



and expend within the FY 1989 Provision for Future Supported Projects a grant award of \$3,834 from the Commission on the Bicentennial of the United States Constitution in the following categories:

	CATEGORY	AMOUNT
1	Administration	\$ 3,634
10	Fringe Benefits	200
		-----
	Total	\$ 3,834

and be it further

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

RESOLUTION NO. 494-88 Re: RECOMMENDED FY 1989 SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION FOR THE CHAPTER I, ECIA PROGRAM

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

RESOLVED, That the superintendent of schools be authorized, subject to County Council approval, to receive and expend an FY 1989 supplemental appropriation of \$293,850 from the Maryland State Department of Education under the Education Consolidation and Improvement Act to expand Chapter I services to 500 additional eligible students in the following categories:

	CATEGORY	POSITIONS	AMOUNT
2	Instructional Salaries Inst. Asst.,Gr. 10 (10 mo.)	15.1	\$210,283
10	Fixed Charges		83,567
		----	-----
	Total	15.1	\$293,850

and be it further

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

RESOLUTION NO. 495-88 Re: RECOMMENDED FY 1989 SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION FOR THE EDUCATION OF ALL HANDICAPPED CHILDREN PROGRAM

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

RESOLVED, That the superintendent of schools be authorized, subject to County Council approval, to receive and expend an FY 1989 supplemental appropriation of \$383,228 from the MSDE under the Education for All Handicapped Children Act to expand special education services in the following categories:

	CATEGORY	POSITIONS	AMOUNT
4	Special Education Tchrs.	2.5	\$297,974
	Inst. Assts.	11.6	
10	Fixed Charges		85,254
		----	-----
	Total	14.1	\$383,228

and be it further

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

RESOLUTION NO. 496-88 Re: EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION FOR ELEMENTARY SUMMER SCHOOL PROGRAM

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 restored the elementary enrichment/ gifted and talented summer school program in FY 1989; and

WHEREAS, The Board of Education increased the tuition rate for the elementary summer school program to \$103 and indicated its intent to request an emergency supplemental appropriation in the amount of the tuition raised for the restored program; and

WHEREAS, There were 1,138 students who enrolled and paid tuition for the elementary summer school program that resulted in total tuition of \$117,214; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education requests an emergency supplemental appropriation from the County Council in the amount of \$117,214 for the FY 89 elementary enrichment/gifted and talented summer school program, in the following categories:

CATEGORY	DESCRIPTION	AMOUNT
2	Instructional Salaries	\$103,925
3	Other Instructional Costs	2,896
10	Fixed Charges	10,393
		-----
	Total	\$117,214

and be it further

RESOLVED, That the county executive and County Council be given a copy of this request and that the county executive be requested to recommend approval of this emergency supplemental appropriation to the County Council.

RESOLUTION NO. 497-88 Re: PROCUREMENT CONTRACTS OVER \$25,000

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Mr. Goldensohn seconded by Mrs. Praisner, 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, contracts be awarded to the low responsive bidders meeting specifications as shown for the bids as follows:

BID	AWARDEE(S)	
88-21	Supply and Delivery of Hardware Items MSF-County Services Company	\$ 50,000
178-88	Classroom Furniture Baltimore Stationery Company	\$ 4,529
	Douron, Inc.	974,000
	Future Furniture	22,000
	Chas. G. Stott and Company, Inc.	47,776
	System Furniture Gallery, Inc.	6,250
	TOTAL	----- \$1,054,955
16-89	Canned Fruits and Vegetables, Soups and Juices Blue Ribbon Food Service, Inc.	\$ 2,874
	Carroll County Foods	129,401
	George D. Emerson Company	118,795*
	Princess Ann Products	29,950
	TOTAL	----- \$ 280,020
24-89	Scanning Forms and Scanning Machines National Computer System	\$ 40,866
25-89	Tank Level Sensor Calco Systems, Inc.	\$ 44,886
COG	Diesel Fuel	
Y-33895	Metallgesellschaft Corp. Green Fuel Company	\$ 682,403 75,822*
	TOTAL OVER \$25,000	----- \$ 758,225 \$2,228,952

\*Denotes MFD vendors

\*Mrs. DiFonzo joined the meeting at this point.

RESOLUTION NO. 498-88 Re: TRANSFER OF CAPITAL FUNDS

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

WHEREAS, Surplus funds have been identified in two capital projects that have been completed; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That excess funds in the following projects be transferred to the local unliquidated surplus account:

S. Christa McAuliffe ES	\$ 90,000
Clopper Mill ES	60,000
	-----
Total	\$150,000

and be it further

RESOLVED, That funds from the unliquidated surplus account be transferred to the following projects:

Broad Acres ES	\$ 81,000
Gaithersburg JHS	83,000
	-----
Total	\$164,000

and be it further

RESOLVED, That the county executive be requested to recommend that the County Council approve these transfers.

RESOLUTION NO. 499-88 Re: ARCHITECTURAL APPOINTMENT - HOPKINS ROAD  
ES (GERMANTOWN AREA ELEMENTARY SCHOOL  
FY 1991)

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

WHEREAS, The County Council has required that repeat designs be used for new school projects whenever possible; and

WHEREAS, Staff and the community have recommended that the Greencastle Elementary School design be used for Hopkins Road Elementary School; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the Montgomery County Board of Education enter into a contractual agreement with Thomas Clark Associates to provide

required design and construction administration services associated with resiting the Greencastle Elementary School design for Hopkins Road Elementary School for a fee of \$224,550.

RESOLUTION NO. 500-88 Re: REQUEST FOR ASBESTOS MANAGEMENT PLAN  
DEADLINE EXTENSION

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

WHEREAS, All Montgomery County Public School facilities have been inspected for the presence of asbestos materials, using professional consultants, and work on the management plans is now underway; and

WHEREAS, Congress, recognizing that developing the management plans presents many difficult and complex problems for local school districts, has provided an option of delaying submission of the plans until May 1989; and

WHEREAS, Because of the financial and policy implications of this multi-million dollar program, the Board of Education, County Council, and county executive should have a full discussion of this issue; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education authorize the superintendent to request an extension of the deadline for submitting asbestos management plans for the Montgomery County Public Schools.

RESOLUTION NO. 501-88 Re: ACCEPTANCE OF WATERS LANDING ELEMENTARY  
SCHOOL

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

RESOLVED, That having been duly inspected on September 21, 1988, Waters Landing Elementary School now be formally accepted, and that the official date of completion be established as that date upon which formal notice is received from the architect that the building has been completed in accordance with the plans and specifications, and all contract requirements have been met.

RESOLUTION NO. 502-88 Re: ACCEPTANCE OF ROLLING TERRACE ELEMENTARY  
SCHOOL

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

RESOLVED, That having been duly inspected on September 22, 1988, Rolling Terrace Elementary School now be formally accepted, and that the official date of completion be established as that date upon

which formal notice is received from the architect that the building has been completed in accordance with the plans and specifications, and all contract requirements have been met.

RESOLUTION NO. 503-88 Re: ACCEPTANCE OF GREENCASTLE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

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

RESOLVED, That having been duly inspected on September 26, 1988, Greencastle Elementary School now be formally accepted, and that the official date of completion be established as that date upon which formal notice is received from the architect that the building has been completed in accordance with the plans and specifications, and all contract requirements have been met.

RESOLUTION NO. 504-88 Re: ACCEPTANCE OF PAINT BRANCH HIGH SCHOOL

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

RESOLVED, That having been duly inspected on September 19, 1988, Paint Branch High School now be formally accepted, and that the official date of completion be established as that date upon which formal notice is received from the architect that the building has been completed in accordance with the plans and specifications, and all contract requirements have been met.

Re: INSPECTION DATES

The following inspection dates were established:

1. Strawberry Knoll ES. Monday, October 3, 10 a.m. Mrs. DiFonzo will attend.
2. Stone Mill ES. Monday, October 10, 10 a.m. Mrs. Praisner and Mrs. Rafel will attend.
3. Clearspring ES. Tuesday, October 18, 1 p.m. Mrs. DiFonzo will attend.
4. Gaithersburg JHS. Thursday, October 27, 1 p.m. Mrs. DiFonzo will attend.
5. Quince Orchard HS. Thursday, November 3, 9 a.m. Mrs. DiFonzo will attend.

RESOLUTION NO. 505-88 Re: PERSONNEL APPOINTMENT

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

RESOLVED, That the following personnel appointment be approved:

APPOINTMENT	PRESENT POSITION	AS
Robert Grossman	Director of Communications Los Angeles County Office of Education Downey, California	Director of Info. Dept. of Information Effective: 9-27-88

Re: PILOT DAY-CARE/KINDERGARTEN PROGRAM

Dr. Pitt stated that the Board had a report prepared by a group set up by the County Council. Mrs. Barbara Contrera was one of two members he had appointed to that group.

Mrs. Contrera explained that they had provided the Board with actions taken by the Council from March of 1988 and a progress report. The report had been prepared by Ms. Millie Grant, chief of the County's Child Care Division. They had people prepared to answer Board questions.

Dr. Shoenberg commented that one of the concerns was that they were providing supervision for children for a day that began earlier than the school day began and ended later than the school day ended. This was opposed to all-day kindergarten which would start later and end earlier. He said there was a necessity to do this pilot program and they would do it. His major concern was that this addressed only kindergarten children. He asked about a model for addressing the much broader need in view of space limitations.

Ms. Grant replied that the Department of Family Resources was looking at and trying to address all of the various needs, and the school system had a long history of helping by utilizing its resources for the benefit of child care programs. However, their charge as a group was to develop programs for children in kindergarten.

It seemed to Mrs. Praisner that they were not evaluating whether this was the best way to go or the best kind of program. They were looking at the curriculum, the climate, and whether the classrooms were appropriate and not whether this was the appropriate way for the county and the school system to work together to address day care needs and whether there were problems with this structure or process. She felt that the format and the structure had to be evaluated along with the costs and services. They had to learn about the long-term implications of using this model both for space in the school system and for other needs and other students. Mrs. Contrera replied that they tried not to put this model in competition with all-day kindergarten. Their charge was limited to the one year, and they were reluctant to do anything other than that which was specifically delineated in the charge. She said they could go ahead with another model and would pursue that with DEA because they would be helping them with the evaluation model.

Mrs. Praisner suggested they ask about the appropriateness of the structure organizationally as well as the facilities and the

relationships of the contract and any problems. Dr. Shoenberg added that anyone going into this was going to want to run a good program. The fact remained that of all the models they could have used this did not seem to them to be the best model they could pursue. He thought they should build into the evaluation whether or not this model was a good one and whether they wouldn't do better to pursue another model. Mrs. DiFonzo remarked that they were not asking themselves if this was the right way to proceed. If this was, they had to look at how it worked.

Dr. Cronin stated that there were two issues here. One was the need for day care which was the responsibility of many different county agencies. The county, the executive, Council, Board of Education, employers, women's organizations, and a variety of other organizations needed to address this as a total unit. In the course of budget discussions all-day kindergarten and this program ended up being coupled. He wondered if they could come back and say this was a nice pilot for kindergarten students in a very limited way and recommend that the county itself look at the entire picture of day care. Dr. Pitt remarked that they were in favor of all-day kindergarten, and while day care was a very important issue, it was not the school system's role. In this program the Council and other agencies would use school space, and a number of years ago the Board made a commitment to provide space where available. While he was sure MCPS would cooperate and do the right thing for children, he would not want this pilot to be seen as a school system program.

Mrs. Praisner stated that she was not opposing going forward with this program. However, in the assessment they had to raise the question of this being the best way to go. She said that it appeared that the school system would contract with the day care providers, and Dr. Gail Ayers clarified the situation. The MCPS would be leasing the space, but the providers would contract with the county government. Mrs. Praisner asked if they would have both morning and afternoon kindergarteners in the same space. Ms. Grant replied that there would be overlap of the two groups of students. Mrs. Praisner asked if parents would be allowed to contract for less than a full week of day care, and Ms. Grant replied that the providers could do this if they had the space, but they wouldn't necessarily do this. She added that the broader questions of child care and involvement in child care by various parties were good questions. However, the committee had a very limited charge and that was what they needed to evaluate.

Mr. Ewing remarked that he was convinced that with Ms. Grant and her staff and the MCPS staff they would have an excellent program. However, he said that some Council members saw this as an opportunity to do something like all-day kindergarten "on the cheap." They would be looking for the outcome that showed all-day kindergarten was not needed. The result of the pilot would be that the Council's case would be proven and all-day kindergarten would be stopped in its tracks. He hoped that the Council would look at the results of the community survey which showed that a rising proportion of people living in Montgomery County and a rising proportion of parents wanted

all-day kindergarten. They did not want half-day day care and half-day kindergarten. He thought the Council had given the group a task which was the wrong task and a set of objectives which were the wrong objectives.

Mr. Ewing suggested that at some point they did need to have a comprehensive discussion of child care. They should review roles and responsibilities particularly vis-a-vis the county and the Board. Dr. Pitt had said MCPS did not want to run day care, and Mr. Ewing suspected that was probably the view of most Board members. However, it seemed to him that the issue was already joined because of their involvement in this project. He pointed out that the Board had never dealt with the issues regarding space, student health, and nutrition, and yet these issues were related to one another and related to education. He felt it would have been healthy to start there rather than to leap into this issue as they had been forced to do.

Mr. Ewing noted that the Board had asked to be involved in the evaluation design. It seemed to him there was insufficient specificity about what it was they were trying to prove. He asked what they were trying to show other than that they could make this work. They had to know what the pilot succeeded in doing, who benefitted, how much did they benefit, did they succeed better than children who didn't have the program, and did they succeed at what. He pointed out that most evaluations involved comparisons. It was not clear to him what the evaluation objectives were. He asked when the Board would be asked to act formally on this issue as stated in their resolution.

Dr. Cronin agreed that the point of comparison was missing from the evaluation; however, he was not sure he wanted to put that in here. This issue had come up in the context of all-day kindergarten versus half-day kindergarten and this program. He thought they were asking whether the county could do a half-day kindergarten and a half-day day care program in a school. He was not sure they could answer this without a longitudinal study similar to ones that had been done in Head Start; however, it took four, five, six or more years to find out whether a child had succeeded in getting into a college because they had this program or an all-day kindergarten. If they got into that, they could see a program continue for the foreseeable future, and he thought they needed to say this is it. They could do the program for a couple of years, but the bigger issue must be addressed fully. The committee might want to say this was limited and had a limited evaluation scheme. He asked if the committee had the ability to come back to the Board and Council and tell them this pilot was shortsighted and they should start over again by looking at day care needs, not as a budget item, but simply care for the children of working parents.

Dr. Pitt asked the committee when they were going to the Council with this, and Mrs. Contrera replied that they had done this. They were now asking the Board to look at the proposal. She pointed out that there was nothing in here that posed this as an alternative to all-day kindergarten. This was an enriched program of day care featuring a salary supplement that was lacking in all other programs.

Ms. Grant called attention to the report before the Board and the list of features they were directed to put in the program. She thought the comparison in this case was between child care programs, this one with involvement of county and MCPS staff versus other child care programs in the schools. Mrs. Contrera explained that the funding was for only one year.

It seemed to Mrs. Praisner that the other difference was that this program was only for kindergarteners and other day care programs were available to all students. This brought them back to issue of whether this was the best way to run a program geared only for kindergarteners because of limitations. She said it was important for the committee to develop the evaluation, for the Board to see that evaluation, and to come up with conclusions afterwards. She said they had to address and evaluate whether it was a good idea to continue with a program for kindergarteners exclusively. They should survey the parents as to whether they wanted one child in one day care and another one someplace else. They also had to look at space limitations because there were going to be space implications that the county had not faced. Dr. Ayers agreed that they were hearing more and more about space limitations.

Dr. Pitt remarked that they did have a concern about child care, but there was a difference between having a concern and being responsible for child care. Child care by definition was not all-day kindergarten. It was not education. Child care was taking care of a child during a period of time when the parent could not do it. It was his understanding that if MCPS needed space for any of its programs, the school system programs came first. If the day care problem was going to be resolved, the county was going to have to provide for space. If the county felt day care should be in the schools, then they were obligated to provide additional space beyond the space the school system needed to run its educational program.

Mr. Ewing noted that the Board's resolution stated that the Board planned to approve a final plan and an evaluation design. Mr. Goldensohn suggested scheduling this for formal action at the next meeting. Mrs. DiFonzo agreed that this would be scheduled at the October 11 meeting for action. Dr. Shoenberg suggested that an evaluation design including Board questions be provided at the next meeting so that the Board could act on it.

Mrs. DiFonzo recalled that she had spoken to Mr. Hanna last winter when this issue had come up. She had pointed out that five-year-olds rarely came in packages all by themselves. Their siblings were usually in need of day care, too. Therefore, you might have families involved with two day care situations. Plus they needed a facility that could deal with not only the morning kindergarteners but also with the afternoon kindergarteners. It seemed to her that the pilot established what the Council had said which was a day care program that would dovetail with a half-day kindergarten program. That was fine as far as it went, but that was not where she was coming from if they were going to talk about day care because day care did not limit itself to half-day kindergarten students. They had to look at the

day care needs of the county. They had to ask whether this program addressed day care needs of parents in the county.

Mr. Goldensohn said he could not see this pilot expanding out to other schools. While it was going to start in two schools, it might be possible to expand it to three or four schools in the future. However, it was not going to get out to all the rest of the schools. It might help two or three communities but would not address the county day care problem. Dr. Pitt added that it would take the same space to expand this program as it would to expand all-day kindergarten. Mr. Goldensohn also pointed out that as growth occurred they might have to move the program out of these schools and go to a totally new area.

Dr. Cronin wanted to see a finetuning of the evaluation. He suggested that the issue be removed from the political arena so that they could get into the needs of the full day care issue. Mrs. Rafel inquired about the salary supplements. Ms. Grant explained that the child care providers felt they could not guarantee the same staff in a pilot program without a salary supplement. The supplement was to help the providers recruit and retain qualified staff for the pilot period. She also indicated that within the next month or two they would have an action plan on child care up to the year 2000 and said she would provide copies to the Board. Mrs. DiFonzo thanked the committee for their work.

Re: COMMUNITY SURVEY

Dr. Pitt reported that they had provided an executive summary and a survey for the Board. He said that 709 parents and others were interviewed and gave MCPS high grades. He indicated that 60 percent of those polled gave MCPS an A or B compared to 40 percent in the Gallup nationwide poll on education. Parents gave 79 percent to MCPS compared to 51 percent of parents in the Gallup sample. Parents also gave the schools good marks for communicating with them, with 91 percent they were kept informed about what was happening in the public schools. This compares to 67 in the Gallup poll. They said that building publications provided that information. Ninety-seven percent of all respondents said good schools were important in attracting people to Montgomery County, and they cited good teachers, the curriculum, academic emphasis, and special programs. As far as problems, parents cited large classes, discipline, obtaining good teachers, and drugs/alcohol. Generally people were more positive about MCPS than parents in the national poll.

Mrs. DiFonzo commented that there were a few things that jumped out at her. One was the overwhelming number of respondents who were very positive about the idea of all-day kindergarten and the expansion of that program. She was bothered by the tremendous number of people who were unaware of what MCPS was doing in the areas of drug and alcohol abuse prevention. The third item was the lack of public information on what MCPS was doing in conjunction with the business community. She was pleased with the generalized report card in terms of ABC's. The Gallup poll listed discipline as the number one

problem and that came in third in Montgomery County. She suggested that there were things they could do about notifying the community regarding activities in alcohol and drug abuse prevention and cooperation with the business community.

Mr. Ewing remarked that the point that Mrs. DiFonzo made about all-day kindergarten was a very good one. There was clearly overwhelming and growing support for that in the county in all groups. In addition, there was a desire to reduce large classes. There was clearly strong support for getting good teachers, and those things were all substantial cost items. One would expect that people wanted these things but with no increase in taxes. However, people did say they were prepared to pay for education. He hoped that the media would note this and that it would be sent to the Council and county government.

Mr. Ewing felt that the survey was a useful device to see trends over time. He would hope they would continue to ask these questions from time to time. It seemed to him it was quite feasible to use this same technique at getting at some other issues including finding out what it was that minority parents and students thought about the public schools. They could use the survey methodology to get at how minority parents felt and the problems they faced in dealing with the school system. Mrs. Sally Keeler replied that this could be done, but they would need a much larger sample for the responses to be meaningful. Of the people willing to pay more taxes, it was 70 percent of those who said MCPS needed more money. However, this was still a significant number. Two trends that showed up this time were the overcrowding issue and an increasing concern about drug abuse. She pointed out that interesting enough parents of high school students said that drug abuse was decreasing.

Mrs. Rafel recalled that a couple of years ago the Gallup poll had asked people how recently they had been in the school buildings, and there was a connection between people's perceptions of what was going on in the schools to how recently they had actually been in the building. She wondered if some of that applied to the drug and alcohol abuse question. Mrs. Keeler said that was possible because when they asked about gifted and talented programs and special education there was a smaller number of people who had information about that.

Dr. Shoenberg pointed out that the question asked was really about drug abuse, and he wondered if the answers were about drug abuse or drug and alcohol abuse. He noted that drug usage was going down but alcohol abuse is going up. Mrs. Keeler pointed out that the follow-up question did mention alcohol separately when they asked about programs. She agreed that the percentage might go up if this had been coupled in the first question.

Dr. Cronin asked for some clarification on the statement that people were willing to pay more money. It stated that 74 percent were prepared to pay more taxes; however, this was 74 percent of those who felt the school system did not have enough. This was 74 percent of

42 percent which meant about 30 percent of the respondents. Mrs. Keeler explained that 60 percent of the respondents were not asked the question about taxes. She agreed that they would have been better off if they had asked everyone that question rather than those who said the school system did not have enough.

Dr. Pitt thought they needed to look at Mr. Ewing's concern of trying to get more data from minority parents. He noted that on the countywide sample the percent of parents giving the highest ratings to the school system were Hispanics and blacks.

Mr. Ewing asked if it was their intent to make sure that the media understood the methodology used. He remarked that this methodology guaranteed them about as much objectivity as any survey could give them. He hoped that people would understand that this was a professionally done survey that had been done for the last decade or more.

Mrs. Keeler agreed to share a copy of the script used with the survey. She explained that they did not know who the people were because they used a computer program of active exchanges in the county. Mr. Goldensohn pointed out that this was as random a sample as they could possibly have. Mrs. Keeler noted that they did try to interpret the results and had given the Board just the results. To get a confidence level they had to call a certain number of people. This gave them a confidence level of 95 percent plus or minus 5 percent. Mrs. DiFonzo thanked staff for the report.

Re: STAFF RESPONSE TO THE STUDY "SCHOOLING  
IN THE INFORMATION AGE" (COMPUTER  
EDUCATION)

Dr. Pitt explained that this was the staff response to the recommendations of the computer education committee. He indicated that to finish the five-year plan they would have to ask for additional funds this year, and he intended to follow that recommendation and speed the process up.

Ms. Beverly Sangston, director of the Department of Computer-related Instruction, felt that the study group did a tremendous job of looking at their computer education program and at their current five-year plan for its adequacy in meeting the needs of MCPS students and staff. They had made two major recommendations. One was to accelerate the five-year plan into a four-year plan. Another was to look at a major comprehensive planning effort that would go across technologies. Dr. Pitt added that they were already making this effort in new schools.

Mrs. Praisner noted that the response talked about strengthening the links between the home and school and consideration of purchasing machines and software for home loan. When they talked with the members of the Housing Opportunities Commission, she had asked if they were working in some of their housing complexes on that same issue. They were looking into that, and it seemed to her this would

be an ideal way for MCPS to start and mesh with what they were doing. Perhaps some representatives of the community might want to work on a project. Dr. Pitt replied that they were very interested in that. They were also looking at other possible kinds of technology including the use of video cassettes with youngsters to give parents help.

Mrs. Praisner pointed out that they had a goal to insure closer coordination between the central and area offices and the schools in planning and implementation. At some point, she would like to know about the specific activities directed toward this objective. Finally, they had talked about recommendations as far as teacher training in technology with new teachers. She wanted to know what progress they had had in discussions with the University of Maryland for their teacher training program and other programs. She offered her assistance in pursuing this.

Dr. Shoenberg remarked that as they had noted many times, the technology far exceeded their ability to use the potential of the technology. With the available technology, there were lots of ideas out there, but they could not take advantage of all those opportunities. Presumably if they had things that worked, they wanted to try and propagate them in some way or another. Some things they would find useful to try and adopt system-wide, and other things would be made available through an in-service workshop. Other things would work for an individual teacher. He asked how they made decisions about things they were going to try and do on a very large scale as opposed to those things they would do on a small scale as opposed to those things they would do with individual teachers.

Ms. Sangston replied that on a large scale they were looking at equity across the school system. One program they felt was extremely important was the computer science curriculum at the high school and making sure they had the hardware, software, and teacher training in place to deliver those courses. Another area of major focus was following research trends and looking at what was happening nationally. One area was looking at the use of computers in writing. Right now 14 out of their 20 high schools had a writing lab. This was one of their primary focuses across all secondary schools. Another area was looking at the teaching of mathematics and how the computer could serve as a tool for teachers and students in math. As the math curriculum was being revised, technology was being incorporated. These were areas to which all students should have access.

Ms. Sangston said they were looking at video disc technology. In this case, they would start out working with subject coordinators or individual teachers in schools that were willing to try out some of these new technologies and to develop programs. Then they had to look at the value of that instructionally for students. At the elementary level, they were putting computers in the classrooms as tools for the teachers. They were providing a variety of software packages so that they could individualize instruction. Therefore, they were not going to find teachers using the same software

packages. They matched what was available to the needs of their students.

Dr. Shoenberg asked if they were getting pressure from sales people or community people and particularly teachers who became enamored of one particular technique or technology who were pushing them to make the thing available system-wide. Ms. Sangston replied that this had not happened yet because they hadn't had that much technology to put out there. One example was writing labs where they brought together the curriculum and teacher training. Once they developed the curriculum and made the link with the technology, they created the base of teachers anxious to have access to the technology. They tried to precede putting the computers out there with that training.

Dr. Shoenberg said it appeared they were able to proceed in a reasonably orderly way without hampering creativity. Ms. Sangston agreed that they did not want to stifle creativity. They did not have all the answers of how these technologies could be used to meet the needs of students. Much of what they had learned had been in a loop of feedback from teachers. At the secondary level they had computer coordinators who were volunteers, and they were trying to establish the same kind of program at the elementary level with computer liaisons. This would help them to increase the communication between schools and areas. They hoped to have meetings and provide special training opportunities for these people. Dr. Pitt added that a teacher having an idea and getting the opportunity to pass that idea along was a good point.

Mrs. DiFonzo said they had talked about the rapid turnover in technology and computers and programs becoming obsolete. She asked about the average lifetime of this equipment. Ms. Sangston replied that the life span was five to seven years for the technology they have had. Fortunately they had flexibility in the programs because they had standardized initially on hardware. When they needed more sophisticated hardware in the senior high school, they could replace equipment and move that original equipment down to the lower levels. The first computers purchased were now being used in the science program at the junior high schools. However, they could not move equipment to the elementary level because they had different needs there including color monitors and also the concept of networking. She indicated that they had not yet built in a replacement program for the capital budget.

Mrs. Rafel asked if they were comfortable with what they were hearing about the programs to enhance what MCPS was doing. At Johns Hopkins there was a new graduate program, and some teachers were taking that program. Ms. Sangston agreed that they needed to look at that and other ways to deliver training. Their present program had been fostered by teachers taking in-service courses on their own time. They now needed to investigate some other ways to provide training. They were now talking to staff development about the new teacher training program in being able to come in at the second year of employment in MCPS.

Mrs. Rafel commented that she found all of this very exciting. This was what they were really going to be doing in the next 10 or 15 years. However, she found the cost of this a little daunting. Dr. Pitt agreed that they were going to have to increase funding in this area. Dr. Cronin remarked that having the plan was instrumental in getting the initial stages of the funding from the Council. Mrs. DiFonzo asked if the report had been shared with the Council, and Dr. Pitt assured her that it had.

RESOLUTION NO. 506-88 Re: AIDS EDUCATION

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

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education approve the AIDS education curriculum plan as presented by the superintendent.

Re: BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS

1. Mr. Goldensohn reported that at the last meeting he had requested that the discussion on the up-county math/science program be scheduled earlier than November 10. He asked that it be moved up to October 11 and scheduled for 15 minutes. Mrs. DiFonzo suggested he bring this up as a motion under new business.
2. Dr. Cronin stated that he had had the opportunity this week to meet with Montgomery County cable people on a proposal to begin a program at the Edison Center on both cable installation and servicing. He would supply the superintendent with the details of that discussion and leave it up to him to talk with the people about the program.
3. Mr. Ewing indicated that the Council was holding hearings on September 29 on several bills related to minority procurement. One bill had been introduced by Councilman Leggett. The suggestion had been made that perhaps the Board would be interested in proposing similar legislation at the state level during the next session. It seemed to him it would be worthwhile for the staff to review what was being proposed by Councilman Leggett and others to see if the Board should react. He asked that the superintendent respond to the Board on this issue.
4. Mr. Ewing felt it would be timely for the Board and superintendent to consider some discussion and analysis of the structure and functions of the Human Relations Department. Mr. Nix and Mr. Robinson had suggested that now might be a good time given that MCPS had a new director and given that the Board had not talked much about that office. Over the years there had been some differences of view about what were the appropriate roles and functions of that office. He asked for the superintendent's view of this suggestion.
5. Mr. Goldensohn reported that teachers at several new schools were having problems with new copy machines. On the plus side, he had heard that the repair maintenance service was excellent. He asked the superintendent to look into this and see whether these new machines should be replaced.

6. Mrs. DiFonzo congratulated the student Board member and other students who had been named National Merit Scholar Semifinalists. She wished the students well in their pursuits.

RESOLUTION NO. 507-88 Re: EXECUTIVE SESSION - OCTOBER 11, 1988

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

WHEREAS, The Board of Education of Montgomery County is authorized by 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 October 11, 1988, at 9 a.m. to discuss, consider, deliberate, and/or otherwise decide the employment, assignment, appointment, promotion, demotion, compensation, discipline, removal, or resignation of employees, appointees, or officials over whom it has jurisdiction, or any other personnel matter affecting one or more particular individuals and to comply with a specific constitutional, statutory or judicially imposed requirement 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; and be it further

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

RESOLUTION NO. 508-88 Re: MINUTES OF AUGUST 22, 1988

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

RESOLVED, That the minutes of August 22, 1988, be approved.

RESOLUTION NO. 509-88 Re: MINUTES OF AUGUST 30, 1988

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

RESOLVED, That the minutes of August 30, 1988, be approved.

RESOLUTION NO. 510-88 Re: APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO THE EDUCATIONAL FOUNDATION, INC.

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

WHEREAS, On July 12, 1988, the Board of Education established the Montgomery County Public Schools' Educational Foundation, Inc.; and

WHEREAS, The Board of Education approved the Articles of Incorporation and Bylaws of the Montgomery County Public Schools' Educational Foundation, Inc.; and

WHEREAS, The Bylaws authorize the Board of Education to select seven directors as follows: one member of the Board of Education (Mr. Blair G. Ewing was appointed on July 25, 1988), three members from the community-at-large, and three members of the Montgomery County Public Schools' staff (appointed on August 22, 1988); now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the following community members be appointed by the Board of Education to serve a term as designated:

Vicki Rafel, January 1, 1989 to December 31, 1989  
Roscoe Nix, January 1, 1989 to December 31, 1990  
Clarence Kettler, January 1, 1989 to December 31, 1991

Re: A MOTION BY MR. GOLDENSOHN ON THE  
SCHEDULING OF A DISCUSSION OF THE  
UP-COUNTY SPECIAL PROGRAM (FAILED)

A motion by Mr. Goldensohn to move the discussion of the superintendent's plan for the up-county math/science program from November 10 to October 11 failed with Mr. Ewing, Mr. Goldensohn, (Mr. Park, and Dr. Shoenberg voting in the affirmative; Dr. Cronin, Mrs. DiFonzo, Mrs. Praisner, and Mrs. Rafel abstaining.

Re: NEW BUSINESS

Mrs. DiFonzo moved and Dr. Cronin seconded the following:

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education schedule a meeting to discuss efforts in cooperation and partnership with the business community with a possible eye to examining ways of doing a better job of publicizing and disseminating what is being done in that regard.

Re: ITEM OF INFORMATION

Board members received Section B of Policies as an item of information for future consideration.

Re: ADJOURNMENT

The president adjourned the meeting at 10:55 p.m.

-----  
PRESIDENT

-----  
SECRETARY

HP:mlw