

NUMBER: 38-1990  
STATUS: APPROVED  
PLACE: ROCKVILLE, MARYLAND  
DATE: SEPTEMBER 24, 1990  
TEXT:





COG	Antifreeze/Coolant	
C90-204		
	AWARDEE	
	Robinson Chemical Company	\$ 29,887
91-01	Physical Examinations for School Bus Drivers	
	AWARDEES	
	Dr. George Kenton	
	Secure Medical Care	
	White Flint Medical Associates, Inc.	
	Rockville Internal Medicine Group	
	Medical Access	
	Dr. Hugo Arias	*
	Potomac Patient Care	
	Total	\$ 54,000
5-91	Elevator and Stage Lift Maintenance	
	AWARDEE	
	Barbee Curran Elevator Company, Inc.	\$ 44,134*
21-91	Transporting Handicapped Students	
	AWARDEES	
	Barwood Cab Company	\$ 9,000
	Malek Investment, Inc.	
	T/A Montgomery County Taxi	26,748*
		-----
	Total	\$ 35,748
	TOTAL MORE THAN \$25,000	\$799,328

\* Denotes MFD vendors

RESOLUTION NO. 567-90 Re: BID NO. 171-89, COPY MACHINES

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

WHEREAS, The Board of Education on July 11, 1989, approved an award for Bid No. 171-89 to Eastman Kodak Credit Corporation for 123 copy machines, with a provision for additional copy machines in the future, on a five-year lease/purchase agreement with preferred municipal financing rates; and

WHEREAS, On September 12, 1989, it was necessary because of the preferred financing rates for the Board of Education to authorize a master lease/purchase agreement for the purchase of additional copy machines in accordance with the terms and conditions of the bid specifications; and

WHEREAS, The Board of Education on July 12, 1990, approved the first year of a three-year potential extension; and

WHEREAS, The Board of Education will from time to time receive additional requests to lease/purchase other copy machines under this arrangement depending upon appropriated funds; and

WHEREAS, It is necessary at this time and in the public interest for the Board to acquire one additional copy machine under a lease/purchase agreement to meet the present needs of the public schools; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education of Montgomery County approve the use of the master lease/purchase agreement with Eastman Kodak Credit Corporation for the acquisition of one additional copy machine at equipment and finance costs totalling \$11,661 over five years under the same terms and conditions contained in Bid No. 171-89, Copy Machines, in accordance with Section 5-110 of Maryland's Public School Law; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education president and the superintendent of schools be authorized to execute the documents necessary for these transactions.

RESOLUTION NO. 568-90 Re: CHANGE ORDERS/RELATED CONTRACTS  
OVER \$25,000

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

WHEREAS, The Department of School Facilities has received two change order proposals for Viers Mill Elementary School that exceed \$25,000; and

WHEREAS, Staff and the project architects have reviewed these change orders and found them to be equitable; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education approve the following change orders to the contract with Columbia Construction Company, Incorporated, for the following items:

#### ACTIVITY 1

Description: Additional asbestos removal - During the demolition work additional asbestos containing material was discovered in areas that were enclosed in masonry walls. This unanticipated condition could not be determined until the walls were removed.

Amount: \$74,000

ACTIVITY 2

Description: Classroom addition - A four-room classroom addition was included as an alternate to the modernization bids for Viers Mill. The county government agreed to fund this alternate for day care use.

Amount: \$93,000

RESOLUTION NO. 569-90 Re: ELEMENTARY ART ROOM KILN  
VENTILATION - VARIOUS SCHOOLS

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

WHEREAS, On September 13, 1990, the following bids were received for art room kiln ventilation at Brown Station, Cannon Road, Darnestown, Germantown, Luxmanor, Poolesville, Seven Locks, and Wood Acres elementary schools:

	BIDDER	BASE BID
1.	Kaemph & Harris Sheet Metal, a Division of R. W. Warner, Inc.	\$17,450
2.	Arey, Inc.	23,100
3.	J. W. Cullop, Inc.	24,100
4.	W. B. Maske Sheet Metal Works, Inc.	26,454
5.	E. J. Murray Company, Inc.	48,600

and

WHEREAS, The low bid is below the staff estimate of \$35,000; and

WHEREAS, The low bidder has completed similar projects satisfactorily for Montgomery County Public Schools; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That a \$17,450 contract be awarded to Kaemph & Harris Sheet Metal, a Division of R. W. Warner, Inc., for art room kiln ventilation at Brown Station, Cannon Road, Darnestown, Germantown, Luxmanor, Poolesville, Seven Locks, and Wood Acres elementary schools in accordance with plans and specifications







## RESOLUTION NO. 574-90 Re: PERSONNEL APPOINTMENTS

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

RESOLVED, That the following personnel appointments be approved:

APPOINTMENT	PRESENT POSITION	AS
Carole J. Burger	Employee Relations Personnel Consultant Carole Burger and Associates, Juneau, Alaska and Seattle, Washington	Director, Dept. of Assoc. Relations Nonscheduled Classification Effective: 10-1-90
Jack Schoendorfer	Asst. Principal Kennedy HS	Director, Div. of Career & Voc. Ed. Dept. of Curriculum & Instruction Grade P Effective: 9-25-90
Sandra S. Days	Teacher Specialist Div. of School Library Media Programs	Supervisor, Instruc. Materials Selection & Processing Dept. of Educ. Media & Technology Grade N Effective: 9-25-90

## RESOLUTION NO. 575-90 Re: PROPOSED TAX LIMITATION AMENDMENTS TO MONTGOMERY COUNTY CHARTER

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

WHEREAS, Four amendments to the County Charter that will appear on the November general election ballot will set limits on the taxing authority of the County and affect the funding of school construction projects; and

WHEREAS, Question F would limit future property tax increases to the rate of inflation and would also require the County Council to adopt guidelines for annual spending affordability limits; and

WHEREAS, Question G would forbid the County Council from setting a property tax rate that exceeds the 1988 level; and

WHEREAS, Question H would forbid the County Council to forward-fund school and road construction projects that are eligible for state funds; and

WHEREAS, Question I would limit future property tax increases to three-fourths of the previous year's inflation rate and would also limit the amount of the operating budget funded by property taxes to 37 percent; and

WHEREAS, These charter amendments would significantly reduce the ability of the county executive and County Council to provide the funds needed by the Board of Education to meet its responsibility for educating Montgomery County students; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education opposes the four amendments to the County Charter, Questions F, G, H, and I, that would limit the taxing authority of the County and prohibit the County's funding of school construction projects; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education supports the efforts of the organizations in the County that have come together to educate the public about the implications of these measures and to oppose the proposed charter amendments.

Dr. Cronin made the following statement for the record:

"I was out of the room during the personnel appointments, and I would like the record to show that I also would support those appointments."

Re: ANNUAL REPORT OF THE CITIZENS  
ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON FAMILY LIFE  
AND HUMAN DEVELOPMENT

Mr. Daniel Finn, chairman, acknowledged the hard work of the committee during the past year. Last year he had appeared before the Board and expressed serious concerns about the low number of high school students participating in the family life program. There were roughly 600 students with 200 from one school.

Mr. Finn pointed out that in Montgomery County they had 1,000 teen pregnancies each year, and 25 percent of those going to clinics for sexually transmitted diseases were teens. Nationally, one in 500 college students had tested positive for the HIV virus. He indicated that 50 percent of teens were sexually active, and 75 percent of teens used alcohol and 37 percent used drugs at the time of sexual activity. He indicated that 77 percent of teenagers 15 years old and younger did not use

any type of contraceptive the first year of sexual activity, and 42 percent did not use anything after the first year of activity. There were teenage myths that serial monogamy would protect them from AIDS. This was the idea of having one boy friend or girl friend for six months and another one for six months. They believed that birth control devices such as the pill would protect them from AIDS or sexually transmitted diseases.

Mr. Finn stated that all high school students attended the biology contraceptive unit unless they had parental exclusion. However, the committee felt there was a need for more than that. It was important to talk about the issues of decision making, peer group pressure, coping skills and the idea it was okay to say no, and the idea it was okay to say no even after they had said yes. Last year they had requested that the half credit program in family life apply towards the practical arts graduation requirement. Thanks to the support of the Board and Dr. Pitt, that had become a reality. They hoped that over the next few years there would be an increase in the numbers of students participating in those programs, gaining from that experience, and making the choice to abstain rather than become sexually active.

Mr. Finn was encouraged by the type of materials the committee was seeing. They were now seeing a much higher proportion of materials focused on the fact that the only true safe sex was no sex. The committee did have some open issues to continue to follow up on. The first was alternative programs. They had talked to Dr. Pitt about programs outside the regular curriculum such as orientation programs, PTA programs, and weekend or afterschool programs. These could expand the offering of decision-making and coping skills to a wider audience. Mrs. Gemberling would be meeting with the committee in October on this issue. They were also looking at why some schools were so successful in their programs and others were not.

Mr. Finn reported that in the fifth and eighth grade programs, instruction was given with parental exclusion. Any parent could choose not to have his or her child attend that program. At the high school level, the family life and human development course was by parental permission. In the spring a high school biology teacher came to the committee and said they could talk about contraceptives in biology class and show pictures of contraceptives and asked why students could not be shown the actual devices. He explained that the request was not that loose condoms would be passed around the class. It was not a change in the curriculum. It was simply showing in some type of sealed case the actual devices rather than pictures. On a 14 to 1 vote, the committee recommended that the staff be requested to look into the matter and evaluate whether this was feasible. Then this would go through the normal review process prior to coming

back to the committee and then to the Board. One of their members had submitted a minority report. He thought it was great to have a wide cross section of representation of the committee, and it was important to have minority reports representing those opinions that did not reflect the majority of the committee. He commended the Board for keeping the open forum to allow people to express their opinions.

Mr. Finn said that he and the committee wanted to make special references to two recent retirees who had been of great help to the committee, Betty Takahashi and Donna Dale.

Mr. Goldensohn wished that those speaking at the Public Comments portion of the meeting had stayed to hear the committee report. One or two of the speakers had given the impression that the committee was recommending passing out contraceptive kits in school. However, in this case, they were talking about a sample kit for the teacher to show which struck him as being no different than when the police came in with a kit showing drug paraphernalia. This was not for students to use but to be aware of what it was. Mr. Finn replied that the committee felt this had to be something that was hermetically sealed because they did not want teachers put in the position of students claiming they had received a condom from a teacher.

Mr. Goldensohn stated that the process to act on this recommendation would take weeks or months, and he would not be on the Board at that time to vote on the issue, presuming there was a recommendation. He was pleased that both sides had expressed their opinions. However, it needed to be made clear that the only change proposed was that a sample kit be in the classroom.

Mr. Ewing remarked that in the minority report there was a question which several speakers raised as well. The question was whether any evaluation had been done on the family life program since its inception 20 years ago. He knew they had not done a full scale evaluation of the program to determine its impact on students and statistics with regard to sexual activity, pregnancy, abortion, etc. On the other hand, there had been repeated assessments of both the curriculum and the materials. The committee itself engaged in continuous assessment and evaluation of materials. He asked whether the committee had discussed whether there was a need for an evaluation. Mr. Finn replied that the committee had not discussed this specifically. There had been changes in the curriculum to incorporate AIDS; therefore, there had been an evolution of the curriculum. As a committee, they went back and reviewed materials still being used. For example, some materials on AIDS that were approved three or four years ago might be outdated. They examined materials rather than curriculum because the staff was involved in this.

Dr. Cronin asked Mr. Finn to describe the process. Mr. Finn reported that printed materials were sent out to six committee members who were asked to review the materials and submit a recommendation to the committee. If they were considering a video, slide presentation, or a model, this was presented for review at the committee meeting. The committee would discuss the material and vote. All members had the opportunity to write comments on the material. For example, there might be an excellent film with one bit of incorrect information. This was in the record for teachers to note. Materials were listed as highly recommended, recommended, or not recommended.

Mr. Ewing noted that another issue raised in the minority report was the directive and non-directive programs. The assertion was made that the Montgomery County program was a mixed program and had elements of both. Mr. Ewing asked for a response to that assertion. Dr. Pitt replied that he would respond to both the minority and majority reports.

It seemed to Mr. Ewing that if one were to do an evaluation, it would be important to try to make some distinctions between the impact of a program on students who were in the courses and the statistics for the school system as a whole. One could not necessarily prove that what went on in the classroom impacted the school system as a whole. Nor were they always sure that what went on in the classroom impacted the students in the classroom. There was a serious problem in terms of how they could design an evaluation to get at that question.

Mr. Finn commented that there had always been an understanding that there was a role for the school system and a role for the parents in the education of students. As a parent, he hoped he spent enough time with his children educating them beyond what the school system might do, but in many cases that might not be happening at all. Part of what would be hard to catch would be whether parents were supporting or not supporting abstinence for their children.

Dr. Shoenberg said that he would not be around when the matter returned to the Board table, if it did. However, he would like to leave some advice for the people engaged in that discussion. This was that they confine their arguments to the facts at hand. The people advocating this needed to say why it was important to do that in terms that were more specific than what appeared in the report. Why should they have the actual devices available for observation? On the other hand, it would be well for the people arguing against this step to confine themselves to the arguments at hand and to make sure their arguments addressed the situation. It was certainly true that the only safe sex was abstinence. He thought that their curriculum emphasized that. It was also true that teenagers liked to behave in contrary ways

and would engage in sexual activity. He was sure that were condoms to be in more general use a lot of the statistics would not be as frightening as they were. It did not seem what they did in the schools took the inculcation of values out of the hands of the family. No one had taken away that right. If they were to address this issue further, it would be helpful to stick to the point, the arguments, and the logic of the situation.

Mrs. Hobbs announced that the seventh state conference on teenage pregnancy and parenting was scheduled for November 20, 8 a.m. to 3:30 p.m. at Hunt Valley. This conference was sponsored by the interdepartmental committee on teenage pregnancy and parenting in Maryland and the governor's council on adolescents.

Dr. Shoenberg thanked Mr. Finn for his report. He pointed out that the state was now looking at the issue of graduation requirements. The Board agreed with the committee that more students should be involved in a more extended discussion of the issues dealt with by the committee and not just the matter of sexual activity. Dr. Pitt commented that they had a good educational system because citizens volunteered to work on difficult committees. He felt that this committee worked very hard, and he commended the majority and minority within the committee because these were not easy issues.

Re: ANNUAL REPORT OF THE COUNSELING AND  
GUIDANCE COMMITTEE

Mrs. Diane Graham, committee chair, introduced Dr. Nancy Ostrove and Ms. Barbara McKenzie, the co-chairs for 1990-91 and Ms. Kathy McGuire, supervisor of guidance. Mrs. Graham stated that in the spring they had reported on the 1987-88 school year and now they were reporting on the 1989-90 school year. They were repeating the recommendations made in the spring.

Mrs. Graham reported that they had traditionally sponsored two workshops, one in the spring and one in the fall. The fall workshop was a sharing session attended by local guidance committees, and the spring workshop had an overview of the comprehensive program. People attending had an opportunity to try out the desk-top information management for educators system which was a computer system for career and college searches. The committee continued its interest in the comprehensive program, and they held an orientation for new members. Several members received training as trainers in the program Parents and Counselors Together. The committee testified before the Board on the FY 1991 budget. They heard a presentation by Vilma Montiel, the resource ESOL counselor, who described the issues affecting the diverse populations that were currently in the county. They heard about the different waves of immigration and the issues the counselors were facing. One of the student members of the

committee had written an article for her newspaper on the issues of ESOL.

Mrs. Graham explained that their recommendations were identical to those made in the spring because they did not want the good intentions stated before to go astray. They also had some additional recommendations. They had reviewed the staff response to last year's recommendations and were pleased to note that a number of their recommendations were being implemented. Mrs. Graham said that more attention needed to be paid to those in the schools who were not clearly college bound. They would recommend the exploration of a fair for high school juniors which would bring them together with prospective employers or trainers similar to a college fair. They believed that employers had a vested interest in the skills that MCPS students had and might be willing to sponsor such a fair. They knew that individual schools had such activities, but they thought it would be worthwhile to have a countywide initiative.

Mrs. Graham understood that MCPS was providing career exploration for eighth grade students, and they agreed that this was an important time to do that. They encouraged the Board to support this effort. She said that even though they had a recommendation in April to consider factors other than numbers in assigning counselors, the presentation they received on ESOL caused them to make a recommendation on this subject. The population served by the ESOL program was one that continued to expand, and the demand for ESOL counseling services continued to grow. They recommended that school-based support for the ESOL counselors be at least maintained and, if possible, expanded. There was a need for a connection between the school-based support and the counselors. They were also concerned about the possibility of burnout among the ESOL counselors. These counselors needed opportunity for growth and diversity so that they would not be kept captive because of their skills in the particular area they were serving.

In terms of future direction, Mrs. Graham suggested that this year's committee look again at issues associated with the underachieving student. This issue was always of concern to parents. This was a concern about students who could be doing better in the classroom but were not enough of a problem to merit special attention. Parents were concerned that students receiving C's could be getting a B if they had motivation and support. She stated that reports on the average minority student were another guidepost that suggested they should look at this issue again.

Mrs. Graham reported that there was an article in the Washington POST on a study that found that math and geometry, in particular, were correlated with minority success in college. This was a guidepost for some direction for the counseling program.

Everyone involved needed to help students to see that math was less about figuring and more about thinking. It was especially important for minority students to see the value of math and know that they could succeed. Finally, she recommended that all parents get involved in the issues.

Dr. Shoenberg thanked Mrs. Graham for her several years of very strong leadership provided to the committee and her service before that. He, too, had read the article in the POST. It occurred to him that both the taking of geometry and the success in college could be the results of the same cause and were not necessarily related as cause and effect. He asked the staff to find out how the people doing the study controlled for that.

Dr. Pitt believed that all youngsters with very few exceptions should take at least algebra and geometry. This was a goal not for minority or majority youngsters, but for all youngsters. Dr. Shoenberg reported that there was also a newspaper article on Sunday about a program in North Carolina which was a Sizer-type program. It was aimed at average but underachieving students. He hoped that the school system would look into this.

Mrs. Hobbs said the report referred to the need for printers for guidance offices. She would be interested in knowing how much it would cost to purchase and install the necessary printers. She would also like to know whether this would be addressed in the next operating budget. In addition, she would be interested in knowing a little more about the career fair they had referred to. Juniors did have the opportunity to visit Montgomery College for a two-day college fair. She wondered if they were referring to that same type of opportunity for all juniors. Mrs. Graham replied that they were. She explained that a lot of students would go to the college fair who might not be planning to go to college. They were suggesting another opportunity where students had a chance to find out about jobs. Not everyone who went to college ought to go to college. Some students could learn about what they could do while they decided whether or not to go to college.

Dr. Pitt reported that they were moving toward career fairs. He did not believe that everyone ought to go to college necessarily, but he believed that everyone should have the opportunity to pursue their education to the greatest extent possible. The purpose of career fairs was to expose young people to careers, and many of these careers required further education. He felt that the most important thing was to leave options open for young people.

Dr. Cronin noticed that in a number of places the report talked about training such as employees learning a second language. He said they often forgot that they were a people intensive

business, and unless they renewed those resources they would burn out people. He thought that when they got to budget they had to look at the training they provided to people to expand their horizons. Under new business, he would be making a motion to have the superintendent work with Montgomery College to do some training of elementary and middle school teachers in math and science. He knew there were people at MC prepared to offer those courses. This was something they did not have to do in-house in MCPS, and they could have tuition reimbursement for courses at the college.

Dr. Cronin pointed out that they had a recommendation on transportation to the Edison Center. He asked whether they discussed the smaller centers in the schools upcounty rather than just Edison. Mrs. Graham replied that they did not because they were focusing on the programs at Edison that were not at the school-based centers. It was her understanding that this transportation issue was being addressed. Dr. Cronin said that the other issue was the ESOL counselors. He thought this recommendation might also apply to schools with significant minority ESOL populations transitioning back into classes. That same burnout might also affect the regular classroom teacher and not simply the ESOL counselor.

Mr. Ewing said he would be interested in having a description of what happened to the ESOL counselors and the problems they faced. Mrs. Graham replied that the presentation was not on burnout. It was on the experience of the ESOL counselors. They might be dealing with a 14-year old student who had never been to school. They could not put the child in first grade, and they had to come up with a way of enabling this child to function as the adult he or she would soon be in the brief period that child had left in MCPS. At the same time, they had to convince these students they should be in school rather than get \$50 a day for cleaning someone's house. The counselor was on call on all kinds of aspects of that student's life because the counselor might be the only one speaking that child's language. Ms. McGuire pointed out that there were seven ESOL counselors and over 5,000 students.

Mrs. Praisner said the other recommendation was that the Board pay attention to career development for these counselors so that they were not kept captive by their bilingual skills. It seemed to her that these individuals would be in great demand, and there would be no one to fill in behind them. The problem for them might be to get more counselors. Mrs. Graham said they might need a counselor who spoke a particular language, and the question would be whether that counselor was now the counselor for this language group and was that a limitation on this person.

Dr. Pitt agreed that they had to have counselors and others who were bilingual. He pointed out that the new director of

vocational education was Spanish speaking. While they needed more people with that ability, they had to make sure that the load of working with young people speaking another language was not totally with people who were bilingual. Other people had to accept some of that responsibility. He thought that people had to recognize different cultures and be available to work with young people. He had seen schools where people might not speak the language but did reach out to young people.

Mrs. Praisner said she was interested in how committee members were going to use their PACT training to the benefit of the school system or parent groups. Ms. McKenzie replied that she had attended the training, and she planned to go to local guidance advisory committees and PTAs.

Mrs. Praisner asked how they proposed to look at the underachieving student. It might be useful to use DEA and some materials to support that review to bring the Board some formal recommendations. Dr. Ostrove explained that they were basically a brand new committee. They were trying to assess the particular interests of the people on the committee and put that together with the concerns raised by the Board. Then they would develop an agenda for this year. They had not thought about how they would go about looking at the problem of the underachieving student. She suggested that one way to start would be to gather some intelligence about other jurisdictions.

Mrs. Praisner commended the committee for selecting this topic because it was one of continuing interest to lots of people. She would encourage the committee to get together with other task forces and committees. She would like to see more cross-fertilization and interaction among the various advisory committees to see where interests and recommendations overlapped. Dr. Ostrove reported that they had started doing this. She had attended a meeting of the sex equity committee, and there were volunteers to serve as liaisons with other committees.

Dr. Shoenberg thanked the committee for their report.

Re: WORK GROUP REPORT ON THE  
EDUCATIONAL NEEDS OF ASIAN STUDENTS

Dr. Pitt reported that on September 12, 1989, the Board of Education adopted a resolution stating that minority students would include black or African-American, Hispanic, Asian-American, and American Indians. Following the adoption of this resolution, he asked Dr. Paul Scott, director of minority education, to convene a small work group to address problems and concerns of Asian students. He had asked that a discussion paper be prepared for the Board of Education as an initial step in that examination.

Dr. Scott introduced Ms. Mary Au, Ms. Carol Chen, Mr. Ronald Feffer, Ms. Sally Han, Dr. James Myerberg, Dr. Thomas Quelet, Mrs. Maria Schaub, and Dr. Donna Stephens. He said that each member of the group was chosen because of his or her extensive involvement with Asian students and the Asian community. It was determined by the group that the initial steps to identify concerns and initiatives could be addressed by focusing on four areas.

Dr. Scott said they reviewed the literature on what was happening in other districts. They looked at the available county data to gain a perspective on the Asian student population particularly with respect to achievement. They also looked at enrollment characteristics and trends. Their final step was to do a small survey of community, staff, and students. The paper was organized around those four sections, and each section was followed by some recommendations. The final page suggested some initiatives for the Board's consideration. It was their hope that the paper would be a catalyst for discussion and future action.

Dr. Pitt asked Dr. Scott to review a few of the major areas. Dr. Scott indicated that the first section dealt with the process which he had just described. The first section was a review of current literature and practices. They found very little in the literature about what was happening in school systems, but there was material on the need for cultural awareness, the pros and cons of bilingual education, and the concept of immersion. There were four major themes in that discussion, and their recommendations were to expand the current staff development activities to increase staff knowledge of Asian culture, to encourage and support multicultural approaches, to develop activities to increase student knowledge and understanding of Asian culture, and to do parent outreach.

Dr. Scott stated that the second section dealt with achievement and participation of Asian students. They looked at standardized test scores, Project Basic, participation in gifted and talented programs, and enrollment in honors classes. The achievement data showed that the Asian student population did very well, and in many areas they performed above the county average for all students. The group recommended looking at students at the individual school level to make sure they were meeting the needs of individual students.

The third section was a profile of Asian students in MCPS. Here they tried to look at the degree to which Asian students were involved in various programs. They found that the majority of the Asian students were not involved in special programs and did not require special assistance. The group felt that additional information was needed to make sure that the needs of all

students were being met. Care and thought would have to go into deciding what that information would be and how it would be developed.

Dr. Scott said that the final section dealt with the survey they conducted. They had surveyed about 80 people including Asian students, community leaders, and MCPS staff. As a result of that, they were recommending that each school should assess the unique needs of their student population. They emphasized the continued need for recruitment efforts with respect to the hiring of Asian staff. There was a need for summer enrichment programs in English to further refine English writing and speaking skills for some students.

Dr. Scott reported that they had spent a great deal of time trying to focus on initiatives for Board consideration. The first was that steps should be taken to broaden the knowledge and understanding of all MCPS concerning the many Asian cultures that made up the MCPS community. This should include the unique needs of refugees and new immigrants. The Department of Staff Development should play a key role in this plan. The second was that through curriculum and instructional programs plans be made to raise the knowledge and awareness level of students concerning the Asian cultures that made up this school system. Efforts in OIPD were a step in the right direction. The third initiative focused on parent outreach. They must continue and strengthen efforts related to that to enhance the communication at the school, area, and central office levels. The final initiative was around achievement and participation indicators and whether there was additional information that could be helpful to schools, particularly on individual students. They wanted to avoid the stereotype of the model minority. There were students with needs, and they had to make sure they were meeting those needs.

Dr. Cronin said that for a long time they had paid attention to two minorities, and he had proposed looking at Asian students. The Asian community was not being included in a number of their studies. He noted that they had a reference to the Asian population in Head Start. He asked why this was more difficult to determine in the Asian community than in the black or Hispanic community. Dr. Scott explained that essentially this was not unique to Asian students because they did not know that age group in any group across the board.

Dr. Cronin stated that one of the questions that arose in Dr. Gordon's report was the cultural experience of a student coming from outside the country. He asked whether it was the intention of ESOL to be that cultural experience or whether it was shared by other agencies in OIPD. He wanted to know if they were asking something from ESOL which might not be their role. Mrs. Schaub

replied that their major mission was to teach the children English so that they could take advantage of what was offered in the mainstream. However, they did help students become familiar with the culture within the school. She thought that all ESOL teachers taught culture to the children just as they taught language. She was happy to hear the counseling report because that was another area where they got into the issue of culture. ESOL counselors did a lot of group counseling with youngsters. Sometimes there were conflicts between school expectations and home expectations. ESOL Parent Services did a lot with parents to help them understand what was happening with the children. The children were immersed in American culture for six hours a day, and the parents often were not.

Dr. Pitt pointed out that he had recommended taking ESOL out of special education. He was convinced that ESOL could not do all of this by itself. While it was an excellent program, they needed to do more things. He was convinced that ESOL needed to be part of the mainstream of the school system. This had to be expanded to the regular program; therefore, they were trying to mainstream the ESOL program rather than have it totally separate.

Dr. Cronin said he would like to give support to the concept of English skills for parents. There were a number of schools in the Asian and Hispanic community where Adult Education and Montgomery College could provide a lot of resources. They needed to give parents the freedom to be able to deal with the school system and the world around them rather than being forced into a language isolated community. He pointed out that in each of the plans the language was "should have," "could have," "might be able to," etc. He was not hearing a firm direction of a kind of matrix which stated "this recommendation ought to go to this department which should come up with this plan by such a date." They could not leave it as a first step. This had to be fleshed out.

Dr. Scott agreed, but he reported that it had taken the committee a great deal of time to figure out how to tackle this in the school system. They saw this report as a first step.

Mr. Ewing remarked that these were excellent recommendations and initiatives. He hoped that having taken this first step that a next step would include making certain that these got stated in a way that made them as clear as possible to people in the community and that they were sent out for community review and comment. These were issues of great concern to the community as a whole and to a wide variety of organizations and individuals within the community. He hoped they would be able to arrange to benefit from their review. They didn't always get as much feedback from the Asian community as they might wish because they did not always ask or know whom to ask. The committee included

people who had deep roots in the Asian community and who could identify the right groups in the community to call on for that feedback.

Mr. Ewing hoped that the Board would be able to know the impact of these recommendations before they voted on the next operating budget. Not all recommendations required budget action, but some did. There was a strong emphasis here on a need for developing good, solid base data on individual students, but there was not a description of how they might go about that. It seemed to him this was another next step that was important to do. It was a sensitive matter, but it was going to be difficult to explain why it was they wanted to know all this about families and their children. Dr. Pitt replied that Dr. Gordon's report referred to this in terms of other minority groups. This was an issue they needed to come to grips with. He felt that the suggestion to distribute this report widely was a good suggestion.

Mrs. Praisner said she was going to raise the same question about base data. She found this to be a very readable paper, but she thought they needed more information. When they talked about expanding current activities, she thought it was going to be important for the Board to know the status now. She would like to know where they were. She had attended one in-service program for teachers which was excellent. It was an excellent way of sensitizing staff to not only the student perspective but the parent perspective. It provided information about the various cultures and cautioned against making generalizations about Asian Americans. Ms. Han reported that they would be presenting a similar program for Hispanic Heritage month.

From the standpoint of budget, Mrs. Praisner thought it was important to know where they were. For example, they needed to know about existing in-service and how many staff members had participated in programs. She said that there would be variation from school to school in the use of data. She assumed this fit into the local school's monitoring of documentation on students. It would be useful for the Board to know how the material was being used and how schools were assessing their local Asian student needs. They needed some sense of what was going on rather than letting local schools proceed on their own.

Mrs. Praisner said there was a recommendation which said that in schools where numbers were large enough the population should be examined using these data. She asked what was meant by "large enough." Dr. Myerberg replied that the standard for looking at group data was to have at least ten students. Dr. Shoenberg assumed that by group they meant different subgroups within the larger Asian group rather than Asians as a whole. Dr. Myerberg thought it would be a good idea to be able to break down the Asian students into subgroups; however, if they were only talking

about one or two students in those subgroups then they were back to individual data. In many cases, the breaking down of data in those subgroups would have to be done at the school level.

Dr. Shoenberg had the feeling that this report was just the first step. The report talked about Asians as a large group and at other times it tried to make distinctions among different groups of Asian students. This was not to criticize the report, but to talk about Asians as a large group was almost meaningless. They really needed to talk about subgroups which also differed in many ways. There might be people who had just arrived in the country and others had been here for a generation or two. It seemed to him it was hard to devise programs if they were going to address Asians as a group without a lot of further breakdown. It all came down to the need to look at individual students with understanding.

Dr. Stephens said they had run into the issue of identifying Asians in subgroups; however, unless they were in ESOL, this information was not available. They did not have data by subgroup on American Asians. She reported that there was a pattern of movement through the county from school to school. If they did not have data to share, the youngster could go to the next school and the staff would not have any idea of where that child had been. There were patterns where immigrants moved from one region of the county to another as families got better jobs.

Dr. Cronin commented that they needed this data to put resources in if they were finding that certain clusters were severely impacted by new immigrants. Dr. Pitt agreed that they needed data about individual groups, but this was a touchy area in terms of what parents wanted to provide. Ms. Au added that they had difficulty answering that question because it was a sensitive area. They did not have that data for other students, either. She said that families were moving around the county according to socioeconomic levels and the way they had progressed in society; however, they were not moving out of the county.

Dr. Scott reported that the committee felt strongly that a great deal of care and thought needed to go into what was needed in terms of information and why. They needed time to think this through very carefully. They looked to see whether the county government had data, but they did not have subgroup data. He remarked that one thing that emerged here that they tried to emphasize was the concern about the unique needs of refugees and immigrants that were not necessarily unique to Asians. They had to develop some understanding of what immigrants went through trying to adjust to the country and the school system.

Mrs. DiFonzo said that the report consistently used the term, "Asian." Some people spoke about Asian Americans, and in a pre-

board question there was mention of Amerasians. She asked whether there was a difference, how they defined it, and if the report spoke to the differences. Dr. Stephens replied that they look at the ESOL immigrant group and the group of Americans of Asian descent. As they looked at the information, they did not find similarities between the two groups. Ms. Au said their report did not refer to Amerasians.

Mrs. DiFonzo asked whether the needs of a third generation Asian youngster differed in terms of their profile and recommendations from those of a brand new immigrant. Dr. Stephens replied that she would want to deal with every Asian child as an individual child. They could not think just because the child had Asian ancestry that the child was a high achieving youngster. Dr. Gordon's report pulled out the ESOL youngsters as having special needs, and this was what the committee also found.

Dr. Vance commented that this would continue to be a moving target. He had heard that the Office of Civil Rights was currently reviewing its racial classification of Americans. They were considering another classification of children born of so-called mixed unions. As the social demographics and the racial patterns of the nation continued to evolve, all of that would change, too. Ms. Chen explained that the report was heavier on the ESOL area because the ESOL information was available. The needs of Asian Americans had not surfaced except their high scores on standardized tests. This masked youngsters having real needs.

It seemed to Mrs. DiFonzo that when she read Dr. Gordon's report it was saying that the Board needed to be more directive in terms of specific programs and strategies that got down to the school level instead of allowing the non-directive approach. Yet, part of what they were talking about here was each school assessing their own needs vis-a-vis their own population. She asked whether this was in conflict with Dr. Gordon's recommendation. Dr. Scott replied that it was not in conflict at all. They had finished their work before Dr. Gordon's report, but the recommendations were similar.

Mr. Goldensohn thought that the diversity had to be reflected in the schools. If they looked at the Walter Johnson cluster, they would see a high concentration of Japanese and the Japanese ESOL specialist would be assigned there. He was concerned about the diversity of the Asian population and their ability to handle that diversity. For example, Indian people were not the same as Japanese and Chinese. They were Caucasians, but the federal government defined them as Asians. The culture of India and the culture of Korea, for example, were very different. He believed that their accuracy of numbers was critical. Outside of ESOL, they got data from only what the parent put down on the forms

enrolling their child in school. For example, Indians might list themselves as Caucasian rather than Asian. Ms. Han commented that in some cases when Indians became citizens they listed themselves as American Indian.

Mr. Goldensohn suggested that one avenue would be to work with local organizations of the various cultures. If they could not get an ESOL counselor for a particular group, they might be able to get help from the various ethnic organizations. He wondered about the accuracy of the head count for Chinese. Dr. Scott replied that this information came from ESOL and the Planning Office. He explained that the Asian student population in ESOL represented a small percentage of the Asian population in the county, approximately 14 percent of the students. This meant that 85 percent of the students were not receiving assistance. The question was whether they were meeting the needs of these children.

Mrs. Praisner said the last recommendation on getting data related to the ESOL information and the fact they only had information on a small group. The other three recommendations dealt with all students and the system as a whole. There was a need to expand knowledge for staff and expand their sensitivity to the fact that they had many students with one foot in one culture and one foot in another. They were not necessarily ESOL students. This was reinforced by the statistics that they had on ESOL as opposed to the total population. This was the point they needed to continue to keep in mind as they looked at further activities in meeting the needs of their Asian students, Asian-American students, and Amerasian students.

Dr. Shoenberg thanked the members of the committee. He agreed that they needed to get further into this problem and to develop more fine-grained data and strategies. He expressed his appreciation to Dr. Scott for his work.

Re: BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS

Mr. Goldensohn called attention to the recent issue of the Management Memo which alerted staff to the upcoming Odyssey of the Mind competition. There would be a training session for judges on November 1.

RESOLUTION NO. 576-90 Re: EXECUTIVE SESSION - OCTOBER 9, 1990

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Mrs. Praisner seconded by Dr. Cronin, 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 9, 1990, 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. 577-90 Re: EXECUTIVE SESSION - NEGOTIATIONS

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Mrs. Praisner seconded by Dr. Cronin, 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 meetings in executive closed session at times to be determined to conduct collective bargaining negotiations or to consider matters and issues in connection therewith; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the president of the Board of Education will announce at public business meetings when the Board of Education has held these executive sessions.

RESOLUTION NO. 578-90 Re: MINUTES OF AUGUST 29, 1990

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

RESOLVED, That the minutes of August 29, 1990, be approved.

RESOLUTION NO. 579-90 Re: RECOMMENDATIONS IN NAACP REPORT ON BLACK MALES AND HIGHER EDUCATION

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

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education direct the superintendent to develop for Board of Education consideration and action a set of specific action plans designed to implement the recommendations in the Report of the Task Force to Address the Decline in Enrollment and Graduation of the Black Male from Institutions of Higher Education, specifically the six recommendations on pages 10 and 11 in the executive summary, the recommendations on pages 35 to 40, as well as other recommendations dealing with elementary and secondary education in the report.

RESOLUTION NO. 580-90 Re: APPOINTMENT OF MEMBER TO THE EDUCATIONAL FOUNDATION, INC.

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Dr. Shoenberg 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, three members from the community-at-large, and three members of the Montgomery County Public Schools' staff; and

WHEREAS, On August 22, 1988, Mr. Leroy Evans was appointed to serve a two-year staff member term; and

WHEREAS, Mr. Evans had indicated his willingness to be reappointed to a second term; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That Mr. Evans be appointed by the Board of Education to serve a term from September 24, 1990, to December 31, 1992.

RESOLUTION NO. 581-90 Re: BOE APPEAL NO. 1990-33

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

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education adopt its Decision and Order in BOE Appeal No. 1990-33 (student grade).

RESOLUTION NO. 582-90 Re: BOE APPEAL NO. 1990-53

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

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education adopt its Decision and Order in BOE Appeal No. 1990-53 (student transfer).

RESOLUTION NO. 583-90 Re: BOE APPEAL NO. 1990-55

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

RESOLVED, That BOE Appeal No. 1990-55 (student transfer) be dismissed at the request of the appellants.

RESOLUTION NO. 584-90 Re: BOE APPEAL NO. 1990-58

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

RESOLVED, That BOE Appeal No. 1990-58 (student transfer) be dismissed at the request of the appellants.

Re: NEW BUSINESS

1. Dr. Cronin moved and Mr. Goldensohn seconded that the Board of Education request the superintendent to develop for Board discussion a policy on school-based decision making.

2. Dr. Cronin moved and Mr. Chang seconded that the Board of Education request the superintendent to appoint a work group to develop with Montgomery College content courses in math and science for elementary and middle school teachers.

Re: ITEM OF INFORMATION

Board members received the FY 1990 Board Office Annual Report as an item of information.

Re: ADJOURNMENT

The president adjourned the meeting at 11:25 p.m.

-----  
PRESIDENT

-----  
SECRETARY

HP:mlw