



Re: STATEMENT BY DR. CHEUNG

Dr. Cheung made the following statement:

"I want to thank my colleagues for their support in electing me as president of the Board. It is, indeed, an honor as well as a privilege to have received your vote of confidence, and I call upon each of you as we move toward the coming year to assist me as we meet the serious challenges that we are facing. I know together we cannot only meet those challenges but we can also exceed any limitations they might impose on us.

"I am reminded during this season of the year, we haven't had snow yet, of a snow fall. In that, if one examines a single flake of snow, one sees the individuality and uniqueness of a single snow flake, but when they are added together they cover the ground with a snow white blanket. So this Board is, in my view, similar to that. In that, each of us has our own individual perception and our own individual point of view. By coming together, we soften the harshness of the landscape, creating a pattern of beauty and ultimately providing a nurturing climate for the students whom we serve.

"It is therefore with deep humility that I accept the presidency and reiterate that together we can face the challenges of tomorrow in a manner which calls upon each of us to contribute our best which demonstrates that our diversity can become a positive force to meet our goals and that any rocks that we must surely encounter as we move forward can be viewed as stepping stones toward a positive future for the children entrusted to our care. Thus, like a snowfall we can by working together diffuse the harsh realities of our winter by creating the tranquility and beauty of our mutually developed snow fall. Thank you."

RESOLUTION NO. 858-92      Re: BOARD AGENDA - DECEMBER 8, 1992

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education approve its agenda for December 8, 1992.

Re: ENERGY CONSERVATION COMPETITION  
(ENCOMP) AWARD

Dr. Vance was pleased to recognize the successful energy conservation program initiated by school plant operations staff.

MCPS had a commitment to controlling energy costs through intelligent investments in energy technology. Because of this, over the previous 14 years they were now saving \$2 million

annually in lower energy costs. In addition to the awards won by two schools, PEPCO was presenting the Board with a check for energy efficient equipment installed over the past two years which was another example of private/public partnership working to produce projects which benefitted the community at large.

Dr. Vance introduced Mr. Edmund Ryan, division manager of the Energy Management Division of the Potomac Electric Power Company.

Mr. Ryan stated that MCPS had won first place in the competition sponsored by ENCOMP for Seneca Valley MS #1's design and had won honorable mention for Travilah ES's high efficiency modular boilers. On behalf of PEPCO, he presented the Board with a check in the amount of \$300,000 in rebates given by PEPCO to MCPS.

Re: ANNOUNCEMENT

Dr. Cheung announced that he had just been informed that the County Council had cut an additional \$2 million from the Board's FY 1993 Operating Budget; however, the county executive had been recommending a cut of \$3 million. The Board was to advise the Council in writing by December 22 of the steps taken to make the savings.

Re: UPDATE ON THE SYSTEMWIDE OUTCOME  
MEASURES FOR THE SUCCESS FOR EVERY  
STUDENT PLAN

Dr. Vance stated that it was exactly a year ago this month that the Board approved its Vision and Goals Statement setting forth the foundation for the Success for Every Student Plan (SES) that was approved the next month. Since that time, staff has been hard at work implementing the beginning stages of the plan which was a large and comprehensive reform of public education in Montgomery County. It was reform which was typified by evolution and not revolution because what they wanted to do was incrementally institutionalize their positive initiatives. The Board had received periodic updates on various components including the executive staff's plan. On August 4, the Board received information about one of the most critical elements of their leadership plan, the evaluation and the accountability components. They presented strategies for collecting and providing data for the various outcome assessments. Today they were presenting the most recent data for each of the 10 outcomes as a way of examining the starting points of the systemwide reform effort.

Dr. Vance explained that because of the timing of the plan there was limited impact on the 1991-92 school year, but the data today would provide a basis on which to measure progress this year and in future years. He was troubled by the data about successful completion of algebra in grade 9 and participation in honors courses. They wanted to disclose the data because that was their

covenant with the broader community. Despite some improvements, the data highlighted the disparity in student achievement among schools' various ethnic and racial groups. They knew the disparities existed, and the Board had employed Dr. Gordon to do a study. Today the data separated fact from perception and provided the harsh reality of disparate educational achievement.

He was convinced that MCPS had to remain committed to the SES plan because this was the future for Montgomery County. They would find that the commitment was difficult to maintain in times of great financial distress when competition for limited resources would grow more intense, but he intended to remain steadfast. He remained committed to the great vision which the Board had adopted and the pledge they had made to the Success of Every Student.

Mrs. Gemberling stated that on August 4 they had provided the Board with the shell and the format they would use for data reporting. They were reporting in December because the Maryland School Performance Plan data could not be released until after November 16. They had tried to include other outcome data in the report and not just concentrate on MSPP data, and they had provided the Board with baseline reports on all 10 major outcomes. They would be coming back to the Board with a separate presentation on their local criterion-referenced testing results.

Mrs. Gemberling explained that today they would give the Board an overview. They had provided a summary from the Department of Educational Accountability of the key points of the data on each of the outcomes. They had also provided a matrix that allowed them to look at the outcomes and data along racial group identity as well as gender. They would like to highlight different aspects they saw in the data outcome measures which were before the Board. They would also like to inform the Board about new initiatives that were in place. She emphasized that what was before the Board was baseline data, and from their perspective, there were no surprises in the data because they had selected these outcomes based on their major areas of concern and what they wanted to accomplish in four years. However, in some cases where they had data they were reporting for the first time, they were surprised by the degree of some of the results. This had caused them to reaffirm some of the priorities they had set and to understand that it would be a long, hard road.

Mrs. Gemberling commented that the state standards were based on the first administration of a test and on everyone who took the test. When they established their local standards, they looked at the same measurement instruments, but they based their clientele on those who had been in MCPS for two years. If they looked at the local standards, they would see MCPS much closer to meeting their goals than indicated by state standards. It was encouraging to them to see the gains they were making in the middle schools in all racial groups. Looking at this data, she

would dispute perceptions out there about SES that it was a floor-type, basics only program. If they looked at the data, they would see that MCPS was prepared to move beyond basics, to satisfactories, to excellent. Once they had met certain standards, they would set higher standards. For example, their initial standard was for students to complete algebra by high school graduation. Now with SES, they had moved that initiative down to ninth grade. The second point was that SES was only focused on low achievers or a certain racial group. Mrs. Gemberling noted that they had focused on raising the achievement of those not on target and enhancing the success of students on target. She said they had looked at the functional tests over a decade. When they began there was a disparity among racial groups in reading, but now the disparity was non-existent and everyone was scoring well above the 90 percent mark. With the writing test, they were beginning to get close to the desired results for all racial groups. With the citizenship test, they were beginning to see movement and a levelling out among the scores. With mathematics, they were showing gains but not to the extent they would like to see them. About four years ago they began to see a trend in mathematics which was the reason for the SES program concentrating so heavily on math. Last year they had made a concentrated effort and were able to bring the scores up; however, they still had a marked disparity in how White and Asian-American students performed when compared to African-American and Hispanic students. This caused them to have initiatives in the area of mathematics, and to look at students much earlier before they got on a track. The disparity was such across the county that they did not have individual schools performing at their goal. If they saw these trends in functional math, it was no surprise when they looked to the higher skills in mathematics they were seeing an even more marked disparity.

Dr. Joseph Villani, associate superintendent, stated that math was the key in their plan. The Office of Instruction and Program Development had been focusing its efforts to improve and support the math program in schools. They had three general functions in OIPD which were staff training, program development, and direct support to schools in conjunction with the Office of School Administration. They had focused all three efforts on math last year, this year, and would continue to do that for next year. The Board had had a presentation on math content connections training, and this program would continue for the next four years. The program involved one third of the schools the first year, a third more the second year, and the final third the third year. In the fourth year, all of the schools would be involved. It was a program to train every teacher in the elementary school on ways that he or she can teach mathematics in their subject areas.

Dr. Villani reported that the Department of Educational Media and Technology took the core books at each grade level and developed

sample lessons for math and science concepts. Their thrust in this whole area had been to improve the math instructional program so that by the time students got to high school they were well prepared to be successful in math. One of the most successful programs so far had been the double-period algebra, but their goal was to phase this out when students were well prepared by the time they got to high school. In the meantime, the program was available in all high schools and had a good success rate. As they developed curriculum K-12, they were looking for ways not only to stress problem solving but also to integrate math throughout the curriculum. For example, in updating their program to meet state requirements in technological concepts, they had infused math and science throughout the course. They had the events-based science course in middle school which was getting national attention. Instead of studying ocean currents, students studied the Exxon Valdez incident which infused higher level math concepts into the curriculum. They were infusing math throughout the elementary science program starting in kindergarten so that students understood how the world worked, how they could measure it, and how they could make predictions about it.

Dr. Villani indicated that there was a pilot program in three elementary schools, Project IMPACT. In this program they trained teachers to use problem-solving strategies in their instruction.

From his perspective, one of the most thrilling parts was the eagerness with which teachers were getting engaged in learning new strategies for developing the math skills of students. They were working with the local graduate schools to make available to teachers more math and science courses to fulfill the Board's requirements. These courses have been made available to teachers at a discount. In schools in need of assistance, OIPD had sent staff in to work directly with teachers and principals for program improvement.

Dr. Villani said that the next section had to do with increased participation of African-American and Hispanic in honors and advanced courses. One of their goals for pre-high school was to get all students ready and interested in the challenge of advanced courses. Part of this had to do with the skills to complete the course successfully, but another dimension was the will to do so. They were working with counselors and resource teachers to identify multiple intelligences in students and to nurture giftedness. A large part of that came from experiences students were having in elementary and middle schools with interdisciplinary topics which were motivating them to explore studies in greater depth. He was confident this would lead to greater enrollment in honors courses. With regard to the SAT, they had several programs going not only to help students to improve their scores but to infuse information one needed to be successful on the SAT throughout the curriculum. Students could not be successful on the SAT unless they had completed algebra

and geometry. He said that last year he had done an analysis of the SAT scores, and he was shocked to find that by a ratio of four to one, students did better on the math portion than they did on the verbal portion. Therefore, they had started an initiative to analyze the test and work with English resource teachers to build up the verbal power of students. The SAT was undergoing changes, and by the time the new SAT was administered they would have in place training for all staff on the new version. For example, the new SAT would not contain antonyms but would have readings in science and social studies demanding interpretation, analysis, and criticism. He reported that the MCPS program now had that emphasis, especially at the middle school. They were developing a prep course which would be offered this spring in a way that would train five teachers who would, in turn, become new trainers for the next year. They were also working with Adult Education to change their SAT prep course. This program was piloted last year by MCPS staff in conjunction with the Banneker Honors Math and Science Society. Students in that course scored 200 points higher than students not having that course. Cable television had been broadcasting tapes on how to prepare for the SAT test.

Dr. Phinnize Fisher, associate superintendent, commented that the Office of School Administration had been established with the primary function of monitoring outcomes, look at individual student data, and determine methods for improvement. They were in the schools looking at instruction and outcomes. During the first three months of school, the office looked at a K-12 perspective in terms of the delivery of the curriculum and the related outcomes. They had identified needs and data, and they were looking at individual schools and school clusters. They were also establishing cluster objectives. They had reviewed every school improvement plan as well as school staff development plans to ensure a match between the two plans. The plans were discussed individually with principals because they wanted to make sure the resources were used appropriately and meeting student needs. They decided to concentrate on cluster training needs in order to economize and focus resources.

Dr. Fisher reported that her office was providing support to administrators to analyze the data. They looked at instruction to determine how they were teaching students so that student experiences became building blocks for learning new things. She indicated that it was not uncommon to see a senior high principal in an elementary school looking at instruction or visiting a program. Her office was trying to show relationships among various levels of schools, but they were also giving the ownership to individual teachers. In terms of algebra, they wanted a kindergarten teacher to really understand why he or she was teaching mathematics and what impact that instruction would have on the student when he or she got to high school.

Dr. Fisher said that they shared the delivery model cluster-wide, and all the clusters were holding meetings to share ideas, in-service training, and staff with particular expertise. They were also sharing what had been successful with individual students. In reviewing the resources, her office made sure they were being used appropriately and to assist students in instruction. Here they were talking about attitudinal changes and taking responsibility for what they were teaching and how to teach children. They were all taking responsibility from K to 12 and looking at articulation from grade to grade and placement of students.

Dr. Fisher indicated that when they looked at some of the other outcomes such as the suspension data, they were also grouping that data. In looking at that data in one school, they found 60 percent of the 20 students suspended were African-American. When they worked with that school they looked at the reasons for suspension and at programs that had been implemented. In addition, they were looking at other schools with a lower rate of suspension to find out what they had done with the idea of moving these activities over to the school with the higher suspension rate. They had looked at programs for peer mediation and conflict resolution and used the coordinator to train teachers at the other school. In addition, they were working with the Office of Special and Alternative Education because many of the students recommended for expulsion had been coded or had had some type of special education interaction.

Dr. Hiawatha Fountain, associate superintendent, commented that looking back at the decision to divide the responsibilities of the deputy into two positions had brought about a unique opportunity for them to focus on instruction. In this past year, they had spent more time talking about instruction than in any of his previous 15 years with the school system. OSAE served as a support as well as a direct service organization. Using the focus of math, they had developed tasks and subtasks in every department and unit. They used the management plan to get that across. They collaborated in training, recruitment, selection, and general problem solving. Therefore, Outcome E which was on math was a focus of OSAE.

Dr. Fountain reported that in addition to efforts in mathematics, they continued to develop strategies and implement approaches to lessen the number and percentage of students with serious emotional disturbance and specific learning disabilities who happened to be African-American. They were doing that through intervention and pre-referral and by refining identification procedures. Much of the training would be focused on classroom strategies that would help teachers become more effective in maintaining African-American students in regular classrooms. Profiles and checklists were being developed to assist regular classroom teachers in ways to identify potential candidates for

special education services. They would use intervention strategies to help many students meet with success in the regular classroom. He indicated that the Board would learn more about this in January when they discussed SED issues.

Dr. Fountain remarked that Outcome J dealt specifically with SLD and SED. The program for students with specific learning disabilities was reviewing the folders of sixth grade students new to the middle school in Intensity 4 programs to develop a profile of students enrolled. Information would be shared with the principal and the feeder elementary schools to identify any potential over or inappropriate identification. They were looking at students who were getting into trouble early on. Programs for students with SED worked closely with schools where African-American students were disproportionately identified for special education to ensure that appropriate identification procedures were followed. They were developing the comprehensive SED data base to link service strategies to outcomes. They were working on "best practices" and pilot models that provided early intervention and prevention for SED students.

Mrs. Gemberling pointed out that the outcomes before the Board were student outcomes. The Success for Every Student plan had a significant number of tasks, activities, and goals that were indirectly focused on these outcomes. They did review each and every task and activity within the plan beyond just reviewing the data of these particular outcomes. They were constantly updating to keep on focus and adjust the plan. She said that staff would be pleased to answer Board questions.

Dr. Cheung thanked staff for the report. He personally thought it was a great report, but he recognized that it was baseline data.

Mrs. Fanconi reported that the Board had received some correspondence dated December 10, 1991, from Joan Karasik and on December 2, 1992, specifically on areas addressing special education. Under new business, she would bring forward a discussion item on changing the wording in 1.4 and 1.5 and possibly 1.7. She was particularly concerned about the data they showed because the charts and graphs, though useful, were for regular education students. MSPP was very clear that special education students would participate in the testing and that the education of those students needed to be accounted for. Mrs. Gemberling replied that all MSPP data reflected and included special education students. The local standards in C and D would reflect Levels 1 through 3.

Mrs. Fanconi believed that SES was for every student, and they needed to provide the data and the goals for the special education population as well. She said that in 1.5 when they talked about identifying students, particularly African-American

students, currently in special education program who might not need special education services, it had been suggested that given IDEA and mandates there, it might be better to rephrase that to say, "enable students currently in special education but who do not need special education services to achieve in regular education." This left open the possibility of additional services, but not necessarily special education services. She felt there were a number of areas that could be discussed if they had a discussion on special education. Secondly, she said she still had a great deal of difficulty looking at a readiness profile. It seemed to her that IDEA was very specific about saying that a system would provide the services necessary for students who needed the special education services. These were dealt with in the EMT and the ARD. She would like to have some discussion about different ways they could provide a review but not necessarily say that a student had to match a profile. She said it was very important to relook these strategies particularly since several of them would be beginning in January 1993. She suggested a special session of the Board on these issues.

Mr. Sims requested information on the mentoring program in regard to outcomes H and I. He said that Dr. Villani had mentioned the importance of will and motivation in encouraging students to take higher level courses, and he agreed. He remarked that one of the important things was that guidance counselors encourage students to take those higher level courses because that had not always been the case. He felt that guidance counselors should encourage students to consider the course load they are taking. He knew a lot of students who would take certain courses so that they could keep their GPA, and he believed that students should take those courses although it might mean getting a B rather than an A. Dr. Vance expressed his agreement and said that this pointed out how complicated this issue was because the approach must vary almost by student.

Mr. Ewing hoped that the Board could find some time to talk about these issues further because they did not have enough time on the agenda. He pointed out that the Board had adopted a resolution which tended to be prominent only by its absence. This was the Board's resolution on math and science education. He thought it was important for them to get an assessment of how they were doing against all of the objectives set forth in this statement.

A second point was with regard to the citizenship results. It seemed to him this was related to the whole area of the social studies curriculum. They needed to change that because of the new state requirements and what MCPS would like to do on its own.

The low scores did cause a problem, and the Board needed to address this. If that meant they had to drill students, they would have to do so to get students to pass the tests.

Mr. Ewing commented that the most important issue was one he had

been raising for 10 to 15 years: what they knew about why it was that the performance of students differed so dramatically. The answer usually was that they knew what strategies worked, and so they could apply the strategies. They knew what worked in some schools, and so they could apply those techniques. Except through the Gordon report, they had not really inquired into why it was these differences existed. He was of the view that in order to be successful in applying strategies, an element of that success was to understand why it was that there were differences in outcomes. He did not think this was a piece of isolated information but rather a base for addressing the strategies. He did not suppose there was agreement on that within the school system, but he thought this was a very important issue. He said that because it seemed to him, if there were agreement, they would have devoted some resources to inquiring into it. He felt that they should at least try to do something here.

Ms. Gutierrez thought this was an area where they did need to have more sessions for the Board to be able to know how they were doing with their efforts. To her, this was the highest priority area for the school system. She was glad to hear the comments made that there was a notable effort to focus in this area. The plan had that as an intent, and she was pleased to see that concrete steps were being made. While this was baseline data, she was troubled by it because the degrees were just extraordinary. Her first reaction was anger. She appreciated the verbal report as well as the data. She liked the type of thing that Dr. Fisher talked about because it was getting to the individual child. She also agreed with Mr. Ewing about finding the root cause. They had to better understand so that they could be effective in whatever change they made. If it took additional focus for DEA and gathering of the data, she thought they had to continue doing that. She hoped that the Board would receive continuous feedback. She thought that the data would probably have an impact on the public, and if they did not share with the Board and the public what they were doing about it in concrete and frequent reports, it gave the impression that MCPS was just inching along to resolve its problems. She would want to make sure it was very clear to everybody that this was a very serious effort to address serious concerns.

Ms. Gutierrez inquired about the budgetary impacts of programs that staff had identified. She recalled that last year she had proposed having math resource teachers at the elementary level. She did not think that they could have business as usual. They had to look at the resources they had and re-orient them. She would like to know about that as they entered the budget season.

In the area of suspensions and expulsions, she thought the comments being made got them closer to getting to the point where they had to understand root causes. She encouraged them to look further at that particular area. They had to really question themselves as to whether what they were doing was producing

results. If it wasn't, they had to be able to change it and change it quickly. As she looked at the outcomes, she could see some clearly wrong directions. In some cases, for African-American and Hispanic students whatever they were doing was not working. She would like to see clear internal measures with shorter term adjustments and evaluations.

In regard to the baseline itself, Mr. Abrams shared some of the same concerns expressed by Board members, but it seemed to him to be a useful place to start. He asked staff to provide him some feedback as to what the cost would be to refine the baseline with regard to subcategories within classifications. In particular, he would be interested in a socioeconomic overlay. Secondly, within the Asian and Hispanic categories, he would like to see a breakdown into a series of subcategories for differentiation in order to identify outcomes better. Thirdly, he understood that among Asian and Caucasian they were dealing with 70 to 75 percent taking the SAT and PSAT. However, among African-American and Hispanic students that percentage was 50 percent. He asked whether there was a comparable measure that could be used in terms of baseline which would not use SAT and PSAT performance. Absent this, he thought it was difficult to make the kinds of judgments that would be necessary in terms of coming into a real detailed analysis of the implications.

Mr. Abrams stated that when staff described the implementation of new approaches in mathematics, they talked in terms of a continuum introducing it in the elementary schools; however, the scoring that they would be looking at probably would look at an eighth grade outcome. Therefore, the continuum would only have an impact on students for a year or two. He wondered whether this was being factored and whether efforts were being taken to handle students during the transition from one approach. In other words, was the expectation level they were imposing now on pre-algebra in eighth grade and algebra in ninth grade realistic given all of the continuum with the introduction of that kind of curriculum change. He requested some feedback on that as well.

Dr. Cheung commented that the report was useful and raised a lot of questions. He hoped they would be able to schedule a meeting to have more discussion between Board and staff. Dr. Vance indicated his support for another meeting. Ms. Gutierrez suggested that it would be useful to get an in-depth presentation of each of the specific areas discussed this morning.

Re: SAFETY AND SECURITY IMPLEMENTATION

Dr. Rohr introduced Mr. Michael Gough, director of school safety and security, and noted the presence in the audience of four security team leaders.

Mr. Gough directed the Board's attention to their organizational

chart for the security unit. They had three field coordinator positions that were about to be filled, and these people had extensive backgrounds in investigation and experience in security matters. They would be working throughout the county in responding to issues in security in elementary schools and giving aid to security assistants in middle schools and in the high schools. They had an electronic detection section with four security monitors who listened in on the BOEMAS system and the infrared system and dispatched the security patrol. There were 21 security team leaders in the high schools with from one to three security assistants for a total of 66 people.

Mr. Gough explained that they had a system set up to respond to requests for assistance. At one high school a rumor was started before a football game with a team from another county. His group had provided extra security from MCPS and from the other county. There were no incidents. At an elementary school this fall, they had an incident where two people in a stolen car being chased by the police abandoned the car very near an elementary school. The security team leader from the cluster high school responded with one of his assistants to secure the building while the police were searching the grounds.

Mr. Gough reported that the security team leader was the focal point in the schools. They acted as a liaison with the beat officer on the street, the district commander's office, and the principal. The principal gave this person direction, but Mr. Gough had staff supervision over them to make sure they were well trained and equipped, but the program direction came from the principal. In some schools some team leaders had gone beyond their traditional role and had been involved in peer mediation, mentoring programs, building surveys, and traffic surveys. The principal made sure that communication was good, that a solid program was implemented, and that the team leader worked with Mr. Gough's office. He anticipated that the security team leaders would be directly involved with the Montgomery County Police Department's community policing program in establishing a neighborhood cooperation program to ensure the safety of children walking to and from school.

Mr. Gough indicated that in late September they had an orientation session for security team leaders and assistants. In October and November, the security team leaders and assistants were certified in CPR and first aid training. On January 27, 1993, they would have an all-day training session on weapons identification and drug identification. He invited Board members to attend that session which would be held at Quince Orchard HS at 8 a.m. Mr. Gough said that he had met with the police district officials, principals, and fire officials to establish communication. He would appear on the "Student Voices and Views" cable television program on December 10 to take phone calls from students. He emphasized that the primary mission of his office

was to establish a safe and secure environment at every school to make sure that students and staff were safe which would contribute to the Success for Every Student program.

Mrs. Brenneman reported that she had met with some friends in the Police Department and one of them had told her how impressed he was with the quality of security teams in the high schools. She had heard the same comments from other people. She wondered about information being provided to school staffs because in one instance an after-school meeting had been held in an isolated section of the building. She asked whether they were telling staff to be aware of what might happen after school.

Mrs. Brenneman noted that in the report there was mention of efforts to accelerate improved lighting and detection equipment for the schools. This issue had been raised over and over again during the CIP budget testimony. She requested a listing of schools having their lighting improved and asked that this information be shared with the PTA of those schools. Mrs. Gordon added her compliments on how quickly the plan had been implemented. She also requested a timeline for when all schools will receive improved lighting and whether or not they considered the evening use of schools in developing this timeline. She inquired about the number of schools currently offering DARE, SMART, and the Drug-free Schools program as well as the timeline for increasing those activities in other schools.

Mrs. Fanconi remarked that police officers did a lot of social work and counseling. She asked about opportunities for Mr. Gough's staff to do prevention and early intervention. Mr. Gough replied that their role was not police enforcement but rather to develop a rapport with students to allow them to succeed in school. If students had problems, the security team was another place to go to get help. The security people would make referrals to peer mediation and to the counseling staff of the schools. They were developing some excellent information networks because students were coming to security staff with information on what was happening in the schools. Mrs. Fanconi asked whether all security staff were trained in peer mediation skills, and Mr. Gough replied that they were not but should be. He hoped that in a month they would be able to have more training sessions.

Mrs. Fanconi commented that she was disturbed that security was not somehow connected to OIPD because it seemed to her that many of the students that come in contact with security personnel were students who needed different services. Mr. Gough replied that the more security people understood about the systems set up to help students, the better they could make an adequate referral. They needed to know the specific services that were available, and for this reason they needed additional training and the support of the principals and guidance counselors.

Mrs. Fanconi asked whether Mr. Gough was aware of the National School Safety Center, and Mr. Gough replied that he was. Mrs. Fanconi explained that she had just returned from a national staff development conference where a presentation was made on the community approach developed by the Los Angeles school system. She suggested that staff talk to the National School Safety Center about this approach. She recalled that three or four years ago there had been an MCPS dropout report, and in that report they talked about being able to identify students who were likely to be truant or behavior problems as early as the third grade. She suggested that the next time they discuss safety and security they pull in some issues about early identification and prevention efforts. She had not seen any mention of the alternative school, and she inquired about progress here. Mrs. Gemberling replied that they would have a final report and expected to bring this to the Board in January.

It seemed to Mr. Ewing that this was an immensely high priority effort, and it was the public's view that safety and security of schools should have a high priority. He was delighted with the amount of successful activity to date, and he had heard nothing but positive comments from the community. With regard to the lighting issue and the safety and security report, he suggested sending the report together with a description of the lighting plans to every PTA in the county. Dr. Vance thought that this was an excellent idea.

In regard to legislation, Mr. Ewing recalled that H.B. 1260 did not include the kind of language the state Board was now recommending with regard to allowing school systems to have more information about what students were alleged to have done in terms of violation of the law. He thought it was critical to get this in the bill and asked that the Board be provided with the draft bill as soon as possible.

Ms. Gutierrez made the following statement for the record:

"I need to identify myself as a bit on the minority side of this issue. I guess I have a very basic philosophical disagreement with an approach to safety and security that seems to be focusing more on enforcement rather than on the prevention side. I think that the kind of issues of safety and security that we are facing are really a community/societal concern and not just a school concern. So I really wonder how such a significant investment, which is obviously identified with the large number of staff that we have hired to do this, will yield the kind of results if they did not also focus on the prevention side. My comment just summarizes some of the comments made by other Board members. I would really like to see an increased linkage with training -- training of the staff within these units that will be carrying out the safety and security functions as well as some strengthening of the conflict resolution skills that are

necessary for students to avoid the problems. From the training that you have identified, I really do see them more as policing and enforcement and not enough of the kind of community relations or people skills as well as conflict resolution. I am familiar with some of the programs listed. I think that we definitely need to, and this is probably for OIPD rather than your unit, focus on developing the kind of course that will really begin to address specifically what the issues are at all the grade levels.

I had hoped for something along the lines that we were developing a course that was going to be addressing how to resolve conflicts and give students those kind of skills. What's mentioned here, for example, the MCR Student Advocacy Program, my son is involved with that. It is just a handful of kids who participate in it, and it is not the kids that are causing the problems or having the need to understand how to deal with conflict and how to understand how to deal with conflict and how to find alternatives to conflict that are not violent. It is not really directed towards those kinds of issues. I strongly encourage whatever can be done to build and strengthen the last item on this report."

Mr. Sims expressed his agreement with Ms. Gutierrez in terms of the importance of the curriculum; however, he thought that the plan the Board had reviewed had shown that staff was looking in this direction. Violence in the schools is a societal problem, but it would not be solved by more police and more punishments. He personally did not subscribe to that philosophy. He said that staff was not taking that approach, and they were looking at different areas. He agreed that security people should have training in peer mediation. He asked if schools were participating in the cooperative neighborhood programs, and Mr. Gough replied that this was getting underway. He would be meeting with each district commander, and the intent was to have the beat officer directly involved with the schools in non-crisis situations.

Dr. Cheung thanked the staff for their report.

Re: CLOSED SESSION

Dr. Cheung announced that the Board had recessed for lunch and had been meeting in closed session to discuss personnel issues.

RESOLUTION NO. 859-92      Re: AMENDMENT TO BOARD AGENDA FOR  
DECEMBER 8, 1992

On motion of Mr. Abrams seconded by Mrs. Gordon, the following resolution was adopted with Mr. Abrams, Mrs. Brenneman, Dr. Cheung, Mr. Ewing, Mrs. Gordon, and Mr. Sims voting in the affirmative; Mrs. Fanconi and Ms. Gutierrez abstaining:

Resolved, That the Board of Education amend its agenda to move the item on the proposed NSBA resolution prior to consent items.

Re: A MOTION BY MR. ABRAMS TO AMEND THE  
AGENDA FOR DECEMBER 8, 1992  
(FAILED)

A motion by Mr. Abrams to amend the agenda to move committee appointments after the NSBA resolution failed with Mr. Abrams, Mrs. Brenneman, Dr. Cheung, and Mr. Sims voting in the affirmative; Mr. Ewing, Mrs. Fanconi, Mrs. Gordon, and Ms. Gutierrez abstaining.

Re: PUBLIC COMMENTS

The following individuals appeared before the Board:

1. Connie Warner, Parent Resource Centers
2. Michele Bloch, Parent Resource Centers
3. Ginny Hillhouse, Parent Resource Centers
4. Zina Green, Parent Resource Centers
5. Haydee de Paula, PISCES
6. Jean Eisenhour, Parent Resource Centers
7. Kennan Cooley, Parent Resource Centers
8. Lori White Wasserman, Parent Resource Centers

Re: FEDERAL SUPPORT FOR EDUCATION

Mrs. Fanconi moved and Ms. Gutierrez seconded the following:

WHEREAS, The Montgomery County public school system is committed to offering every child the opportunity for a quality education; and

WHEREAS, Our nation's success in the post-Cold War world will depend on the ability of America's public schools to educate each and every child, and no school district has the financial capacity to build a quality educational program for the 21st Century and overcome the social and economic problems that prevent students from coming to school ready to learn; and

WHEREAS, The end of the Cold War and the collapse of the Soviet Union offer our nation a once-in-a-generation opportunity to rethink our national priorities; and

WHEREAS, Our competitors in the global marketplace invest more tax dollars on children and elementary and secondary education than does the United States; and

WHEREAS, Federal budget savings made possible by the end of the Cold War could be used to rebuild America and ensure that every

child comes to school healthy and ready to learn; and

WHEREAS, All educationally-related national organizations including the National School Boards Association have called for new federal budget priorities that reflect post-Cold War realities; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the members of the Board of Education of Montgomery County, Maryland believe it is time to reinvest in America and join school districts across the United States to urge the Congress and the President elected on November 3, 1992, to make education America's top priority by reordering federal spending priorities in 1993; and be it further

Resolved, That the Montgomery County Board of Education will forward this call for new priorities to our county's elected representatives in Congress and to the President of the United States; and be it further

Resolved, That the Montgomery County Board of Education will also forward this resolution to its local legislative leaders and urge the Montgomery County Council, county executive, and Delegation to join this call to reinvest in America.

At the suggestion of Mr. Ewing, Board members agreed to amend the second WHEREAS from the bottom to state "could be used to help rebuild America."

RESOLUTION NO. 860-92      Re:    AN AMENDMENT TO THE PROPOSED  
RESOLUTION ON FEDERAL SUPPORT FOR  
EDUCATION

On motion of Mr. Abrams seconded by Mr. Ewing, the following resolution was adopted with Mr. Abrams, Mrs. Brenneman, Dr. Cheung, Mr. Ewing, Mrs. Fanconi, Mrs. Gordon, and Mr. Sims voting in the affirmative; Ms. Gutierrez voting in the negative:

Resolved, That the proposed resolution on federal support for education be amended in the second WHEREAS to substitute "some school districts lack the financial capacity" for "no school district has the financial capacity."

Re:    A MOTION BY MR. SIMS TO AMEND THE  
PROPOSED RESOLUTION ON FEDERAL  
SUPPORT FOR EDUCATION (FAILED)

A motion by Mr. Sims to turn the first Resolved clause into a Whereas clause failed with Mr. Abrams and Mr. Sims voting in the affirmative; Mrs. Brenneman, Dr. Cheung, Mr. Ewing, Mrs. Fanconi, and Ms. Gutierrez voting in the negative; Mrs. Gordon abstaining.

Re:    A MOTION BY MR. ABRAMS TO AMEND THE

PROPOSED RESOLUTION ON FEDERAL  
SUPPORT FOR EDUCATION (FAILED)

A motion by Mr. Abrams to delete "in 1993" from the first Resolved clause failed for lack of a second.

RESOLUTION NO. 861-92 Re: FEDERAL SUPPORT FOR EDUCATION

On motion of Mrs. Fanconi seconded by Ms. Gutierrez, the following resolution was adopted with Mr. Abrams, Mrs. Brenneman, Dr. Cheung, Mr. Ewing, Mrs. Fanconi, Mrs. Gordon, and Ms. Gutierrez voting in the affirmative; Mr. Sims abstaining:

WHEREAS, The Montgomery County public school system is committed to offering every child the opportunity for a quality education; and

WHEREAS, Our nation's success in the post-Cold War world will depend on the ability of America's public schools to educate each and every child, and some school districts lack the financial capacity to build a quality educational program for the 21st Century and overcome the social and economic problems that prevent students from coming to school ready to learn; and

WHEREAS, The end of the Cold War and the collapse of the Soviet Union offer our nation a once-in-a-generation opportunity to rethink our national priorities; and

WHEREAS, Our competitors in the global marketplace invest more tax dollars on children and elementary and secondary education than does the United States; and

WHEREAS, Federal budget savings made possible by the end of the Cold War could be used to help rebuild America and ensure that every child comes to school healthy and ready to learn; and

WHEREAS, All educationally-related national organizations including the National School Boards Association have called for new federal budget priorities that reflect post-Cold War realities; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the members of the Board of Education of Montgomery County, Maryland believe it is time to reinvest in America and join school districts across the United States to urge the Congress and the President elected on November 3, 1992, to make education America's top priority by reordering federal spending priorities in 1993; and be it further

Resolved, That the Montgomery County Board of Education will forward this call for new priorities to our county's elected representatives in Congress and to the President of the United States; and be it further

Resolved, That the Montgomery County Board of Education will also forward this resolution to its local legislative leaders and urge the Montgomery County Council, county executive, and Delegation to join this call to reinvest in America.

RESOLUTION NO. 862-92      Re:    UTILIZATION OF FY 1993 FUTURE  
SUPPORTED PROJECT FUNDS FOR THE  
STATE LITERACY WORKS PROGRAM

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

Resolved, That the superintendent of schools be authorized to receive and expend within the FY 1993 Provision for Future Supported Projects a grant award of \$19,879 from the Maryland State Department of Education (MSDE) for the State Literacy Works program, in the following categories:

<u>Category</u>	<u>Amount</u>
2    Instructional Salaries	\$13,471
3    Other Instructional Costs	5,330
10  Fixed Charges	<u>1,078</u>
Total	\$19,879

and be it further

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

RESOLUTION NO. 863-92      Re:    SUBMISSION OF AN FY 1993 GRANT  
PROPOSAL TO STUDY INSTRUCTIONAL  
MODELS FOR CHILDREN WITH LEARNING  
DISABILITIES

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

Resolved, That the superintendent of schools be authorized to submit an FY 1993 grant proposal for \$170,436 to the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development (NICHD), through the University of Maryland, for a research project to study the effectiveness of specific instructional models for children with learning disabilities; and be it further

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





project.

RESOLUTION NO. 867-92      Re:    AWARD OF CONTRACT - MECHANICAL  
EQUIPMENT AT BENJAMIN BANNEKER  
MIDDLE SCHOOL

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

WHEREAS, Sealed bids for improvements to the heating, ventilating, and air-conditioning system at Benjamin Banneker Middle School were received on November 18, 1992, with work to begin immediately and be completed by February 28, 1993; and

WHEREAS, Details of the bid activity are available in the Department of Facilities Management; and

WHEREAS, The low bid is below the budget estimate of \$32,000, and sufficient funds are available to award the contract; and

WHEREAS, The low bidder has completed similar projects successfully at Stonegate Elementary School and Earle B. Wood Middle School; now therefore be it

Resolved, That a contract be awarded to the low bidder meeting specifications for the project and amount listed below:

<u>Project</u>	<u>Amount</u>
Mechanical Equipment for Benjamin Banneker Middle School <u>Low Bidder</u> : Adrian L. Merton, Inc.	\$29,790

RESOLUTION NO. 868-92      Re:    ARCHITECTURAL APPOINTMENT - COL.  
ZADOK MAGRUDER HIGH SCHOOL

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

WHEREAS, It is necessary to appoint an architectural firm to provide professional and technical services during the design and construction phases of the addition to Col. Zadok Magruder High School; and

WHEREAS, Funds for architectural planning were appropriated as part of the FY 1993 Capital Budget; and

WHEREAS, The Architectural Selection Committee, in accordance with procedures adopted by the Board of Education on May 13, 1986, identified Bowie-Gridley, Architects, as the most qualified





## RESOLUTION NO. 873-92 Re: PERSONNEL REASSIGNMENT

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Ms. Gutierrez, the following resolution was adopted with Mr. Abrams, Mrs. Brenneman, Dr. Cheung, Mr. Ewing, Mrs. Fanconi, Mrs. Gordon, and Mr. Sims voting in the affirmative; Ms. Gutierrez being temporarily absent:

Resolved, That the following personnel reassignment be approved:

<u>Name</u>	<u>From</u>	<u>To</u>
Dolores Hester	Classroom Teacher McAuliffe ES	Instructional Asst. Location to be determined Will maintain salary status To retire 7-1-93

## RESOLUTION NO. 874-92 Re: EXTENSION OF SICK LEAVE

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Ms. Gutierrez, the following resolution was adopted with Mr. Abrams, Mrs. Brenneman, Dr. Cheung, Mr. Ewing, Mrs. Fanconi, Mrs. Gordon, and Mr. Sims voting in the affirmative; Ms. Gutierrez being temporarily absent:

WHEREAS, The employees listed below have suffered serious illness; and

WHEREAS, Due to the prolonged illness, the employees' 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>
Judith Gecan	Head Start Teacher Strawberry Knoll ES	10
William McIver	Classroom Teacher Westland Middle	10
Wilmer Watson	Building Service Worker Kennedy HS	30

RESOLUTION NO. 875-92 Re: DEATH OF MR. JOHN C. WYNDHAM,  
BUILDING SERVICE MANAGER IV, COL.  
E. BROOKE LEE MIDDLE SCHOOL

December 8, 1992

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Ms. Gutierrez, the following resolution was adopted with Mr. Abrams, Mrs. Brenneman, Dr. Cheung, Mr. Ewing, Mrs. Fanconi, Mrs. Gordon, and Mr. Sims voting in the affirmative; Ms. Gutierrez being temporarily absent:

WHEREAS, The death on November 8, 1992, of Mr. John G. Wyndham, a building service manager IV at Col. E. Brooke Lee Middle School, has deeply saddened the staff and members of the Board of Education; and

WHEREAS, Mr. Wyndham had been a loyal employee of Montgomery County Public Schools for more than 18 years; and

WHEREAS, Mr. Wyndham's pride in his work and his dedication to duty were recognized by staff and associates alike; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the members of the Board of Education express their sorrow at the death of Mr. John G. Wyndham 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. Wyndham's family.

RESOLUTION NO. 876-92      Re:    PERSONNEL APPOINTMENTS AND TRANSFER

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Mr. Abrams seconded by Mrs. Fanconi, the following resolution was adopted with Mr. Abrams, Mrs. Brenneman, Dr. Cheung, Mr. Ewing, Mrs. Fanconi, Mrs. Gordon, and Mr. Sims voting in the affirmative; Ms. Gutierrez being temporarily absent:

Resolved, That the following personnel appointments and transfer be approved:

<u>Appointment</u>	<u>Present Position</u>	<u>As</u>
Judith Docca	Asst. Principal Blair HS	Principal Argyle MS Effective: 2-1-93
<u>Transfer</u>	<u>From</u>	<u>To</u>
Jeffrey Pitt	Principal Fallsmead ES	Principal Quince Orchard #7 ES Effective: 2-1-93
<u>Appointment</u>	<u>Present Position</u>	<u>As</u>
Kathleen Lazor	Food Services Supervisor	Asst. Director Div. of Food

Div. of Food  
Services

Services  
Grade M  
Effective: 12-9-92

RESOLUTION NO. 877-92 Re: SCHOOL CALENDAR FOR 1993-94

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Mrs. Brenneman seconded by Mr. Ewing, the following resolution was adopted with Mr. Abrams, Mrs. Brenneman, Dr. Cheung, Mr. Ewing, Mrs. Fanconi, Mrs. Gordon, and Mr. Sims voting in the affirmative; Ms. Gutierrez being temporarily absent:

WHEREAS, The establishment of school terms by the County Board of Education is required by state law; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the proposed school calendar for 1993-94 be adopted.

Mr. Abrams left the meeting at this point.

Re: USER FEES AND AN UPDATE ON ADULT  
EDUCATION AND SUMMER SCHOOL  
ENTERPRISE FUND

Dr. Vance introduced Dr. Hiawatha Fountain, associate superintendent; Dr. Marion Bell, director of the Division of Adult Education and Summer School; Dr. Pam Splaine, acting director of the Division of Administrative Analysis and Audits; Mr. Zvi Greismann, school system attorney; and Mr. Larry Bowers, director of the Department of Management, Budget and Planning.

Mr. Bowers explained that the handout provided to the Board responded to the Board's resolution of July 8, 1992. The first section was about Constitutional law issues which they had addressed through the issue of mandated services. The second section got into the Council's policy on user fees, and the third issue was on enterprise funds. The final section was a discussion of adult education and summer school. In regard to mandated services, he said this was a key issue as the state legislature had taken the social security payments and shifted them to the local jurisdictions. There had been a request from MACO and MABE for the state to look at mandated services and the requirements being put upon the local jurisdictions. The Educational Article for the state did not mandate a tremendous number of services. For example, they mandated the length of the school year, the number of school hours, and kindergarten. COMAR had more requirements, and the federal government imposed some requirements. One area which had a lot of implications for the budget was special education, and the levels and intensity of service was prescribed by federal law and described by COMAR.

Mr. Bowers said they had tried to highlight general issues

regarding mandated services. They had included information about charging for evening high school and summer school transportation. He reported that MCPS went far beyond what was mandated. There were decisions that were made locally such as the seven-period day and class size. Some states did have requirements for specific class sizes, but Maryland did not have such a requirement.

Mrs. Brenneman asked how Maryland defined "school supplies" which had to be provided free of charge. Mr. Bowers replied that the law did not define this or such things as stationery.

Mr. Ewing stated that Mr. Greismann had provided an opinion to the Board dated April 27, 1992, which stated that parents were responsible for providing transportation to and from summer school centers. He asked whether MCPS could charge a fee for transportation to students during the regular school year with the exception of students with disabilities. Mr. Greismann replied that until recently the opinion had been that no county school system could charge for transportation; however, the attorney general had rendered an opinion to Howard County that charging for transportation would not violate the state constitution. At the same time, the attorney general thought that this action would be challenged and perhaps would not withstand a challenge.

Mr. Ewing asked what would happen to state transportation assistance if MCPS were to charge for all or part of the cost of transporting students. Dr. Rohr replied that the state had reduced participation to less than \$10 million for MCPS, and there was really no direct link between actual transportation of students and the grant; however, the state might assert that they should receive some benefits from this. Mr. Bowers added that some jurisdictions received close to 100 percent of their transportation costs, but MCPS received only 25 percent.

Dr. Vance commented that they were current with the latest opinion from the state attorney general. He asked whether a school system would have to get permission from the state if they decided to charge for transportation, and Mr. Greismann replied that this was not addressed in the opinion but it seemed to infer that no permission was required.

It seemed to Mrs. Fanconi that it was illegal to charge for drivers education, and she asked staff to give her a call on this. Mrs. Brenneman asked if they had information on how the student parking fee collection was working. Mr. Bowers replied that the report was due in this office, and he would have a report within a week or two. Informally, it appeared that collection was as high as they expected, if not higher.

Ms. Gutierrez recalled that she had raised the transportation

question before, and she had received a clear answer that MCPS could not charge for transportation. She asked if they were sufficiently clear as to the legalities of charging user fees on transportation. Mr. Greismann replied that they now had guidance from the attorney general's office that their position had changed. The attorney general had said that if a bill were passed that imposed transportation fees on students, and if the governor asked for an opinion on whether or not to veto the bill on Constitutional grounds, the attorney general would say no. However, there might be other legal questions and challenges not related to the Maryland State Constitution. There had been three states adopting transportation bills that had withstood some kind of legal challenge.

In regard to the Council's policy on user fees, Mr. Bowers said it was to ensure that county agencies had a consistent rationale for charging user fees. The policy went on to say that if state law granted authority to a separate legal body to set fees, this policy was a guide to that body in setting fees. Mr. Bowers pointed out that the Board of Education was a state agency and did, in fact, have the authority to set fees. Therefore, the Council policy was a guidance but not a requirement for the Board.

In terms of the criteria that Council had established, Mr. Bowers stated that MCPS did follow most of those criteria as they set fees. The one issue they had highlighted was the ability of users to pay the fee. If the users were not able to pay, the general fund should pay for the support of those who were not able to pay rather than having users able to pay paying for those who were not. This differed from MCPS policy. He said that when the Council established this criteria it was their feeling that everyone should pay something even if only a minimal amount and that there should be some way to assess the ability of people to pay. With summer school, if a student was eligible for free or reduced price lunch, they were able to attend summer school for free. When MCPS structured this last year, they assumed that those able to pay would be charged fees to cover the fees of those who were unable to pay. The issue now was how did MCPS get the funds for those students unable to pay. He suggested that the Board could request from the Council a general fund contribution to pay for those students as opposed to trying to get the revenue from students able to pay. If they did that, the Council would look at the MCPS fee structure for the summer school program and the issue of charging a sliding scale based on income level. This was the major issue related to the Council's policy.

Mrs. Brenneman asked what would happen if they charged user fees on transportation or extracurricular activities. Would they have to go to the Council for general fund monies for those not able to pay. Mr. Bowers replied that either of these would not be put

into an enterprise fund. Even if they charged for transportation, it would only generate revenue to cover a small portion of the activity. Mr. Ewing asked about having an enterprise fund containing revenue from fees and revenue from the general fund. Mr. Bowers thought this would be acceptable; however, there were people who would argue that an enterprise was only for user fees. He pointed out that they had the Model Learning Center in the enterprise fund, and this was a program funded by the county government.

Mr. Bowers said that the third issue was about the enterprise funds. They had three funds: food services, real estate management, and adult education/summer school. He pointed out that they also collected revenue from outdoor education, field trips, tuition payments, and the hospital teaching program at NIH. These were not in an enterprise fund. Dr. Cheung asked if they were experiencing an increase or decrease in tuition payments. Mr. Bowers replied that it was a little early in the year to tell, and he would have to get back to Dr. Cheung.

Ms. Gutierrez asked whether there was an advantage to lumping adult education and summer school in one enterprise fund. Mr. Bowers explained that when the Board adopted the policy it was basically for adult education and summer school programs. He said they did not really want a proliferation of a lot of enterprise funds. The other issue was increasing adult education fees to generate additional revenue to help pay for other parts of the program, and having one enterprise fund gave them a bit more flexibility. Ms. Gutierrez asked whether or not general fund monies could be segregated within the total enterprise fund, and Mr. Bowers replied that it could because there were separate accounts within the enterprise fund. They did, in fact, already receive some other funds from the state for adult general education which were in the enterprise fund.

Mr. Bowers called attention to the October 29, 1992, memorandum on summer school and the year-to-date experience in adult education programs as well as driver education and evening high school. They did have significant fiscal problems in both summer school and evening high school. Two assumptions made when they prepared the budget did not hold true. The first one was the percentage of students in the program who were receiving tuition waivers which was much higher than anticipated. The second issue was a lower class size which was related to a reduced enrollment in the program which made it more difficult to run the classes at the higher class size they had assumed. In the evening high school program they had made an assumption they would generate additional fees through adult education and a \$10 fee in the evening high school program. The additional fees were not adequate to begin to cover the cost of the evening high school program. Last spring when they came to the Board, their cost estimates for the evening high school program were not inclusive

and did not include some of the costs related to the program such as media specialists and the counselors. They estimated they would generate \$43,000 in the evening high school program, but they were looking at a program costing them almost \$500,000. In terms of the summer school program, there was a difference between revenue and expenditures of almost \$400,000. They had received some benefit from the fee structure for adult education to help offset that deficit by \$100,000. They had provided the Board with papers on enrollment, review, and expenditures.

Mrs. Brenneman asked why they kept class sizes as low as they did in adult education. Dr. Bell replied that they arranged the enrollment at a level that would pay for the class. It was a minimum of 18 in order to cover the cost, but this year enrollment averaged 18. Dr. Bell said it would be difficult to combine some of these classes because some of them were one of a kind.

Mrs. Fanconi read the following into the record:

"I want to specifically speak to the summer school and evening high school and Saturday school. Change is important, but I think only when it improves, and I think we are under severe financial constraints. Even today we heard from the Council about another \$2 million, and we certainly are downsizing in response to that. But I think we have to keep our wits about us, and when business downsizes they assess what is essential to the survival of their industry, how they can make the same product or an improved product by making systemic changes. What we have done, I believe, is try to respond to the fiscal shortfall without adequate assessment of what is essential to the survival of our industry, and that is the achievement of all children.

"That may have been understandable in the heat of the crisis. Now we understand that this is not a one or two year crisis. We will probably never go back to the growth of the 80's. So now is the time to reassess. Everything we do should be directly connected to our vision of the success for all students. If we have made errors in judgment, or things didn't work out the way we hoped they would, we need to acknowledge that at least we know what doesn't work and try again.

"I believe in my heart that evening high school, GED, and Saturday School are essential parts of our total curriculum. I believe we should not charge for these programs any more than we should charge for regular education or special education. These programs are utilized in large part by minority students at very high risk of dropping out of school. I believe this is the same as educational discrimination because we say that if you are not doing well in the regular program or you need to work during the day or you need to have evening classes to replace a course that you failed in the regular program so you can graduate then you

have to pay to get your education. Now if the superintendent wants to evaluate the program and the population, gather a good profile on the students, come up with a better way to serve these children at less cost, I might support that.

"I went this weekend to a national staff development conference.

I caught my cold, but I also listened to Dr. George McKenna who was an extremely impassioned speaker. He is a past principal of a preparatory school in L.A. He is currently the superintendent of the Inglewood United School District in California. He said some very important things that I would like to insert into my comments. I want to be sure that I give credit for the way that he thought this through. Maybe instead of success for all students, we should say we believe that there is no student who cannot learn, and we believe that so strongly that we will do whatever it takes to assure they get the educational opportunities they need. What if we had mandatory peer counseling programs and everybody had to participate, and this is his idea. Peer counseling is what young men seek when they enter gangs. What if we had peer counseling teams of students that would be trained as well as we train our football teams. Instead of celebrating touchdowns, we would celebrate not letting kids slip away. The peer counseling team picks them up in the morning, walks them to class, tutors them at lunch, helps them after-school. What if the whole school was working to make sure that not one child dropped out? What if we had clubs of parents of children who are doing well coaching parents of children who were not doing so well? There are so many ideas that we haven't tried. What are the educational goals for this population that we serve in summer school and GED and in evening high school? We need to expand the number of interventions, go back to the 1988 study on dropouts and truants. That study said we could identify these children as early as third grade. What interventions can we put in at that level?

"I am delighted to see on the same agenda today safety and security because we know that kids who achieve tend not to get into trouble at least not at the rates of those who are having more difficulty. I really feel that we need to look at multiple ways to address this. As part of the staff development conference I went to a session on planning, and they took as an example in this planning session, how to revitalize their adult education courses. That was the issue that they took as an example. What they suggested you do is that you look at what courses would be more relevant to increase participation. Don't run a course that is less than -- they chose 10 participants. Change the format, look at the topics, look at the marketing. In this particular program they spent large amounts on direct mail to every home, and they suggest instead of doing that, buy newspaper advertising. Look at the location, does that affect the participation? Gather data, costs, consumer surveys, alternative ways to provide the service such as contracting. Key

questions that they suggested needed to be answered as we looked at this is how to develop course offerings that 'people would die to attend.' And those verbs were chosen very specifically because they wanted to put passion into it. How to market programs that would attract more attendees. How to maximize locations to draw certain populations. How to vary the format to remove obstacles for attendance. For instance, they were offering some programs late afternoon and found out that most of the people wanting to take those programs were working so they shifted them to the evening. How to get the highest quality teaching in the courses for the dollars.

"I am not being critical in what I am saying, but what I am saying is this recession is going to continue for a long period of time. We are going to have to reassess and there are some programs in adult education that I think we really need to look at getting some advice from our business community on how to run a business. We have very good success with our food service. I am sure that Joanne or Scotty would be happy to come in and help you look at how to do that. But there are some program issues as well.

"I believe that Evening High School, Saturday school, and GED should be removed from that fee schedule. I truly believe that that is a part of our regular education program, that that is a part of the interventions that we do for students who are not succeeding. Last year we had 635 students that dropped out. I think that is fairly consistent with the 700 something students that we had in Evening High School and Saturday school. Instead of putting obstacles of fees there, I think we need to make a concerted effort to look at how we can serve those children. If we can serve them during the school day better, then let's do it. If we can't, then let's make sure that those educational opportunities are available.

"I would like to make several recommendations, and I know this is not an action meeting, but I believe that we should direct the superintendent to remove Evening High School, Saturday school, and GED from the enterprise fund and henceforth have it be considered as an alternative program. In fact, it should be perhaps put in OIPD as an extension of the regular program. Second, once returned to the regular program, we would reevaluate the population served by the GED and Evening High School and Saturday school for educational needs and look at how early they can be identified, use the information to address Success for Every Student plan, and design programs specifically to enhance not reduce opportunities for this population. Third, to evaluate courses for their relationship to SES, all of our courses, and that those courses that are not a part of the regular education program, look at innovative ways to provide opportunities at a cost so that students can benefit and yet still maintain the program (keep the price from costing the program out of

existence). Fourth, to form a task force to look at re-vitalizing adult education and make it self supporting. That would be part of that goal.

"I think we have just got to be more creative and use the data and data collection much more when we assess the impact of fees on the users. Thank you."

Ms. Gutierrez asked for a clarification of what was before the Board. She understood this to be a discussion item on user fees, but she had received an inordinate number of phone calls and letters regarding evening high school and talking about proposed changes. She did not see these changes before the Board except in a memo from Dr. Bell to Dr. Fountain about increasing class size and increasing fees. She asked whether the Board was going to receive a recommendation from the superintendent particularly in regard to a "get well" measure. Dr. Vance replied that what was in front of the Board was what the Board had requested. They wanted to have this discussion prior to the superintendent's submission of the operating budget so that if there were changes such as those proposed by Mrs. Fanconi these could be considered by the superintendent. The "get well" measure was the request to go back to the County Council and request they make up the shortfall. At that point, he expected the Council would ask the Board what they intended to do to make sure there wasn't a shortfall every year.

Ms. Gutierrez stated that she would second Mrs. Fanconi's position. She thought they had made a mistake by going in this direction with this particular population. For example, at Wheaton High School every student was at risk, 70 percent were minority, and many of them had children and were supporting themselves. She pointed out that for many of these students the program was the last resort, and they were struggling to stay in school. She said that in Dr. Bell's memo there was mention of the success rate for these students which was outstanding. She suggested that an effort be made to correct the record if the public assumed that changes were to be made. The superintendent had not proposed any changes to the Board.

Mr. Ewing reminded the Board that last year when they put this in the enterprise fund and set the fees they set them at a rate that caused the budget director to say to the Board that he thought those fees would not generate enough money, and he was right. Mr. Ewing was sympathetic to the notion that evening high school was a very special case; however, one could argue that a fee for evening high school could be seen to be an incentive to students to avoid ending up in evening high school. He did not believe this would prove to be the case. He was interested in knowing what was meant by the last two sentences in the memorandum of December 8 which stated "it would be necessary to generate savings in general fund categories to cover the deficits this

year, and these savings will have to be generated through the measures that have already been put in place to address the savings requested by the Council." He asked whether this meant a further freeze, reduction in services, or reduction in evening high school. There were rampant rumors producing vast numbers of telephone calls to Board members. He asked what was going to be done now regarding evening high school for the rest of this year or what was proposed to be done aside from asking the Council for money. Mr. Bowers replied that although they could carry a deficit forward in an enterprise fund with the anticipation that in the future you could generate savings that would cover it, the magnitude of this was such they did not believe this was going to be possible. They needed to deal with the deficit this year. The suggestion was that the measures put in place to generate savings to cover the savings the Council had requested would need to include this issue. They would also need to request that the Council take money saved from those general fund categories to transfer it into the enterprise fund to help with the deficit.

Mr. Ewing asked about the impact of those actions on evening high school. Mr. Bowers replied that there would not be any impact on the program. What Board members were hearing about evening high school was, as they looked at the structure of the program this year and last year, they had looked at creating larger class sizes closer to the norm of regular high school classes. They might have a program on one night rather than two nights. They were trying to develop efficiencies in offering courses and to look at the way they delivered some support services to the program in the second semester. They were not talking about not offering courses and selections they had now. Mr. Ewing said that one of the themes in the phone calls was saving the evening high school teachers. He asked whether they would be reducing the number of teachers, and Mr. Bowers replied that potentially there could be a few less teachers if they increased class size. The decision would be based on enrollment similar to the situation they faced in summer school when they did not know how many students would enroll.

Mrs. Brenneman said that while she was sympathetic to Mrs. Fanconi's suggestion she would not be willing to support this. They were talking about possible user fees for transportation, and she would wager that if they did this they would get thousands of letters from parents who could not afford to pay the fees. If they talked about charging fees for extracurricular activities, they would get thousands of letters on that as well. She remarked that no one wanted to charge user fees, but they were going to have to make some choices. She would like to see options when they went into the budget, but at this point she could not see eliminating any user fees.

Mrs. Fanconi said that her statement had nothing to do with any letters. Her issue has to do with the basic philosophical

feeling that these students deserved the same free and appropriate education as other students. The other issue was actual program changes, and the staff memo said they were considering changes as well as increasing fees. She thought that the \$500,000 belonged in the regular operating budget, and if they had to look at delivery of services for everyone else, that would have to happen. She could not support charging for these services for students at risk.

Ms. Gutierrez commented that not all user fees were created equal. One clear criteria that was being violated was the ability of users to pay, and if they did not consider that when they set user fees they would be walking down the wrong path. It seemed to her that as they talked about efficiencies it sounded as if they were restructuring for the second semester. She asked that the superintendent come to the Board if he were proposing any changes. Dr. Vance stated that he would inform the Board of any programmatic changes, but he would not be bringing this for approval because it would be an internal decision made by the superintendent and his staff. The document being discussed by the Board was an internal document and one that he had not seen prior to this meeting.

Mr. Ewing stated that if changes were proposed that would reduce positions this was a matter for the Board to see and review.

Dr. Cheung thanked the staff for their presentation.

Re: STAFF DEVELOPMENT - ORGANIZATION,  
PROGRAM DELIVERY, COURSE OFFERINGS  
AND COURSE CONTENT

Mrs. Gemberling explained that they had been asked to have a discussion of staff development in terms of the restructuring, a change in focus, and how they were addressing priorities. The Board would hear from the school improvement training unit and the systemwide training unit. She reminded the Board how new these units were.

Dr. Villani acknowledged the fact that Mrs. Kitty Blumsack was the chair of the National Staff Development Council conference which was being held as they spoke at the Washington Sheraton. He was proud of the fact that staff were involved at the national level. He recalled that in last year's budget action they took the former Department of Staff Development and split it into two units to economize and streamline. This enabled them to focus their resources on system priorities especially those in the Success for Every Student plan. Mrs. Blumsack and Mrs. Karolyn Rohr would share information about the units.

In regard to the school improvement training unit, Mrs. Blumsack stated that their challenge was a unique one. The first

challenge was providing training for teachers because although they had an experienced staff, many needed updating and retooling. She reported that at the conference the speaker this morning had talked about the educational reforms coming from business and the community. In MCPS they needed to get results from fewer resources, and they were also faced with the challenge of increasing student achievement when the population was shifting.

Mrs. Blumsack said that Montgomery County had 177 different schools with 177 different ways of approaching training, and yet each school needed the same kind of resource support. They all needed to be able to analyze data to set training priorities, and they all needed to set goals. They needed to tailor the training to their specific needs in that building, and they all needed access to resources. They all needed to implement training to bring about change and to evaluate that as part of a long-term process.

Mrs. Blumsack stated that their goal was to assist schools in making the most effective and efficient use of their resources to improve skills for teachers, support staff, and administrators so that student learning improved. They were looking at three different ways of doing this. The first was generalized training including some training portfolios that were scripted training packets that schools could use. Some schools had followed these word-for-word and other schools used portions of the packets. They were developing a computerized resource bank. They were having their first consultant showcase, and they had invited exterior consultants to come in and be videotaped. Schools could then check out the video tape and make a decision about which consultant to hire. To identify and disseminate successful practices, they started with the magnet at Eastern, and they were in the process of developing a plan to disseminate information. At the same time they were working in collaboration with the Department of Academic Programs, the Office of School Administration, and the systemwide unit to make sure they were not competing but rather were coordinating resources. For specialized training, they were referring schools to other schools working on the same issue. They were going to provide training for clusters. Another aspect was the site-based participatory management training. Finally, they were working on school improvement training with principals, leadership staff, and directors to create plans to train the staff.

In regard to the systemwide training unit, Mrs. Rohr stated there were several points she wanted to make. The first was the continuum of training for different target groups in MCPS. They worked with the placement of and support for student teachers. They provided modules for new teachers as well as credit courses and workshops for veteran teachers. They had leadership training for candidates in the leadership pool and intensive training for

interns preparing to be elementary principals or secondary assistant principals. They had workshops for new principals and conferences and training for veteran A&S staff. Support staff training ranged basic skills to technical skills to a supervisory skills program. Directions for the training came from the superintendent, Board of Education priorities, and local, state and federal mandates. They also worked with certification requirements which was why they were positioned in the Personnel office.

Mrs. Rohr explained that for systemwide topics these would be tailored for specific groups or would involve training for broad MCPS populations such as the Americans With Disabilities Act or sexual harassment. They were very proud of the many partnerships they had formed with universities, businesses, community, and interagency. They had master's programs in administration, special education certification, and science and math with Hood College and Johns Hopkins University. They were also proud of the grants they had received which brought money into the system. They also administered the tuition reimbursement program for all three groups. They were looking into many uses for technology including interactive television, cable television, and videotaping. This would enable them to stretch their training dollars.

Mrs. Rohr stated that they collaborated with the many offices in MCPS to facilitate planning. They worked constantly with the academic programs groups, and now they were working with the math CRTs and the revised science curriculum. They worked with the directors of school administration on training for principals, and they were planning the training for safety and security. She explained that one of the strengths of the two units was that they had an ongoing communication between and among the groups.

Mrs. Blumsack reported that this year they had found many issues coming out of Success for Every Student. One of the major ones was the science and math dissemination, and they were looking at successful programs to be moved to other schools. One of their staff members did "Tips for Parents" on cable television, and one topic would be "math made simple." They hoped to have parents and teachers call into the program. Mrs. Rohr said that her unit was looking at in-service credits and course work for the new certification requirements in math and science, and they had been establishing the partnerships with the universities.

Mrs. Rohr commented that Dimensions of Learning (DOL) was the framework adopted by the State of Maryland. Each teacher would receive a handbook on DOL which included different aspects of thinking skills that students needed to be productive and contributing citizens. This tied directly to all of the Maryland School Performance Program. They ran modules and courses and worked with the State Department of Education. Mrs. Blumsack

added that two of their scripts used these dimensions so that teachers could use these. She introduced Ms. Elsie Robison and Mr. Lee Evans from E. Brooke Lee Middle School.

Ms. Robison stated that she had been teaching for many years in MCPS and during those years there had been many changes. Each time these changes occurred teachers had to make adjustments. Today they were faced with MSPP, DOL, and SES which required teachers to make changes. This could not occur unless staff had support and the flexibility to be able to do that. At Lee this past summer they took the time to look at the statistics from testing and attendance to make assessments as how they could use DOL in forming their management plan for their school. They took this to the staff, and some staff went to a training session where they were taught how to disseminate information to the rest of the staff. They used staff development funds for substitute time and planned a half day workshop for teachers on Dimensions of Learning. Then they went on to implement their management plan needs. She emphasized that this could not happen unless the classroom teacher had the time to do this as well as the staff development support.

Mr. Evans reported that over the past two and a half years they had implemented a number of instructional and extracurricular programs to assure that their students had the best possible educational experience. In addition to that, they had created a learning environment that they believed was conducive to the successful implementation of this program. They were preparing students to achieve success on the MSPP program and were developing a school management plan that would guarantee every student success. They had focused on DOL concepts, on encouraging parent involvement, and on maintaining staff enthusiasm and creativity. In the process of doing this, they realized that they were going to have to focus on some training programs. When they contacted the school improvement training unit, the unit provided them with immediate access to materials directly related to their goals and objectives. The unit provided staff support to assist in planning, and they provided highly structured training strategies that placed limited demands on Lee staff and required minimal preparation time. These resources could be tailored to meet the specific needs of Lee Middle School. Mr. Evans said that without the resources of the training unit, his school could not provide an excellent education.

Mrs. Blumsack explained that one of the things that made this possible was that this years schools were given their own budgets. This came as a result of the staff development pilot. As a trainer she worried that the expertise she provide left with her after she provided the training. Now the expertise stayed in that building.

Mrs. Rohr welcomed Vicki Rodgers Tamakloe, a teacher from Glenallan Elementary. She was one of the first graduates from the Creative Initiatives in Teacher Education (CITE) intern program where support staff became teachers. She taught a three-four combination class.

Ms. Tamakloe commented that she would not have had the opportunity to teach had it not been for the CITE program. Her classmates ranged in age from 20 to 60 with bachelor's degrees in arts, science, math, and business. Their racial and cultural backgrounds were equally as diverse, and some of them were mothers, grandmothers, and wives. Their only common link was that they wanted to teach. The University of Maryland and MCPS developed a program for them which provided for their social, economic, and educational needs. They worked very hard to become teachers for Montgomery County, and along the way they were provided with excellent course work which provided them with a master's in education. As student teachers, they got to observe the day-to-day workings of MCPS during the day, and they attended classes in the evening. Their training was especially focused with regard to MCPS curriculum. She believed that all CITE 1 graduates were effective and tenured teachers.

Mrs. Rohr added that this program had brought in a number of Asian, African-American, and Hispanic teachers into the school system.

Mrs. Gordon explained that she was a former MCPS staff person, and staff development had been an interest of hers for a number of years. She thought that the CITE program was a great success. She was concerned that support staff receive similar training to that received by the professional staff so that they could implement programs. She thought this happened as local schools made more determinations as to the training they needed. She felt that with the increased role that support staff played in the instructional program, there were other support staff working with children on a daily basis who should receive more training without being in a program similar to CITE. She thought that the report before the Board was excellent, and she was glad to see that they were reaching out to the business and higher education community.

Mrs. Brenneman said that they had talked about improving technical skills, and she wondered about training provided to building service workers and/or cafeteria workers. Mrs. Rohr replied that technical training was provided by supervisors in food services or transportation. Her unit provided supervisory training, basic literacy, and interpersonal skills. This year they had a brand new initiative for support staff who did not work in schools, and they were developing video tapes to show the relationship of their work to Success for Every Student. The real technical training was done by the specific supervisors.

Mrs. Brenneman reported that she had met with John Goodloe to talk about dissemination of the Eastern magnet information. She thought they needed a lot better public relations to let the community know that the dissemination of magnet information was being shared. Mrs. Blumsack agreed that they did need to let people know what was happening, how it was happening, and why it was happening. Mrs. Brenneman suggested that this sharing of information had to filter down to the parents as well.

Mrs. Fanconi expressed the Board's apologies for pulling Mrs. Blumsack away from her other responsibility. She asked whether they had been able to fill all their vacancies before the employment freeze, and Mrs. Blumsack replied that they had filled their last vacancy by October 19. Mrs. Fanconi asked about the physical arrangements for the new units and plans for moving them to their permanent offices. Dr. Vance replied that they had been working on utilization of space since August, and he hoped to present a housing plan to the Board of Education.

Mrs. Fanconi inquired about interagency partnerships. Mrs. Rohr explained that as a cost saving measure the County Council asked that all five agencies in the county get together to discuss training. Last spring they met to look into cost saving efforts. They were looking at electronic registration, and they had agreed to share topics and consultants to save money. They were also providing slots in each other's training programs on certain issues. For example, she had attended a gender equity workshop that the county government had sponsored.

Mrs. Fanconi commented that she was overwhelmed by the number of things the units had been able to do in such a short period of time.

Mr. Ewing indicated that he would transmit some of his questions in writing because of the lack of time to comment. These were in two categories. One was the priorities for the utilization of limited resources and the nature and the use of management improvement plans for staff development purposes. There was reference in the report to the use of management improvement plans and the requirement that schools include staff proposals of their own in the plan. Then there was a decision after review as to what would be done. He was assuming that the directors in the office of school administration reviewed those and that staff development reviewed them. He assumed that decisions were made on the extent to which the staff development plan was realistic and some judgment on the extent to which the plan met the needs of that school.

Mr. Ewing said that the second category had to do with priorities. What had happened as a result of budget action was that they had substantially more tasks for staff development to

do and substantially fewer resources with which to do it. This suggested the necessity for setting some priorities. He hoped there was a process that involved some criteria for deciding which requests for help from schools and other units were more important to meet and which could wait. For example, was it more important to attend training mandated by law or more important to give priority to training for math and science. He would be interested in getting some sense of this before the Board took action on the budget. This was critical to the amount of resources the Board should try to obtain for staff development. Dr. Vance felt that these were both reasonable requests. He could present to the Board conceptually what the intent was and the realities of what had happened with the directors and the people in staff development. On the other question, this was evolving, and he would provide the Board with an update. This would be reflected in his presentation of the budget.

Ms. Gutierrez was pleased with the presentation especially the structure and implementation approach they had taken. She was very happy to see sexual harassment on the list of requirements.

She asked that they share what their plans were for this because she had two filing cabinets filled with material she would be glad to share. She strongly encouraged staff to pursue whatever might be available to them as federal funding because this pocket of money had increased. She would like to know how their training related to other areas such as TQM because she hoped they would be able to have a partnership with some of the larger corporations here. Some of these companies had offered MCPS access to their training.

Ms. Gutierrez stated that she would also like to see how they were relating to the challenge grant in the Wheaton area. She thought there were funds available in that grant. She recalled that Dr. Gordon had said he would put money in staff development.

She would suggest that the staff take the time to look at their plan and see how the thread of changing attitudes and behaviors was part of the training effort. She thought this was one way to begin to do something in this very important area. She knew they had had a major effort to organize the vast amount of needs, and she thought they had done a very good job of beginning to structure them into some doable fashion. She agreed with Mr. Ewing that they needed priorities because there was no way they would be able to train everyone. Training trainers was wonderful, but there was a limit to what they could do. She suggested a checklist for every course to indicate what that course was doing to change attitudes and behaviors to support achievement of students. If it were not a clear component of the course, make it a component or eliminate the course.

Mr. Sims remarked that their presentation had answered a lot of his questions. He, too, would like to know what they would be doing with the Wheaton cluster in relation to the challenge

grant. He believed there was a desire in the community to help education, and he thought it was great how staff development had been able to reach out to those people. They had been asked to do more with less, and he believed they had done a marvelous job.

As he learned more about the school system, he thought that staff development was one of the hidden gems of the school system. Students did not get a chance to see this, but their teachers were the product of that training. He was trying to show students the importance of staff development especially in this crucial budget season.

Mrs. Fanconi noted that Ms. Gutierrez had mentioned TQM, and they would be having companies coming in. She wondered if it would be worthwhile to have Mrs. Blumsack look at commonalities and listen to what the various companies were saying. Dr. Vance agreed that Mrs. Blumsack would be welcome to attend these meetings.

Dr. Cheung commented that their enthusiasm was contagious. In regard to TQM, he reported that he was a former advisor to the county executive on TQM. He could share information with staff.

He felt that everyone was going to make demands on staff development. One area they might want to look into was outcome measures which the Board had discussed this morning. After staff examined the data they would know which schools were in need of additional help.

Dr. Vance said he would like to come back to something. He would meet with Mrs. Rohr and Mrs. Blumsack to provide them with an update on TQM and to invite them to the next meeting of the entire group. Dr. Cheung thanked staff for their presentation.

Re: BOARD/SUPERINTENDENT COMMENTS

1. Mrs. Fanconi reported that she had represented the Board at a kickoff of the National AIDS Awareness Day at N.I.H. She was very touched by the many presentations and returned fully committed to making sure that MCPS did everything they could to make students aware of this totally preventable disease. There was a very alarming increase in the numbers of 20 to 29 year olds with the disease which meant they had contracted the disease while they might have been in high school.

2. Mrs. Brenneman said she and other Board members had attended the community involvement program for the challenge grant in the Wheaton cluster. Her hat went off to the way the principals involved the community. They had interpreters there, they ran buses to bring community members into the school, they had babysitting services, and they made it as easy as possible for parents to participate.

3. Mrs. Brenneman complimented the football teams from Seneca Valley, Gaithersburg, and Damascus for the outstanding job they

did. She had attended the Gaithersburg game. It was exciting and emotional because the coach had been there for 35 years. On Sunday night, the City of Gaithersburg had honored the football team and had given special certificates to the seniors on the team. Mrs. Fanconi added that the number of honor roll students on the team was impressive, and Dr. Vance stated that there were 17 students in that category.

4. Mr. Ewing hoped that at some juncture they could spend some time talking about the social studies curriculum for the future. There was a change in requirements by the state which created the necessity to make some change. It was also the case that the citizenship functional test continued to give students difficulty. He thought there were a number of things they needed to do in that arena, and one was a year-long course on government to include more information on economics and geography. There was a world history requirement, and the need to focus on what sort of course that would be. He hoped that the Board could discuss this before the staff completed its work in this area.

5. Mr. Ewing assumed that in the near future the Board would be discussing the \$2 million budget reduction and the Council's request for a Blair alternative. Dr. Vance assured him that they would.

6. Mr. Ewing recalled that during the recent campaign for the school board a great number of people talked about the virtues and attractions and benefits of contracting out. Having worked in the federal government where a good number of things had been contracted out, it was his view that contracting out was one of the least attractive measures one could devise. It was disruptive and rarely did the anticipated savings materialize. There was an impact on current employees and on morale and on the ability of the system to get jobs done. He was not saying there was nothing that ever could be contracted out, but he hoped they did not get swept away by this notion and would give it very close scrutiny.

7. Mr. Sims stated that today they learned that the Council would be asking the Board to make an additional \$2 million in cuts. It was unfortunate that they had to make cuts at all, but the final vote reflected by the Council showed a respect for what had been already done by MCPS. He extended his appreciation to the Council because the cuts could have been much deeper. He looked forward to working with the Council in a new spirit of cooperation. Mrs. Fanconi suggested that the president of the Board write a letter to the Council conveying these thoughts.

8. Dr. Vance said he would like to take this opportunity to brag about the school system. He reported that Richard Montgomery High School had taken the national championship in the Knowledge Master Open Competition, a rigorous academic contest with 1600



23, 1992

On November 10, 1992, by the unanimous vote of members present, the Board voted to conduct a closed session on November 23, 1992, as permitted under Section 4-106, Education Article of the Annotated Code of Maryland and State Government Article 10-501.

The Montgomery County Board of Education met in closed session on Monday, November 23, 1992, from 6:40 p.m. to 8 p.m. The meeting took place in Room 120 of the Carver Educational Services Center, Rockville, Maryland.

The Board met to discuss contract negotiations and a site item. A straw vote was taken on the school site which was confirmed in public session.

In attendance at the closed session were: Stephen Abrams, Melissa Bahr, Fran Brenneman, Carole Burger, Alan Cheung, Sharon DiFonzo, Blair Ewing, Carol Fanconi, Thomas Fess, Wes Girling, Beatrice Gordon, Ana Sol Gutierrez, Marie Heck, Catherine Hobbs, Brian Porter, Philip Rohr, Jon Sims, Janice Turpin, Paul Vance, William Wilder, William Westall, and Mary Lou Wood.

Mrs. Brenneman left the meeting at this point.

RESOLUTION NO. 879-92      Re: CALENDAR FOR STUDENT BOARD MEMBER ELECTION

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education approve the calendar of major events for the election of the sixteenth student member of the Board of Education as proposed by MCR.

RESOLUTION NO. 880-92      Re: CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR FAMILY LIFE AND HUMAN DEVELOPMENT

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

WHEREAS, COMAR 13A.04.01 requires that each local education agency have a Citizens Advisory Committee for Family Life and Human Development; and

WHEREAS, Montgomery County has had such a committee since 1970, consisting of representatives of various civic associations and religious groups, community members at large, and student representatives; and





Resolved, That the following persons be appointed to serve through December 31, 1994:

Jill Gessner  
Cathy Rinzel

Sharon Turner  
Renee Plummer

RESOLUTION NO. 885-92      Re:    APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO THE TITLE  
IX GENDER EQUITY ADVISORY COMMITTEE

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

WHEREAS, On July 19, 1977, the Board established the Title IX Gender Equity Advisory Committee; and

WHEREAS, The members of the Advisory Committee are appointed by the Board; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the following individuals be appointed to serve a two-year term through December 31, 1994:

Phyllis S. Preston  
Ella Iams  
Sally Seawright  
Mary Ann Jobe

Mary Gallagher  
Nancy Rea  
Constance Tonat

RESOLUTION NO. 886-92      Re:    APPOINTMENTS TO THE ADVISORY  
COMMITTEE ON MINORITY STUDENT  
EDUCATION

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

WHEREAS, On May 14, 1991, the Board of Education revised the composition of the Advisory Committee on Minority Student Education; and

WHEREAS, The members are appointed by the Board of Education; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the following persons be appointed to serve through December 31, 1994:

Elizabeth Ingram  
Miriam Stewart-Early

Emma Munoz-Duston

RESOLUTION NO. 887-92 Re: APPOINTMENTS TO THE AUDIT COMMITTEE

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

WHEREAS, On September 13, 1978, the Board of Education passed a resolution creating an Audit Committee; and

WHEREAS, The Audit Committee consists of three members, appointed by the president of the Board of Education, serving staggered terms of three years each, and the term of office begins on the date of the first all-day Board meeting in December of the year of appointment and ends three years later on November 30; and

WHEREAS, Eligibility for appointment to the audit committee is limited to members of the Board of Education whose remaining terms of office with the Board are equal to or greater than the terms for which they are appointed to the Audit Committee; and

WHEREAS, Ms. Ana Sol Gutierrez's term expired on November 30, 1992, and a vacancy now exists on the Audit Committee; and

WHEREAS, Mrs. Carol Fanconi was appointed to serve on the Audit Committee through November 1993; and

WHEREAS, The term formerly shared by Mr. Jon Sims and Mrs. Fran Brenneman on the Audit Committee needs to be filled through December 1994; and

WHEREAS, Mrs. Carol Fanconi's term as chairperson expired on November 30, 1992; now therefore be it

Resolved, That Fran Brenneman be appointed to serve on the Audit Committee through November 30, 1994; and be it further

Resolved, That Beatrice Gordon be appointed to serve on the Audit Committee through November 30, 1995; and be it further

Resolved, That Carol Fanconi serve as chairperson of the Audit Committee until November 30, 1993.

RESOLUTION NO. 888-92 Re: APPOINTMENTS TO THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON RESEARCH AND EVALUATION

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

WHEREAS, On January 14, 1986, the Board of Education established a Subcommittee on Research and Evaluation; and

WHEREAS, The Subcommittee on Research and Evaluation consists of three members, appointed by the president of the Board of Education, serving staggered terms of three years each, and the term of office begins on the date of the first all-day Board meeting in December of the year of appointment and ends three years later on November 30; and

WHEREAS, Eligibility for appointment to the Subcommittee on Research and Evaluation is limited to members of the Board of Education whose remaining terms of office with the Board are equal to or greater than the terms for which they are appointed to the Subcommittee on Research and Evaluation; and

WHEREAS, Mrs. Sharon DiFonzo's term expired on November 30, 1992, and one vacancy now exists on the committee; and

WHEREAS, Dr. Alan Cheung was appointed to serve until November 30, 1993, and Mr. Blair Ewing was appointed to serve until November 30, 1994; and

WHEREAS, Mr. Ewing's term as chairperson expired on November 30, 1992; now therefore be it

Resolved, That Ana Sol Gutierrez be appointed to serve until November 30, 1995; and be it further

Resolved, That Blair Ewing serve as chairperson of the Subcommittee on Research and Evaluation until November 30, 1993.

RESOLUTION NO. 889-92      Re:    TELEVISION FOUNDATION

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

WHEREAS, The Montgomery County Board of Education voted on January 9, 1990, to establish the Montgomery County Public Schools Television Foundation, Inc.; and

WHEREAS, Under the bylaws of the Foundation the Board of Education shall elect one of its members to serve a three-year term on the Board of Directors; and

WHEREAS, Mrs. Sharon DiFonzo, the current Board representative, is no longer a member of the Board of Education; now therefore be it

Resolved, That Steve Abrams be appointed to a three-year term on the Board of Directors of the Montgomery County Public Schools Television Foundation, Inc., through December, 1995.

RESOLUTION NO. 890-92 Re: ANNUAL AUDIT

On motion of Mrs. Fanconi seconded by Ms. Gutierrez, the following resolution was adopted unanimously by members present:

Resolved, That the members of the Board of Education approve the recommendation of the Audit Committee that the annual audit be competitively bid and that KPMG Peat Marwick be permitted to respond to the bid and that the process be changed in the RFP by requiring the draft management letter to be completed by October 15 and that this draft letter be delivered simultaneously to the audit committee and the superintendent.

RESOLUTION NO. 891-92 Re: DISCUSSION OF RECOGNITION OF SUPPORTING SERVICES

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education schedule time to consider the adoption of a form of recognition of employees now in place in Frederick County which is called "Support Service Recognition Day."

Re: NEW BUSINESS

The following items of new business were introduced:

Mrs. Fanconi moved and Mr. Ewing seconded the following:

Resolved, That the Board of Education receive a briefing from the superintendent on how Success for Every Student addresses the success of special education students and receive recommendations on wording changes in the tasks and strategies for these students, particularly 1.4 and 1.5.

Ms. Gutierrez moved and Mr. Sims seconded the following:

Resolved, That the Board of Education schedule a discussion to putting GED and Evening High School in something other than an enterprise fund.

Mr. Ewing moved and Ms. Gutierrez seconded the following:

Resolved, That the Board schedule time for a review of the action taken and planned for the implementation of the Board's resolution on math and science initiatives.

Re: ITEMS OF INFORMATION

Board members received the following items of information"

1. Items in Process
2. Monthly Financial Report
3. Construction Progress Report

RESOLUTION NO. 892-92      Re: ADJOURNMENT

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education adjourn its meeting at 5:50 p.m.

---

PRESIDENT

---

SECRETARY

PLV:mlw