





WHEREAS, Federal legislation; PL 94-142; the Education of All Handicapped Children Act, and PL 99-457, the 1986 amendment to PL 94-142; and COMAR 13A.05.01.01 call for early intervention programs for children from birth through five years of age who are identified as educationally handicapped; and

WHEREAS, The Council on Instruction, charged by the superintendent with considering recommendations for curriculum change, has recommended approval of the Special Education Birth - 72 Months Section of the PROGRAM OF STUDIES; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education approve the Special Education Birth - 72 Months Section of the PROGRAM OF STUDIES, presented to the Board of Education on July 25, 1988, for inclusion in the MCPS PROGRAM OF STUDIES for this population.

RESOLUTION NO. 391-88 Re: PROCUREMENT CONTRACTS OVER \$25,000

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

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

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

AWARDEES

149-88	Frozen Foods	
	Atlantic Food Services, Inc.	\$ 82,268
	Bagel Master, Inc.	2,280
	Carroll County Foods	29,642
	Continental Smelkinson	104
	Granny's Kitchen, Ltd.	11,750
		-----
	TOTAL	\$126,044
157-88	Shade and Upholstery Material	
	Ace Blinds, Inc.	\$ 1,310
	Bedell's	2,370
	John Duer and Sons, Inc.	5,440
	Mileham and King, Inc.	6,091
	Stark Enterprises, Inc.*	6,356
	Tedco Industries, Inc.	2,985
	Window Moods*	14,335
		-----
	TOTAL	\$ 38,887
158-88	Fresh Donuts	
	Montgomery Doughnut Company, Inc.	\$ 57,530

159-88	Snack Foods, Chips and Popcorn Nibble With Gibble's, Inc.	\$ 80,332
168-88	Metal Exterior Doors, Frames and Accessories Commercial Door and Lock Service, Inc.	\$ 66,176
175-88	Continuous Form Stock Tab McGreger Printing Corporation	\$ 1,200
	OEI Business Forms	2,373
	Toucan Business Forms*	58,565
		-----
	TOTAL	\$ 62,138
	TOTAL OVER \$25,000	\$431,107

\*Asterisk denotes MFD vendors

RESOLUTION NO. 392-88 Re: ARCHITECTURAL APPOINTMENT - JOHN F.  
KENNEDY HIGH SCHOOL

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

WHEREAS, It is necessary to appoint an architect to provide required design and construction administration services for the addition of a new auditorium and gymnasium at John F. Kennedy High School; and

WHEREAS, Architectural planning funds were approved in the FY 1989 Capital Budget for a capital project at John F. Kennedy High School; and

WHEREAS, The architectural/engineering selection procedures approved by the Board of Education on May 13, 1986, were employed in the selection of The Maguire Group as the architect-of-record for this project; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the Montgomery County Board of Education enter into a contractual agreement with The Maguire Group to provide required design and construction administration services associated with the addition of a new auditorium and gymnasium at John F. Kennedy High School for a fee of \$203,000.

RESOLUTION NO. 393-88 Re: CHANGE ORDER OVER \$25,000 - QUINCE  
ORCHARD HIGH SCHOOL

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

WHEREAS, The building contract for Quince Orchard High School site contained a unit price agreement to spread topsoil as part of the final grading; and



WHEREAS, All construction, restoration, and future maintenance will be performed at no cost to the Board of Education, with the Montgomery County Government and contractors assuming liability for all damages or injury; and

WHEREAS, This land dedication for a road widening and easement for storm drainage will benefit the surrounding community and the school site; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the president and secretary be authorized to execute a deed for the conveyance of land required to widen a portion of Bowie Mill Road, and an easement for storm drainage at the future Olney High School site.

RESOLUTION NO. 396-88 Re: ASBESTOS REMOVAL AT PARKLAND JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL

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

WHEREAS, Sealed bids were received on July 20, 1988, for the removal of asbestos in the mechanical area at Parkland Junior High School as shown below:

BIDDER	AMOUNT
LVI Environmental Services, Inc.	\$58,550
Barco Enterprises, Inc.	60,666

and

WHEREAS, Sufficient funds are available to award the contract; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That a \$58,550 contract be awarded to LVI Environmental Services, Inc., in accordance with the plans and specifications dated July 8, 1988, prepared by the Department of School Facilities.

RESOLUTION NO. 397-88 Re: PERSONNEL APPOINTMENTS, TRANSFERS, AND REASSIGNMENTS

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

RESOLVED, That the following personnel appointments, transfers, and reassignments be approved:

APPOINTMENT	PRESENT POSITION	AS
H. Philip Rohr	Director Dept. of Educational	Associate Supt. for Supportive Svs.

	Facilities Planning and Development	Effective: 7-26-88
Robert N. Humbles	Principal Julius West MS	Supervisor of Sec. Instruction Area 2 Admin. Office Effective: 7-26-88
Karen B. Karch	Principal Walkersville MS Frederick Co., MD	Principal Gaithersburg ES Effective: 7-26-88
Dorothea Duffy	PPW Intern Area 3 Admin. Office	PPW Area 3 Admin. Office Effective: 7-26-88
TRANSFER	FROM	TO
Patricia Lesnick	Asst. Principal Longview School	Asst. Principal Stephen Knolls School Effective: 7-26-88
APPOINTMENT	PRESENT POSITION	AS
George W. Fisher	Special Assistant Support Svs. Project Office of the Assoc. Supt. for Sup. Svs.	Admin. Asst. to the Deputy Supt./Business Effective: 7-26-88
REASSIGNMENT	FROM	TO
Regina Sclar	Classroom Teacher Hoover JHS	Media Assistant Assignment to be determined Will maintain salary status To retire July 1, 1989

Re: ASSERTIVE DISCIPLINE

Mrs. DiFonzo reminded the Board that when they agreed to put this on the agenda, they had agreed they would keep the discussion to the report and the superintendent's response to that report. Dr. Pitt stated that he did not necessarily agree with the committee's report. He was personally not in favor of the program as he knew it, packaged and called, "assertive discipline." However, this was a far cry from what he said here. He said they ought to get rid of assertive discipline, but he was not saying remove the term and leave the program. In many schools there were elements of assertive discipline that to him made sense, but it was not assertive discipline because it was not packaged together. He was very concerned that the approach to discipline was having a whole series of small material awards that were not relevant in many ways. He was concerned if they set up consequences for children at any age that

were not appropriate for children at that age. He was concerned that in setting consequences up they automatically applied consequences without ever finding out why a child was behaving this way. As he observed most teachers, these were the things they did. However, in the classroom they could come out with some practical aspects of dealing with young people. They were dealing with a classroom of young people, and not an individual child in a parent relationship. He thought that modeling behavior was very important. He thought that setting rules for children was not bad. If they did it in a way that said if a child did not reach certain expectations that child would be punished, this was bad. He thought they had to use positive reinforcement, and this wasn't always material things. However, there were material rewards that children did receive including scholarships and winning awards. He said they had to be practical and not penalize students who did not, but he thought they had to show with praise what was appropriate behavior. If the behavior was not appropriate and it continued, there had to be some consequences.

Dr. Pitt stated that school discipline plans ought to be developed at the school level and not sent down from the area office. These should be tied to the policy on student rights and responsibilities. He did not have a problem with certain consequences being established and children being expected to meet certain basic standards. He had a problem if they used punishment as their basic approach. He had a problem if they treated children in a very harsh and unfair way. He always had a problem if people did not try to find out what the problem was.

Dr. Pitt said the bottom line was that not all of their attitudes were developed intrinsically. They were developed in a relationship with the environment. They must help people relate to the environment in a positive way. He had said their staff development would not have assertive discipline as one of its developmental processes in terms of teaching. He was a far cry from supporting that kind of approach as a package plan. On the other hand he supported teachers working together to try and develop a positive reinforcement for children with reasonable consequences. They did need to work very carefully with young children.

Mr. Ewing reported that one of the concerns that parents raised about the report and Dr. Pitt's comments on it was the extent to which principals, teachers, and parents in the schools where assertive discipline had been vigorously pursued heard about the report and Dr. Pitt's comments. He had heard parents praise Dr. Pitt's comments and say that the principals and teachers had not changed their behavior at all. He asked about the extent to which the message had gotten out. Dr. Pitt replied that he had delivered his message to the area superintendents, and he expected that the message would be delivered to everyone. He thought that they had to work slowly and carefully in this area and spend time working with teachers and principals in those schools. He thought there would be changes.

Mr. Ewing said that when the committee observed the schools and looked at what was going on there, they had a relatively short period

of time to do this. He wondered about the extent to which the committee felt its observations were adequate to determine the extent to which there was a problem. Dr. Pitt replied that the members of the committee had met with him, and he had made it very clear that they should look at this carefully and thoroughly and listen to all sides. He believed the people on the committee represented a lot of skills and a lot of knowledge. For example, Dr. Richard Towers is a nationally known expert who has written a number of books. He did not believe there was any intent on the part of people on the committee to prove or disprove anything. Dr. Oliver Lancaster was a part of the group, and Dr. Pitt believed him to be a fair person.

Dr. Towers commented that they never knew to what extent an observation affected how people behaved. However, they did have three-member teams go to each of the schools; and they spent about three hours on each visit, one hour in the classroom, half an hour talking with teachers, half an hour talking with parents, and a half an hour talking with the principal. They looked at behaviors with regard to Lee Canter's model. They also looked at behaviors with regard to concerns parents had raised as to whether or not this was inhibiting interaction and whether or not students were being held up to ridicule or embarrassment. They also looked at what was going on in the classrooms in the schools where this training had taken place. They did not know to what extent behavior they observed might have been affected by the very fact that they were observing it.

Dr. Towers reported that they used a structure instrument and rotated people on the teams. They took some measures to make sure they were objective. Their findings indicate a wide range of activities that were observed which varied from classroom to classroom. He noted that there was a divergence of opinion on the committee, and the report they prepared did represent a consensus. They were all impressed with the ingenuity of principals and teachers to never slavish adhere to a particular approach without deviance. They observed accommodations and modifications based on different approaches, philosophies, and experiences.

Mr. Ewing pointed out that in his memo, Dr. Pitt had asked the deputy superintendent to work with area associate superintendents and principals to do four things. He asked about training opportunities being provided in classroom management and what monitoring of school discipline practices were going on. He wanted some sense that these four things were being done. Dr. Pitt replied that he had personally been involved with Staff Development to see what programs were available. When they talked about induction, he said there were two things that would help support new teachers in the area of discipline. Dr. Vance said he had not made an effort to define for the area associates and Dr. Fountain how they would go about monitoring and supervising those practices. He had asked them to provide him with periodic reports about their findings and the circumstances surrounding their monitoring. When they pulled that together, he would share it with the superintendent and members of the Board.

Mr. Ewing recalled that there were a number of community comments. At one school the principal had named a discipline committee, but no one on the PTA board knew who was on the committee. In another case, the principal appointed a discipline committee which deliberately did not include anyone involved with the PTA. He did not know that PTA boards should be the sole source of members of discipline committee, but it seemed to him that PTA executive boards should know that there was a discipline committee and who was on it. In these schools, the parents had reported no change after the report had come out. He was concerned about that and the Board's discipline policy and parental involvement. He thought that in the student handbook it said in four or five places that parents should be involved. He noted that the superintendent had reached this conclusion as well. He was concerned that while they had discipline policies in virtually all the schools that in some schools parents were not involved.

Dr. Pitt stated that he had made it clear where he stood. They had almost 200 schools and 13,000 employees, and lots of things happened that he was not aware of. He thought that it behooved the area superintendent to see that the policies of the school system were followed. If a principal violated a policy, he wanted to meet with that principal. The principal had a responsibility to have good communication and let people know who was on the discipline committee.

Dr. Towers reported that in most cases that was one of two particular areas of the policy that was consistently violated. In their report they stated that involving students as well as parents in the development of the policy was something that was not taking place. People were being informed afterwards. Student involvement was another issue. This they attributed to the commercial approach being used which advocated this as a teacher-oriented approach. The other thing was taking into consideration the developmental stages and ages of individual youngsters. The major deficit in the commercial approach was the lack of consideration of individual differences; however, they observed over and over again that there were efforts to take into account individual differences although it was not uniform. Dr. Pitt observed that when they talked about a school discipline plan this was obviously where they expected parents to be involved. However, a teacher in a classroom could decide what rules should be involved, but obviously teachers did involve students and let parents know what was going on.

Mr. Ewing remarked that several people had mentioned the packaged, commercially available product. In his judgment that package was profoundly antidemocratic and fundamentally in conflict with MCPS policy. He was glad to hear Dr. Pitt's view of that. They had been badly advised to go forward with this, and he was pleased they were no longer pursuing this. He noted that one of the Board's priorities was to teach children to be independent learners, and the package contradicted this. Finally, the package manipulated teachers in his view. He was particularly pleased to see the superintendent's recommendation that they needed to provide training opportunities for teachers in classroom management.

Dr. Shoenberg asked about conditions in the schools which led to the decision to move forward along these lines. Dr. Towers replied that it appeared that there was a felt need. Some principals were concerned about the number of referrals to them for discipline. The teachers were concerned about the extent to which they were receiving support from the administration. This filled a void. He thought that more attention to this was going to help because there was a perception on the part of staff that not enough resources and support were given to discipline. One school picked up on this plan, and word spread so that others wanted the training. The plan cut down on referrals to the office and created a uniform approach to discipline throughout the school. It gave the school feelings of security and support.

Dr. Pitt explained that he was not advocating that they did not have rules and regulations or consistent practices. Principals and others had to support teachers to make sure that they were reinforced. The problem was that this could not be interpreted in a way that said there were not individual differences or that there wasn't a need for people to determine the cause of behavior. Some of the things in the package were not bad, but putting it together was a problem. Some schools used parts of the package and did very well with it. He thought there was a need for consistency and for children to understand that there were rules and regulations and certain kinds of behavior that were unacceptable. However, they had to do this in a way that was tempered and looked at growth and development.

Dr. Shoenberg commented that throughout this process he had been impressed with the amount of evidence from research that the group of parents as represented by Ms. McCracken had brought to bear to suggest that the general strategy of classroom management was not well founded. He had not seen any similar argument based on research from those who were proponents of the technique in which the teachers received training. He asked if he had missed something here. Dr. Towers replied that the only thing he had seen was a paper by a Dr. Barrett purporting to make a case for assertive discipline. It talked about a teacher-centered approach and the need for teachers to have assertiveness training in terms of their effectiveness. It did not refute the case of the research on the other side in terms of positive and negative reports on dampening motivation. On the other hand, a number of well-thought-of volumes on classroom management and disciplines reviewed a number of models of human growth and behavior. He said that human behavior was not totally dictated by an inner potential as opposed to outside stimuli affecting people. The behavioristic approach took the point of view that everything was the outside stimuli. Intrinsic motivation took the other extreme. However, most people in the field assumed it was an interaction between outside stimuli and intrinsic factors affecting human behavior. He thought that the case made most validly was for an eclectic case based on types of youngsters, the situation, with room for positive reinforcement, feelings, relationships, and self discipline. It would include positive reinforcement as well.

Dr. Shoenberg explained that he was looking for a preponderance of informed and supported opinion. It seemed to him that Dr. Towers was saying that to swallow the behavior modification techniques whole was not very good practice. He was concerned about the fact that this was entered into without a professional scholarly examination of the data that was available. As they talked about the need of teachers to have more opportunity to exercise professionalism, this seemed to him to be an example of having failed to exercise professionalism in that sense.

Dr. Shoenberg asked about the numbers of teachers they talked with you were in the early years of their careers. He wondered what they might have been able to discover about the preparation of teachers as regards their ability to evaluate one technique or another or their training in classroom management. He asked if this was something that colleges and universities needed to pay more attention to. Dr. Towers replied that this was a topic of discussion. It was the opinion of a number of people that preservice training in the area of classroom management did not hold them in good stead when they got into the field. He thought that teachers needed more than what they were getting. The committee recommended that they interact with teacher training institutions in the area to see whether or not this could be brought to their attention and perhaps work cooperatively with them in this area. Their other recommendation had to do with MCPS training of new teachers.

Mr. Goldensohn asked about the number of schools actually involved in the program. Dr. Towers replied that there were about eight in that cluster and three other schools in the county.

Mrs. Rafel observed that several years ago she had heard a secondary school principal talking to some students about discipline. The principal had based that discussion on the premise that discipline was based on respect. If you could instill a value for respect for oneself, for others, and for the environment, you had the starting place for discipline. After that, whenever she looked at discipline policies she had looked at them in that context. She had found the original Lee Canter model and other programs sufficiently deficient in that "respect" component. She was glad they were moving in other directions.

Mr. Ewing noted that there had been substantial numbers of parents who said they had either withdrawn or were planning to withdraw their children from the public schools. Most of these were majority parents in the Blair cluster. He asked what they were doing or what they planned to do to encourage these parents to reconsider. Dr. Pitt replied that he had not heard about large numbers, but it was important to work directly with parents who had a concern. Mrs. DiFonzo assumed that when school reconvened that the four recommendations articulated by the superintendent would be the guiding force in monitoring and working with parents and teachers vis a vis the student discipline policies. Dr. Pitt agreed. He asked Dr. Vance to provide the Board with some feedback in mid-October.

Re: NEXT STEPS REGARDING TEACHER INDUCTION

Dr. Pitt introduced Mr. Randy Changuris, chair of the induction work group. He said he was very proud of this committee as he was of the flexibility committee. He pointed out that a teacher was chair of this committee, and the group was very diverse, representing all segments of the school system. He thought the group had come up with some very good suggestions which he was pleased to recommend to the Board.

Dr. Pitt reported that he had followed the same process he had followed with the flexibility committee. When the report was issued, he met with the committee and later came back to the committee with his recommendations. He modified his recommendations slightly based on the committee's further input. He said that in the area of induction they had started a number of things a year ago, and the committee had examined those and then made its recommendations. He thought they were way ahead of where they were just two or three years ago in giving support to new teachers. He commended the Board for providing extra days for new teachers. He indicated that teachers themselves had done much to stimulate the need for this. He commented that these committees worked because teachers, administrators, MCEA, and the administration were trying to work together to be supportive.

Dr. Pitt said they were going to continue a number of recommendations. Last year they had selected a teacher to work with a number of new teachers in pre-training and during the school year. The group recommended this continue but recommended that the teachers doing this be selected collegially. He agreed and recommended they do this next year because the selection process was nearly completed. The second program had to do with a local school support team. This set up a colleague teacher for each new or beginning teacher. They would pilot this. The critical point here was that the principal and the staff together would select this colleague. He said that one of the recommendations was to draw lots to select that teacher, but he did not believe they should do that. His reasons had to do with the idea of teacher empowerment. If they were going to have teachers be involved in decisions like selecting a colleague teacher, they had to be involved in making decisions. He thought they had not done a very good job of helping teachers be in that mode of decision making. This had always been the job of the principal. He had reduced the number of schools from 15 to 10 for the pilot, and they had focused on elementary schools because that was where the new teachers were. They did believe there ought to be compensation, and that would have to be worked out with MCEA. They would have to come back to the Board on this one.

Dr. Pitt indicated that there was a third recommendation that he did not support. While it was not a bad idea, he did not think they could pay for it. The teacher-advisor model would free a teacher full-time to work with ten beginning teachers, and this would be expensive because of the number of new teachers they had. He thought there might be some modification of this that they could look at in

the future.

Mr. Changuris commented that the report was a result of many hours of discussion and debate. He thanked all the members of the group and especially Ken Muir and Dottie Nenstiel for their support and editing. The program was a formalized induction program which was long overdue. He felt that it would improve the quality of instruction and make it easier for new and beginning teachers to integrate into the total school community. The program was comprehensive and would guide teachers through their first two years of teaching. It would also provide them with all the resources that this school system had to offer. He echoed Dr. Pitt's remarks about the composition of the committee and the way it worked.

Mrs. Rafel stated that she had read the paper and was very excited about it. She had noted that there were not parents or public representatives on the committee and could understand why. She recalled that when she had done surveys for MCCPTA, teacher training and support had ranked as a very high priority among parents. She wondered how they envisioned explaining this induction process to parents and the community at large. Dr. Pitt explained that they tried to set these committees up with the people who would be most able to produce a product. He agreed that this information needed to be disseminated widely. They had already transmitted the document to a number of parent groups.

Mrs. Praisner noted that the report spoke to creating a standing induction advisory committee composed of teachers, parents, and administrators. However, when she looked at the membership plan, no parents were listed there. Mr. Changuris indicated that this would be rectified because there was no problem having parent representation on an advisory committee especially in terms of communicating to the committee.

Mrs. Praisner said she was intrigued by comments that adjustments might need to be made when some of the models were used at the secondary level. They would be hiring secondary teachers and special education teachers. Mr. Changuris explained that two of the teachers on the committee were secondary teachers. They had decided to concentrate on an induction program for the elementary schools at this time because of the need. However, in regard to the local support team, the composition would be the administrator, resource teacher or department chair, the resource counselor, the new beginning teacher, and the colleague teacher. All of these could be adapted to the secondary level. However, because they would not be piloting on the secondary level, they did not feel the need to go into detail.

Mrs. Praisner said the report had talked about what needed to be part of the training for new teachers. She wondered where this fit into the development of the program they already had. Dr. Pitt replied that they talked about taking some of these recommendations and looking at the current program. He would assume that the colleague teacher could give support here. Dr. Judy Patton added that they

were talking about modifying what they were doing already. At the present time the program for new teachers focused on the curriculum. In terms of dealing with the community they were beginning to look at how the local school could support that integration into the community. Mr. Changuris explained that a lot of this was based on work that Staff Development was already doing.

Mr. Allen Eisel reported that new teachers had needs in four areas. They had personal needs to get established in Montgomery County and in the community. They had curricular needs because no school in the country trained teachers to teach the MCPS curriculum. They had process skill needs including classroom management. They also had noninstructional needs such as back-to-school night and parent conferences. The teacher consultant program was a needs assessment based model where the new teachers would specify their needs. As the year progressed those needs changed. Dr. Pitt was pleased that Staff Development personnel had served on the committee along with teachers because this had produced some integrated thinking and programs.

Mrs. Praisner inquired about assessing the pilots once they were in place. Dr. Pitt replied that evaluation would be focused on the program rather than the individual teacher; however, this was an area they had to explore further. This was an area the standing committee could work on. He thought there would be good evaluation from the teachers in terms of how they perceived the program supporting them. He also thought they would get some data when new teachers were evaluated. Mr. Changuris added that what the committee had produced was a result of some prior research done by Staff Development. Dr. Patton stated that evaluation was a critical area. They had to decide how they wanted to evaluate it, what they wanted to evaluate, and how they could use this to make decisions about continuing the program or modifying it. Mrs. Praisner suggested that there might be some information they could generate which could be communicated to teacher training institutions.

Mrs. DiFonzo recalled that about a year ago they were concerned about recruiting Hispanic teachers who came to MCPS from other countries. These individuals had a culture shock moving into Montgomery County, and it seemed to be their needs should be part of this induction process. She thought that when they set up the programs with the mentors they should be particularly sensitive to foreign-speaking teachers. Ms. Maria Rodriguez stated that she was one of the Puerto Rican recruits. She reported that the minority recruitment team and other Hispanic teachers had formed an informal support team.

Ms. Bonnie Cullison suggested that needs of these teachers should be included in the training of experienced teachers who would be working with the new teacher. The concept behind the pilots was to make experienced teachers more responsible for the new teachers in dealing with these issues. Frequently in the past new teachers teamed up with experienced teachers, and this process systematized this. Dr. Pitt pointed out that when they hired Hispanic, Asian, and black teachers they might be placed in an environment where they were the only minority person. They recognized that they had to give support

to these people. He thought that if the colleague teacher understood the needs of these teachers, it could go a long way in breaking down attitudes that developed within a staff.

Mr. Ewing remarked that this was a very good report, and he hoped they would move on it promptly. He had looked for some discussion in the text about one of the summary recommendations that the beginning teachers should not be given complex assignments or noninstructional duties during their first year. Ms. Cullison replied that the committee had had quite a bit of discussion on this issue. In an elementary school a brand new teacher might be given a split classroom because they were low man on the totem pole. In addition, they should not be given noninstructional duties because they needed more time for planning and consulting with other teachers. Mr. Changuris reported that 17 years ago when he joined the school system he had four preparation and three cafeteria duties, and had it not been for a colleague it would have been extremely difficult for him. He was pleased that Dr. Pitt had recommended that the load be lightened for these new people. Dr. Pitt commented that this would become more of a problem when they hired more new teachers, and unfortunately they would be unable to do all of that. However, if the principal recognized this, they could do what they could in this situation.

Mr. Ewing asked if this was something which all affected parties would support. Mr. Changuris replied that they had consensus on this. The primary goal was the new teacher, and there was agreement that this was long overdue. Dr. Pitt said they were going to have to work on this, but he had seen some change in the last couple of years in terms of recognition of this problem. However, they had a long way to go. Mrs. DiFonzo hoped that they would not have schools loaded with new and beginning teachers. Dr. Pitt reported that three years from now they would be hiring 800 teachers, and he hoped that when they got to that situation they would have learned some things to allow them to adapt.

Mr. Ewing noted that one of the beliefs stated by the committee was that induction activities should provide collegial, formative assistance and should never be the basis for summative evaluations. He was sure that this was clear to the committee, but many community people would not find it so clear. Mr. Changuris suggested that Dr. Muir look at the wording. Mr. Ewing stated that this was a key issue in this whole enterprise. They were not arguing that this form of assistance in any of these pilots was in any way designed to evaluate. The program was to help teachers. Mr. Changuris added that new teachers would be reluctant to admit they were having trouble if they thought it might be used against them.

Mr. Goldensohn remarked that he was very pleased with the report. This was another piece of the puzzle to make a better school system for children and employees. He thought that the pilot level must be productive and effective. He pointed out that there was another political body in the county that would be looking at this because of the money budgeted for the recommendations of the Commission on

Excellence. The pilot phase must be very successful to survive that scrutiny later on. He was concerned that later on they would monitor the evenness of the efforts. The first ten pilot schools might run well, but when they had 150 schools operating that way it might not work as well. He thought that the advisor positions in the area office were critical.

Dr. Pitt pointed out that teachers would be giving feedback, and he thought they would get clear feedback when people were not getting the services they expected. Secondly, he thought they did need to put more money in Staff Development. He could not go along with some recommendations because of cost; however, the things they were talking about were reasonable although they would cost more money. Mrs. DiFonzo said it appeared from the discussion that Dr. Pitt should move forward. Mrs. Praisner requested a running tally on what had been allocated based on the budget application for this purpose.

Re: TEXTBOOK QUALITY AND SELECTION PROCESS

Dr. Pitt did not think there was any question about the major reports that had come out on textbooks. The problems with textbooks were clearly enuciated in Harriet Bernstein's study and others. Textbooks varied from subject to subject in their effectiveness. They were not saying that MCPS textbooks were wonderful. The point they wanted to stress was that a textbook was just part of the curriculum. In mathematics, it might be a significant part of the curriculum, but this varied in the subject areas. In the social sciences and English they tried to use a much more eclectic approach in trying to use a variety of materials and support. They had a lot of materials in their libraries that supplemented these programs. He suggested that they needed to work with textbook companies to improve textbooks. Mrs. DiFonzo said she had heard comments and read articles on the subject of textbook quality. She wondered what they were going to do if their conclusion this evening was that textbooks had been "dumbed out." Dr. Lois Martin, associate superintendent, suggested that they ought to call textbooks, "McBooks."

Mrs. Fran Dean, director of the Department of Instructional Resources, reported that in the late 60's and early 70's they had a lot of contact with publishers around the country with reference to sexism and racism in instructional materials. They did not know that this would lead to "dumbing down." Perhaps they needed to reestablish some of the contacts they had had in the past and talk to publishers. She believed that publishers wanted to issue good books and did listen to school systems when they had a serious criticism. Mrs. Dean hoped that they would never go back to the old days when they were not concerned about racism, sexism, and ageism in books.

Mr. Ewing appreciated the memo from Mrs. Dean which was helpful and right on target. He was pleased that Montgomery County was not a participant in a statewide textbook adoption process, and he hoped they would never go that route. Dr. Martin had supplied him with textbooks, and he had spent time reviewing texts in American history. There were one or two that were pretty good and would come up to the

standards set up by MCPS and Harriet Bernstein. However, there were examples of texts he hoped they could avoid. Some teachers had said that the increased reliance on standardized testing in school districts to show effectiveness resulted in districts selecting books to help students to do well on standardized tests and to emphasize the use of textbooks as repositories of information. He did not know that MCPS had ever gone through that kind of thought process. Some teachers were telling him that MCPS was placing more emphasis on standardized tests and as a consequence they were using textbooks more centrally and more significantly in classroom instruction. Since the textbooks were not in many cases terribly good, they were the victims of their own good intentions. He did not know what was happening in the classrooms in this regard. He asked if there was anything in their policies or procedures to them them correct this. He thought it was not a major problem for MCPS, but the emphasis on standardized testing promoted the possibility that they would get caught up in this problem.

Dr. Pitt stated that this was the dilemma facing them right now. There were systems focusing on minority test scores as MCPS was doing. There was an emphasis on standardized tests. Some school districts had put in new systems to improve on those tests. The issue was whether to develop these systems across the board that would do that. So far he had argued that they did not want to do that. Many of their students, both minority and majority, did not fit into that group of youngsters at the bottom of these tests. It was his feeling that they had to find ways to improve the test scores and yet not succumb to systematizing. This lost the opportunity for flexibility and for independent thinking. For a superintendent, this was a tough dilemma. The staff had discussed this, and their challenge was not to have that happen and still succeed.

Dr. Martin said she would like to approach this from the standpoint of the state accountability testing and with regard to the College Board tests. Dr. Thomas Rowan, coordinator of elementary mathematics, reported that in elementary math they had done correlations with standardized tests and their curriculum. They had a good correlation, and students did quite well on the standardized tests when they were succeeding in the MCPS curriculum. Textbooks were chosen to match the MCPS curriculum and not to match the standardized tests. This morning he had met with a group of MCPS teachers who asked about the issue of standardized tests and whether they could believe the data that teaching the curriculum well would get students where they needed to be on standardized tests. The tests and textbooks tended to be much more skill-oriented than the curriculum. A study had been received on math textbooks, and the imbalance in skill development in textbooks rather than concept development was significant. All the data indicate if you worked toward concept development, the skills would follow. A group from the National Council of Teachers of Mathematics was going to come out with recommendations for curriculum and evaluations for mathematics K-12, and there would be a section on evaluation of student and program outcomes which would be critical of standardized tests.

Mrs. Christa Norment, teacher specialist, reported that they did not select books to help students do better on standardized tests; however, imbedded in the test were many of the basic skills that students encountered in everyday reading experiences. The fallacy was looking at the standardized tests as something in isolation from what the children were doing daily. If their reading philosophy was that children should gain meaning from what they were reading, then standardized testing was a continuous part of what was happening in the classroom. They were trying to tell teachers to teach effectively, and the children will do well on the test. An irony was that if children were taught phonics in isolation and not in decoding in context, they did not seem to make the transition when they were taking the test.

Mr. William Clark, director of the Department of Academic Skills, reported that in the reading/language arts they had moved away from basal series and focused on good literature books. He said that standardized tests were making inroads on publishers of math textbooks in that a lot of math texts did contain tests at the end of the chapters. More and more of these were appearing in a multiple choice format which showed a sensitivity to the kinds of tests these students would be taking. He did not see this as a bad thing in and of itself, but they had a problem when texts reflected only standardized tests and not the rich curriculum.

Ms. Sally Walsh, coordinator of secondary English/language arts, said they were concerned about student performance on the scholastic aptitude tests. Every high school and most J/I/M schools had a vocabulary program. This was a separate entity, and she did not like it that way, but it did focus on vocabulary. Teachers had always drawn vocabulary from the readings being studied. While they were not specifically gearing for a test, they did try to make students aware that scholastic aptitude tests were very important. In the context of reading skills, they were teaching strategies for understanding. At the high schools with the generic approach, they were teaching students how to attack a piece of literature. Teachers were trying to show students that literature could be approached in many different ways. They had a range of different approaches to literature, but the aim was always to use literature as it was. Dr. Pitt noted that they had started with a discussion on textbooks and moved into a discussion on testing. His conclusion was that American education was being influenced more and more by testing.

Dr. Shoenberg commented that discussions of textbooks seemed to focus largely on history texts, and they never discussed the science texts. It seemed to him that science courses were very frequently textbook based. Some textbooks focused rather narrowly on scientific concepts with very little information about the history of science or scientific reasoning. He asked what they did in the way of evaluating science texts so that the texts they used would be richer and more complex. He also asked whether they used very much in the way of supplementary materials. Dr. Wayne Moyer, coordinator of secondary science, replied that textbook publishers were market driven. For the lower grades, the tendency was to take the most

popular text and clone it. All texts were pretty much alike. They could purchase good textbooks in chemistry and physics. At the lower grades it was necessary for the teacher to work much harder to obtain a text that did correlate and to supplement the text with their own material.

Dr. Charles LaRue, coordinator of elementary science, reported that elementary science textbooks had improved drastically in the last decade. There was an attempt to have some greater depth on topics and better reading opportunities within the text on related subjects. There were opportunities to cross over to other areas of the curriculum. There was a 1989 series just on the market which received rave reviews from teachers. Mrs. DiFonzo asked if a set could be made available in the Board Office.

Dr. Pitt did not think there was much more that MCPS could do. He thought they had to join with other places and people and make their thoughts felt on a national level in this area. They should emphasize the good things that they had seen. They had to maintain good common sense and flexibility in the classroom and not teach from an individual textbook.

Mr. Ewing suggested they might be underestimating their impact. He thought that as a premier school district they might have some effect on publishers. Mrs. Praisner said it might be useful to find out if other jurisdictions shared those concerns. She asked that they check with the rest of the State of Maryland and the National Federation of Urban-Suburban School Districts. They could survey some of their colleagues and find out if they shared some of those concerns, and she suggested that a little questionnaire be crafted. It could also be raised at the NFUSSD conference in October. Mr. Ewing added that they had the Metropolitan Area Boards as well. Dr. Pitt suggested that Mrs. Dean and Dr. Martin could do some of that on a local basis with other jurisdictions.

Re: BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS

1. Mrs. Rafel said she had read the DEA/NSF study on mathematics. She had read the comments about parent participation in their children's math education. The superintendent mentioned that he was also concerned about how they were communicating to parents and what parents were doing for their children. She would be interested in knowing what they would be discussing about that issue. Mrs. DiFonzo noted that SCIENCE magazine had an article about Montgomery County and that study. Dr. Pitt was going to make copies available to Board members. The article asked what the study meant for the rest of the country.
2. Mrs. Praisner reported that she had just returned from two weeks in Korea as a guest of the Korean government to learn a little more about Korean culture, education, and family support for education. In addition to learning a great deal about Korea, she learned a great deal about some of the other school districts that were part of the trip. This left her with a very positive feeling about what they were doing in Montgomery County. For example, many of the people

talked about their English-as-a-second-language students. Montgomery County referred to those students as English-for-speakers-of-other-languages. MCPS recognized that these students in many cases spoke more than one language and came from very rich cultures. She had shared information about their ESOL counselor programs and found out they were way ahead of a lot of jurisdictions in that kind of support for students.

3. Mr. Goldensohn recalled that a year ago he had asked questions of staff about getting information out to teachers during the summer time about personnel vacancies in the school system. Normally those were advertised in the BULLETIN which was not published during the summer. The management memo picked up the slack in the summer time; however, the management memo had a shorter press run. His survey of teachers at workshops at Wootton High School revealed that copies were not getting to them. He asked that efforts be made to make sure copies were in all schools and available in high school lobbies.
4. Mrs. DiFonzo commented that she had been in New England for three days visiting a number of MCPS youngsters in special education residential placement. She was pleased with the services that these youngsters were receiving, and she was especially pleased with the high regard in which MCPS was held by those special education schools. She urged Board members to visit these schools if they had the opportunity.

RESOLUTION NO. 398-88 Re: EXECUTIVE SESSION - AUGUST 22, 1988

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Mrs. Praisner 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 August 22, 1988, 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. 399-88 Re: MINUTES OF MAY 10, 1988

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

RESOLVED, That the minutes of May 10, 1988, be approved.

RESOLUTION NO. 400-88 Re: MINUTES OF MAY 23, 1988

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

RESOLVED, That the minutes of May 23, 1988, be approved.

RESOLUTION NO. 401-88 Re: MINUTES OF JUNE 9, 1988

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

RESOLVED, That the minutes of June 9, 1988, be approved.

RESOLUTION NO. 402-88 Re: ELEMENTARY FOREIGN LANGUAGE PROGRAMS

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

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education request the superintendent to develop a plan or plans for additional intensive foreign language experiences in an elementary school or schools in parts of the county sufficiently far removed from the French Immersion Program at Oak View so as not to disturb the effectiveness of that program. For the record, Mrs. Praisner stated that the next step was not to expand the intensive programs but to do what Dr. Shoenberg and Mr. Ewing were talking about which was to expand elementary foreign language experiences and opportunities across the board. She was afraid that doing what this motion suggested might be counterproductive to what she thought the next steps should be. Mrs. Rafel expressed her agreement with Mrs. Praisner's remarks.

RESOLUTION NO. 403-88 Re: BOARD GUIDELINES FOR ADVISORY COMMITTEES

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

WHEREAS, Resolution NO. 278-84, May 1, 1984, amended by Resolution No. 215-86, March 24, 1986, sets forth current Board Guidelines for Advisory Committees; and

WHEREAS, The guidelines are scheduled for reprinting in the Policies and Regulations Handbook in the near future and should be revised before printing; and

WHEREAS, The title of the guidelines does not make it clear that these are guidelines for Board of Education committees; and

WHEREAS, The guidelines need to specify terms of office for student advisory committee members; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the guidelines be renamed, "Guidelines for Board of Education Advisory Committees"; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the word "weekly" be deleted from Item 2 regarding advertising in Montgomery County newspapers; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the Board revised Item 2 in the guidelines by adding the following:

Student appointments to Board advisory committees shall be for one-year terms. All student member terms will begin on January 1 and end on December 31 of the same year.

#### GUIDELINES FOR BOARD OF EDUCATION ADVISORY COMMITTEES

1. The Board of Education will normally announce the formation of an advisory committee, and its purpose, in a display advertisement or news release in one or more Montgomery County newspapers and through other media. The advertisement will encourage interested persons to apply to the president of the Board of Education for membership on the advisory committee. Persons who apply as a result of the announcement, plus others who may be recommended by Board members, the superintendent of schools or organizations, will be considered for appointment to the advisory committee.
2. The Board will endeavor to appoint advisory committees balanced by geographic area, race, sex, and a range of viewpoints. All appointments shall be for a two-year term unless specifically designated. Terms of office will end on June 30 or December 31. Student appointments to Board advisory committees shall be for one-year terms. All student member terms will begin on January 1 and end on December 31 of the same year. If the committee's task is expected to take more than one year to accomplish, overlapping terms and rotating membership will be considered. No members shall be appointed to serve for more than two consecutive terms on the same committee unless specifically designated.
3. If vacancies occur on advisory committees, replacement members usually will be selected by the Board, whenever possible, from a list of persons who have previously indicated an interest in serving. In the event there is no list of interested candidates for an advisory committee, or names on the list have been in existence for 18 or more months, new candidates will be solicited through newspaper announcements. Members filling vacancies will be appointed at the June all-day Board meeting or the December all-day meeting. When a member has resigned during his/her term of office, the person filling the vacancy will be appointed for the remainder of that term. In cases where the Board has determined membership on a committee will be by organization, the organization will be requested to submit nominees for vacancies.

4. In some cases, the superintendent will be asked to designate a staff liaison member to facilitate information-gathering for the committee, to ensure good communication between the committee and the Board, and, when requested, to assist the advisory committee in preparing the committee's report(s).

5. The responsibility of advisory committees is to the Board of Education, and committees receive their direction and guidance from the Board of Education.

For the record, Mrs. Praisner explained that this was one of three resolutions involving the activities of Board committees.

RESOLUTION NO. 404-88 Re: APPOINTMENT OF BOARD MEMBER TO MCPS  
EDUCATIONAL FOUNDATION, INC.

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

WHEREAS, On July 12, 1988, the Montgomery County Board of Education established the Montgomery County Public Schools Educational Foundation, Inc. to receive escheated funds under Maryland Estate Law; and

WHEREAS, The Bylaws of the Foundation require that one member of the Montgomery County Board of Education serve as a foundation director for a term of three years; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education appoint the following member to a three-year term on the MCPS Educational Foundation, Inc.:

Blair G. Ewing

and be it further

RESOLVED, That the term of office for the Board member begin immediately and terminate on June 30, 1991.

RESOLUTION NO. 405-88 Re: DISCUSSION OF THE PROPOSED UP-COUNTY  
SPECIAL PROGRAM

On motion of Mr. Goldensohn seconded by Mr. Herscowitz (on June 27, 1988), the following resolution was adopted unanimously:

RESOLVED, That the Board schedule a review of the recommendations of the superintendent issued last November on the proposed up-county special program with the intention to reach a Board decision on next steps and whether to support the superintendent.

RESOLUTION NO. 406-88 Re: BOE APPEAL NO. 1988-1

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

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education adopt its decision and order in BOE Appeal No. 1988-1, student disciplinary matter.

RESOLUTION NO. 407-88 Re: BOE APPEAL NO. 1988-5

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

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education adopt its decision and order in BOE Appeal No. 1988-5, personnel matter.

RESOLUTION NO. 408-88 Re: BOE APPEAL NO. 1988-7

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

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education adopt its decision and order in BOE Appeal No. 1988-8, personnel matter.

RESOLUTION NO. 409-88 Re: BOE APPEAL NO. 1988-9

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

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education adopt its decision and order in BOE Appeal No. 1988-9, student transfer.

RESOLUTION NO. 410-88 Re: BOE APPEAL NO. 1988-11

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

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education adopt its decision and order in BOE Appeal No. 1988-11, student transfer.

RESOLUTION NO. 411-88 Re: BOE APPEAL NO. 1988-10

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

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education adopt its decision and order in BOE Appeal No. 1988-10, student transfer.

RESOLUTION NO. 412-88 Re: BOE APPEAL NO. 1988-12

On motion of Mrs. Rafel seconded by Mrs. Praisner, the following

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

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education adopt its decision and order in BOE Appeal No. 1988-12, student transfer.

RESOLUTION NO. 413-88 Re: BOE APPEAL NO. 1988-14

On motion of Mrs. Rafel seconded by Mrs. Praisner, the following resolution was unanimously:

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education dismiss BOE Appeal No. 1988-14, student transfer, at the appellant's request.

Re: NEW BUSINESS

1. Mr. Ewing moved and Mr. Goldensohn seconded that the Board of Education schedule a time for discussion of the DEA study of gifted and talented programs, the report of the superintendent's advisory committee for gifted and talented and, if appropriate, a review of the policy on gifted and talented.
2. Mr. Ewing moved and Dr. Shoenberg seconded that the Board of Education schedule a discussion of the recently issued report funded by the National Science Foundation and completed by the DEA staff on the Participation and Performance of Women and Minorities in Mathematics.

Re: ADJOURNMENT

The president adjourned the meeting at 11:10 p.m.

-----  
PRESIDENT

-----  
SECRETARY

HP:mlw