

parents attend workshops in the county. They had made special efforts to transport these parents and, as a result, more parents had become active in organizations. They had organized parent groups in the community to make parents more vocal and confident. Next year they would like to formalize this effort starting with the parents of the youngsters who had attended the leadership conference. In regard to computer education, Ms. Brown said they had been approved by the Community Development Committee for a block grant for computer learning centers in several of their communities. This summer they would be conducting their ninth Summer-in-the-Square program which was an enrichment and reading program held at Bel Pre Square. For the third year they were sponsoring a computer camp at Sherwood High School.

Mrs. Bell commented that at the leadership conference the youngsters were taught the roles of group members, communication skills, problem solving, image awareness and time management. Most of the youngsters thought it was a very enjoyable experience, and she would like to know about these youngsters six months from now. The high school youngsters who had taken the course previously had found themselves on the honor roll for the first time and had participated more in school activities. In fact, one youngster ran for the student seat on the Board of Education.

Mrs. Praisner asked what they might do to formalize the parent workshops. Ms. Brown replied that they had not held the workshops themselves, and they would like to work on this including parenting skills and understanding the school system. Dr. Pitt commented that he would like to explore some ideas about parenting skills with Mrs. Bell. Mrs. Praisner remarked that they needed to help every parent understand the school system because it was a problem shared by all parents. She suggested that there might be ways Mr. Fess and the Board could help. She personally would like to come to a meeting and answer questions; however, the Board had a busy schedule. Mrs. Bell thought that parents understood that the Board had a heavy schedule. She had introduced herself as a representative of the Board and the Board was interested in hearing their concerns. She said that the problem was getting to large groups of people. She and MCPS staff had held workshops about parent conferences, Child Find and ESOL services.

Dr. Cronin suggested they needed a special outreach to the Hispanic and Asian communities, and he thought the Literacy Council might be helpful in helping with that outreach. He asked about efforts to reach the minority foreign language community. Ms. Brown replied that they had a bilingual person who helped them on their education committee, but she agreed that this probably was not enough. They had a staff person who understood some of the Asian languages, but she was not able to provide translations of materials.

Mr. James Brodsky asked about groups in their housing that the Commission was trying to reach. Ms. Pat Scissors replied that their foreign speaking population was growing, particularly in the down-county area. People with housing vouchers were scattered around the county, and the Commission was unable to get to these

individuals. It was easier to reach youngsters and parents in HOC housing.

Mr. Ewing remarked that the HOC's efforts to involve parents were extraordinarily important. There was good solid research that sustained the impact of that on student academic achievement. Vicki Bowers of the MCPS staff worked with parental involvement, particularly in the basic skills area. The Board had saved that position by taking dollars out of its own budget to fund that program. He hoped they would be able to call on that resource. Ms. Brown reported that last week they had met with Vicki Rafel of MCCPTA. They were looking forward to working with her and the new president of MCCPTA. Dr. Pitt suggested that if they were interested in being briefed about certain areas of the school system, they should contact Mrs. Bell and he would work with her to provide staff members and information.

Dr. Cronin was glad they had mentioned they were working with the PTA, because when he was with the Human Relations Commission they only heard what other agencies were doing occasionally. He suggested that Mr. Tetreault, MCPS, and other agencies might want to set up quarterly meetings. They could channel the resources of the various agencies to do a concerted effort on problems they wanted to resolve. Dr. Shoenberg stated that given the turnover rate in the schools he had the sense that many of the neighborhoods they worked with had rapidly changing populations. He was curious about the continuity within those neighborhoods with which they made contact. Ms. Joyce Seigel replied that they had found a lot of turnover in low income communities but not in those getting assistance from HOC. People tended to stay in their housing for enough time to feel part of that community. The HOC turnover was about 10-12 percent of their 2,000 units. Most of their family housing was scattered site housing. They could identify certain communities like Emory Grove and Middlebrook, but they had an equal number of scattered units around plus about 2300 Section VIII households which were not owned by HOC but were supported by housing assistance. She would guess that more than 50 percent of the Section VIII households had children.

Mrs. Praisner asked about the number of units they planned to increase each year. Mr. Brodsky replied that there was no more public housing. They were struggling to maintain the quality of the housing they had in the face of federal cutbacks. Ms. Kathy Bernard explained that they were working on 84 units in Timberlawn which would be for families, on the Kensington Junior High School project for the elderly, and Elizabeth II in downtown Silver Spring which might be for the elderly or for families. At present they were not in the building market. Mr. Tetreault added that this was the first time they had no new public housing under construction; however, they did have an application in for 50 units. From their experiences in the last eight or nine years, they had learned that economically mixed developments worked. He thought there needed to be a greater federal role in assisted housing, but they were in a very dry period. The need had not changed, and recent statistics showed that 36 percent of the population was below the level of income required for

an average priced unit.

Mr. Mark Winston commented that an additional factor was the growth policy issue. Development was going to occur at a more expensive level. He hoped that in the next few weeks as the Council addressed the Annual Growth Policy that they would take account of adjustments to deal with affordable housing. He would not diminish the impact of housing on transportation and education, but the AGP should consider the need for affordable housing. He reported that the combined impact of the loss of federal funds, changes in tax laws regarding incentives for the private center to build this housing, and limitations on land use was a stranglehold. Dr. Cronin added that the ultimate cruelty would be to build and not to provide space for these students who needed advantages. They wanted to maintain the linkage and make sure that students were going to school in a relatively close area and that they would not be moved from school to school. Mrs. Praisner agreed that if they provided the housing and not adequate schools they would not have a marriage of needs. It seemed to Mr. Ewing that if indeed the AGP had the impact they were suggesting as creating incentives for the construction of more expensive homes and if the national administration did not change its role in providing support for public housing, he saw a reinforcement of the concentration of low income residents in limited segments of the county which frustrated the Board's efforts to achieve a higher degree of racial and socioeconomic balance. Mr. Winston replied that HOC was trying to help in that regard, and this went back to the county's policy on scattered housing under the MPDU law. Ms. Bernard added that they had financed about 7,000 to 8,000 multi-family units in the Route 29 corridor, Gaithersburg and Germantown. They had built in Takoma Park and Silver Spring. Therefore, these units had spread out the minority population. However, the federal changes and the tax law incentives had changed that through no fault of Montgomery County. The APFO and the AGP were making it more difficult to spread out low-cost housing.

Mr. Brodsky reported that they were seeking formal exceptions to the growth policy formula for low-income housing. The needs of the population they served were driving them because the study on the unmet need for moderate and low-income housing in the county was startling. He said that he would share their study with the Board as well as their AGP proposal.

Dr. Pitt remarked that the concept of scattered housing was being pushed by a lot of people around the country with the idea that they did concentrate a large number of minority or low socioeconomic people in one area. Therefore, they would have a better diversity in the schools. For example, in Dallas they were getting rid of a large housing development and moving people into rental apartments. He asked if HOC had a continued ability to subsidize housing. For example, he understood that builders had to put aside a certain percentage of their construction for low-income people. Ms. Bernard replied that it used to be a 15 percent density requirement, but four years ago that was lowered to 12.5 percent for any development over 49 units. Therefore, some developers were building in 48-unit

increments to be exempt from the MPDU requirement. At 49 units, builders received a 12.5 percent density bonus for building MPDU's because the theory was that the MPDU had zero land cost. There was disagreement among county officials as to the price of these units. Most of these are in townhouse developments and were supposed to look the same as the other townhouses. Inside these units might not have dishwashers and other amenities. The theory was that they were spreading these units and economic diversity; however, some builders did not like the program because it added to their costs because they needed different designs and different amenities within the same development. HOC was now having problems in buying these units and had floated a bond issue for 59 units. HOC was allowed to buy one-third of the 12.5 percent of the units. If HOC did not buy these units, they were held for 10 years and sold at market rates. She explained that they were always going to hear about one or two tenants who were causing problems as renters of these units.

Mr. Tetreault reported that they had no intention of reverting to a concentration of low-income housing because of the federal cutback or the county's Annual Growth Policy. HOC had a commitment to scatterization. However, they were concerned that fewer of these houses were being built and those tended to be more expensive because of the profit margin. Mr. Winston hoped that when the Board dealt with the AGP they would reflect on this problem from HOC's perspective. Mrs. Praisner explained that it was not the Board's view to restrict growth but to insure that facilities were there and that the Council should make a commitment to provide roads, schools, and libraries to go along with growth. Mr. Winston stated that they felt that housing for people with low-income was itself a public "facility." Dr. Pitt observed that their concern was to get the schools built and not have a lot of portables or have to transport students long distances. Mr. Brodsky suggested that the Board might want to take a position on their views regarding the AGP. Mrs. Praisner reported that the Board had already taken positions on various proposals for the AGP and would be discussing this later this evening. The Council would be discussing this on June 2.

It seemed to Dr. Shoenberg that if growth was a good thing, it should produce wealth for the county. If the prosperity was going to be there, he thought it should be there in such a way to support schools and low-income housing as it went along rather than public facilities always lagging behind. Mr. Winston commented that the county had a lack of willingness to incur debt for capital programs.

Mr. Brodsky said they were concerned that programs representing good progress not be cancelled because of the budget situation. He hoped that they would not lose the momentum, and Dr. Shoenberg assured him that the Board had determined it would not eliminate programs for disadvantaged students. Mrs. Praisner explained that this was Dr. Pitt's recommendation for summer school, and Dr. Pitt reported that they had kept summer programs for basic skills and disadvantaged students. They were also trying to provide a program for J/I/M level students who had failed basic subjects.

Mrs. Praisner observed that they would soon be in the process of building a budget for next year. She thought they had made a good start in increasing communication with the HOC and hoped that they would be kept informed through another meeting or staff meetings. She thought it would be useful for the county executive and County Council to know the progress they were making and where they would like to increase their efforts. Dr. Pitt commented that they needed support to get extended year employment days back in the budget so that they would offer these programs. Mr. Brodsky said that they had common goals and should work together as effectively as they could.

Mr. Robert Bell stated that he was most appreciative that the summer programs would be held. He knew that there would have to be economies, but he urged the Board to keep programs targeted for youngsters in their developments. Mr. Ewing reported that as the Council cut improvements, the Board was unable to keep pace with the growth in the number of students requiring extra help. They had proposed expanding Chapter 1 services to three more schools which meant that now they would be serving a smaller proportion of the children in need. He thought that this was an issue where they could collaborate with HOC.

Mrs. Praisner said they enjoyed the opportunity to meet with the Housing Opportunities Commission. She thought they should continue to share information and get together. Ms. Brown reported that this was their first year of working together. She said they had 58 graduating seniors from their developments, and they were very pleased. She invited the members of the Board to a reception for these students on June 17.

Re: MEETING WITH INTERAGENCY COORDINATING
BOARD

Mrs. Praisner thanked the members of the ICB for supplying the Board with background information and their priorities from the ICB retreat.

Dr. Robert Parilla, ICB chairperson, reported that legislation was passed in the late 1970's and beginning in 1979-80 the ICB began. Two members were appointed by the Board of Education and two were appointed by the county executive. In addition, others served on the ICB by virtue of the position they held in the county. These were the superintendent of schools, the president of Montgomery College, the staff director of the County Council, the chief administrative officer and a member of the Park and Planning Commission. Dr. Gail Ayers had been the executive director of the ICB from the very beginning. He thought that the Interagency Coordinating Board worked well despite the varied interests of its membership.

Mrs. Linda Burgin stated that she felt honored to be part of the ICB board. Nothing she had been involved with had been more effective than the ICB and its impact on the county, students and community. She recognized the support the Board had given to the ICB. She said

that the citizens advisory committee had worked for two years to try to determine the actual cost of community use of school facilities. They had done an outstanding job of determining direct costs which included supplies, utilities and staff costs and indirect costs which included maintenance reimbursement. A second subcommittee had recommended the adoption of new criteria for the distribution of equipment replacement funds. The third subcommittee had developed a methodology to recognize MCPS supporting staff who provided services to community groups above and beyond the call of duty.

Mrs. Burgin reported that a major thrust of the ICB this year had been to focus on the needs of the older school-aged child who did not go to day care and had nowhere to go except home to an empty house. This was the latchkey initiative which began in September 1986 with three goals: (1) to develop and operate a pilot afterschool program, (2) to stimulate the interest of private agencies to design and operate innovative programs and (3) to promote the concept of services and activities for all school-age children not just latchkey. She reported that the ICB was becoming involved in the issue of the use of shared space. As a result of the need for day care providers to use the buildings, it has resulted in the concept of shared space. The ICB worked with the schools and the community to determine how that would work out best, and she thought the ICB had been effective in trying to anticipate needs. She explained that the community school coordinator positions had been restructured and consolidated, and they felt these should be full-time professional positions.

Mrs. Praisner asked if they were talking about classrooms as shared space. Dr. Ayers replied that generally they were talking about all-purpose rooms. In some schools there was a need for day care, but space was not available. For example, they had made arrangements to share space at Damascus and Jones Lane. However, this was not an ideal situation.

Dr. Cronin inquired about data for FY 86 or 87, and Dr. Ayers replied that they would do that when they had data on hours of use, which probably would be in August or September. Dr. Cronin noted that the total cost and actual reimbursements were based on FY 1984 data with inflation running at 5 to 10 percent per year. Dr. Ayers explained that this was done by the advisory committee using the most current data which was FY 1984. However, they planned to update this. Mrs. Burgin praised Herman Lipford, director of the Division of Plant Operations, for his help and cooperation. He knew which schools needed supplies because of heavy use. Dr. Cronin thought that once this was on the computer it could be updated every year. Dr. Ayers replied that this was the plan. Actually what was in front of the Board was a formula which would be updated.

Dr. Cronin asked about the difference between the cost of form processing and the current reimbursement level. Dr. Ayers replied that they had a group of principals who sent a survey to school staff asking them how much time was spent on paperwork. A discussion was held on in-kind contributions the county government would make to

support this operation. She had recommended centralized scheduling which was not supported by the Interagency Coordinating Board. They felt this was an interagency function and should have a connection between the school staff and the community. Therefore, this was viewed as an MCPS in-kind contribution. Mrs. Burgin added that there was a strong feeling that if this were centralized they would lose flexibility. There was also a feeling that the time spent on this depended on how the school office was organized, and principals asked about training to streamline activities.

Dr. Cronin recalled that the Council had put funds in the ICB budget for MCPS employees and had taken out funds from the MCPS. This wrecked the concept of in-kind. Dr. Ayers reported that the Council had wanted to charge the ICB for a 14.5 percent increase and had to be reminded that this was an in-kind contribution from the Board of Education.

Mrs. Praisner asked for an update on community schools. Dr. Ayers reported they had had the same community schools for a while. Richard Montgomery was changed, and Ridgeview had been added because of the growth in the Darnestown corridor. There had been a request to add one at Banneker; however, because of the growth in that area, the principal had asked that not be a community school. There was also interest in making Pyle a community school and providing afterschool services.

In regard to the issue of payback, Dr. Ayers pointed out that MCPS staff members were very active on the advisory committees. The study was done with the cooperation of MCPS staff. She said that the most critical problem they were facing was the need to have good afterschool activities for latchkey children. As more and more of their space in the all-purpose rooms went to day care, there was less space for latchkey activities. She thought there was a crisis situation regarding the Grade 3-and-up children who did not want to participate in day care.

Dr. Pitt reported that the Council had cut funds for activity buses and had said they would provide Ride-on. He said that \$100,000 of those funds were directly involved in the elementary schools, and in terms of providing afterschool opportunities for children, it would be more limited next year. Mr. Ewing commented that there was not understanding and financial support by the executive and Council of their joint efforts here. Cuts had been made in funds for activity buses and building service workers. He felt that this was going to be a real problem. He did not think they could say they would do more for children if the Council was going to say no buses and no care for the buildings.

Mrs. Praisner noted that they had the added issue of space. They were hit with the issue of elementary gyms when they tried to renovate elementary schools. Now they had to have a line item to add elementary gyms but not necessarily for every single school. This would provide additional space for those 9-11 year olds because they could only divide up an all-purpose room in so many ways.

Mrs. Praisner recalled that in the Board's day care policy they had indicated the Board's support for day care to the Council but also encouraged the Council and county executive to build space exclusively for day care when schools were constructed. This would mean that this space would be exclusively for community use and would never be in jeopardy. However, they had not gotten any takers on that issue. She thought they should remind people and look at whether it was cheaper to build an extra two or four rooms for the community than to find additional leased space. Dr. Ayers pointed out that it cost about \$200,000 to purchase and site a portable classroom. She thought that the ICB could talk with the County Council and county executive about these issues.

Mrs. Praisner reported that in talking with members of the Housing Opportunities Commission the Board heard they had done some surveying on the need for adequate housing. She knew that several years ago Park and Planning had done a survey of recreational space, and she knew there was a survey of day care space. She wondered whether any one had pulled together all of that information. Mrs. Ann Yeaman reported that the Community Action Committee was interested in getting people together to work on all of these issues. Mrs. Burgin added that part of the education of the community and Council was to understand that education was not just 9 to 3 anymore. They needed to provide for these children because some parents were unable to do so. Mrs. Praisner emphasized that they wanted to be a partner in that effort, but they did not want to find out that the responsibility became the school system's because their primary responsibilities must be that 9 to 3 education.

Dr. Shoenberg stated that the problem had been the pay for weekend building services. He suspected that had kept the Board and the ICB from coming together at budget time to talk about mutual concerns. He suggested that they did need to do something together next year. In regard to the capital budget, he remarked that as long as they were consistently behind in space needs for students that would mean that there wasn't space for other kinds of activities.

Dr. Cronin commented that it was often left to the day care providers to find the space and to individual parents to find the day care placement they needed. He wondered if they could expand the partnership to include the business community. Dr. Ayers replied that Chuck Short was trying to do this by working with the Chamber of Commerce. She said that the ICB staff had been very active in helping principals. The ICB advertised for day care providers to provide services in a specific area because the schools did not have time to do this and ICB had connections with other agencies. In addition, they were holding breakfasts for principals to talk about day care programs. Dr. Cronin noted that the ICB had a Council member on it who had also been a member of the Board of Trustees of Montgomery College and the Chamber of Commerce. He wondered whether this individual could take a leadership role in this area.

Dr. Alan Cheung stated that on a recent trip to China he had found that major businesses were operating their own day care. If companies helped the children of their workers, it would be a fringe

benefit and a good management technique. He suggested they go to the Chamber of Commerce with this issue. Dr. Ayers indicated that she would meet with Chuck Short and send the Board a letter.

Mrs. Yeamans reported that several weeks ago the ICB had held a retreat to discuss areas of concern to address in the coming year. In regard to afterschool services, they felt it was real significant for the ICB staff to continue to determine what were the needs of the community, to reevaluate the program content, and to seek greater private sector involvement and support. A second concern was geographic boundaries for community schools, and as a Board they were asking the question of how they determined what was a community. Were communities MCPS clusters? Should geography determine the community's assignment to the community school? Should they look at redesignating community schools? Mrs. Praisner asked if they were talking about taking away community school coordinators from certain schools and moving them or adding more coordinators. Mrs. Yeamans replied that they needed to educate the community as to what it meant to be a community school including the services of the coordinator, the hours, the programs, the funds available, etc. They felt it was time to go forward on community education. She said another priority was publicity because public awareness was essential to support community education and programs. For example, in some places there was a nasty view of the ICB as the people who collected rent for building use.

Mrs. Burgin reported that with some of the interest money in their fund they had developed the concept of seed money to get programs going in communities that could then become self-perpetuating. In one case, they used the funds to hold a fund raiser for seed money. Another school received funds to publish a newsletter about their community programs. They hoped to get people to support the newsletter by advertising in it.

Mrs. Yeamans reported that another priority was the concern that there was an increasing need to share building space. In regard to closed schools, they felt there needed to be an affirmation of ICB's role in the utilization of closed schools. This was critical if services to communities were to be continued.

Another priority was the fee exception schedule. Mrs. Yeamans said that ICB wanted children to continue to receive services regardless of their economic status which led to another priority which was the subsidy for afterschool services. Another concern was ball field maintenance and fees. They also wanted to look at community schools as a focus for community education. In the title establishing ICB, it was for community educational services rather than community "use."

Dr. Cronin asked for information on the day care afterschool program. Dr. Ayers explained that they had piloted latchkey projects at Ridgeview, Takoma Park, and New Hampshire/Rolling Terrace. In Takoma Park they ran into the situation of the children paying for the program out of their own allowances because parents had stopped

thinking of these programs as day care and thought of them as recreational. The ICB staff would go back and look into this. They had lost money on this program and were limited by law not to spend more than they made. She commented that they needed all the help they could get on the latchkey project.

Dr. Shoenberg recalled a letter having to do with discontinuing the program at Key. Dr. Ayers explained that these programs were not breaking even. When they looked at the incomes of the parents of the children, the incomes would not have met the subsidy standards for the state day care supplement to parents with low incomes. Therefore, the ICB program was subsidizing day care which was not an approved policy. Therefore, they looked at the possibility of advertising the space and letting a nonprofit organization provide the program, but the community did not accept these fees. Now they were working with the Recreation Department to put a program there so that the fees would not be as high. The nonprofit provider would charge about \$120 a month for afterschool care, and the Recreation Department charged \$16. However, that created the question of subsidizing day care through the Recreation Department. She said that it might be the decision of the policy makers, but they should not do this until the decision was made.

Dr. Shoenberg asked if Chuck Short was working on a day care policy. Dr. Ayers recalled that when Odessa Shannon worked for Mr. Gilchrist they had an active committee. However, the committee would be meeting in a few weeks and she would bring up this issue. She did not think the ICB should be subsidizing day care unless they had a clear indication that this was to be their role. For example, they were developing the latchkey program with the goal of making it self supporting. Mrs. Burgin added that one of the problems they ran into with the Takoma Park community was that because of income levels they could not find a way to make the program self-supporting. If the ICB subsidized this program, it would not have funds for other schools. Mrs. Praisner commented that there was no county policy that said there would be some public support for day care. Dr. Cronin asked if they could initiate a countywide dialogue on this particular issue. Dr. Pitt remarked that he was interested in discussing a longer day program at New Hampshire Estates which was not day care. Dr. Ayers added that they did have state funds for some programs at New Hampshire Estates including tutoring.

Mrs. Praisner thought this was an area where they could find common goals and work together. She thought they now had a better understanding of what the problems were. Dr. Shoenberg suggested that this had to go beyond the Board of Education and the ICB because they were getting into duplication of effort and totally different policies on day care. Mrs. Yeamans reported that she had testified before the Congressional Select Committee on Day Care. While Northern Virginia had private sector involvement, Montgomery County did not. Therefore, they had to raise this issue with their Congresspersons. Mrs. Praisner thought that the first thing they had to do was identify the issues and resolve some of the differences in policies. Dr. Ayers commented that the more extended day programs

done by the school system, the happier the ICB staff. They did not see the latchkey project as being in completion with extended day because extended day was an educational program. They saw their role as providing the supervisor who made sure that the children got to these afterschool activities.

Mrs. Praisner thanked the members of the ICB for their overview and discussion.

Re: ANNUAL GROWTH POLICY

Board members discussed the different proposals that would be before the County Council on the Annual Growth Policy and how those proposals affected education in Montgomery County. They talked about different strategies that might be used by the Board at the Council meeting on June 2. After an extended discussion, Mrs. Praisner stated that the Board's bottom line was that they were not in the business of restricting growth in the county, but they were there to argue for educational and facilities needs, to provide an educational program, and to assure community stability. Mrs. Praisner thanked Board and staff for their guidance to the president and vice president for the Council meeting on the AGP.

Re: ADJOURNMENT

The president adjourned the meeting at 11:05 p.m.

PRESIDENT

SECRETARY

HP:mlw