



January 14, 1992

Re: ISSUES RELATED TO SERIOUS EMOTIONAL  
DISTURBANCE

Mrs. Hobbs reported that Board members had attended a meeting last week with the Children's Committee of the Mental Health Association and the steering committee of Parents Supporting Parents on the topic of serious emotional disturbance.

Dr. Vance invited the following people to the table: Dr. Hiawatha Fountain, associate superintendent; Mr. Tony Paul, coordinator of Programs for Students with SED; and Mrs. Mary Jo Quinlan. These people would discuss an update of the interagency task force recommendations, a survey of students who are SED, and the staff response to the Mental Health Advisory Committee annual report.

Dr. Fountain introduced the following people who would be participating in the discussion: Dr. Joan Dodge, Department of Family Resources; Mr. Tom Koehler, director of the Division of Systems Development; Dr. Steve Frankel, acting director of the Department of Educational Accountability; and Dr. Joy Markowitz, model development specialist. Dr. Fountain reported that they were fortunate to receive a grant from the U.S. Department of Education, and about a month ago MCPS and other awardees from around the country attended a conference in Georgetown. At the conference the school systems discovered they were in the same place regarding services to students who are SED and their families. The national debate centered around the proper identification of students who are SED versus those who might be behavior- or conduct-disordered. The nation was seeing an increased number of students at risk of life-long failure due to factors in their own lives and in their families. At the same time there was a growing awareness that current methods of planning, financing, and delivering services needed significant improvement. The services must be coordinated among the various agencies and be based on the specific needs of the child and the family. Services must be child-centered, family-focused, and community-based. The comprehensive model must include mental health and other services to provide an array of community-based treatment services with access to a wide array of prevention and supportive services organized into a network to meet the multiple and changing needs of children who are SED and their families. Case management was essential to the delivery of these services. He felt that the direction MCPS was taking was in keeping with what he was hearing on the national level and in Montgomery County.

Mr. Paul stated that they were developing a plan that was comprehensive and systemwide. Through research, they had found good plans in isolation and decent models of higher levels of service. However, no one had a systemwide comprehensive delivery of service for SED students. There were three pieces to the

discussion today. They were the interagency task force recommendations, the survey, and the response to the Mental Health Advisory Committee. Staff envisioned that this was the first of many reports to come on SED issues particularly on the task force recommendations.

Mr. Paul reported that as they reviewed the task force recommendations, the primary goal was to develop and implement a comprehensive systemwide plan to address the needs of students who were emotionally disturbed and who were experiencing emotional difficulties. They had reviewed the literature, consulted university experts, and studied current service delivery models. Many small programs existed that were successful with SED students; however, there was nothing that was comprehensive or that addressed the numbers of students or the range of student needs represented in MCPS. Data and research to verify student or program success was very limited, and the successful components in SED programs had not been applied across the continuum of levels of service. There had been no general application of the mental health component or the parent support component. No school system had a successful plan to address all students who were SED or had emotional difficulties. Many systems had model programs as did MCPS. For example, they had Mark Twain which was a model for programs in other school systems and RICA which was a model of interagency cooperation. MCPS had been working with non-coded students in alternative centers and Kingsley Wilderness long before the term "at-risk" became popular.

Mr. Paul explained that the nation was facing increasing numbers of children who had these particular difficulties. They needed to develop a comprehensive program and reach a broad spectrum of ideas and different things for these children. At this time it was probably not feasible to develop a comprehensive, fail-safe plan to service students who were SED. It was feasible, however, to take the best practices and their own experience to develop the basis for a comprehensive plan. They now had the beginnings of a plan which was based on parental concerns and feedback, recommendations from the task force, data collection, and the use of pilots to bring out concepts before applying them systemwide. Their end goal was to produce a plan based on research, solid data, and a more valid process of identification and placement that would produce a higher success rate for these students. He believed that, if successful, MCPS would be the pilot for other school systems throughout the country.

Mr. Paul reported that they were developing a comprehensive data base system, the SED Services Data Base. This system would form the basis for analyzing student and program success on both the short- and long-term. First, they would use as much information as possible from the current SEDS data base. Secondly, they would transfer that information to a computer program that would

allow them to collect program data, specific IEP data, and outcome data. From this they would be able to link student profiles, strategies, and services to outcomes. They would be able to validate student success as well as predict future outcomes for newly identified students. This plan was underway now, and by July 1993 they hoped to have a complete set of data as the final step in linking students, strategies, and services to outcomes.

Mr. Paul commented that they were fortunate to have received the grant in the amount of \$150,000. The grant focused on a case management model to identify students needs and develop a model to meet these needs. Supports included direct mental health services which meant that for the first time the school system would be delivering direct mental health services to students in the pilot schools. This also included referral support to other agencies and training for staff. The research component would be coordinated with the data base system, and the pilot would focus on developing a model for coordinated interagency services to students and families.

Mr. Paul indicated that a major component of the grant was to develop a system for on-going assessment of the needs of students who were SED, their families, and their service providers. They would coordinate services to students in the pilot schools, and the grant included staff training for crisis intervention. They would facilitate interagency coordination and referral and provide on-site crisis intervention, therapeutic services and behavior management for at least five to eight families in the pilot school. The grant had afforded them the opportunity to study and develop a model with interagency components, and there would be an advisory group with representation from the county government to help with the grant.

Mr. Paul said that another important component was the comprehensive cluster model where they had more than one class of SED Level 4 located in a particular elementary school. This was an outgrowth of previous area models and Mark Twain satellite programs. Currently they had five cluster models, and they were currently assessing the success of this model. They wanted to have early inclusion, identification, prevention, and intervention. It was important to reduce the number of students referred to Level 5 and Level 6 programs and to increase the number of students moving to lower levels of service. He pointed out that approximately 85 percent of youngsters identified as SED were in Levels 4, 5, and 6.

He said that the program was to increase staff knowledge and skill in working with students who were SED. One of the keys to success was to get the building level staff ready to work with SED youngsters. When he had been principal of RICA, the biggest success factor for youngsters leaving RICA was acceptance in the

regular school. They had to prepare the regular education staff, the principals, and all staff in the building. If successful, this model could be utilized systemwide for students needing Levels 1 through 4 services and might reduce the number of students requiring higher levels of service.

Mr. Paul thanked the Board and the superintendent for the behavioral support teacher pilot. Currently they had three such teachers working directly with schools. They were assigned to each area to provide support to the cluster models and other programs. In a few months they had worked with staff and students from 60 schools. They were working with area, central, and school-based staff to increase the skill of the educational management team. The EMT was a non-handicapped process to help with early intervention and prevention. They also worked to increase the skill of regular and special education staff in dealing with Level 4 students, and they had worked to develop crisis support teams within the schools. In addition, they had set up mainstream readiness programs.

Mr. Paul said the next model was the counselor consultant model. A half-time counselor consultant worked with counselors in schools housing classes for students who were SED. In the cluster model they were trying to put a full-time counselor there and in other schools, a half-time counselor. The position gave them immediate access to people in the schools.

Mr. Paul stated that these pilots, the SED grant, the data base system, the cluster model, the behavioral support teachers, and the counselor consultant model supported the basis for the development of a systemwide structure for SED programs. The structure would include a comprehensive data base, intensive staff training, early intervention and prevention, an increased use of counselors, and an increased availability of services at both the lowest and highest levels of need. There would be an integration of services to address mental health, social skills, family needs, and parent participation in the overall SED plan. He felt that if they had a comprehensive plan they would have fewer students in more restrictive centers which would provide more space and better services for those students at the upper end of the continuum. Therefore, they would not need to build more segregated facilities.

Mr. Paul remarked that the model would include a comprehensive system for data collection including student data, strategies, services, and outcomes that would enable MCPS to link students, strategies, and services to outcomes. MCPS would have a data base that matched the needs of students to intervention strategies that facilitated student success. It would enable MCPS to conduct studies related to student success based on long-term follow-up. It would include educational services ranging from prevention strategies through guidance departments and

school EMTs for those students experiencing emotional difficulties to highly intense services within self-contained settings. It is anticipated this approach would reduce referrals to more intense and exclusionary programs. The model expanded services to students currently in regular education and brought the service to the student rather than removing the student from the mainstream. It also provided services to students returning to a less restrictive setting. By providing services earlier, they would reduce the need for more intense levels of service later. This would increase the availability of space in programs such as Bridge, Mark Twain, and RICA. These were programs that had proven successful for a segment of the SED population. The model under consideration would include case management, direct therapeutic services, staff consultation and training, and a referral process procedure for connecting with other agencies.

Ms. Quinlan thanked staff for inviting her to sit at the table to represent parents. It seemed to her that parent involvement had been a difficult aspect to overcome in MCPS. She saw more movement in the direction of parental involvement, and they hoped to be included in the comprehensive program described by Mr. Paul. As a representative of Parents Supporting Parents of the Montgomery County Mental Health Association, she worked on the state and national level. There were successful programs out there, and she hoped that MCPS would not have to reinvent the wheel. There were successful programs in Wisconsin, Minnesota, Florida, and California.

Ms. Quinlan agreed that a good strong effective case management program was extremely important in getting the comprehensive model to work effectively. In order to have effective case management, they had to have related services. She was pleased to learn about the therapy because her group had been advocating it for many years. Children who were SED needed more than educational services because in order to succeed in school they needed clinical services as well. In order to have those services, they needed the support of psychologists and clinical psychiatrists. Parents have to provide input because they knew their children best. She said that while Mr. Paul had mentioned the success of the Level 4, 5, and 6 programs, her group had not really seen any data. It would be interesting to track former students and see how well they were doing, because a lot of parents she talked to did not think their children were doing that well. She expressed her support for Mr. Paul and urged the superintendent and Board to consider providing him a full-time secretary to help with his administrative duties.

It seemed to Mrs. Fanconi that the Board should center its discussion around the implementation of the cluster, the data collection, and the model. She would like to hear from Dr. Dodge first. Mrs. Hobbs said they would start with Mrs. Fanconi, but they needed to allow time for every Board member to ask several

questions. She suggested they start with general observations and comments.

Dr. Cheung stated that he was pleased with the superintendent's responses to the questions and with his recommendations. He was particularly pleased about the data system and hoped that it would relate to the efforts of SIMS and other data bases rather than having a separate system. Secondly, he was concerned as to whether staff was adequately trained in identifying behavior disorders, functional disorders, and mental health issues. Identification, prevention, and intervention required different skills. They had to address the issue of staff training and preparation. For example, he wondered whether MCPS had the appropriate mix of psychologists because psychologists had different backgrounds and not all had therapeutic skills.

Dr. Fountain said that being capable of identifying and separating out the various kinds of behavior was at the very crux of the national debate. However, they might be able to get some help from NIMH and the mental health people in the county. As far as psychologists, there was a bell-shaped curve of those who were clinical in training versus those who were educational. They would discuss this with the psychologists and look at how they could train some of them in the clinical aspects of this.

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

Mr. Paul reported that there were on-going efforts to train, update, and certify psychologists. The national debate was whether or not to include youngsters who were behaviorally disordered within those who were emotionally disturbed. The impact of doing this would be severe because of the number of youngsters involved. He emphasized that psychologists were an integral part of the cluster model concept, and they were doing a good job.

Mr. Ewing remarked that he had been on the Board a long time, and it seemed to him they were continually starting over. He was pleased to learn that they were starting up again, and he was encouraged by what Dr. Fountain and Mr. Paul had described. However, he had to point out that it had been 30 months since the report of the interagency task force had been presented to the Board. Prior to that there had been a series of discussions on the growing seriousness of the SED problem in MCPS with repeated requests for specifics about the nature and extent of the problem, the trends and numbers of students affected, the kinds of diagnoses, the availability and quality of local services, and their appropriateness of the population they now had and expected in the future. These discussions and the request for a comprehensive program went back five to ten years. While they had an encouraging set of recommendations, he continued to worry that they had not fully grasped what it was

that needed to be done. He commented that Mr. Paul's candor was refreshing, and he hoped it was the beginning of future wisdom. Too often they had excused their inability to do something by talking about the things they were doing as if they were the answers to all problems.

Mr. Ewing hoped that before they began they would do some simple things like determining the extent of the problem and the trends. They knew what current resources were, but they did not know whether those resources were fully effective. They had had some evaluations, but no long-term follow up. While they talked about parental involvement, parents had told them that their participation was made more difficult, not only by the stress they were undergoing, but also by an approach which was highly bureaucratic and budget driven because the cost of serving these students was high. He thought they had created an antagonistic and adversarial relationship that had impeded their ability to work with parents. Mr. Paul's own history as an administrator was one that showed he was successful in this area. Parental involvement would happen when the school system committed to it and when it became systematic.

Mr. Ewing stated that they could not wait several years to put a comprehensive plan together. It was his view that the delays had been extraordinary. While this may have been because of budget problems, he thought it was important for them to admit that in many cases they had not known what to do, whom to serve, why to serve them, and how to serve them. He thought that if they could address these issues honestly, they could come up with a plan that met real needs. He, for one, had run out of patience and would be very attentive to what was going on. He thought the Board ought to insist on getting regular reports on progress made.

Mrs. Fanconi reported that five members of the Board did meet with Mental Health Association parents last week. It was clear that these parents lived in an atmosphere of crisis. While they were very strong advocates for the services they needed, they were also very emotional about the situation. They had children with special needs that impacted the quality of life in their families and their ability to handle the crises that occurred. She was very pleased that Mr. Paul was able to work with these families and had their support. She commended Mr. Paul for his efforts.

Mrs. Fanconi indicated that she did have a number of questions, and these questions were not meant as criticisms but rather clarifications so that she could become better educated on what the system provided. She commended Dr. Fountain and his staff for taking the initiative to put the SED grant together. It seemed to her that the grant looked toward evaluating what they had and saying they were not happy with it which fit in with

total quality management and their ability to take a critical look at services and adapt those services to better meet the needs of children.

In regard to the data base, Mrs. Fanconi said it seemed that the present system was not able to provide sufficient data on the numbers of students, their academic and functioning process, and what related services were provided. If students had a secondary code of SED, this was not entered in the data base. There was no system in place that determined baseline data on the need for mental health related services or provided outcome data on the effectiveness of services provided.

Mr. Koehler explained that they currently had a comprehensive MCPS student data base. Currently there were over 2,000 data elements that could be associated with any given child, and the students with the most data were special education students because of federal government reporting requirements. The student data base did not provide performance level information. What they were talking about now was a periodic extract from the comprehensive student data base. This would include demographic data, special education data, programs, and the level of services. This data would be downloaded into a comprehensive SED data base to which other performance variables would be added to measure the performance and success of these students.

Dr. Frankel added that they would download the basic data from the mainframe into a relational data base program which could collect an infinite amount of information and link it together through the student name, number, or class. It would be quick and easy to get reports out of this system. After they got the basic data from the mainframe, they would survey schools to find students who were receiving SED services and who, for some reason, were not recorded as receiving these services. The data on these students would be entered from the mainframe. Then they would go to the schools and find out the strategies and treatments that the IEP and teachers were using. Later they would return to the schools for outcome data. The final step was to expand the data base to other county agencies to see what services students were receiving. The information would be shared among the various agencies. This would give them a student-centered comprehensive data base. They expected to have a prototype up by the end of the year with the MCPS elements, and they hoped to work out the details with the county by the end of next year.

In response to Board questions, Dr. Frankel indicated that they were acquiring the hardware and were looking at relational data bases. His staff, the SIMS staff, and the computer staff were assessing data base packages. Ms. Gutierrez believed that they already had a lot of data and that it was important for them to not start from scratch. Dr. Frankel assured her that anything

that was in machine-readable form would be entered. Ms. Gutierrez suggested that they needed to look at other information that might not be in machine-readable form to give them an historical perspective and to see where their successes had been. Mr. Koehler reported that they were now writing interim programs to get information to Mr. Paul. He said that one of the problems was how they asked the questions. If the right question wasn't asked, they were not going to get the right answers. Dr. Frankel assured Ms. Gutierrez that they had plenty of data, but they didn't have all the treatment data they wanted except in hard copy. For this reason, they had staff checking the folders of every student getting SED services.

Dr. Cheung asked for assurances that the relational data base software would be user friendly. He would like to see teachers, parents, and the EMT able to use the system. For example, in the EMT they could enter data on a laptop or notebook computer which would cut down on paperwork and speed up the process.

Mrs. Fanconi did not think it would be easy to get information on classroom strategies. She would also like to have Dr. Dodge come to the table to talk about the interagency collection of data and what was required in the grant for data collection. She would like to see reports to the Board every six weeks to inform the Board on what had been purchased and what was on line. She would also like to have this report in language that would be understood by those not very knowledgeable about computers.

Mr. Paul replied that strategies were in the IEP. They were going to be asking a lot of questions of staff, and they were already developing all kinds of strategies. They were looking at catching those youngsters having emotional difficulty and training the EMT about services that could be delivered that were directly related to the outcomes they wanted.

Dr. Dodge reported that in the last two years there had been a number of efforts toward a truly collaborative process among agencies. One of these efforts was the mental health resource fair which was an interagency training for people from various agencies, and MCPS was one of the sponsors. Another effort was a large grant submitted to the state of Maryland to do some family preservation services which would be non-categorical in nature. Another piece of that grant was returning a small number of children from out-of-state placement. This was where part of the interagency data system would come in because they would be required under that grant to collect a lot of data on these children before they came back to the county and entered into the continuum of services in MCPS.

Mrs. Fanconi asked about the problem of the confidentiality rules of each agency. Dr. Dodge replied that they would have to work it out and decide what it was that they could share. Dr.

Fountain commented that he was on an interagency committee that would be dealing with the whole area of sharing and cooperation and how they would face the confidentiality issue.

RESOLUTION NO. 7-1992

Re: REPORTS TO THE BOARD OF  
EDUCATION ON SED ISSUES

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education direct the superintendent to provide regular and periodic updates on the implementation of the SED grant including accomplishment of the design of the data collection system and the full support of the system to assure that during the new year MCPS could have the best possible results from the grant.

Mr. Ewing made the following statement for the record:

"I would like it to be noted that while I supported the motion I don't think it goes nearly far enough in terms of its inclusiveness. It doesn't speak to the comprehensive plan. It doesn't provide the Board with the kind of comprehensive information I would like us to have. I would hope that the superintendent in the spirit of this discussion would see fit to include that sort of information in his timely reports as well."

Mrs. Fanconi made the following statement for the record:

"The implementation of the clusters as recommended by the SED task force and as we are beginning to implement them is absolutely critical if we are going to have any data of success on which to build a new comprehensive model. I believe the pieces are in the budget. The behavioral support teachers are there and should be directed to work closely with Mr. Paul. The counselor consultant should be used as designed, and teachers should be released for the training that is designed in the cluster. Full support has to be given to the implementation of the cluster model so that we will have some successes or failure on which to build the comprehensive system that Mr. Ewing and, I believe, the entire Board is committed to. With the full support of that cluster, we are going to be able to do what I think all of us want to do and that is to provide the best possible services Levels 1 through 6, grades K through 12, for students with serious emotional difficulties."

Mrs. Hobbs thanked staff and guests for their presentation.

## Re: EXECUTIVE SESSION

The Board of Education met in executive session from 12:40 to 2:10 p.m. to discuss legal issues, contractual issues, and administrative matters.

## Re: PUBLIC COMMENTS

The following individuals appeared before the Board:

1. Lois Bell, ESAA
2. Tom Israel, MCEA
3. Rhonda Newcomer
4. Kathy Hulley
5. Marilyn Van Degrift
6. Amy Gilleland
7. Carol Stanat
8. Bob Whitaker, InfoDisk
9. Holly Joseph, B-CC Cluster
10. Sandy Nakamura, Blair Cluster
11. Richard Jaworski
12. Erin Coyne
13. Eileen Coyne
14. Edward Kim, Ronald Hsu Construction Company
15. Georgia Allen

RESOLUTION NO. 8-92

Re: PROCUREMENT CONTRACTS MORE THAN  
\$25,000

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

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

Resolved, That having been duly advertised, the following contract be awarded to the low bidder meeting specifications as shown for the bid as follows:

16-92	Aftermarket Automotive Parts	
	<u>Awardees</u>	
	Automotive Parts Plus	\$ 2,000
	Clarksville Auto Parts, Inc.	43*
	County Engine Shop	289
	District International Trucks, Inc.	41,971
	Ditch, Bowers and Taylor, Inc.	21,833
	Estes Fleet Services and Supply	500*
	General Fleet Service Company	625
	Heavy Duty Parts, Inc.	24,917
	K & M Supply, Inc.	15,122

January 14, 1992

	K S & B Enterprises, Inc.	12,500*
	Myco Service and Supply	2,800
	Northern Virginia Supply, Inc.	19,083
	Patco Distributors	5,036*
	Rosedale Auto Electric and Parts	8,430
	Vehicle Maintenance Program	12,667*
	Wareheim Air Brakes, Inc.	31,283
	Western Branch Diesel, Inc.	<u>12,530*</u>
	Total	\$226,277
24-92	Electrical Supplies and Equipment	
	<u>Awardees</u>	
	Allied Electronics	\$ 63
	C. N. Robinson Lighting Supply Company	46,235
	Dominion Electric Supply Company	513
	Eastern Electric Supply Company	7,106
	Lange Electric Company, Inc.	4,450
	Lee Electric Company of Baltimore City	13,104
	Maurice Electric Supply Company, Inc.	17,800
	Tri County Electric Supply Company, Inc.	92,114
	Washington Cable Supply, Inc.	<u>2,749</u>
	Total	\$184,224
31-92	Industrial and Technology Education - Hand Tools	
	<u>Awardees</u>	
	Allegheny Educational Supply Company, Inc.	\$ 252
	Brodhead-Garrett	105
	Chown Hardware	3,416
	Diamond Core Drilling and Sawing Company	6,967
	DoAll Baltimore Company	176
	Fairway Electronics	3,209
	Graves Humphreys Company	2,173
	Harco Electronics, Inc.	273
	The Meyer Seed Company	1,897
	Noland Company	31,607
	Rutland Tool and Supply	2,242
	Satco of Indiana, Inc. DBA Satco	3,668
	Sears Industrial Sales	2,857
	Skarie, Inc.	39.5% Off List
	Thompson and Cooke, Inc.	6,785*
	Tool Shack	40% Off List
	Tools Unlimited	<u>131</u>
	Total	\$ 65,758
40-92	Photographic Supplies	
	<u>Awardees</u>	
	American Printing Equipment and Supply	\$ 2,105
	Kunz, Inc.	5,316
	Penn Camera Exchange, Inc.	5,537
	Photo Tech	19,297
	Photopro	41,075
	Regal Photo Products, Inc.	422

	Ron-Com Camera	37,444*
	Vari-Comp Systems, Inc.	6,411
	Wholesale Educational Suppliers Company	<u>1,152</u>
	Total	\$118,759
45-92	Door Hardware Closers and Exit Devices	
	<u>Awardees</u>	
	Blaydes Lock Company	\$ 29,342
	Chown Hardware	127
	Door Closer Service Company	30,124*
	General Supply Corporation	100
	Safemasters Company, Inc.	28,078
	Southern Lock and Supply	1,523
	Swingin' Door, Inc.	844
	Taylor Security and Lock Company, Inc.	<u>7,292</u>
	Total	\$ 97,430
49-92	School Bus Glass Replacement	
	<u>Awardee</u>	
	Banner Glass, Inc.	\$ 30,000
	TOTAL OVER \$25,000	\$937,769

\* Denotes MFD vendors

RESOLUTION NO. 9-92                      Re:    AWARD OF CONTRACT - WHITE OAK  
MIDDLE SCHOOL

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

WHEREAS, The following bids were received on December 17, 1991, for the modernization to White Oak Middle School, with work to begin immediately and be completed by June 15, 1993:

<u>Bidder</u>	<u>Bid Amount</u>
1. Triangle General Contractors, Inc.	\$7,352,000
2. Dustin Construction, Inc.	7,438,000
3. Northwood Contractors, Inc.	7,484,000
4. Kimmel & Kimmel, Inc.	7,506,000
5. Henley Construction Co., Inc.	7,648,000
6. V. F. Pavone Construction Company	7,739,000
7. Coakley & Williams Construction Company, Inc.	7,878,000
8. Alekna Construction, Inc.	8,079,000

and

WHEREAS, This represents excellent bid activity, and the low bid is below the staff estimate of \$7,500,000; 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 for the amounts and contracts indicated:

ACTIVITY 1

Project: Seneca Valley Middle School #1

Description: Seneca Valley MS #1 will be used as an elementary level facility until Seneca Valley ES #8 is opened. This change order is for the minor modifications to the middle school building that are needed to use it for an elementary school program.

Contractor: Merando, Inc.

Amount: \$73,927

ACTIVITY 2

Project: Pine Crest Elementary School

Description: When the Pine Crest ES building was demolished, it was discovered that the subgrade soils were unsuitable for construction of the new facility. The existing soil under the area of the old building where the new facility was to be constructed had to be replaced with off-site fill material. This change order is for the cost to remove and replace the unsuitable material.

Contractor: Falls Church Construction Co.

Amount: \$130,176

Dr. Vance withdrew his recommendation for Activity #1.

RESOLUTION NO. 11-92 Re: CHANGE ORDER OVER \$25,000

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

WHEREAS, The Department of School Facilities has received a change order proposal for a capital project that exceeds \$25,000; and

WHEREAS, Staff and the project architect have reviewed this change order and found it to be equitable; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Board of Education approve the following change order for the amount and contract indicated:

ACTIVITY 2

Project: Pine Crest Elementary School

Description: When the Pine Crest ES building was demolished, it was discovered that the subgrade soils were unsuitable for construction of the new facility. The existing soil under the area of the old building where the new facility was to be constructed had to be replaced with off-site fill material. This change order is for the cost to remove and replace the unsuitable material.

Contractor: Falls Church Construction Co.

Amount: \$130,176

RESOLUTION NO. 12-92 Re: CHILD-CARE CENTER - WATERS LANDING  
ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

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

WHEREAS, The Gifted Child Resources, Inc., has operated a day-care center at Waters Landing Elementary School since 1988; and

WHEREAS, The Center has requested permission to install a modular building on the school site to house the day-care program; and

WHEREAS, Staff and legal counsel have developed a lease agreement to permit the Center to place a unit on a portion of the site that is not needed for the school's programs during the term of the lease; and

WHEREAS, The proposed lease is for a term of five years with a five-year renewal option, including a clause that gives the school system the right to terminate the lease if the site is needed for school purposes; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Board authorize the use of a portion of the Waters Landing Elementary School site for the installation of a modular building by the Gifted Child Resources, Inc., for child-care purposes during the term of the lease; and be it further









Resolved, That the superintendent of schools be authorized to receive and expend a grant award of \$10,239 within the Provision for Future Supported Projects from the Maryland Department of Human Resources, under the Refugee Act of 1980, for the FY 1992 Intensive English Language (ESL) Program, in the following categories:

<u>Category</u>	<u>Amount</u>
2 Instructional Salaries	\$ 8,856
3 Other Instructional Costs	675
10 Fixed Charges	<u>708</u>
Total	\$10,239

and be it further

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

RESOLUTION NO. 18-92            Re:    RESCISSION OF RESOLUTION NO. 821-91, and UTILIZATION OF FY 1992 FUTURE SUPPORTED PROJECT FUNDS FOR PROJECT INDEPENDENCE - ESOL

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

WHEREAS, Montgomery County Public Schools (MCPS) has been advised by Montgomery College, Montgomery Employment & Training (MET) that the grant award for Project Independence - ESOL will be \$15,586, not \$32,229 as originally specified; now therefore be it

Resolved, That Resolution No. 821-91, dated September 23, 1991, be rescinded; and be it further

Resolved, That the superintendent of schools be authorized, subject to County Council approval, to receive and expend within the FY 1992 Provision for Future Supported Projects, a grant award of \$15,586 from Montgomery College, Montgomery Employment & Training (MET), administrative entity for the Montgomery County Private Industry Council (PIC), under the Family Support Act of 1988, P.L. 100-485, for Project Independence - ESOL, in the following categories:

<u>Category</u>	<u>Amount</u>
2 Instructional Salaries	\$13,228
3 Other Instructional Costs	1,300
10 Fixed Charges	<u>1,058</u>

Total \$15,586

and be it further

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

RESOLUTION NO. 19-92      Re:    RESCISSION OF RESOLUTION NO. 741-91, AND FY 1992 SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION FOR MARYLAND'S TOMORROW

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

WHEREAS, Montgomery County Public Schools (MCPS) has been advised that the grant award for Maryland's Tomorrow will be \$516,381, not \$542,015 as originally specified; now therefore be it

Resolved, That Resolution No. 741-91, dated August 28, 1991, be rescinded; and be it further

Resolved, That the superintendent of schools be authorized, subject to County Council approval, to receive and expend an FY 1992 supplemental appropriation of \$54,024 from Montgomery College, administrative entity for Montgomery County Private Industry Council, financed by state and federal Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA) funds, in the following categories:

<u>Category</u>	<u>Amount</u>
2 Instructional Salaries	\$20,227
3 Other Instructional Costs	7,618
7 Student Transportation	2,000
10 Fixed Charges	<u>24,179</u>
Total	\$54,024

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. 20-92      Re:    PRESENTATION OF PRELIMINARY PLANS - CANDLEWOOD ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Mrs. Fanconi seconded by Ms. Gutierrez, the following resolution was adopted with Dr. Cheung, Mr. Ewing, Mrs. Fanconi, Ms. Gutierrez,



Resolved, That the Board of Education approve the preliminary plan report for the addition to College Gardens Elementary School developed by Murray & Associates, Architects

RESOLUTION NO. 23-92            Re:    PRESENTATION OF PRELIMINARY PLANS -  
FARMLAND ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

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

WHEREAS, The architect for the addition to Farmland Elementary School has prepared a schematic design in accordance with the educational specifications; and

WHEREAS, The Farmland Elementary School Facilities Advisory Committee has approved the proposed schematic design; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Board of Education approve the preliminary plan report for the addition to Farmland Elementary School developed by Murray & Associates, Architects.

Re:    MONTHLY FINANCIAL REPORT

Mr. Larry Bowers, budget director, pointed out that this was the first report this year in the normal format because of the budget reductions made after the start of the fiscal year. They were projecting revenue problems in their projection of surplus that was used from FY 1991 to fund the FY 1992 budget and in the state funding of transportation. On the expenditure side, they were looking at a \$400,000 deficit. The report also highlighted savings from the measures to control expenditures. He said the revenue shortfall was significant, and they saw no way that they would be able make up enough to cover this. The superintendent would be writing to the county executive and County Council to share this information. He thought that this shortage would be made up by Council action and not through expenditure savings. Mr. Bowers believed that they would be able to make up that \$400,000 deficit by the end of the year, but they did not believe they could make up the shortfall on the revenue side.

Mr. Ewing commented that this did not take into account any reductions that the county government or state government might determine based on the current fiscal situation. He knew they were tracking what was happening in Annapolis, but that there could be big changes in the financial situation. Mrs. Fanconi asked whether cost savings from the warm winter had been figured in. Mr. Bowers replied that they were looking at possible savings from the milder winter, but they did not want to jump on this too quickly and build it into their projections. Mrs.

January 14, 1992

Fanconi asked whether this savings could be used for the curriculum specialists. Mr. Bowers hoped that this would help with the \$400,000 deficit; however, they were also monitoring employee benefit claims and staff turnover.

Mrs. Brenneman temporarily left the meeting at this point.

RESOLUTION NO. 24-92            Re:    MONTHLY FINANCIAL REPORT

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Mrs. Fanconi seconded by Ms. Gutierrez, the following resolution was adopted unanimously:

Resolved, That the following appointments, resignations, and leaves of absence for professional and supporting services personnel be approved (TO BE APPENDED TO THESE MINUTES).

RESOLUTION NO. 25-92            Re:    EXTENSION OF SICK LEAVE

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Mrs. Fanconi seconded by Ms. Gutierrez, the following resolution was adopted unanimously:

WHEREAS, The employee listed below has suffered serious illness; and

WHEREAS, Due to the prolonged illness, the employee's accumulated sick leave has expired; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Board of Education grant an extension of sick leave with three-fourths pay covering the number of days indicated:

<u>Name</u>	<u>Position and Location</u>	<u>No. of Days</u>
Evans, Edith	Spec. Ed. Bus Attendant Area III Transportation	7

RESOLUTION NO. 26-92            Re:    DEATH OF MR. RONALD E. CARTER, DATA PROCESSING ASSISTANT, DIVISION OF DATA PROCESSING

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Mrs. Fanconi seconded by Ms. Gutierrez, the following resolution was adopted unanimously:

WHEREAS, The death on December 31, 1991, of Mr. Ronald E. Carter, a data processing assistant in the Division of Data Processing, has deeply saddened the staff and members of the Board of Education; and



has deeply saddened the staff and members of the Board of Education; and

WHEREAS, Mr. Warren had been a dedicated employee of Montgomery County Public Schools for more than 27 years; and

WHEREAS, Mr. Warren took pride in his work, and his pleasant and cooperative attitude helped create a warm atmosphere at McKenney Hills Learning Center; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the members of the Board of Education express their sorrow at the death of Mr. Albert J. Warren and extend deepest sympathy to his family; and be it further

Resolved, That this resolution be made part of the minutes of this meeting and a copy be forwarded to Mr. Warren's family.

RESOLUTION NO. 29-92            Re:    PERSONNEL TRANSFER

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Mrs. Fanconi seconded by Ms. Gutierrez, the following resolution was adopted unanimously:

Resolved, That the following personnel transfer be approved:

<u>Transfer</u>	<u>From</u>	<u>To</u>
Kennon D. Evans	Principal Cresthaven ES	Principal Seneca Valley #8 ES Effective: 2-1-92

Mrs. Brenneman rejoined the meeting at this point.

Re:    INTERAGES REPORT

Mr. Austin Heyman, executive director of Interages, thanked the members of the Board and staff who had joined him at the Interages anniversary celebration. He had last presented a report to the Board in the fall of 1989. Since that time Interages had been recognized by the National Association of Partners in Education for "Closing the Gap," an intergenerational model and by the Chamber of Commerce for "Grand-care." Last spring the American Association of Retired Persons in its magazine, Modern Maturity, had featured a story on the Intergenerational Bridges Project. Congresswoman Morella had recently nominated Interages for a public service excellence award.

Mr. Heyman stated that Interages had five goals: (1) to broaden the participation of older adults in the public schools to increase the number of volunteers and to provide elderly with a positive view of schools, (2) to provide direct educational

benefits to children, (3) to provide a healthy view of aging to youth, (4) to facilitate community service for youth for the elderly, and (5) to leverage non-MCPS dollars to benefit children and youth.

Mr. Heyman reported that several thousand older adults had participated in county intergenerational programs in recent years. There had been a major growth in the number of schools initiating intergenerational projects. Some schools now had ongoing relationships with the elderly such as Germantown Elementary School with the Upper County Senior Center and Flower Valley Elementary School with Homecrest House. Last year there was a 47 percent increase in the number of senior volunteers in the schools. There was a major effort to recruit older volunteers through SAVIE (Senior Adults Volunteering in Education), and 40 to 100 volunteers were added each year from that effort.

Their second goal was being accomplished through such projects as the 20 mentors in Bridges Projects who met weekly with students who were recent immigrants. Volunteers provided support and assistance with language and homework. An evaluation of this project revealed that these students became more familiar and better adjusted to American culture, increased their use of the English language, and had shown some improvement in their self-esteem. Mentally retarded youngsters from Diamond Elementary were meeting with the frail elderly. At-risk students from Sligo Middle School were involved in the Shared Lives Project. Tilden and West had just formed linkages with homes for the elderly.

Mr. Heyman reported that they had supported the growing interest in community service by linking youth with nursing homes. Their latest project was called SETS (Self-esteem Through Service) and involved at-risk youth from Sligo with frail elders who also suffered from a lack of self-esteem. As to their fourth goal, all of their work and projects should lead children to acquire a healthy view of aging. Children in Montgomery County were disconnected from older adults. The best estimate was that about 25 percent of children had grandparents in this area. Intergenerational programs provided children with a balanced view of aging. A principal had told him that his students had grown through their intergenerational experience and had a new awareness of the energy, interest, concerns, and compassion of an older generation.

As to their fifth goal, Mr. Heyman said they had been able to obtain over \$200,000 in project funding from corporations, foundations, and individuals. He remarked that the superintendent's proposed \$10,000 cut in operational expenses would be keenly felt. This 16 percent cut would set them back to their 1986 staffing and funding level. While he understood the severe fiscal constraints facing MCPS, he wanted the Board to know that while this was a small part of the MCPS budget, it was

a large part of the Interages budget. He hoped that they would consider restoring this money to their budget.

Mr. Heyman believed that their original agenda and goals remained even more valid today. He said that intergenerational programs remained a sound investment now and for the future because their young and their old represented the fastest growing populations in Montgomery County. The challenge was to find new ways to open the school doors to senior citizens and to connect children to the living history, patience, wisdom, and often non-judgmental love of elders. He showed the Board a brief view of the Bridges project and invited Board members to visit the project.

Mrs. Hobbs asked about the effect of the employees charity campaign on the contributions Interages received. Mr. Heyman replied that this was a very small amount of money but it had increased from the first year to the second year that they were listed on the campaign literature.

Ms. Gutierrez asked about the impact the reduction in funds would have. Mr. Heyman replied that the funds from MCPS and the county government paid for the operation of the center and three-quarters of those funds were for salaries. They had one full-time person and two part-time people. All of the projects and activities were privately funded. The \$10,000 would affect the technical assistance part of their budget which was provided by the program coordinator.

Mr. Ewing commented that it was clear from the report that the investment made by MCPS was one on which there was an enormous return in terms of the total numbers of people involved. There had been a very impressive growth in programs, activities, and involvement. He asked for an estimate of the total number of seniors involved as volunteers. Mr. Heyman replied that it was a couple of thousand ranging from people who attended the senior program to those who came to the schools on a regular basis as mentors. Dr. Cheung asked about the involvement of retired MCPS teachers, and Mr. Heyman believed there were some retired teachers, but not a lot.

Ms. Gutierrez asked whether they were doing any outreach towards senior citizens who were recent immigrants. There were two very active centers for senior citizens from foreign countries. This would give the Interages programs a multicultural dimension. Mr. Heyman replied that one of their frustrations was not being able to do all they wanted to do. They had a request to work with Soviet Jewish immigrants, and Whitman High School had a project with Elizabeth House where there was an Hispanic population. There was more to be done than Interages could possibly do, but they were trying.

Mrs. Hobbs pointed out that the Board had received a letter from Dr. Shoenberg, chair of the Interages Board of Directors, supporting continued funding for Interages. She thanked Mr. Heyman for his report and invitation to visit Interages programs.

Re: ANNUAL REPORT OF THE COMMISSION ON  
CHILD CARE

Mrs. Hobbs welcomed Ms. Anne Schmitz, chair of the Commission on Child Care, and Ms. Eleanor Northway, past chair of the Commission.

Ms. Schmitz stated that the Commission was appointed by the county executive and confirmed by the County Council. Their 25 members were chosen to represent child care providers, parents, business, the public, and public agencies involved in child care issues. Their charge was to advise the county government on policies and programs which supported high quality, affordable, and accessible child care.

Ms. Schmitz pointed out that in their annual report they continued to support the expansion of public and private child care at school sites. They currently had over 100 child care centers located on site or adjacent to public schools. They had sought out very innovative solutions to space problems such as land leases for modular child care and classroom swaps for portable classrooms. There was an early childhood advisory council so-sponsored by Dr. Naomi Plumer and assisted by the Child Care Division staff. They had been pleased to learn of the Board's adoption of an early childhood education policy. She indicated that they were doing some exciting things in terms of collaborative training with MCPS staff on early identification of children with special needs.

Ms. Schmitz stated that now more than ever children and families in Montgomery County needed help and support. They believed that comprehensive quality child care was an important component of that support system along with schools, churches, recreational agencies and others. She said that child care services would benefit from increased cooperation from the schools. Child care often formulated a bridge role among family, school, and child care. She requested that the Board of Education and superintendent send a clear message to school personnel about the importance of this cooperation. Child care providers could act more in partnership to serve the children. The Commission also encouraged the consideration of school policies related to transfers, transportation, space leasing, after-school activities, and the appropriate transportation to get children to school activities. They felt that now was the time for careful planning for the immediate and future growth of schools where existing child care would be displaced. The Commission supported

the position of the real estate management specialist in MCPS to ensure that planning and coordination did occur.

Ms. Schmitz said they knew it was a time of fiscal constraints, but they would be happy to look for ways to share and collaborate with the school system. They could assist with early identification of children with special needs, particularly emotional and behavioral problems. They believed there were mainstreaming opportunities in child care that had not been utilized. Parent education on issues of appropriate child care was clearly a very easy task for both of them to accomplish. She invited Board members to attend Commission meetings which were held every third Wednesday.

Mrs. Hobbs commented that the Board was sensitive to child care needs, and last month when making some improvements to the student transfer process they had included some consideration of the child care component of that policy.

Ms. Gutierrez asked whether there was a recommendation to child care providers that they take a certain percentage of those parents receiving a lower subsidy. Ms. Schmitz replied that affordability was a very critical issue. Part of the problem was that 60 to 90 percent of their budgets was in salaries. When asked who was really subsidizing child care, the answer was staff was, in fact, subsidizing child care. They were having difficulty in finding quality staff because they couldn't pay enough. Ms. Northway said that her center was totally subsidized. The problem was that oftentimes the centers that could absorb losses were not where the people lived or worked. Ms. Schmitz reported that the industry did recognize it was not meeting the needs of the marginal workers or the working poor. Ms. Northway indicated that the larger centers might be able to subsidize, but families in those centers felt they were already subsidizing care through taxes.

Ms. Gutierrez stated that she was on the board of a center in Washington, D.C. which was training women to be certified to be child care providers. These women probably would not be employed because of their educational background, but in eight months they were certified and employed. She asked whether they were doing any of this in Montgomery County. Ms. Northway said that many organizations paid for on-going training of staff. Ms. Schmitz added that they were excited about the cooperative training offered by MCPS because it was training that the centers could not afford to provide.

Mrs. Fanconi inquired about the statement made that the Board needed to tell staff about the importance of cooperation. Ms. Schmitz replied that there should be clear statements about the importance of child care. Staff could do something as simple as

calling the centers to let them know there would be an early dismissal.

Mrs. Hobbs invited the Commission to provide testimony at the operating and capital budget hearings. Dr. Vance asked whether Dr. Plumer had any remarks to add to the discussion. Dr. Plumer commented that she was pleased they had been able to work in a collaborative way with the child care community. As her office received training grants, they were providing space for child care staff. A recent grant in science provided five slots for child care providers.

Ms. Northway remarked that she had been involved in child care from the early 1970's. Child care had grown tremendously, and now they had a Commission. She stressed that they wanted to continue their very positive relationship with the school system. Mrs. Hobbs thanked the members of the Commission for meeting with the Board.

Re: CURRENT AND FUTURE NEEDS FOR MAGNET  
SCHOOLS AND UPDATE ON QIE POLICY

Dr. Vance invited the following people to the table: Mrs. Marie Heck, assistant to the superintendent; Dr. Mary Helen Smith, director of the Department of Curriculum and Instruction; Mr. Barron Stroud, director of the Division of Quality Integrated Education; and Dr. Maree Sneed, attorney. Dr. Vance indicated that on August 28, 1991, the Board had raised many issues falling into two broad categories. One was whether there was a need to update the QIE policy in light of changing demographics in MCPS. The second was whether QIE funds, including those for magnet programs, were being allocated to the schools of greatest need given current fiscal constraints.

Dr. Vance reported that staff had provided a brief overview of the QIE policy, an update on how the QIE policy had been implemented, and conclusions/recommendations regarding future allocations of QIE resources including those for magnet programs to support Success for Every Student. He remarked that having played a major role in developing and creating magnet programs, he had an obvious bias toward magnet programs and the QIE policy. It was the mark of persons in his generation because they came through an exciting period in American history where great social issues were confronted. Perhaps one of the greatest was what Gunnar Myrdal called the American dilemma. When the QIE policy was adopted in 1975, it was MCPS's initiative to undo past wrongs and to assure equity and parity in equal educational opportunity for primarily black youngsters. Looking back over the years, their track record wasn't very good. The reality was that public schools in America today were more racially and economically segregated than they were in 1954 at the time of the Brown decision. There were some notable exceptions: Mount Airy near

Philadelphia and to some extent Columbia, Maryland, and the B-CC and Blair clusters. The MCPS initiatives through magnet programs and the QIE policy not only assured them of racial and economic integration but also helped stem the tide of white and middle class flight and stabilized communities.

Dr. Vance commented that developing this paper wasn't the easiest thing for him because he belonged to the category of old tired integrationists who still thought this should be a major social issue confronting America, particularly given the increased diversity and multicultural nature of the national population. He suspected that one of the major issues that would determine the future of this nation was the extent to which it addressed the complete integration, both social and economic, of all peoples into mainstream culture.

Dr. Vance said it was interesting to note that countywide percentages of minority students had gradually increased since the inception of the QIE policy. In 1973-74, the countywide percentage was 10 percent. It increased to 31 percent in 1986-87 and to approximately 39 percent in 1991-92. This growth was the result of an increase in African-American, Hispanic, and Asian-American students; and this growth was reflected in the geography and the demographic distribution of schools with minority enrollments. For example, when the QIE policy was adopted, this population was localized in the B-CC and Blair clusters. Multicultural population was now distributed throughout the county but most notably in the Einstein, Gaithersburg, Kennedy, Rockville, Springbrook, and Wheaton clusters. This gave them one reason to go back and reconsider the QIE policy particularly as it related to the distribution of resources.

Dr. Vance stated that the work of the QIE unit was impressive, and there was a list of initiatives and programs for which they had responsibility. He wondered what role QIE could play in addressing issues related to conflict resolution in schools with increasing multicultural populations. However, in MCPS they had never defined "multicultural" education, either legally or socially.

Dr. Vance said it was his conclusion that magnet programs were still viable in terms of promoting program innovation and multiculturalism. He had asked staff to conduct a careful review of QIE, magnets, and other resources to be completed this spring to determine how resources could be redirected to support Success for Every Student. Prior to the next school year he would forward his recommendations for updating the QIE policy and for reallocating QIE and other resources to support Success for Every Student.

Mr. Stroud commented that the QIE policy focused on equity and equality. The policy had a 20 percent guideline above the

minority student population level which was now 39 percent. The information provided to Board members showed how the need for service had expanded. It was no longer a black/white issue because of the significant growth in Asian and Hispanic populations. They had also had a significant growth in ESOL populations. The original plan called for the focus of resources in the Blair and B-CC areas. The policy itself addressed meeting the needs of all students, providing services and resources in schools to complement other programs, and providing training and support to staff so that all schools had equal opportunity and equal access.

Mr. Stroud reported that each year the QIE Office looked at every school in the county and did an analysis of achievement data and other factors including free and reduced lunch. They did this to see whether additional resources were necessary for that school. Once that assessment was one, the policy indicated that the Board was to look at options in terms of resolution of such issues which could be magnet programs, alternative programs, boundary changes, paired schools, etc. Over the years they had implemented mentoring programs, summer search programs, and other activities to enhance the opportunities for both access and success of students. Much of their information indicated that students had achieved and had made significant progress. Now in times of financial problems the issue was how they reviewed the priority of allocation of resources in a changing environment. They needed to look at how they assessed and provided resources.

Dr. Smith commented that magnet school staffs had learned a lot that they were willing to disseminate and had done some dissemination. Last week the staff of OIPD had the opportunity to participate in a program offered by secondary magnet coordinators and teachers. The program was outstanding. These people could put Success for Every Student into practice in terms of providing program ideas and innovative strategies. Many magnet schools had partnership programs to involve all students and to share what they had learned with other schools.

Mr. Ewing indicated that he would support Dr. Vance's recommendations although he was somewhat nervous about the notion of redirecting resources. While well-functioning magnets might not need as much support as start-up programs, there was also the fact that ongoing magnet programs had been structured in many cases so that they utilized those resources to make the program work. For example, East Silver Spring had math and science teachers, and the program would not function nearly so well without those people. He pointed out that the scores on math and science at East Silver Spring had taken substantial leaps forward as a direct result of that program, and this was a total school magnet. He knew that Dr. Vance would keep in mind that there were many programs needing resources beyond the minimum in order to function.

Mr. Ewing thought that Dr. Vance's third recommendation was insufficiently bold. He thought they should consider what Sandy Nakamura said about the magnet programs not being there solely because of better racial or economic balance or community stability. Increasingly these schools should be thought of as centers for innovation or laboratory schools. These were places where development took place of a kind that cried out for dissemination throughout the county. He felt that the value of magnet schools would go up enormously in the eyes of people all over the county if they were perceived in that light and utilized in that fashion. What they learned at Blair High School would not be seen as valuable to everyone unless they thought of Blair as a place where instruction in math, science, and computers could provide lessons for students throughout the county. He knew that Mike Haney and his staff were actively involved in dissemination of what they had learned, but there should be more emphasis and publicity about this.

Mr. Ewing commented that he had lived in the Blair area for nearly 25 years, and it was very clear that the magnet schools had made an enormous difference in that community over those years when they had been in place. It was clear that without the magnets the stability of the community would not have been as great. Like Dr. Vance he was an unreconstructed integrationist, and he thought they had a unique experiment underway in the Blair and B-CC areas. They had to distill these lessons and make them available to everyone in the county.

Mrs. Brenneman was not sure about the focus of today's discussion. In August the Board had a presentation of the magnet study which she felt was very useful. The material supplied by schools and staff was excellent information. At that time Board members raised a lot of questions on QIE, the magnets, and next steps while at the same time recognizing the good things that were going on in the magnets. She had thought that they would be discussing the answers to those questions today. It seemed to her that Dr. Vance was suggesting they would come back to those questions in the future. She did like the attachments to today's paper on the Eastern magnet and dissemination efforts.

Mrs. Hobbs added that in August Board members raised a total of 16 issues affiliated with the magnet report, and someone had come to the conclusion that those questions fell into two broad categories. She, too, was disappointed that they were not moving forward with the issues that were raised last August. For example, they had asked the superintendent for a timeline to consider all these issues prior to budget decisions. They also wanted to see specific recommendations on expanding, decreasing, and even terminating some magnets.

It seemed to Ms. Gutierrez that the superintendent was proposing further review and then a recommendation. She was not quite

clear as to who would be doing the review and what the results of that would be because the three results Dr. Vance mentioned in his memo did not address all of her concerns or what the Board had raised before. The information today did provide some more of the quantitative information that was going to be important for the Board to assess to come to some decisions. The bottom line was that she was still concerned about the timeline and being able to take action prior to budget decisions. She did not think the recommendations in the superintendent's paper were what the Board intended. She thought they wanted a clear idea of what recommendations would be forthcoming not only with the QIE policy but also with the assessment of the magnet program.

Mrs. Fanconi commented that on both the major agenda items, the SED report and this one, the Board had received information that was quite different from what had been discussed. In both cases, the Board follow-ups reflected very clearly what the Board wanted. She suggested that the superintendent and his staff should follow more closely what the Board stated in its meetings. She wanted to focus her remarks on QIE and try to update herself about what they were doing, what they wanted to do, and what their legal obligations were. She wanted to know what the effects were from the change in reporting minority student data and moving to Success for Every Student. Were they still going to be looking at the 20 percent factor when they moved to Success for Every Student? They had had major changes in reporting student progress because they no longer had CAT scores.

Mrs. Fanconi pointed out that they were using and re-using a lot of acronyms. For example, they had SEDS, SED, and SES. The system really needed to realize when an acronym had been used for something else. It was very confusing to the general public.

Dr. Vance stated that he had made a conscious decision not to address some of the Board's questions ad seriatim. Once he began to consider the rather massive and extensive demographic changes, he realized the issue was more than just redistributing resources based on their old interpretation of the QIE policy or a redistribution or elimination of some of the magnets. He felt that policy changes had to be brought forth that addressed the increasing multicultural changes in Montgomery County. Now in 1992 it could be very desirable for them to encourage multiculturalism in schools. For example, a school that was 20 percent African-American, 25 percent Hispanic, 15 percent Asian, and the rest white would be very desirable. They had to look at the implications of this for a revised QIE or multicultural policy and the allocation of resources. He thought they had to look at this issue legally and socially in terms of the future.

Mrs. Heck commented that for years they had used the QIE guidelines in order to review schools and determine where resources had been placed. With limited resources they had

looked at other ways and other programs to spread resources because the need had increased and other schools were requesting these resources. If children were being educated, were achieving, and were in a situation that was 25/25/25/25, did they need a policy that said they had to do certain things? For this reason, they felt they had to relook at the QIE policy so that it could continue to guide them in the future as the county continued to change.

Dr. Sneed remarked that it was difficult for MCPS because they had a lot of flexibility. They were known in the eyes of the court and the law as a unitary school district. They did not have a Constitutional violation they were trying to address. If they were just dealing with whites and blacks, it would be easy to figure out how to balance the schools racially; however, they were now dealing with multiculturalism, and there were a lot of options they could explore. The Board had to make a policy decision on what multiculturalism meant to it and then look at this in a legal context.

As Dr. Cheung read the document, it talked about equity and equality with an emphasis on quality. All parents wanted their children to get the highest quality education. The concern was that a school with a higher minority population might be perceived as not having that type of quality. They were investing money and resources in QIE and seeing better outcomes. Did they know what they got for these resources and how much improvement was a result of extra staff? How many students improved? These were important questions and the center of innovation. Could they duplicate these programs in another school with a slightly different environment? Would this produce the same result? He was interested in finding out exactly what happened in terms of the resources related to the quality of the program.

Dr. Cheung was particularly interested in the report by Ms. Virginia Tucker which was very innovative. She talked about how to disseminate the innovation to other staff and offered a practical model which did not cost much. This could be a model for other programs such as Success for Every Student. He asked why this was not being implemented. He also asked if they had information on programs that still continued in a pilot mode or programs for which there was a decreasing return on funds. He asked whether they were taking a systems approach to resolve problems. It was difficult for him to look at this issue and try to make a judgment on providing more resources to a particular program without knowing outcomes or whether the program was reaching the target students. Dr. Smith explained that Eastern did have an outreach program. The proposal by Ms. Tucker was very new, and they had not had an opportunity to try it. This was an example of the kinds of ideas that were generated when people got together to focus on education.

Mrs. Fanconi asked Dr. Vance to consider including as part of the requirement for receiving magnet funds that there be a plan for dissemination. Last year the Board had talked about using Human Relations Day as an opportunity for teachers to learn about various strategies and to get some innovative plans into the hands of teachers. This would treat teachers as professionals and tie together threads that ran through many Board discussions. They had fewer resources for staff development and dissemination, and they had to look to innovative ways to institutionalizing this.

Ms. Gutierrez indicated that she was going to have to leave the meeting and wanted them to know that she fully supported the superintendent's proposal on this subject. She commented that in reviewing the policy she was amazed about how well it had stood up over the years and how well written it was. However, she would encourage the superintendent to bring his recommendations to the Board as soon as possible.

Mr. Ewing pointed out that there had been two major evaluations of the magnet programs, and while they did not answer all of Dr. Cheung's questions they would give him a good solid start. The studies were careful critiques which talked about the accomplishments, limitations, issues, and problems of the magnets. It was also important to note that the magnets had done extensive dissemination. Dr. Haney and his staff had disseminated the results and lessons learned from the Blair magnet in the county, in the state, and around the nation. What was needed was to systematize and organize that dissemination, and Mrs. Fanconi's comments about tying that to every school receiving magnet funds was a good way to think about that. To some extent this had been done through Successful Practices.

Mrs. Hobbs noted that the Board had made difficult decisions in its reductions in the FY 1992 budget. She asked about budget reductions in the area of magnet programs or QIE. Dr. Smith replied that substitute days had been frozen so that it was difficult for them to take innovative practices to other schools. Consultant funds had been frozen, and many schools used consultants to provide the initial impetus to get research going. Some magnet schools didn't order all of their materials immediately and were now caught in the materials freeze. Magnet schools were affected by the loss of the activity buses. They lost the opportunity to provide programs such as peer tutoring where magnet students shared what they had learned with other students.

Mrs. Hobbs thanked the staff for their report.

\*Ms. Gutierrez left the meeting at this point.

## Re: BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS

1. Mr. Ewing announced his intention to propose that the Board go on record as favoring the abolishment of the Interagency Coordinating Board. During budget he would propose that MCPS take on the responsibilities held by the ICB with a proposal that the cost to the taxpayers would be 5 percent less.

2. Mr. Ewing pointed out 12 months ago the Board had adopted a series of Action Areas. He had sent a memo to the Board which indicated what the Board had covered on the Action Area list. While there were some Action Areas they had not covered, this Board had done a good job of setting goals and achieving those goals. He thanked Board members, the superintendent, and the staff for their exceptional performance.

3. Dr. Cheung reported that he had attended a seminar at NIST conducted by Dr. Leon Letterman. Dr. Letterman had made a commitment to train teachers in the Chicago public schools, and this year 2,200 teachers were being trained in science and mathematics. If it could be done in Chicago, it could be done in Montgomery County. Dr. Letterman had promised to send Dr. Cheung some information on the program.

4. Mrs. Fanconi indicated that she had represented the Board in a meeting with Russian exchange students. She had been presented with an example of local crafts, and she was now presenting it to the Board for display.

5. Mrs. Hobbs reported that she and Dr. Cheung had represented the Board at the recent rally in Annapolis. The rally was well organized, and Montgomery County was well represented.

RESOLUTION NO. 30-92      Re: EXECUTIVE SESSION - JANUARY 27,  
1992

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Mr. Pischevar seconded by Mrs. Fanconi, 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 January 27, 1992, at 7:30 p.m. to discuss, consider, deliberate, and/or otherwise decide the employment, assignment, appointment, promotion, demotion, compensation, discipline, removal, or resignation of employees, appointees, or officials over whom it

has jurisdiction, or any other personnel matter affecting one or more particular individuals and to comply with a specific constitutional, statutory or judicially imposed requirement that prevents public disclosures about a particular proceeding or matter as permitted under the State Government Article, Section 10-508; and that such meeting shall continue in executive closed session until the completion of business.

RESOLUTION NO. 31-92            Re:    MINUTES OF NOVEMBER 12, 1991

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

Resolved, That the minutes of November 12, 1991, be approved.

RESOLUTION NO. 32-92            Re:    MINUTES OF NOVEMBER 13, 1991

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

Resolved, That the minutes of November 13, 1991, be approved.

RESOLUTION NO. 33-92            Re:    MINUTES OF NOVEMBER 18, 1991

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

Resolved, That the minutes of November 18, 1991, be approved.

RESOLUTION NO. 34-92            Re:    MINUTES OF NOVEMBER 19, 1991

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

Resolved, That the minutes of November 19, 1991, be approved.

RESOLUTION NO. 35-92            Re:    MINUTES OF NOVEMBER 20, 1991

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Mrs. Fanconi seconded by Dr. Cheung, the following resolution was adopted with Mrs. Brenneman, Dr. Cheung, Mr. Ewing, Mrs. Fanconi, Mrs. Hobbs, and Mr. Pishevar voting in the affirmative; Mrs. DiFonzo abstaining:

Resolved, That the minutes of November 20, 1991, be approved.

RESOLUTION NO. 36-92 Re: MINUTES OF NOVEMBER 25, 1991

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

Resolved, That the minutes of November 25, 1991, be approved.

RESOLUTION NO. 37-92 Re: MINUTES OF NOVEMBER 26, 1991

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

Resolved, That the minutes of November 26, 1991, be approved as corrected.

RESOLUTION NO. 38-92 Re: MINUTES OF DECEMBER 2, 1991

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Dr. Cheung seconded by Mrs. Brenneman, the following resolution was adopted with Mrs. Brenneman, Dr. Cheung, Mr. Ewing, Mrs. Fanconi, Mrs. Hobbs, and Mr. Pischevar voting in the affirmative; Mrs. DiFonzo abstaining:

Resolved, That the minutes of December 2, 1991, be approved.

RESOLUTION NO. 39-92 Re: MINUTES OF DECEMBER 3, 1991

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Dr. Cheung seconded by Mrs. Brenneman, the following resolution was adopted with Mrs. Brenneman, Dr. Cheung, Mr. Ewing, Mrs. Fanconi, Mrs. Hobbs, and Mr. Pischevar voting in the affirmative; Mrs. DiFonzo abstaining:

Resolved, That the minutes of December 3, 1991, be approved.

RESOLUTION NO. 40-92 Re: HEALTH NEEDS OF STUDENTS

On motion of Mr. Pischevar seconded by Ms. Gutierrez (on December 10, 1991), the following resolution was adopted unanimously:

Resolved, That the Board of Education discuss the health needs of students in Montgomery County.

Re: PROPOSED RESOLUTION ON BOARD  
SUBCOMMITTEE ON MINORITY  
ACHIEVEMENT

Board members postponed action on this proposed resolution until January 27, 1992.

RESOLUTION NO. 41-92            Re:    LIST FOR NAMING NEW SCHOOLS

On motion of Mr. Ewing seconded by Ms. Gutierrez (on December 10, 1991), the following resolution was adopted unanimously:

Resolved, That the Board of Education receive and consider the list of names of women and minorities being proposed for school names; and be it further

Resolved, That the Board of Education review this list of names and solicit additional names.

RESOLUTION NO. 42-92            Re:    HB 52 - EDUCATION - COUNTY BOARDS -  
AUTHORITY TO BORROW; HB 29 -  
ENGLISH LANGUAGE - OFFICIAL  
LANGUAGE OF MARYLAND; AND HB 95 -  
RELIGIOUS AND ETHNIC CRIMES AGAINST  
PUBLIC INSTITUTIONS

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education reaffirm its previous positions on the following bills:

HB 52 - Education - County Boards - Authority to Borrow  
Support

HB 29 - English Language - Official Language of Maryland  
Oppose because it sent the wrong message to ethnic  
communities that it was un-American to be actively bilingual  
and unpatriotic to maintain one's cultural and linguistic  
heritage.

HB 95 - Religious and Ethnic Crimes Against Public  
Institutions  
Support

RESOLUTION NO. 43-92            Re:    HB 111 - STATE BUDGET - MANDATED  
APPROPRIATIONS

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education oppose HB 111 - State Budget - Mandated Appropriations.



January 14, 1992

Re: ADJOURNMENT

The president adjourned the meeting at 6:10 p.m.

---

PRESIDENT

---

SECRETARY

PLV:mlw