulty. He reported that the research and evaluation committee and the staff had been trying to figure out how to state the questions they wanted to ask. So many of those questions had been asked traditionally in terms of racial and ethnic groups; therefore, the answers were phrased in terms of racial and ethnic groups. Often this was not constructive. They needed to look at the practices in schools that made a difference and the kinds of experiences at home. If they could find that a certain activity made a difference, this would be powerful information. Dr. Cronin asked when they would be able to construct the solution. Mrs. Praisner commented that they were trying to structure the question and gather the information that would answer that question.

Dr. Pitt said he would rather look at what succeeded rather than what had failed. They knew that some things worked, but they were not sure why they worked. He thought they were going to have to work at this without knowing all the answers.

Mr. Ewing asked about the extent of the involvement on the part of the leadership of the Hispanic community. He was aware there had been continuing contact with them as a normal part of the ESOL program plus some special outreach efforts. He asked if they anticipated that community would support the programs being proposed. He asked if they had mechanisms to increase parental involvement. Dr. Fountain replied that the answer to both questions was "yes." They contacted the Hispanic community when they developed the BICEPS program, which had developed as a result of some contacts with the Hispanic community. Dr. Cody added that his involvement came at the request of Mr. Perche Rivas and members of the Hispanic community.

Mrs. Schaub agreed that there was a need for the whole school system to involve parents. Within the ESOL program, they were fairly successful and a lot of hours were spent calling individual parents and picking them up for meetings. However, there was still a reluctance on the part of many Hispanics to become involved in PTAs and in general school programs.

Mrs. Praisner reported that Mrs. Bell as part of her human relations activities had been going out into the community. She asked for a list of strategies that had worked or the efforts that were involved in community outreach both in a general sense and with specific parent populations including Hispanics. Dr. Cody commented that one of the major initiatives that Dr. Scott had proposed to him was a major community outreach program.

Mr. Ewing said that in the research and evaluation committee discussions if they learned something about the variations in cluster among groups within major ethnic and racial groups, the information was interesting but it might not help them to make decisions. They could not do very much about this variable. They needed to work on the conditions that made it difficult for children to succeed.

Dr. Fountain explained that Dr. Towers could not be present, but he wanted the Board to be reminded that they received a continuous concern from building principals that even though they worked with youngsters through levels five, when they got into the mainstream they were not as proficient as the principals and teachers thought they should be. Consequently, they were suggesting as a long term strategy that they look at ways of training the teachers receiving these youngsters. He explained that ESOL was never intended to have the youngster totally ready but to get to them to a level of facility in English so that they could survive in the classroom.

Mrs. Praisner thanked staff for their presentation and assured them that the Board would continue to work on this issue. Dr. Cody commented that Dr. Scott had been central and crucial to this work, but he wanted people to know that when Dr. Scott made his report he would not be by himself.

Re: EXECUTIVE SESSION

The Board met in executive session from 11:50 to 2:40 p.m. They discussed school sites, legal issues, and personnel matters.

Re: BOARD/PRESS/VISITOR CONFERENCE

Stephan Jalon appeared before the Board of Education.

RESOLUTION NO. 5-87 Re: AWARD OF PROCUREMENT CONTRACTS

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

MUDDY BRANCH ELEMENTARY SCHOOL (AREA 3)

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

WHEREAS, The Board approved as part of the FY 1988 Capital Budget a request for a supplemental appropriation to the FY 1987 Capital Budget to begin planning the proposed Muddy Branch Elementary School which is scheduled to open in September, 1988; and

WHEREAS, In accordance with Board-approved procedures, staff reviewed the qualifications of firms expressing an interest in providing architectural services for this project and selected the firm of Grimm and Parker Architects as the most suitable architect for the Muddy Branch Elementary School project; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education enter into a contractual agreement with the firm of Grimm and Parker Architects for the required design services and administration of the construction contract for the proposed Muddy Branch Elementary School, for the lump sum total of \$355,000, contingent upon the County Council's approval of a FY 1987 capital budget supplemental appropriation for project planning.

RESOLUTION NO. 8-87 Re: CABLE TV - VARIOUS SCHOOLS

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

WHEREAS, Sealed bids were received on January 6, 1987, for installation of a cable television/telecommunications network at Lucy V. Barnsley, Meadow Hall, and Maryvale Elementary Schools and Earle B. Wood Junior High School as indicated below:

BIDDER	LUMP SUM
1. Dickinson-Heffner, Inc.	\$ 62,215.00
2. B & L Services, Inc.	84,500.00
3. Vector Communications	198,765.87

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 \$62,215 be awarded to Dickinson-Heffner, Inc., for installation of a cable television/telecommunications network at Lucy V. Barnsley, Meadow Hall, and Maryvale Elementary Schools and Earle B. Wood Junior High School in accordance with plans and specifications prepared by Von Otto and Bilecky, consulting engineers.

05 Furniture and Equipment	\$14,072	
03 Supplies and Materials		\$14,072

and be it further

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

RESOLUTION NO. 20-87 Re: FY 1987 CATEGORICAL TRANSFER WITHIN THE PROVISION FOR FUTURE SUPPORTED PROJECTS

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

RESOLVED, That the superintendent of schools be authorized to effect within the FY 1987 Provision for Future Supported Projects the following categorical transfer in accordance with the County Council provision for transfers:

CATEGORY	FROM	TO
01 Administration	\$3,500	
02 Instructional Salaries		\$3,500
03 Instructional Other		1,000
04 Special Education	1,000	
07 Transportation		1,400
10 Fixed Charges	1,400	
	-----	-----
TOTAL	\$5,900	\$5,900

and be it further

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

RESOLUTION NO. 21-87 Re: UTILIZATION OF FY 1987 FUTURE SUPPORTED PROJECTS FUNDS FOR THE SPECIAL EDUCATION TRINITY COLLEGE STUDY CENTER

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

RESOLVED, That the superintendent of schools be authorized to receive and expend, within the FY 1987 Provision for Future Supported Projects, an additional \$6,075 supplemental grant from Trinity College to operate a special education professional materials and study center in the following categories:

CATEGORY	AMOUNT
----------	--------

CATEGORY	POSITION	AMOUNT	
02	Instructional Salaries	1.0*	\$12,960
03	Instructional Other		5,362
07	Student Transportation		900
10	Fixed Charges		4,925
		---	-----
TOTAL	1.0		\$24,147

* .5 Teacher (A-D) 10-month, partial year funding
.5 Instructional Assistant, partial year funding

and be it further

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

RESOLUTION NO. 24-87 Re: FY 1987 FUTURE SUPPORTED PROJECTS FUNDS
SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION FROM THE
MONTGOMERY COUNTY INTERAGENCY
COORDINATING BOARD (ICB) FOR
MAINTENANCE OF THE ICB/OCUS COMPUTER
SUPPORT SYSTEM

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

RESOLVED, That the superintendent of schools be authorized, subject to County Council approval, to receive and expend within the FY 1987 Provision for Future Supported Projects, a supplemental appropriation of \$2,500 from the Montgomery County Interagency Coordinating Board (ICB), Office of Community Use of Schools (OCUS), to maintain the ICB/OCUS computer support system in the following category:

CATEGORY	AMOUNT
01 Administration	\$2,500

TOTAL	\$2,500

and be it further

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

RESOLUTION NO. 25-87 Re: MONTHLY PERSONNEL REPORT

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

RESOLVED, That the following appointments, resignations, and leaves of absence for professional and supporting services personnel be

approved: (TO BE APPENDED TO THESE MINUTES)

RESOLUTION NO. 26-87 Re: EXTENSION OF SICK LEAVE

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

WHEREAS, The employees listed below have suffered serious illness; and

WHEREAS, Due to the prolonged illness, the employees' accumulated sick leave has expired; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education grant an extension of sick leave with three-fourths pay covering the number of days indicated:

NAME	POSITION AND LOCATION	NO. OF DAYS
Bowie, Clifton	Compactor Operator I Division of Maintenance	10
Coates, Agnes M.	Bus Operator Area 3 Transportation	30

RESOLUTION NO. 27-87 Re: PERSONNEL REASSIGNMENTS

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

RESOLVED, That the following personnel reassignments be approved:

NAME	FROM	TO
Anna A. Cohen	Classroom Teacher On Pers. Ill. Lv. MEQ+30-18	Instructional Asst. School to be determined Effective: April 1, 1987 Will maintain salary status and retire July 1, 1988
James J. Wall	Classroom Teacher Baker Intermediate MEQ-18	Instructional Asst. School to be determined Effective: Jan. 5, 1987 Will maintain salary status and retire October 1, 1989

RESOLUTION NO. 28-87 Re: DEATH OF DR. MARIAN M. NEALE, CLASSROOM TEACHER AT HIGHLAND VIEW ELEMENTARY

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

WHEREAS, The death on January 3, 1987, of Dr. Marian M. Neale, a classroom teacher at Highland View Elementary School, has deeply saddened the staff and members of the Board of Education; and

WHEREAS, Dr. Neale served the Montgomery County Public Schools for over thirteen years; and

WHEREAS, During that time, Dr. Neale taught a variety of grade levels in elementary and secondary education, as well as serving as a specialist and school coordinator for remedial reading and with the gifted and talented program; and

WHEREAS, Dr. Neale developed a reputation as a highly creative, knowledgeable and tireless educator; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the members of the Board of Education express their sorrow at the death of Dr. Marian M. Neale and extend deepest sympathy to her family; and be it further

RESOLVED, That this resolution be made part of the minutes of this meeting and a copy be forwarded to her family.

Re: REPORT OF RESEARCH AND EVALUATION
COMMITTEE

Mr. Ewing noted that the Board had agreed to schedule the report of the research and evaluation committee at this juncture so that if there would budget issues they would have a chance to take a look at the report and compare it with what Dr. Cody was recommending. The report was before the Board for a more general discussion as well. He chaired the committee, and the members at the time the report was done were Mrs. DiFonzo and Mrs. Praisner. He said that the report was in two parts, a list of recommended research studies and a set of recommendations to deal with ways in which the research and evaluation function could be more useful and productive from the point of view of the Board. He explained that the report reflected the combined judgment of the committee, not that of the Board as a whole or staff although staff members were present at committee meetings. The superintendent had provided a memo dated January 8 which indicated which recommendations were reflected in the budget.

Dr. Cody included virtually everything the committee recommended in his plans though not every thing was reflected as a budget dollar. Dr. Cody commented that part of the research and evaluation committee's report was a series of recommendations on how to make research and evaluation functions more useful to the Board. He thought these were good suggestions. He drew the Board's attention to the last meeting of the committee in which the committee and staff built an agenda. He said that this process if continued was going to do more to give better rationale and better use to research efforts. He said that in a sense research and evaluation needed to be responsive to what was important. This would change over time, and he would caution against some kind of comprehensive research and

evaluation program tied to specific questions which did not allow that kind of meeting to take place and to be influential in determining a research and evaluation agenda. He suggested that this type of meeting be held several times a year. He added that it was framing the questions they needed answers to which was the toughest and most important part of this activity.

Dr. Shoenberg said that this was a wonderfully sophisticated and useful document. He was pleased with the questions it asked. His question had to do with the stance that the committee had taken vis a vis the function of DEA. Much of the report read as if it were based on the assumption that DEA's purpose was to serve the Board per se rather than the system as a whole. Mr. Ewing replied that Dr. Cody has raised this issue. He said it would be clearer to Dr. Shoenberg that this was not their intent if he saw some of the attachments the committee looked at including a listing of plans that DEA had developed. The committee's conclusion was that that list was a good list and met a great many needs of the school system itself. Dr. Cody also said there needed to be the capacity on the part of DEA to respond to any concerns that he or his staff had with regard to specific issues they needed to address. The committee thought that was wise. Therefore, the committee's list was not a comprehensive list but was a compilation of high priority areas for Board consideration. They tried to focus on areas that might be of concern to the Board but not to assume that the sole function of DEA was to serve the Board.

Dr. Cronin commented that this was one of the concerns he had initially in the formation of the committee. He had a question about the committee beginning to give direction to DEA as the "Board" rather than as a committee. He noted that DEA had an oversight committee, and he wondered how the two committees worked together to give DEA direction. Dr. Steve Frankel, director of DEA, replied that this was not a problem. The oversight committee was established originally to insure that DEA would stay within bounds and now the committee looked at how they did what they did. He commented that the question he was asked most frequently was how DEA decided what to study. The answer in regard to research was that they followed the wishes of the Board and the superintendent. Under the policy, DEA was not permitted to initiate study but they were not above selling ideas. Studies were done only with the consent of the Board and the superintendent.

Dr. Cronin asked if there had been conflicting directions concerning the Board committee and the oversight committee. Dr. Frankel replied that it had never happened. In fact, through nine years and three superintendents, they had never had a study stopped.

Mr. Ewing remarked that the committee never thought it spoke for the Board. Their recommendations were to the superintendent and were in front of the Board for discussion. They did not presume to instruct Dr. Cody on behalf of the Board or Dr. Frankel and his staff to start any studies. He commented that the superintendent had played a very substantial role in what it was the committee ended up recommending.

Dr. Cody suggested that at some point they discuss the specifics. He had put specific studies in the budget because they planned to do it anyway or he had become convinced during the process that the studies should be in the budget. There were also other things in the budget for study that were not in the committee's report. Dr. Cody said his understanding of the role of the committee was that it was a Board advisory committee that would advise him and share its advice with the Board. He had never viewed the committee which would make decisions. Mrs. DiFonzo pointed out that the committee meetings were publicized, and any Board members who wanted to was free to come and provide their input.

Mr. Ewing suggested they might want to look at the listings of studies. He called attention to what the committee was recommending in the way of procedures. He remarked that what made the meeting in November so useful was that they had looked at an agenda prior to that because they had requested a complete list of the topics on the plate for DEA. They were suggesting having that information available in an orderly form they could review and discuss. They were not attempting to make the process rigid or inflexible.

Dr. Cody found the report very well prepared, and he agreed with the recommendations particularly the idea of the literature searches. In the studies themselves, there was only one he thought he might have difficulty with (k) an analysis of administrative structure of the school system. He thought they had had a number of studies on this subject. Dr. Frankel replied that they had not addressed this issue. There was nothing in DEA looking at the administrative; however, there were pieces of it such as a report on staff development training. Dr. Cody commented that in terms of the budget there was no money earmarked for that purpose, but that did not mean there was no some work to be done in that area. This could be either a study by DEA or a staff activity. Dr. Cronin thought they had done this study area with the area study. Dr. Shoenberg agreed that they had an area office study which took the point of view of the area office. The report in k) would be to look at the system as a whole and raise issues about central functions versus area functions versus local school functions.

Dr. Cody recalled that two years ago the question of additional staffing needed for the area office came up during budget sessions. He had suggested a study, and Peat Marwick came out with a report suggesting additional staffing. A year ago those positions were put in the budget. They also proposed some organizational changes, and the senior staff looked at management principles and had recently returned to that topic.

Mr. Ewing recalled that the issue arose in part because of some of the reactions to the area office study. That look was focused on one element of administration and did not seem to be able to come to grips with how that fitted with everything MCPS was trying to do. Another consideration was the Council's view on administration. A study would be useful to explain the functions of the central and

area offices.

Dr. Pitt saw this not so much as studying the school system from the point of view of central or area administration, but rather analyzing the way they were now administering the school system. He saw this as a very different kind of look.

Mrs. DiFonzo asked if they needed to accept the report formally or note the report as having been duly discussed. Dr. Shoenberg replied that the report was on the right track and that they should instruct the committee to keep going on. Mrs. DiFonzo stated that there was consensus for that point of view.

*Mrs. Praisner left the meeting during this discussion, and Mrs. DiFonzo assumed the chair.

RESOLUTION NO. 29-87 Re: EXECUTIVE SESSION - JANUARY 26, 1987

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

WHEREAS, The Board of Education of Montgomery County is authorized by Section 10-508, State Government Article of the ANNOTATED CODE OF MARYLAND to conduct certain of its meetings in executive closed session; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education of Montgomery County hereby conduct its meeting in executive closed session beginning on January 26, 1987, at 7:30 p.m. to discuss, consider, deliberate, and/or otherwise decide the employment, assignment, appointment, promotion, demotion, compensation, discipline, removal, or resignation of employees, appointees, or officials over whom it has jurisdiction, or any other personnel matter affecting one or more particular individuals and to comply with a specific constitutional, statutory or judicially imposed requirement that prevents public disclosures about a particular proceeding or matter as permitted under the State Government Article, Section 10-508; and that such meeting shall continue in executive closed session until the completion of business.

RESOLUTION NO. 30-87 Re: MINUTES OF NOVEMBER 11, 1986

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

RESOLVED, That the minutes of November 11, 1986, be approved.

RESOLUTION NO. 31-87 Re: MINUTES OF NOVEMBER 17, 1986

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Mr. Ewing seconded by Dr. Shoenberg, the following resolution was adopted with

Dr. Cronin, Mrs. DiFonzo, Mr. Ewing, Dr. Shoenberg, and (Mr. Steinberg) voting in the affirmative; Mr. Goldensohn abstaining:

RESOLVED, That the minutes of November 17, 1986, be approved.

RESOLUTION NO. 32-87 Re: MINUTES OF NOVEMBER 18, 1986

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

RESOLVED, That the minutes of November 19, 1986, be approved.

RESOLUTION NO. 33-87 Re: MINUTES OF NOVEMBER 19, 1986

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

RESOLVED, That the minutes of November 19, 1986, be approved.

RESOLUTION NO. 34-87 Re: MINUTES OF NOVEMBER 24, 1986

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

RESOLVED, That the minutes of November 24, 1986, be approved.

RESOLUTION NO. 35-87 Re: MINUTES OF DECEMBER 4, 1986

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

RESOLVED, That the minutes of December 4, 1986, be approved.

RESOLUTION NO. 38-87 Re: BOARD APPEAL NO. 1985-10

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

RESOLVED, That the Board agree to the settlement in Appeal No. 1985-10 and that the appeal be dismissed and a written decision and order to that effect be provided to the Board.

*Mrs. Praisner rejoined the meeting at this point and assumed the chair.

Re: BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS

1. Mr. Ewing noted that the Board had received the monthly financial

report as an item of information. It occurred to him that given some communications they had had from the Council that it might be worthwhile sending the Council an explanation of what these monthly statements meant. Mrs. Praisner reported that was pursuing doing this verbally.

2. Mr. Ewing reported that the Board had received a report on transfer activity, and Dr. Cody had said in the paper that he would report to the Board before the next transfer period. That period came up fairly soon. Dr. Pitt explained that this would be for the following year.
3. Mrs. Praisner said they had been advised today that the Commission on Excellence in Teaching would like more time to put together their recommendations and prepare for their formal presentation to the Board. She would contact the chairperson to reschedule the report. She wanted the public to know that the meeting for January 27 has been postponed.
4. Mrs. Praisner reported that the Board was continuing on schedule with the process for selecting a new superintendent. A brochure was being prepared, and Korn/Ferry had been hired as a consultant. Advertisements had appeared in the New York TIMES and the Washington POST. She reminded the public that the Board was in the process of soliciting comments and would be holding a meeting on Saturday, January 24, to give citizens an opportunity to meet with Board members to discuss those characteristics. The Board would also be meeting with specific employee associations and MCCPTA.
5. Mrs. Praisner said she would put her comments on the transfer activity report in writing. She asked the superintendent to share the timetable for that review before the next year's transfer activity started.
6. In regard to the final report of the Reading Study, Mrs. Praisner asked about a timetable for gathering staff comments and what the superintendent's plans were regarding the recommendations of the report. She also asked for information about in-service associated with the reading program each year since the Board adopted the program in 1981 and what was included in the 87-88 budget. Dr. Cody explained that this study was based on collecting data and analyzing that date. It did not reflect what took place last year in terms of the effort to improve reading and what was taking place this year. Having said that, he would still provide Mrs. Praisner with the information she requested.
7. Mr. Ewing recalled that the commissioners of Poolesville had requested a meeting with the Board regarding the elementary schools there. He wondered if the meeting was going to be held and when. Mrs. Praisner said she was going to ask whether some Board members should meet or whether staff should attend.
8. Mrs. Praisner reminded Board members that on January 26, at 2 p.m. the education committee would be dealing with the Board's capital improvements program.

RESOLUTION NO. 39-87 Re: SCHOOL CALENDAR FOR 1987-88

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

WHEREAS, The number of duty days for employees is negotiable; and

WHEREAS, For the purposes of planning, budget development, and providing tentative information to parents and staff members a calendar is needed; and

WHEREAS, If the need arises from negotiations, this calendar can be revised; and

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 1987-88 be adopted, subject to negotiations of the number of duty days.

Re: RICHARD MONTGOMERY INTERNATIONAL
BACCALAUREATE PROGRAM

Mrs. Praisner stated that the concern was that the brochure being shared with the community implied that the program was for gifted students.

Mrs. DiFonzo called attention to the second panel on the inside of the brochure. She suggested that staff look at this language. It should say something to the effect that if a student wanted an IB degree they needed to take certain courses, but the student was not precluded from buying into as many of the other courses as the student wanted and not pursuing that degree. It was her understanding that the IB program would not be targeted at gifted and talented students. She thought they had to do a better job of reaching out to all students who would be willing to do the work required for any element of the program.

Dr. Shoenberg said he realized the brochure did not say that this was a curriculum for gifted and talented students, but it used language which implied this. He did not believe that any student was going to do well in the program who wasn't academically committed. It seemed to him that the tone of the brochure and the mailing list used for the brochure implied it was for gifted and talented students. He provided several specific suggestions for improving the brochure.

Dr. Cody said they would respond to questions about the brochure. He commented that they had one of the most exciting things that had come along in Montgomery County in a long time. He did not think the issue of using certain words in the brochure should be an issue. He said for students going into this program they were making a commitment to those students that they would excel. He was concerned that in the beginning stages of trying to describe what was to be an outstanding opportunity for young people in Montgomery County that they were challenging the major thrust of the program.

Dr. Shoenberg stated that there was no one more enthusiastic about the availability of the program. He wanted to see it presented in a

way that people who participate in it were not going to be disappointed with it or disillusioned by it. This was the reason for his concern.

Mrs. Praisner suggested that a committee could not write a brochure. She knew there was a strong commitment around the table to make the program a success and that all students wanting to participate could feel they were not excluded from participating. Another issue was to insure everyone had the information about the program.

Dr. Shoenberg asked if there would be another brochure describing to students that they could take additional IB courses and not be part of the IB program. Dr. Robert Shekletski, associate superintendent, explained that this was their first cut. The students receiving the brochure needed to have certain prerequisites to go into the pre-IB program and on to the IB if they so chose. In the meetings with JIM counselors and principals it was made clear to them that it was not only available to the students meeting these prerequisites. Other students were to be encouraged to participate. There would be follow-up meetings to deliver that same message. He did not believe the group had talked about a second brochure.

Dr. Tom Quelet, principal of Richard Montgomery High School, reported that the level of interest had their phones ringing off the hook. There had been two newspaper articles mentioning that the program was open to any student. They would be holding their first orientation session tomorrow night. They would look at the issue of a second brochure. Dr. Cody remarked that in terms of informing and trying to attract students, the brochure was only a small piece of the efforts.

Mr. Ewing noted that the letter from Karen Baker and the special program task force that stated that it would not be a school within a school and would be open to honors and non-honors students. It also stated that courses could be taken by students not enrolled in the full program. All of these things were in the brochure but were not as apparent to the reader. He recalled that on December 9, when the Board adopted the name for the program. An element of the discussion was that the Board did not need to go into the details of the program then because it would come back to the Board for further discussion. It didn't. If the task force was scheduled to have a meeting tomorrow, he remained uneasy about it because it did not fully reflect what he thought they were doing. He was a strong supporter of the program, but he believed they had a problem here. Mr. Bill Henry, director of information, remarked that the brochure was written by a committee and needed to be taken and edited. He agreed that it needed a good rewrite.

Mrs. Baker expressed her appreciation to the Board for their comments because they had addressed the sensitive issues the community was concerned about. Mrs. Praisner remarked that no one could question the Board's interest in the program. She asked that the Board be informed about the modifications being made and assured that the program was available beyond the gifted students. She asked about efforts being made beyond the brochure to ensure that students from

outside of that school and community were involved in and encouraged to enroll in the program.

Re: ITEMS OF INFORMATION

Board members received the following items of information:

1. Items in Process
2. Construction Progress Report
3. Monthly Financial Report
4. Report on Transfer Activity
5. Reading Study

Re: ADJOURNMENT

The president adjourned the meeting at 3:55 p.m.

PRESIDENT

SECRETARY

WSC:mlw