

Dr. Cody reported that he had asked Dr. Paul Vance and Mrs. Nancy Perkins to be present to answer questions. He explained that they were not taking issue with the formal policy; however, the most important thing was that the policy itself conveyed a message to citizens. If the policy went out in this form it was likely to short circuit what was a very extensive and responsive set of informal steps that were taken. He had had discussions with Cliff Baacke and a group of principals, and from comments, attention had been directed to the informal aspect of resolving problems. This was also raised at an executive staff discussion. A lot of problems were resolved by informal discussions at the school level or the area office level. It was very important to capture that informal resolution of problems and include it in the policy. Mrs. Perkins stated that principals wanted to be responsive and resolve problems on an informal basis. The formal process should be started only when issues were unresolvable. This should be the exception to the rule rather than the rule.

Mrs. Praisner understood that staff had not seen the modifications made by Mr. Titus which spoke to some of the concerns being raised and were reacting to the original document. Mr. Fess indicated that staff had not seen the second document.

Dr. Cody said that he did not want to minimize the importance of the formal process. He agreed that the formal steps should be taken before a matter got to his office.

Dr. Shoenberg said he had not had a chance to compare the two documents, and some of the questions may have been taken care of. He agreed with Dr. Cody that they ought to use informal processes to the degree possible. He did have a problem with the title, Community Involvement Policy, because this was a complaint policy. Mr. Fess noted that the second draft was now entitled, "Citizen Complaint." Dr. Shoenberg noted that the brochure starts out, "The Board of Education and the staff of the Montgomery County Public Schools...." One of the problems they had was that citizens thought the Board of Education was the point of first recourse on some issues and complaints. He wondered if it made sense to have the Board of Education as the first words in the brochure when they were trying to get problems resolved informally. Mrs. Praisner suggested starting with, "The Montgomery County Public Schools wish...." Mr. Ewing said that he did not disagree, but he thought they should find a way to strengthen the point by making a statement that the Board of Education as a matter of policy wants to have problems resolved at the school level whenever possible, and this procedure was designed to accomplish this. It seemed to Dr. Shoenberg that there should be something to suggest to the person submitting the complaint that he or she ought to be sure to keep copies of original letters.

Mr. Ewing had a comment about the last sentence in the first paragraph of the brochure where they encouraged citizens to contact

three people for assistance. The implication was that you could call all three or any one, but that you should call these people first. He was not sure they wanted to say that. He thought they were really saying that if you had a complaint that you hadn't been able to resolve in informal discussions then you ought to follow the procedure in the brochure. If the person needed advice on the process, then the person could call someone, but he was not sure the numbers belonged in this place in the brochure. He suggested that perhaps this should be included later in the brochure.

Dr. Cronin was concerned about the time it would take to resolve a complaint. If the complaint was not resolved informally at the school level, it could take anywhere from two to two and a half months. If a person started in September, it might be November before the person heard back on the first level of decision. Therefore, it could take a semester to resolve a complaint.

Mr. Fess explained that in talking with staff there was a desire to have a speedy resolution within the formal process with appropriate documentation. This took time, and he did not think pragmatically that they could speed it up much more. He was concerned that they have a clear understanding of the timelines of the informal process so that someone did not get stonewalled before going into the formal process.

Dr. Vance agreed with Mr. Fess about the timing. He explained a lot of the timeline depended on the time of the year the complaint was filed. For example, a complaint filed at the beginning of the school year would be handled with much more dispatch than a complaint filed in the spring when the area offices were in the middle of staffing and the transfer process. He stressed that the area superintendents felt the timeline provided was the maximum amount of time allowed.

Dr. Cronin asked whether they had any process built in to have a periodic monitoring of the time it took for an appeal to work its way through the process. Mr. Fess replied that at the end of the transfer appeal process a study was done by the superintendent's office and his office. He did not know of any studies of other appeals. Mrs. Praisner thought that with the documentation now required they might be able to review the timing in the future. Mr. Fess said that by building a record they should be able to cut down on the time required. Dr. Pitt thought that his office or the superintendent's office could do a periodic check. Dr. Cody stated that this could be a simple analysis or a full DEA study.

Mrs. DiFonzo thought that the remarks made by Mr. Fess were on target. She had had occasion to pursue a complaint informally, and although it was handled as expeditiously as possible from the school to the area level it took from late February to the end of May before she, her husband, and the area associate were able to get together. She did not feel they were being stonewalled, but it did take a long time for the affected parties to get together because of their schedules. While the formal process did take a lot of time, she did not know how they could expect school officials to complete the process any faster. They need to give those people adequate time to

respond professionally.

With regard to the process, Mr. Ewing said that the process was reasonable in the time period allotted because it involved notice, due process, and reviews at higher levels which were bound to take a couple of months. He believed that about 90 plus percent of citizen concerns about the operation of the school system got dealt with in the informal process. Therefore, they were talking about a very small number complaints reaching this level of formality, with very few coming to the Board of Education. In terms of the brochure, he suggested that it be changed to "how to file a complaint" because people knew how to make complaints.

Mrs. Slye noted that on the first page of the brochure if one read it literally it would appear that if the complaint was not resolved with the staff member directly involved that the complaint would go into the formal process. There should be some indication here as to how many staff members one could contact before jumping into the formal process.

Dr. Cronin pointed out that there was reference to a letter being sent to advise a person of the date and place of a meeting. The date might not be acceptable to the person; therefore, he thought they should start off with a letter or a call to arrange a date and time. Mrs. Praisner suggested that staff take the suggestions and comments made by Board members and also look at the second version of the proposed policy. If Board members had additional suggestions, they should provide them to Mr. Fess within a week. The next step would be to bring a revised or superintendent recommended policy and process for resolving citizen complaints to a future Board meeting. At that time, the policy would lay on the table for several weeks prior to Board adoption. She thanked staff and Mr. Roger Titus for the work they had done on the proposed policy.

Re: MINORITY EDUCATION

Mrs. Praisner reported that this discussion had been scheduled for the January evening meeting which had been snowed out. It was scheduled this morning to allow Board members to have a discussion of the issue prior to the completion of budget action. She acknowledged that the timing of this discussion was not as convenient for the community as they would have liked.

Dr. Cody asked Dr. Paul Scott, director of minority education coordination, and members of the executive staff to come to the table. He said that he needed to make a few comments to put the paper in perspective. Three years ago they established improving the achievement and participation of minority students as a priority for the entire school system. Implicit in that commitment was the firm belief that minority students could achieve as well as their counterparts, and that it was the school system's responsibility to create the conditions and provide the resources and leadership to realize that goal. While he could not say that they had achieved that goal, there were many constructive and successful things that

had occurred. Minority students had demonstrated significant progress in many areas.

Dr. Cody stated that a major premise in their planning and activities had been that the best approach was to build commitment to this priority by giving local school staffs and principals the responsibility to meet the needs of their student population. He believed that this was the best approach because it stimulated initiative, creativity, and ownership of the goals and the priority. As he viewed the progress they had made in the past three years, his conviction that they took the right road had been enforced.

Dr. Cody reported that each of the area associates could cite school after school and program after program where minority students had made remarkable gains. He believe the minigrant program had been an important element because it had bankrolled initiative and creativity. He cited PADI as another program making a significant difference.

Dr. Cody said that as they headed into the fourth year of their work he felt a growing sense of urgency about the distance they had yet to cover. It was perplexing to him that the progress made had been neither as uniform nor as consistent as they had hoped and expected. There were schools showing much progress and schools showing little progress. He believed that in the years ahead the school system must more aggressively pinpoint areas of weakness and make intensive efforts to accomplish needed changes. An important part of this process was the identification, recognition, and dissemination of the more successful efforts. The initiatives he was proposing would help them do this.

Dr. Cody stated that accountability must be given a higher priority in their planning and actions. He had distributed a memorandum to the Board which outlined steps to strengthen this accountability. In the spring of this year each school would be required to establish improvement objectives for Priority 2 and would be held accountable for progress made. This approach was already taking place in Area 1 and a very similar process was being worked out in Area 2. Schools that made progress would be recognized for doing so. Schools that were not making progress would be identified and audited by professionals from the central and area office. These schools would be required to modify their plans or would be given new directions. The progress of schools would be reported to the superintendent and Board on a periodic basis.

In line with this approach, Dr. Cody said that they needed to review their present targets and devise ways to make them responsive to local schools. He pointed out that given the issue of mobility and years in MCPS, they could not expect all schools to have the same kind of guideline that they would apply and hold them accountable countywide.

Dr. Cody believed that in the future they should do a better job of identifying successful programs and practices, validating them, and disseminating them throughout the school system. When they knew

something worked even if they did not know why, they must get the program or practice working in other schools. To do so would require a renewed commitment to foster successful practices and get staff to use them. They were proposing several steps including a series of demonstration labs and centers for dissemination, validation, and training. He believe that this effort would benefit all students in MCPS.

Dr. Cody commented that a tremendous responsibility had fallen to Dr. Scott in his new position. With very little leadtime, he had to assess present efforts, pull them together, and begin to plot next steps. To Dr. Scott's credit, he had produced a useful document. However, Dr. Cody emphasized that the ideas in the paper were not Dr. Scott's alone. They were new directions for the school system, and no individual could be expected to shoulder the responsibility for such a complex and difficult task. For that reason, the associate superintendents were at the table with Dr. Scott.

Dr. Cody reported that the document before the Board was not a plan. It was a series of proposals for changing the way they had been doing business. He believed that these proposals would made a significant difference in Montgomery County. Some were modest in scope and some were major. Some like the dissemination effort would require funds, and others like the accountability process would not. He asked that they go over the six major proposals and have Board member questions and comments. After the discussion they would proceed with the proposals taking into account Board directions and modifications. They would develop a management plan which would include objectives, activities, reporting, timetables and the persons responsible.

Dr. Cody commented that in retrospect they believed they had had a plan, but they really had not put together a total document which captured all of their efforts. He thought that within two or three months they would have a plan for the Board. He emphasized that the timing was critical because this would need to be in place in the schools in May. He presented the Board with an outline of a timetable they expected to follow.

Dr. Scott said he would provide the Board with a brief historical context for the paper before the Board and share some personal reflections on his four month tenure in a new role. Secondly, he wanted to highlight some of the major recommendations and third, he wanted to comment on the section on next steps.

Dr. Scott stated that at the direction of the superintendent he spent the first few months pulling together all information on efforts related to Priority 2. It became clear that what began as a priority focusing on 11 achievement and participation areas in 1983 had grown to include monitoring suspensions and a major suspension project, a special education initiative which focused on the disproportionate numbers of minority students in special education, a minority recruitment team, and a yearly review process including all 154 schools as well as every department and area office. Out of the assessment grew a framework for future progress which identified five

components: instruction and school programs, staff employment and promotion, training and staff development, community outreach, and research and evaluation. Five staff committees appointed by the superintendent spent the month of December working with him to review progress to date and distance remaining before it could be said that all races and groups are being well served in MCPS.

Dr. Scott reported that he had spent much of his time meeting with community leaders and speaking to concerned community groups as well as other professional educators nationally and locally. Many of the same questions and comments were made. Is the Board of Education really serious about this issue? Are they willing to tackle some of the more systemic matters related to Priority 2? How will the change in leadership affect this effort? How does MCPS intend to hold those in authority accountable? How can you, Dr. Scott, do this by yourself?

Dr. Scott commented that there seemed to be a strong belief on the part of MCPS staff, parents, and community leaders in the efficacy of this priority, but there was also a growing sense of urgency to translate these beliefs into positive experiences for children. He shared this sense of urgency as he believed the Board of Education did. He said that both careful and thoughtful planning and a will to act would be needed to realize the goals that had already been set and the initiatives that were proposed.

Dr. Scott reported that the paper discussed present initiatives and progress to date, present efforts and their analysis of need. They were proposing six categories of changes which were summarized on page 11. The first called for the strengthening of existing school- and area-based strategies. A major change would be to assign to the area office the responsibility for deployment and coordination of staff and material resources. Another element under this initiative was the development of an area/school-based accountability model for clear recognition of outstanding results as well as providing support and direction to those schools that were less successful.

Dr. Scott said that the second was to identify and expand centrally supported programs such as PADI, METS, and TESA. The third group of initiatives focused on the validation and dissemination of successful school programs and practices. It proposed multiple approaches to dissemination including a sharing of ideas in a newsletter entitled "Successful Strategies for Successful Schools." It also called for the systematic examination of practices by the Department of Educational Accountability. The demonstration sites or lab schools would provide a forum for identification of successful practices in addition to serving as a center for staff development and training. Dr. Scott said the fourth group called for improving assessment, accountability and monitoring procedures. They would need to develop outcome measures for schools. The fifth set of initiatives spoke to the need to strengthen community outreach efforts and provide an opportunity for parents, staff, and community organizations to work together to achieve improved communication and support.

Dr. Scott reported that the final category of initiatives was the authorization of a formal affirmative staffing policy. Although significant progress had been made in the employment of minorities in selected positions, categories of positions with little minority representation still existed. He said that following the discussion and review by the Board and with the approval of the superintendent, they would begin immediately to translate these initiatives into action. Plans would be completed by July with full implementation scheduled for September.

Dr. Cronin commented that support for minority education was paramount, and it was the prime function of the Board and staff to educate all children. He said he thought several questions might come up. If they had set this priority for three years, if they had set targets and needed to go back and revise targets, and if they were looking for outcome measures and measures of accountability, what would they say to the community that would assure them that this time they meant it. This time they meant to do it right, and there would be consequences if it did not happen.

Dr. Cody did not think the measures they had, including the California Achievement Test, Project Basic tests, and participation measures, needed to be changed as goals. The timeframe would just take longer. The measures applied to individual schools did not recognize the turnover in student bodies. Therefore, they were shifting from a statement about the school system to a statement for which individual schools would be held responsible.

Dr. Cronin stated that a goal was only accomplished by the teacher in the classroom and by the principal in the school, not by a statement of wish. He asked if Dr. Scott or the area offices have sufficient authority and staff to monitor the process. Dr. Cody believed that the overall monitoring could be and should be done with existing resources.

Dr. Vance stated that the proposals in front of the Board could be done, but it would require a dramatic change in operational policy at the area level. They were going to need sufficient staff to supervise and monitor and support the schools. They were going to have to change the role of the instructional supervisor to a monitoring one with the authority to be more directive. The area offices would have to improve their assessment capability, which suggested that someone from DEA might be assigned to the area office staff. He believe this could be done, but it depended upon the extent to which the Board was willing to empower the area office to do this. He said that the executive staff under the superintendent's leadership could begin fine tuning the accountability model.

Mr. Ewing commented that Dr. Scott had made the remark that they all shared a growing sense of urgency about this problem. Mr. Ewing said he was well beyond that point. He now had intense impatience bordering on anger about the progress they had not made. While there had been progress on the CAT for all students, there had not been the achievement of real and dramatic growth in the accomplishments of minority students. They had not really grasped what it was that needed to be done.

Mr. Ewing said that while he did not object to the general themes in the report, he had the feeling that they were doing what they always did which was to assemble committees, review progress, develop and announce plans, and leave it to the people in the schools to do what they would do. There were no consequences for failure for the schools, but there were consequences for failure for the students. He was alarmed by the sense that they had an accountability model which allowed every school administration choosing to do so to escape accountability. He was convinced that they did not have an accountability process that made people genuinely accountable. Mr. Ewing remarked that after almost four years it was still not clear to him what individual schools were doing, what they had accomplished, and what the results had been. It was not clear to him that if they adopted certain strategies they would know that the consequences for students were the results of those activities. They had a set of test scores and a set of activities and no relationship that they could point to and say this caused that to happen. He noted that based on what was in the report they still would not know whether what they were doing was the right thing to do.

Mr. Ewing stated that he liked the notion of looking at effective practices, validating them, and disseminating them. He was pleased to hear Dr. Cody say that dissemination might require issuing orders to people to implement certain kinds of practices. However, he had a great sense of unease about all of this. He said it was pointless to complain further about what they could have been doing in the last four years. He just did not want to waste any more time with more committees, more plans, and more activities to go on doing things in a routine way. If he were asked to vote on the paper this minute, he would vote no. He was angry about the absence of clarity and specificity after all this time.

Mr. Ewing hoped that they did not continue to make the same errors in the future, but he saw them all laid out for them to do over again in the paper before the Board. He explained that this was not a criticism of any particular individual, certainly not Dr. Scott, but it was the view that what needed to be done had yet to be identified with the dramatic urgency the system ought to be exhibiting as it faced up to the task before it.

Mr. Ewing explained that he wanted an accountability model which stated that they would know what each school was to do in terms of how it would accomplish the goals of the school system. He wanted to know what each school was going to do to accomplish its own goals. He wanted a public report from the school system because it was time for them to be fully and publicly accountable in ways that got them to make judgments about just how well each school was doing in meeting the Board's goals.

Dr. Cody observed that no one discussing the accountability plan had the view that each school could simply choose its own objectives separate and apart from the priorities of the school system. Schools needed to come up with statements that would define the criteria by

which success or lack of it would be determined.

Mrs. Slye stated that she was extremely concerned that their focus had been and appeared to be continuing to be those objective measures that apply primarily to the latter part of the student's career. A learner's pattern was fairly well established before Grade 3. She thought they had to agree at some point that a significant part of their focus must be on the earliest educational experience for those children who were with the school system for a long period of time. This was not to say that they couldn't and shouldn't hold themselves responsible for successful intervention at later points in an academic career. Unfortunately she did not see specific outcome measures specifically targeted toward improving progress at the earliest levels.

Dr. Cronin asked if there was a way in which the Board would receive reports on the yearly success of particular schools. Dr. Cody replied that when they talked about success measures they were really talking about student outcome measures and student participation. There were a whole series of other things that a school should look at in terms of self assessment. He emphasized that they were talking about accountability which included pupil achievement, participation, suspensions, and staffing. If there were other things that the Board thought ought to be measured as outcome measures, they would be accountability measures. The Board would get criteria statements that would be applied to local schools in evaluating where they were and in terms of schools having objectives for what they were supposed to work on and accomplish. For example, in some schools where the staffing ratio was below a reasonable proportion, the schools would have that as an objective.

It seemed to Dr. Cody that they had to come back to the Board as to what the local school accountability criteria were doing. He said that this was a Board decision. The Board would receive regular reports on progress monitored and data collected. This would be an individual school status report of success or lack of success, the kind of thing the area associate would be working with. He thought that schools that were successful or were making progress in areas needed to be publicly recognized.

Mrs. Praisner commented that Dr. Vance had raised the issue of support and the relationship of the area office to the local school. It seemed to her that all of this was going to require a considerable amount of commitment, not only at the school level but at the area office level as far as the relationship that needed to develop in both monitoring and providing support and resources. She said that they did not have that model right now, and this had significant budgetary implications for the future. She wondered about institutionalizing further frustration by not having the support that was necessary or by asking for an outcome that was not practically possible if those resources were not available to the local school. It seemed to her that if they were going to talk about this issue from the standpoint of reviewing outcome measure, monitoring, and providing coordination, they were going to need to spend a lot more

time at the table talking about the area office and the way it was constituted and the resources needed beyond this budget. She was also concerned that any improvements in the area office would be defined as administration, but this was significant support to the local school that they were talking about.

Dr. Pitt commented that they might not get all the support that they thought they needed at any level, and he did not think this plan ought to be contingent upon that. He thought there were resources available to give support and ways to strengthen the area office, and staff was working on these. He said that if they had the commitment, there were many things they could do with the funds they had now. He was not going to argue the point because they did need more resources, but he would not want to tie the program totally to that. He said they were going to move toward the concept of reporting to the Board in terms of identifying where a school was in relation to the criteria that had been established for that school. They would show what they had done in terms of supplying resources and support, and what programs they felt the school needed to succeed. The area office would have to work with the school in saying what needed to be done in that school and would have to monitor and report on what had been done.

Dr. Cody noted that MCPS was one of the few systems capable of doing research to validate a particular program. On the other hand, when there was a need and something needed to change to improve the education of students, they had to do the best they could without validated information. He thought that the dissemination part of the program would need funds, but in regard to accountability and management, he was talking about people doing something different from what they had been doing. For example, if a school was not making progress, people from the area office and the central office would have to spend time in that school and try to identify weaknesses and strengths.

Dr. Cronin inquired about trigger points, and Dr. Cody explained that this went back to defining the criteria that they would apply against outcome measures. They would evaluate a school and its objectives would be set. At the end of a year, the data for determining progress would be reviewed. Each school would have not only criteria and data to analyze criteria but would have objectives of what it was to accomplish. They would have to work out what the trigger was over the next several months. In his mind, schools would fall into three categories of accomplishing all objectives, accomplishing some, and making no progress in one or several. If a school had made little or no progress, then it was time to call in the outside troops to find out what was going on. He did not think this would involve a large number of schools.

Dr. Shoenberg stated that the research effort was intimately tied with the accountability effort. Board members had the real concern that they had not had a model that fixed accountability at levels where it made a difference. A lot of faith was being put in a research effort from which they expected much. However, if they

wanted to know that something worked, they might have three somethings going on. It might be difficult to know which of these actions produced the results. The temptation was to allow the research agenda to drive the program agenda, and they needed to resist that. They needed to do what had to be done, and not worry so much that they were going to get clean results.

Dr. Shoenberg noted that the task they were trying to accomplish with minority students was not unrelated to what they were trying to do with students who were socioeconomically disadvantaged or who had language difficulties. The report included efforts that had been undertaken which included Chapter I, Head Start, ESOL/Bilingual, and the special education initiatives. There was some overlap of those problems, but they must be understood in some appropriate relationship to each other. They were not the same problem. His third point was that a priority meant a priority. They had a tendency to be concerned with any major problem they had before them at the time. This one was a priority, and they were concerned about lack of success here and had put in a good deal of funding. They could not make a lot of other things priorities as well. They had to focus their efforts and funding on priorities. A lot of the plans did not have to do with funding but with the ways in which people were asked to do things and focus their efforts. If they focused their efforts here, they would not be focusing their efforts someplace else.

In regard to the research issue, Mr. Ewing commented that when everything was going fine and problems were being addressed, no one bothered about research. People did research when they had a troublesome, difficult, and unresolved problem. They had a lot of things going on in the area of educating black children, but they really didn't know for sure whether those things were working. However, they all could not be working well because they would be doing better with black children. Doing more wasn't necessarily going to be the way to get the answer, unless they knew what more was, what and why. This was the point of going some evaluation and some research. He didn't care about clean results, but he did care about the preponderance of the evidence. He wanted to know whether something worked better than something else. He had heard that PADI, TESA, and METS were good things, but how did he know they were good when he was not getting black children educated the way black children ought to be educated. They were not going to get at this by receiving bland assurances that if they appropriated more money they could have more and more of these programs. They needed direction, authority, priority, and commitment in dramatic ways to get things done.

Mrs. Praisner suggested that Board members focus on some of the other issues in the time remaining. It seemed to Dr. Cronin that they were expressing their anger and frustration. He would rather say "no more," and ask the staff what they were going to do about this situation now.

It seemed to Mrs. Praisner that at some point they needed a

discussion of the lab school and its relationship to the whole plan and the budgetary implications of the school. They were going to have to talk about the way the area offices were organized to effect the kind of success they wanted.

Dr. Shoenberg stated that he saw \$120,000 to plan something, but they wouldn't know what it was to be before they planned it. He asked if one of the models would be a lab school entirely for minority students. Dr. Scott replied that the lab school idea had been around for a while, and the National Alliance of Black Educators was moving in that direction. He saw the lab school was an opportunity to improve dissemination, validate successful practices, and look at new programs. DEA would be involved in this process, and there could be collaboration with local universities. The second part was the notion of staff development and training. There was a need to demonstrate good instruction including high expectations for children. They had many fine teachers who did that quite well. Another function of the lab school was to demonstrate the importance of community involvement in the life of the school. They saw the lab school as one piece of an overall staff development plan. As they talked with people in the school system, they became aware that there were many ways of having a lab school. They could have multiple demonstration sites.

Dr. Cody stated that there were two ways of doing this. One was to identify a school they already had and identify successful practices, install them, and use the school as a demonstration center to try things out and to disseminate information. The other approach involved picking sites where a particular program or activity could be validated as successful. That program would become the demonstration site for the purposes of school visits and staff training. This would lead not to a lab school but to a whole series of sites. One program might have a good community outreach component, and another might have a good program where the expectations of staff had an impact on student learning.

Dr. Shoenberg gathered that they were not talking about establishing a school that did not exist now, arranging its population in some way, and bringing students in to that school from all over. Dr. Cody replied that this idea had not surfaced. Dr. Shoenberg stated that "lab school" conveyed a certain image. They were talking about identifying an existing school that was typical across a whole range of student characteristics and doing a lot of things in that school that had demonstrated effectiveness.

Mr. Ewing thought the description was very helpful. He had proposed something similar about eight years ago to have a center involving itself in the identification, validation, and demonstration of good ideas and effective practices. He thought that people would be confused if they called that a lab school. He suggested that they call it a center of some sort. A lab school implied establishment of an elite school of some sort. He said that the concept of a center had been demonstrated to be effective in other places, and he cited the example of one in the Justice Department for training and research in the field of criminal justice.

Mrs. Praisner asked when they could anticipate some decisions being made about the lab school and budget funds. Dr. Scott replied that the framework could be developed by May. The planning committee appointed by the superintendent would address some of those questions and the overall feasibility of the concept. Dr. Cody said they would have the specifics of what they proposed to do in terms of the specific planning that would go on next year. Mrs. Praisner stated that in May they would have a series of Board action items with the affirmative staffing policy coming in July. Dr. Cody added that they would have an overall plan incorporating the proposed modifications and encompassing the total effort in Montgomery County.

Mrs. Praisner asked for specifics as far as next steps were concerned. Dr. Cody replied that the first one would be adoption of the budget. In February they would have a refinement of the PRAT process. In April they would be receiving information items on the timetables for PADI, METS, and TESA. In May they would have an overall report plus outcome measures, a monitoring and reporting plan, the conceptual framework, and a timetable for developing the demonstration sites.

In regard to the community outreach plan, Dr. Cronin suggested they look at a community "inreach" program as well. He was frustrated that so many educated parents were not finding a way in which to help their children in their education in this school system. He hoped they would help parents become an integral part of their children's education. He thought that the Board should go on record with a statement about Dr. Cody's departure. He appreciated the fact that Dr. Cody was setting up a process which would continue through the transition to a new superintendent. The Board would be looking for a commitment to those plans and that process in a new superintendent. Dr. Shoenberg stated that a lot of people had devoted a lot of thought and effort to developing a series of activities which the Board saw as being highly promising for the school system. A lot of individual schools and individuals within the schools cared deeply about that matter and had devoted a great deal of effort to the education of minority students. That should not go unrecognized as they moved to the next phase.

Mr. Ewing commented that in the budget it looked as if they were going to implement the lab school, but what they had before them was a proposal to plan. Implementation costs might very well exceed the amount in the budget for planning. He suggested that they discuss that when they got to the budget.

Mrs. Praisner stated that it was clear from the discussion that they had made progress and that there was school system commitment to that issue that would continue in the next phase. She thought that Board members had again demonstrated their seriousness about that priority. The next budget would reflect that commitment as well as their time and attention to that matter.

Re: EXECUTIVE SESSION

The Board of Education met in executive session from 12:05 p.m. to 1:30 p.m. *Mr. Goldensohn joined the meeting during executive session. The Board discussed legal issues and personnel matters.

Re: BOARD/PRESS/VISITOR CONFERENCE

The following individuals appeared before the Board of Education:

1. Roscoe R. Nix, National Association for the Advancement of Colored People
2. John W. Smith, Montgomery County Effective Schools Study Group

RESOLUTION NO. 80-86 Re: PROCUREMENT CONTRACTS OVER \$25,000

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

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

WHEREAS, It is necessary to reissue Bid. No. 68-87, Boiler Tube Turbulators, because of changes in specifications and excessive costs; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That Bid No. 68-87 be rejected; and be it further

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

BID	NAME OF VENDOR(S)	DOLLAR AMOUNT
64-87	HVAC Supplies	
	Boland Trane Services, Inc.	\$ 796
	Control Wholesalers, Inc.	2,921
	Fraleay Supply	280
	Johnson Controls, Inc.	11,097
	MCC Powers	18,503
	Melchor/Armstrong/Dessau, Inc.	850
	Dan Rainville & Associates, Inc.	418
	Rockville Air Condition & Supply	389
	Temp Air Co.	6,329

	TOTAL	\$ 41,583
70-87	Office Papers	
	Antietam Paper Co., Inc.	\$130,173
	Barton, Duer & Koch Paper Co.	32,255
	McGregor Printing Corp.	16,260
	Mudge Paper Co.	12,595
	Stanford Paper Co., Inc.	40,185
	Wilcox-Walter Furlong Paper	649,414

TOTAL \$879,882

GRAND TOTAL \$921,465

RESOLUTION NO. 81-87 Re: RECONSIDERATION OF BID 19-87,
TYPEWRITERS

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

RESOLVED, That the Board reconsider its action of November 11, 1986, as it related to Bid 19-87, Typewriters.

RESOLUTION NO. 82-87 Re: RESCISSION OF TYPEWRITER BID

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

WHEREAS, The Board issued Bid No. 19-87 for typewriters for instructional use; and

WHEREAS, Upon the recommendation of the superintendent, the Board, on November 11, 1986, awarded the bid to Tri-County Office Equipment, Inc.; and

WHEREAS, Upon review of protest filed by Swintec, Inc., and reconsideration of the bid by the superintendent and in view of the superintendent's new recommendation, the Board wishes to rescind its previous action of November 11, 1986, awarding the typewriter bid to Tri-County Office Equipment, Inc., and to reject all bids; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education rescind its action of November 11, 1986, on Bid 19-87 awarding the bid for typewriters to Tri-County Office Equipment, Inc.; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the Board, based on the recommendations of the superintendent and the reasons in support of its action, hereby rejects all bids in Bid 19-87.

RESOLUTION NO. 83-87 Re: SEVEN LOCKS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
REROOFING

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

WHEREAS, Sealed bids were received on January 29 for reroofing Seven Locks Elementary School as indicated below:

WHEREAS, The architect, Smolen/Rushing + Associates, Inc., by its letter of January 8, 1987, has asked for an upward adjustment in their contract to reflect these changes; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the contract with Smolen/Rushing + Associates, Inc., be amended from \$280,000 to \$317,500.

RESOLUTION NO. 87-87 Re: PUBLIC EASEMENT - FORMER WOODLEY GARDENS
ELEMENTARY SCHOOL (AREA 2)

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

WHEREAS, The Washington Gas Light Company has requested a subsurface easement through a portion of the Board's property, located at 1150 Carnation Road in Rockville, Maryland, in order to provide gas service to an adjacent property undergoing development; and

WHEREAS, This property together with the improvements thereon, formerly known as the Woodley Gardens Elementary School, has been and continues to be leased to Montgomery County Government until final disposition and transfer of title has been effected; and

WHEREAS, The Montgomery County Government has reviewed the proposed easement and received the approval of the City of Rockville, which subleases the property through its Office of Elderly Affairs; and

WHEREAS, All construction, full restoration, and future maintenance will be performed at no cost to the Board of Education; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the president and secretary be authorized to execute a permanent easement between the Board of Education and the Washington Gas Light Company, consisting of a ten-foot-wide by 660-foot-long area at the former Woodley Gardens Elementary School for the purpose of installing a 6-inch gas pipe line.

RESOLUTION NO. 88-87 Re: CEDAR GROVE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL -
RIGHT-OF-WAY AGREEMENT FOR PUBLIC
UTILITIES (AREA 3)

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

WHEREAS, The Potomac Edison Company has been requested to supply new electric service to the Cedar Grove Elementary School now undergoing construction and modernization; and

WHEREAS, The Potomac Edison Company requires an easement within the Board's property to construct and install the conduit, cables, wires, and other equipment necessary to supply the electric service

01 Administration	\$29,877
10 Fixed Charges	1,390

TOTAL	\$31,267

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 County Council.

RESOLUTION NO. 91-87 Re: UTILIZATION OF FY 1987 FUTURE SUPPORTED PROJECTS FUNDS FOR THE INTENSIVE ENGLISH LANGUAGE PROGRAM

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

RESOLVED, That the superintendent of schools be authorized, within the FY 87 Provisions for Future Supported Projects and subject to County Council approval, to receive and expend a \$13,000 grant amendment 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, in the following categories:

CATEGORY	AMOUNT
02 Instructional Salaries	\$11,575
03 Instructional Other	500
10 Fixed Charges	925

TOTAL	\$13,000

and be it further

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

RESOLUTION NO. 92-87 Re: FY 1987 CATEGORICAL TRANSFER WITHIN THE PROVISION FOR FUTURE SUPPORTED PROJECTS

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Mr. Ewing 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	\$ 2,471	
02 Instructional Salaries		\$11,488
03 Instructional Other		75
04 Special Education	4,424	
07 Transportation	200	
10 Fixed Charges	4,468	
	-----	-----
TOTAL	\$11,563	\$11,563

and be it further

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

RESOLUTION NO. 93-87 Re: FY 1987 SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION TO PROVIDE SUPPLEMENTARY EDUCATIONAL SERVICES TO IMMIGRANT CHILDREN

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Mr. Ewing 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 an FY 1987 supplemental appropriation of \$154,140 from MSDE under the Emergency Immigrant Children Act in the following categories:

CATEGORY	POSITIONS	AMOUNT
02 Instructional Salaries	Teacher Specialist (C-D) 1.0	\$ 89,727
	Therapeutic Counselor 2.0 (Grade 20)	
03 Instructional Other		37,917
10 Fixed Charges		26,496

TOTAL		\$154,140

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. 94-87 Re: FY 1987 SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION TO PROVIDE TRANSITION PROGRAMS FOR REFUGEE CHILDREN

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Mr. Ewing 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 an FY 1987 supplemental appropriation of \$35,792 from MSDE under the Refugee Act

of 1980, for the FY 1984 Transition Program for Refugee Children in the following categories:

CATEGORY	AMOUNT
02 Instructional Salaries	\$33,203
10 Fixed Charges	2,589

TOTAL	\$35,792

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. 95-87 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. 96-87 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 employee listed below has suffered serious illness; and

WHEREAS, Due to the prolonged illness, the employee's 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
Minor, Helen	Instructional Assistant New Hampshire Estates ES	19

RESOLUTION NO. 97-87 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 assignments be approved:

NAME	FROM	TO
------	------	----

Bouey, Eugene F.	Resource Teacher Woodward High School M+30-18	Instructional Assistant To be determined Effective July 1, 1987 will maintain salary status and retire 7-1-88
Gartrell, Eugenia	Classroom Teacher Damascus ES M+30-18	Instructional Assistant To be determined Effective July 1, 1987 will maintain salary status and retire 7-1-88
Gilham, Roy	Classroom Teacher Wheaton Woods ES M+30-18	Instructional Assistant To be determined Effective Feb. 1, 1987 will maintain salary status and retire 1-1-88
Grigsby, Mary	Classroom Teacher Woodfield ES MEQ-18	Instructional Assistant To be determined Effective Feb. 1, 1987 Will maintain salary status and retire 2-1-89
Hamann, Edna	Food Service Delivery Food Services Warehouse 8-F-L1	Cafeteria Worker II Highland ES Effective Feb. 1, 1987 Will maintain salary status and retire 7-1-89
Wetherill, John	Classroom Teacher Walter Johnson HS M+30-18	Instructional Assistant To be determined Effective Feb. 1, 1987 Will maintain salary status and retire 7-1-87
Wright, Calvin	Classroom Teacher Oak View ES M+30-18	Instructional Assistant To be determined Effective July 1, 1987 Will maintain salary status and retire 6-1-89

RESOLUTION NO. 98-87 Re: DEATH OF MRS. DOROTHY V. CARTER, SPECIAL
EDUCATION BUS ATTENDANT, AREA 2
TRANSPORTATION

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 24, 1987, of Mrs. Dorothy V. Carter, a special education bus attendant in Area 2, has deeply saddened the

WHEREAS, Mrs. Morgan was a skilled and creative teacher who used a variety of techniques and materials to teach her students the basic skills and confidence needed in the future; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the members of the Board of Education express their sorrow at the death of Mrs. M. Kathryn Morgan 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 Mrs. Morgan's family.

RESOLUTION NO. 101-87 Re: PERSONNEL APPOINTMENT AND TRANSFER

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

RESOLVED, That the following personnel appointment and transfer be approved:

APPOINTMENT	PRESENT POSITION	AS
Mary Helen K. Smith	Principal Winston Churchill HS	Area Director for Educ. Services Area Admin. Office Grade Q Effective: 2-11-87
TRANSFER	FROM	TO
Diane Ippolito	Principal Woodward HS	Principal Winston Churchill HS Effective July 1, 1987

Dr. Cronin explained that he voted in the negative not because of the quality of the two people involved because it was clear these were outstanding people who would do an outstanding job. He voted in the negative because a year and a half ago the Board had assured the Churchill community they were giving them a strong principal who would remain at that school for some time. This assignment would give that school four principals in a two year period, and he was concerned about the process of community involvement here. Mr. Ewing said he would associate himself with Dr. Cronin's remarks because one and a half years in a principalship was much too short.

RESOLUTION NO. 102-87 Re: PERSONNEL APPOINTMENT

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

RESOLVED, That the following personnel appointment be approved:

APPOINTMENT	PRESENT POSITION	AS
Nancy D. Perkins	Principal Chevy Chase ES	Director of Staffing Dept. of Personnel Grade P Effective 2-11-87

Re: STAFF RESPONSE TO THE REPORT OF THE
COMMITTEE ON THE EDUCATION OF THE
GIFTED AND TALENTED

Mrs. Praisner pointed out that this was another item which had been scheduled for the January meeting which had been snowed out. Dr. Lois Martin, associate superintendent, reported that she had been present at the birth of their efforts in the education of gifted and talented students, and she was pleased by how far they had come.

Dr. Robert Davidson noted that his committee had made 41 recommendations which the Board had before it. He reported that gifted and talented programs had been in place now for well over a decade, and while much remained to be done, most of that had to do with the consistency of program delivery and the quality of the programs. Many of the recommendations spoke to who ought to be providing training to help with supervision of the programs. He noted that there were some grade levels that were not as well served as other grade levels. Their original plan was to start with the upper elementary, go to the J/I/M level, and into the high school, but that plan had not been honored. In fact, they had programs only in the upper elementary and in the high schools, and they ought to pay attention to the J/I/M schools. He also thought they needed to look at the identification of students and service to students in the early elementary grades as well.

Dr. Davidson called attention to the items at the end of their list having to do with equity of access to programs including transportation. He said that if the Board was serious about magnet programs for the gifted and talented they would have to make these programs readily attainable and provide the resources for students to get to the programs.

Ms. Cindy Brandt pointed out that some of their recommendations concerned efforts to serve all gifted and talented students including minority groups, females, learning disabled, handicapped, and non-English speaking. The committee was encouraged by the system's commitment to PADI, and she hoped they would have a similar commitment to the learning disabled gifted and talented students and would expand the pilot. They were concerned that the funds allocated for this program would not be enough, and they hoped that the Board would make a response to this concern in the budget.

Mr. Goldensohn asked if they had discussed having a J/I/M center for students similar to the elementary centers. Dr. Davidson replied

that the committee was not prepared to make that recommendation, but there was a lot of sentiment on the committee for that type of program. He said that in Area 2 there had been discussions with the area superintendent on a possible program for Grades 6, 7, and 8 students. He felt that this population did not move closer to the mean as they got older and still needed the specialized teaching techniques.

Mr. Goldensohn stated that the response to Recommendation 3 did not address the recommendation to "duplicate in appropriate locations programs for which there is sufficient need and demand." Dr. Davidson replied that the recommendation came about because of two things. One was the desire of Area 3 parents to have a program equivalent to that in Blair High School that was accessible to Area 3 students. In addition, in some years there had been larger numbers of students qualified for and interested in the gifted and talented center programs than there had been places for them. Mrs. Praisner recalled that up until a few years ago there was only one center, and now there were centers in each area.

In regard to J/I/M/ school plans, Dr. Pitt recalled that the commitment was made to go with the gifted and talented program at the elementary level. The question of whether they went with gifted and talented special schools other than the magnet had not been decided. Dr. Davidson felt that this was a good policy issue for the Board. Dr. Cronin was glad to see a focus on the J/I/M level, and he planned to address more issues about J/I/M schools in the budget. Dr. Cronin stated that this morning the Board had discussed the education of minority children and the suggestion was made that they focus their efforts on minority education. There was need here also to do something for children at the upper end of the educational scale. He asked how they would monitor this so that within two years they would be someplace. Dr. Davidson replied that for some years now the staff had been running a very successful program at the elementary level. They were finding ways to identify minority students, and programs were located in schools with high minority populations. Another issue was providing those students with the nurture to support their participation in high level academic programs. A lot schools had developed effective ways of doing that through the minigrant program. He felt that good things were being done to get minority participation up to appropriate levels.

Dr. Cronin said he was looking for concerted administrative effort through the system to find children past K-6 which he felt was on target. Dr. Martin thought that if these children were not identified in the primary grades and nurtured then, it was difficult at the J/I/M level to make a difference. She reported that there was a proposal in the budget to expand PADI which did require considerable staff resources to support.

Dr. Shoenberg did not see their efforts regarding minority students as being concentrated on improving the lower end of performance. He called attention to recommendation 7 to "catalyze the delivery of programs by local staff" rather than having special pull-out

programs. He suggested that they take this request of principals, minority student education, mainstreaming, health education, and the thousand other special requests. He recognized that principals and teachers were extraordinary people, but they could not pay attention to everything at once. They had to decide what it was they wanted to pay the most attention to. This was not to say that the recommendations on gifted and talented were not appropriate items to pay attention to. While there should be an effort to get principals to respond, there was a limit to how much could be front and center.

Dr. Shoenberg reported that a number of items responded in terms of teacher training. They knew that they could not reach every teacher or provide the enormous investment in training that that would take. He wondered if there were some other kinds of possibility there in terms of focusing on certain teachers for training in terms of the way they organized for gifted and talented instruction in elementary schools. Those students could be taught by people who had the appropriate training. Dr. Martin explained that by necessity the staff responses were brief. They had been successful in training teachers to differentiate instruction in the honors program and in reaching teachers through stipends. They felt that the training approach had not been supported until recently. Training was not a panacea but it certainly helped.

Mrs. Slye said she was interested in the recommendation to establish a second center for the highly gifted in the three areas. The staff response was that this was perhaps not the time. She asked if they had long-term studies on the different progress rates of children coming from the centers as opposed to those coming out of elementary schools with strong local programs. She asked if they looked at high school participation in honors courses. Dr. Martin replied that they were planning something along these lines. Dr. Davidson replied that responsibility for those studies was in the Department of Educational Accountability. The committee had worked with DEA over a number of years to try to devise instruments and means for evaluating those programs, but other priorities had captured the attention of DEA. Dr. Cody indicated that he would like to search the files, because he had a recollection there was a study which concluded those programs did not make a difference.

Mr. Ewing noted that Recommendations 9, 13, and 14 had to do with planning for the future and the expansion of programs. The direction from the committee was that they ought to give special focus to the primary and elementary school program. It was not clear to him where they ought to go over time. For example, did they want to have programs at one level building on programs from a lower level. He assumed that to some extent Carl Smith's committee would be interested in this. He asked whether the committee expected to work on this, whether the staff was planning to focus on this, and whether Carl Smith's group was going to look into this. Dr. Davidson replied that there was a recommendation for a systematic staff plan for phasing in instruction. There was a plan that had not been fully implemented. For example, the honors program had been mandated out of sequence.

Mr. Ewing thought that it was important for them now to assess again what their assumptions were. For example, did they want to spread the program in elementary schools or did they want to start building upward. In regard to staff assumptions, Dr. Martin reported that they were working on three major items. The first was increasing minority participation and participation of other unserved students such as the learning disabled. The second was improving the consistency of elementary gifted and talented programs. The third was concentrating on getting good quality programs at the J/I/M level.

Re: STAFF RESPONSE TO THE SUICIDE PREVENTION
TASK FORCE REPORT

Dr. Cody reported that the task force had made good recommendations, and those had been reviewed by the Administrative Team. There were earlier ideas considered which were much more extensive and called for each school developing its own plan of action. Many of them felt they needed to improve sensitivity to identifying warning signs in students at risk which could be handled with a good communication plan.

Mrs. Praisner asked about the development of a suicide prevention coalition. Mr. Ed Masood replied that the coalition was extremely supportive in doing what they could in terms of community efforts. They planned to put together a brochure of community resources which might be available in draft form in March. Dr. Ron Redmond added that the brochure would list where people could go for help in an emergency situation. He hoped that it would be in the schools and in the homes, and that MCPS would publish it.

Mrs. DiFonzo asked how the coalition evolved and whether there was any interaction with the CARE Center. Dr. Redmond replied that the coalition had evolved, and it was a good working group. They hoped to have a presentation for schools on how suicide could be prevented. They were also working on "postvention." They had good cooperation with the county government, MCPS, the state system, and the consortium in five other counties. Mr. Masood said the coalition evolved from the need within the community to get their act together. Montgomery County Hotline had taken the leadership role in this venture.

Mrs. DiFonzo said that concern had been articulated that the PIP program put a tremendous additional burden on school counselors. The same comment had been made about teachers. Her third concern was about MCPS making referrals to mental health professionals and how they would get around the problems that the referral might raise. Dr. Redmond replied that a lot of this depended on how the guidance operation was structured. They were hoping that with proper training counselors would feel comfortable in taking a leadership role there. They saw this as a school responsibility with the administrators working with the nurse and teachers. For example, he had been doing work at White Oak, and it was stressed with the teachers that this

was not something extra that they would have to do. They were to get the information to someone when they noticed something. At White Oak, he was raising the level of awareness. Next week he would be meeting with students, and the following week they would be working with parents.

Mrs. DiFonzo asked if the members of the team would be volunteers. Mr. Masood replied that at this point, the PIP team might or might not need to exist depending on the needs of a particular school. In some cases where there had been problems, some teams were established. These teams were comprised of people who were interested. The recommendation would be that each school would have a plan to implement, and it would be the responsibility of the administrator to implement the plan should the need arise. In regard to mental health referrals, Mr. Masood said they were still reviewing the regulation. He did not yet have feedback from the mental health subcommittee. Dr. Pitt felt there was some indication that they would be able to work this out. Dr. Redmond added that on referrals they did have some very constructive guidelines which helped them to avoid pitfalls. Mr. Masood said that they did recognize the need for standardized guidelines that every school would have available for their use.

Mr. Ewing commented that this was a good report and a good response. The report spoke to dealing with a comprehensive program for students K-12. The program would include communication, problem solving, death and dying, grief and bereavement, etc. He noted that these were highly personal and conditioned by religious belief. He asked how they handled these sensitive issues. Mr. Masood replied that this was brought out as a part of the review of a total prevention program offered by the St. Francis Center. He was personally concerned about including a lot of these things. The depth of the program would depend on the various grade levels for the students. It would not be one program in place for all students at all grade levels.

Dr. Redmond reported that they had a new guidance pilot program which stressed that they were not therapists. They were helping students function as students. They did have group counseling but that required parental consent. In those sessions, they did not get into values but rather stressed helping students going through a crisis. Dr. Cronin said that when he was teaching he tended to think about intellectual students, and yet there were students whose minds were so far away because of emotional crises. Teachers had to see that child and get the help to that child. He saw the interventions and preventions in this process as extremely important. When there was a loss which was school related, teachers were also affected. The postvention process bonded the school as well as the students.

Dr. Shoenberg recalled that in an information item on the K-12 task force there was mention of the need for students to pay attention to affective issues. People thought that schools should inform students about different things by having counseling sessions for students going through particular problems. There were other needs for

information such as sex education, substance abuse, etc. At some time if they were going to be expected by society to deal with the informational part of these issues and to help students deal with emotions, they might consider having a course in the high school to deal with those issues.

Mrs. Praisner expressed the Board's appreciation for the work that had gone into this effort. She asked that the Commission on Children and Youth be kept informed of activities. She had asked staff about information on the number of school nurse positions so that the Board could draft a comment on that part of the county's budget.

Re: RELOCATION OF AREA 2 HIGHLY GIFTED PROGRAM

Dr. Cronin moved and Dr. Shoenberg seconded the following:

WHEREAS, A review was made of all schools in Area 2 as possible sites for the Highly Gifted Program; and

WHEREAS, The criteria of space, location, and staff and community interest and input were carefully considered; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the Area 2 Program for the Highly Gifted be relocated to Rock Creek Valley Elementary School beginning with the 1987-88 school year.

Re: A SUBSTITUTE MOTION BY DR. CRONIN ON THE RELOCATION OF THE AREA 2 HIGHLY GIFTED PROGRAM

Dr. Cronin moved and Mr. Ewing moved that the Area 2 Highly Gifted Program be left in place for the 1987-88 school year with a decision on its location to be made in November, 1987.

Re: A MOTION BY MR. EWING TO POSTPONE UNTIL FEBRUARY 25 (FAILED)

A motion by Mr. Ewing to postpone consideration of the location of the Area 2 Highly Gifted Program until February 25 failed with Dr. Cronin, Mr. Ewing, and Mr. Goldensohn voting in the affirmative; Mrs. DiFonzo, Mrs. Praisner, Dr. Shoenberg, and Mrs. Slye voting in the negative.

RESOLUTION NO. 103-87 Re: POSTPONEMENT OF THE PROPOSED RESOLUTION ON THE RELOCATION OF THE AREA 2 HIGHLY GIFTED PROGRAM

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

RESOLVED, That the proposed resolution on the relocation of the Area 2 Highly Gifted Program be postponed until March 10.

Re: BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS

1. Dr. Cronin reported in the February 2 issue of EDUCATION USA there was an article suggesting that the middle school should be the next focus in education reform. The article noted that failure in school often originated among adolescents in Grades 6 through 8 whose unique characteristics were not met by effective programs. He was going to send for the report of the California task force on which the article was based. Dr. Cronin stated that in the K-12 policy proposal there was a recommendation for a blue ribbon commission to study middle school issues and help MCPS develop a consistent and effective approach to educating students in the early adolescent years. He asked the superintendent whether this commission needed to wait until they got through the policy development in June or if it could be started now with a study of that California task force.
2. Mr. Ewing requested information on the proposal to pair Bel Pre Elementary and Strathmore Elementary.
3. Mr. Ewing said the Board had discussed the Richard Montgomery program in December and January and whether or not the Board was to be scheduled to vote on the program. He thought the Board would be voting on the program. He had a transcript of the January 13 meeting, and it did not mention a vote. He thought that the December discussion might refer to a vote, and he asked staff to check the record.
4. Mr. Ewing reported that he had given the Board a brief statement on physical and occupational therapists. He would bring this up under new business and in the budget action.
5. Mrs. Praisner stated that the Board had met in retreat over the weekend on the superintendent selection process and on how they could improve communication and meeting schedules. They would have a report on that later.
6. Mrs. Praisner shared with the public and Board members a plaque that she had accepted on behalf of the school system from the Martin Luther King, Jr. Commemorative Committee in recognition of their magnet programs and desegregation efforts. The plaque would hang for a month at a time in each of the magnet schools, and then would come back to the Board room.

RESOLUTION NO. 104-87 Re: EXECUTIVE SESSION - FEBRUARY 25, 1987
On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Dr. Cronin
seconded by Mr. Goldensohn, 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 February
25, 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. 105-87 Re: MINUTES OF JANUARY 5, 1987

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

RESOLVED, That the minutes of January 5, 1987, be approved.

RESOLUTION NO. 106-87 Re: MINUTES OF JANUARY 7, 1987

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

RESOLVED, That the minutes of January 7, 1987, be approved.

RESOLUTION NO. 107-87 Re: BOE APPEAL NO. 1985-6

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

RESOLVED, That the Board dismiss BOE Appeal No. 1985-6 (a personnel matter) because the Board had authorized settlement.

RESOLUTION NO. 108-87 Re: BOE APPEAL NO. 1985-17

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

RESOLVED, That the Board dismiss BOE Appeal No. 1985-17 (a personnel matter) because the Board had authorized settlement.

RESOLUTION NO. 109-87 Re: ETHICS PANEL MEMBERSHIP

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

WHEREAS, The Board of Education adopted Resolution No. 162-84 which appointed three members to the Ethics Panel; and

WHEREAS, Dr. Adele Liskov was appointed to complete the term of Mrs. Elizabeth Spencer, which expired on February 28, 1986; and

WHEREAS, Dr. Liskov has served subsequent to the expiration of the appointed term; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That Dr. Adele Liskov be appointed to a three-year term commencing retroactively to February 28, 1986, and expiring on February 28, 1989.

RESOLUTION NO. 110-87 Re: PHYSICAL/OCCUPATIONAL THERAPISTS

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

RESOLVED, That the Board ask the superintendent to develop a plan of action which would provide resources to deal with students now during this school year awaiting OT/PT services and awaiting diagnosis assessment, with the plan to be presented to the Board at the earliest possible time; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the Board prepare and send a letter calling on the State Board to study the classification, salary, recruitment, incentives, etc. for pursuit of people who might be trained in this field and that it encourage the state to look to other ways to deal with the shortage of personnel in public education in Maryland; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the superintendent be asked to undertake an effort to identify this spring exemplary programs, approaches and practices in OT/PT in this area in other school systems which could conceivably be used or applied in MCPS.

RESOLUTION NO. 111-87 Re: AN AMENDMENT TO THE FY 1988 OPERATING BUDGET, GIFTED AND TALENTED LEARNING DISABLED STUDENTS

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

RESOLVED, That the FY 1988 Operating Budget be amended to add \$52,890 for programs for gifted and talented learning disabled students as noted in the answer to Question 6 Amended-1.

RESOLUTION NO. 112-87 Re: AN AMENDMENT TO THE FY 1988 OPERATING BUDGET, J/I/M CURRICULAR/ORGANIZATIONAL STUDIES

On motion of Dr. Cronin seconded by Mrs. Praisner, the following resolution was adopted with Dr. Cronin, Mrs. DiFonzo, Mr. Ewing, Mr. Goldensohn, Mrs. Praisner, and Mrs. Slye voting in the affirmative; Dr. Shoenberg abstaining:

RESOLVED, That the FY 1988 Operating Budget be amended to add \$30,000 for J/I/M curricular/organizational studies.

RESOLUTION NO. 113-87 Re: AN AMENDMENT TO THE FY 1988 OPERATING BUDGET, AMERICAN INDIAN EDUCATION

PROGRAM

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

RESOLVED, That the FY 1988 Operating Budget be amended to add \$3,300 for counseling services in the American Indian Education Program.

Re: A MOTION BY MR. EWING TO AMEND THE
FY 1988 OPERATING BUDGET, OCCUPATIONAL/
PHYSICAL THERAPISTS

Mr. Ewing moved and Dr. Cronin seconded that the FY 1988 Operating Budget be amended to add \$20,000 for consultants, 10 EYE days, and five aide positions in the amount of \$99,780 for occupational/physical therapist services.

Dr. Shoenberg asked that the question be divided.

RESOLUTION NO. 114-87 Re: AN AMENDMENT TO THE FY 1988 OPERATING
BUDGET, OCCUPATIONAL/PHYSICAL THERAPISTS

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

RESOLVED, That the FY 1988 Operating Budget be amended by adding \$20,000 for consultants for occupational/physical therapist services.

RESOLUTION NO. 115-87 Re: AN AMENDMENT TO THE FY 1988 OPERATING
BUDGET, OCCUPATIONAL/PHYSICAL THERAPISTS

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

RESOLVED, That the FY 1988 Operating Budget be amended by adding \$10,000 for 50 EYE days for occupational/physical therapist services.

RESOLUTION NO. 116-87 Re: AN AMENDMENT TO THE FY 1988 OPERATING
BUDGET, OCCUPATIONAL/PHYSICAL THERAPISTS

On motion of Mr. Ewing seconded by Dr. Cronin, the following resolution was adopted with Dr. Cronin, Mrs. DiFonzo, Mr. Ewing, Mr. Goldensohn, Mrs. Praisner, and Mrs. Slye voting in the affirmative; Dr. Shoenberg abstaining:

RESOLVED, That the FY 1988 Operating Budget be amended by adding \$69,780 for five aide positions for occupational/physical therapist services.

RESOLUTION NO. 117-87 Re: AN AMENDMENT TO THE FY 1988 OPERATING
BUDGET, STEPHEN KNOLLS SCHOOL

On motion of Dr. Cronin seconded by Mr. Ewing, the following

resolution was adopted with Dr. Cronin, Mrs. DiFonzo, Mr. Ewing, and Mr. Goldensohn voting in the affirmative; Mrs. Praisner, Dr. Shoenberg, and Mrs. Slye abstaining:

RESOLVED, That the FY 1988 Operating Budget be amended by adding \$27,912 for two instructional aide positions for Stephen Knolls School.

RESOLUTION NO. 118-87 Re: AN AMENDMENT TO THE FY 1988 OPERATING BUDGET, PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT IN BASIC SKILLS

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

RESOLVED, That the FY 1988 Operating Budget be amended by adding \$18,400 for the Parental Involvement in Basic Skills program.

RESOLUTION NO. 119-87 Re: AN AMENDMENT TO THE FY 1988 OPERATING BUDGET, CHAPTER I

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

RESOLVED, That the FY 1988 Operating Budget be amended by adding \$40,988 for one teacher specialist for the Chapter I program.

RESOLUTION NO. 120-87 Re: AN AMENDMENT TO THE FY 1988 OPERATING BUDGET, ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS

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

RESOLVED, That the FY 1988 Operating Budget be amended by adding \$52,033 for an additional five percent for textbook improvement for elementary schools.

Mrs. Praisner temporarily left the meeting at this point, and Mrs. DiFonzo assumed the chair.

RESOLUTION NO. 121-87 Re: AN AMENDMENT TO THE FY 1988 OPERATING BUDGET, DIVISION OF ACCOUNTING

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

RESOLVED, That the FY 1988 Operating Budget be amended by adding \$36,382 for two account clerk positions and deleting \$15,000 in overtime funds in the Division of Accounting.

Mrs. Praisner rejoined the meeting at this point.

Re: ITEMS OF INFORMATION

Board members received the following items of information:

1. Items in Process
2. Construction Progress Report
3. PreK-12 Policy Interim Status Report
4. Recommended Approval of Proposed Computer Science Courses (for future consideration)
5. Policy Sections D & E (for future consideration)
6. Nonresident Tuition Report
7. State of Administrative Computing in MCPS

Re: ADJOURNMENT

The president adjourned the meeting at 5:30 p.m.

PRESIDENT

SECRETARY

WSC:mlw