

contacted the MCPS Division of Food Services to solicit assistance;
and

WHEREAS, Within two hours four food service drivers, who had just completed an eight-hour work day, departed for West Virginia with truckloads of MCPS commodity foods; and

WHEREAS, Stopping only for gas and food the four drivers alternated driving for sixty-eight hours (over 4,000 miles) through fog and mountain terrain; and

WHEREAS, The four drivers delivered six truckloads or 59 tons of urgently needed food to the central storage facility in Charleston, West Virginia; and

WHEREAS, On February 27, in Washington, D.C., the Assistant Secretary of the United States Department of Agriculture honored these four drivers for their outstanding service and the Governor of West Virginia sent each driver a letter praising his service to the flood victims; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Board of Education hereby commends James M. Barnett, Thomas P. Davey, Kenneth R. Schaeffer, and George H. Watson for outstanding service above and beyond the call of duty; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be given to James M. Barnett, Thomas P. Davey, Kenneth R. Schaeffer, and George H. Watson, and included in the minutes of this meeting as well as in each individual's personnel folder.

RESOLUTION NO. 169-86 Re: HB 817 - TUITION ASSISTANCE - TEACHING CERTIFICATES; HB 1113 - TEACHER EDUCATION TUITION ASSISTANCE; HB 1480 - TUITION ASSISTANCE FOR TEACHING IN THIS STATE; SB 769 - TUITION ASSISTANCE FOR TEACHING IN AREAS OF CRITICAL SHORTAGE

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education support HB 817, HB 1113, HB 1480, and SB 769.

RESOLUTION NO. 170-86 Re: SJR 20 - TEACHER SALARY DISPARITIES

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education oppose SJR 20 - Teacher Salary Disparities.

RESOLUTION NO. 171-86 Re: HJR 83 - GOVERNOR'S COMMISSION ON
TEACHER SALARIES AND INCENTIVES

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education support the concept of HJR 83 - Governor's Commission on Teacher Salaries and Incentives.

Re: STATUS AND FUTURE DIRECTION OF MCPS
FOREIGN LANGUAGE PROGRAM

Dr. Lois Martin, associate superintendent, introduced Dr. Myriam Met, coordinator of foreign languages.

Dr. Met remarked that postponing the second meeting on this topic had given her an opportunity to learn more about the program. She had had a chance to be in a lot of schools and her goal was to observe every teacher teaching. She had observed about one third of the 270 foreign language teachers. She said they had some hardworking dedicated teachers and good leadership in their resource teachers. As a result of those visits as well as visits to the immersion schools and the FLES program, she had a good picture of the foreign language program in the county.

Dr. Met said she would like to see the expansion of the immersion programs at the elementary school level because it was the most effective way to teach a foreign language in a school setting. Not only was it effective, but it was cheap because it did not require extra resources. One goal of such a program was to develop high levels of second language proficiency while maintaining and improving the native language skills, and every study of immersion had shown this result which addressed Priority 1. There was good research supporting the fact that children who acquired a second language in their early years demonstrated higher levels of cognitive flexibility and divergent thinking. In her previous experience, minority students outperformed expectations on local and national norms which addressed Priority 2.

Dr. Cronin inquired about follow-up in the secondary schools. Dr. Met replied that there had to be articulation for immersion to be successful. They now had a good program at Eastern, but there had to be a senior high school program as well. She indicated that she had written some proposals for an international high school which would form a natural bridge for immersion students at the high school level. Dr. Martin reported that she had asked the Richard Montgomery group to examine the possibility of an international program.

Dr. Shoenberg said he was curious about why the international foreign language option for a special program in Area 3 finished last. He was glad that Richard Montgomery was taking a serious look at that. He said that in the Blair cluster the immersion program at the

elementary level created the demand for the program at the higher level. It seemed to him that if they did move in the direction of expanding the immersion at the elementary level they would have to expand it considerably. Dr. Met commented that it was her experience in Cincinnati that the more programs they had, the harder it was to keep up with the demand.

Dr. Pitt reported that there were some additional costs. In an elementary school there might be additional staff needed as well as instructional materials and a need for a coordinator. Dr. Cronin said that in Montgomery County they had grafted one program onto another. He asked whether in Cincinnati they had an English and immersion program or a complete immersion program. Dr. Met replied that they had both. When they made a school an all magnet school, the community felt cheated because their school had been taken away from there. Mrs. Praisner asked if these programs were magnets for racial balance, and Dr. Met replied that they were. Dr. Pitt recalled that when the French immersion program started in Montgomery County it was not a magnet, but when it was moved it became a magnet program.

Dr. Floyd stated that if they wanted to think about expanding the program generally, they did not have to think about magnets. Dr. Cronin pointed out that they did have to think of the effect on the existing magnets. Dr. Cody added that they used choice in Montgomery County to avoid racial isolation. As soon as they started adding those same choices in other locations, they would be in serious jeopardy.

Mrs. DiFonzo asked if the improved achievement was across the board or whether it was caused by the better achieving youngsters being pulled into the program. Dr. Met clarified her statement by explaining that these students did as well and often better but not always better. There was about 20 years' worth of research on the Canadian immersion program which used matched students with comparable entry level skills. The statement that "students do as well and often better than" was controlling for entry level ability. In cooperation with McGill University a study had been done of the Cincinnati program which matched students for ability and socioeconomic status. The study showed the students were gaining in the English language skills commensurate with students taught entirely in English. She cited another study on the long-term effects of foreign language study and SAT scores. Dr. Cody asked that he be provided with copies of these studies.

Mrs. Praisner commented that she had heard from students in the FLES program and other programs that they did not continue in high school because of some question about the instruction and the content of the program. They had expressed doubts about the usefulness of the program. The paper given to the Board spoke to a change in focus. She asked where they were with the change and where they were with in-servicing teachers. She said that the paper made reference to the low percentage of students in Japanese and Chinese, because it did not present the figures as a percentage of the students having that

opportunity. She recalled that when they had three-year junior high schools they had a Level I Part I introduction to language for one year and a Level I Part II for the second year. She wondered where they were in making that transition to a full year.

Dr. Met said that in regard to teaching for communication they had many teachers very interested in that movement and some of them had participated in activities. Most teachers felt that while they would like to do this they did not have the information to implement most of the techniques in their classrooms. They had tentatively scheduled a three-day workshop in August for up to 90 teachers. She felt that they should follow up this in-service throughout the year so that people would have an opportunity to share their experience. They hoped to train about one third of their staff this summer. In regard to the less commonly taught languages, Dr. Met replied that a very good teacher made the program and they needed more dynamite teachers. Mrs. Praisner asked whether these programs were growing at new schools, and Dr. Met replied that they were not. She commented that with languages like Chinese, Japanese and Russian, the earlier the students started the better the chance they had for mastery of these languages. She felt that the earlier they offered students an opportunity to begin these languages, the more likelihood the students could gain mastery and build a constituency for programs at the high school level which would encourage other high schools to expand their language offerings. Mrs. Praisner would disagree. She would rather have more high school students have that experience than have this at an elementary level. She would not like to focus all of their energies at the elementary school level. If they could get more teachers of Japanese or Chinese, she thought there was a constituency out there for these foreign languages.

Dr. Shoenberg said he would agree with Mrs. Praisner's statement only if the languages were offered in a double period. He commented that one hour a day did not build competency. If they were going to expand the offerings, it would be good to start thinking about teaching those languages two periods a day. He did not know that the present format for teaching French or Spanish was going to have an effect on increasing competency unless they thought about different formats for offering it.

In regard to expansion of languages at the elementary level, Dr. Shoenberg noted that they had trouble enough finding curriculum materials in French and Spanish and wondered whether they would have the same difficulty with Chinese and Russian. Dr. Met replied that they would. She had visited the San Francisco Chinese immersion school and had talked with people in Fairfax who were planning a program. When she left Cincinnati she had been setting up a modified immersion program in Arabic, Chinese, Japanese and Russian beginning at the kindergarten level with art, music and physical education being taught in the language. They looked at activities they could do in the language which did not get into the issue of instructional materials.

Dr. Floyd was sure they would have ample opportunity to talk about expansion of the program. He would look closely at the option of starting earlier because time on task did bear dividends. If they were trying to get an orientation of students in a variety of languages in one or two years that was one thing, but if they were trying to get a significant level of competency ten years out they clearly needed to put their efforts in starting earlier. He felt that if they concentrated on starting earlier, some of the format questions about the high school would become moot.

*Mr. Foubert joined the meeting at this point.

Mrs. DiFonzo remarked that one of the problems they had with enrollment of youngsters in foreign languages was what she would call an American arrogance. She felt that they were very spoiled because they were accustomed to people from other countries knowing English. Other people were learning English, and as a result it was less and less likely that their youngsters would learn another foreign language. In addition, parents were not very good role models. She thought the response received in Area 3 was a result of people not seeing that their children needed a proficiency in another language in order to achieve in this world. She said that as youngsters got older it was more difficult for them to learn a language. Children saw learning language as a game rather than as a challenge. At an older age, students found studying a foreign language to be intimidating.

Mrs. DiFonzo recalled that at their first discussion of this subject she had questioned the style that they used. She had asked if they were trying to teach youngsters to be conversant in a language or were they trying to teach them grammatical structure. She felt they should be teaching students to be conversant and comfortable enough to function with native speakers rather than worrying about the grammatical structure. She did think they needed to look at the way in which they were teaching languages.

In regard to a student's wanting to transfer to another school for a language program, Mrs. DiFonzo said that because of the transfer policy and minority balance lots of youngsters had been kept from transferring. She said that sometimes they were not allowing youngsters complete flexibility to have access to these programs because of their policy. She was concerned that there were not enough youngsters taking foreign languages in high school to warrant the kind of differentiation of instruction that they had in other subjects. For example, foreign language teachers taught to the middle student, and they needed some way to challenge the upper level youngsters, meet the needs of the middle students, and make sure that the students at the bottom did not get lost.

Mrs. Slye asked about the two-year approach to Level I languages. Dr. Met reported that she had visited schools using the pilot approach of one level in one year as well as schools using the other approach. She felt that this was a difficult question to answer. Normally a student starting a foreign language in the seventh grade

tended to be the more able student. Mrs. Praisner noted that in some junior high schools students started the language in the eighth and in the ninth grade took the second half of the language and received credit for that. There were some schools where students were told they could not start a language in the eighth grade.

Dr. Pitt recalled that this started because they had a six period day in the junior high schools and the language was taught three days a week. Therefore, it took two years to cover one year of a language. When they moved to a seven period day, they never made a decision about where they were going on that.

Mrs. Slye requested information on the different configurations for beginning a language. She was concerned about the view that the study of a language was an appropriate activity for a student who is of high language ability or high ability and that it is not particularly an appropriate activity for an average student or one needing support. She said that the orientation to language and culture course appeared to break down the prejudice that only children who were very able could learn a language. Some social studies teachers had started teaching several phrases in a foreign language. The most fascinating thing that was occurring that children who were not designated as high ability took this as a natural part of that unit and flew with it. She would like to see an elementary program focusing on the orientation to language and culture. She inquired about different outcomes in terms of which beginning approach was taken by the student.

Mr. Foubert stated that it was important for their language program to emphasize speaking more than grammar. However, when he took the achievement test after four years of Spanish he did not do so well. The achievement test did emphasize grammar, and there was no place for students to demonstrate how well they spoke the language. He thought they needed to emphasize some grammar in the classroom in order to prepare students for these tests. Dr. Met explained that this was a controversy in the field of foreign languages. She said that the forward-looking people were emphasizing communication, but the tests had not kept up with that. She thought there were changes coming in the achievement tests in recognition of that, but unfortunately students were being caught in the middle. She said they were not abandoning grammar. She explained that grammar was not the end of the line, but the reality was that the better they knew the grammar the more effective they were at communicating. For some learners the communication skills might be all that they wanted, but other learners might have other purposes which might be more academic.

Dr. Cody suggested they needed to keep in mind what they expected and required of everyone and what they made available. He said that the question was whether they should require a foreign language of all students. At present 50 percent of their students were enrolled in a foreign language. For example, if they had a double period, it would mean something would have to be replaced. He said that perhaps a double period for a year might be a more efficient way or the options

might not be limited to a six-hour school day. They might consider longer periods of immersion or optional programs at the elementary schools.

Dr. Shoenberg stated that the question about the double period had raised the question of what it was they were trying to teach in high school anyway. He noted that they still had not dealt with that issue, and he still wanted to deal with it. They had one program where students were learning Latin in the elementary school, and in Philadelphia they had used Latin with some students from impoverished families with enormous success. He recalled that parents at Eastern were interested in that. Dr. Met replied that they were having audiolingual Latin at Eastern. Dr. Shoenberg commented that children learned languages in a different way before they were 12 or 13. One of the reasons for success in introducing language in social studies was an example of the way that students learned. He suggested that if they wanted to do something that would distinguish the school system, they might have a greater involvement of all students in language from the very beginning. The problem was getting teachers who were prepared to teach languages. He thought that the Board seriously wanted to address that issue. He pointed out that they would have schools in Germantown that would be a mile or two apart which would provide opportunities to introduce these programs and allow students to opt out of them. He explained that he was not talking about having students coming into those schools but rather setting up one or two schools with a strong emphasis on language. This would not involve interference with the magnet program in the southern part of the county. They could do this now before some of the schools were in operation. He also suggested they think about opening the two new high schools with special programs in language and get the faculty in those schools before they had an established faculty and had to move people in and out. He commented that they had talked about making Americans aware that they lived in a world community, and it seemed to him that language could be a cross-cultural vehicle. This should be a basic part of the curriculum, and he hoped that they could start to take this seriously.

Mrs. DiFonzo stated that two years of one hour a day for language instruction did not constitute speaking another language. She said they had to decide whether they wanted all of their youngsters exposed to a foreign language or all to be able to speak a foreign language. This required an articulation of Board goals with regard to foreign languages.

Dr. Cronin commented that the paper raised a number of policy and implementation questions. He thought they needed a discussion of their purposes. They needed to know what supports the staff needed to accomplish the mission they already had. He said that if they started going over towards expansion, they needed to know staff needs and the availability of staff. He looked to Dr. Martin and Dr. Cody for direction for the next two to three months regarding planning for the up-county schools and Richard Montgomery.

Dr. Martin commented that there were some fundamental curriculum

issues she hoped they would address. At one time they did have a great deal of local option on curriculum and should address this because it was tied to the transfer issue. Mrs. Praisner suggested that there were fundamental policy and curriculum issues that needed to come from the superintendent, the administrative team, and the Council on Instruction.

Dr. Cody stated that the staff had not completed its work because there were major policy implications. He did not think they could proceed on any of these changes without looking at the impact. Dr. Floyd remarked that they should not lose sight of the fact that the Board had to say where it would like to go, and then the superintendent would tell the Board what the advantages and disadvantages were. Dr. Shoenberg commented that if the Board thought that this was something that was educationally important, they and the staff had to do a lot of community education. Dr. Cronin asked about next steps. Dr. Cody said he would go back to the documents, take into account what they had now, and identify changes and improvements. He would work with Dr. Martin and Dr. Met and come back and discuss alternatives and impacts with the Board.

RESOLUTION NO. 172-86 Re: PROPOSED COOPERATIVE VENTURE WITH
COUNTY GOVERNMENT ON PROGRAM FOR
EMOTIONALLY DISTURBED STUDENTS

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

WHEREAS, The Department of Family Resources in the Montgomery County Government is planning a 6-8 bed, 24-hour residential care center for seriously emotionally disturbed males under 12 years of age; and

WHEREAS, The facility will be staffed by trained professional counselors and professional house parents; and

WHEREAS, The children will be screened by the center's staff so that only students who are able to profit from a day educational program will be admitted to the center; and

WHEREAS, Plans are that the children will remain in the faculty for up to two years, and when appropriate, regular contact with their family will be required; and

WHEREAS, The goal of the center program is to maintain children in a program close to home and at less cost than a private residential placement; now therefore be it

Resolved, That MCPS will provide the appropriate educational program for these students in a regular school or at a special learning center; and be it further

Resolved, That the Board of Education encourages the Montgomery

County Council to provide the necessary start-up and operating costs for the facility.

Re: EXECUTIVE SESSION

The members of the Board met in executive session from 11:45 a.m. to 2 p.m. to discuss personnel, legal matters, negotiations, and school sites. *Mr. Ewing rejoined the meeting during executive session.

Re: BOARD/PRESS/VISITOR CONFERENCE

Ms. Barbara Campbell, representing school crossing guards, appeared before the Board of Education.

*Mrs. DiFonzo temporarily left the meeting at this point.

RESOLUTION NO. 173-86 Re: PROCUREMENT CONTRACTS OVER \$25,000

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

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

WHEREAS, There was a lack of competitive bidding for Bid 98-86, Science Equipment, and a survey of vendors indicated that a rebid would obtain more response and better prices; and

WHEREAS, Bid 103-86, Sod, did not allow delivery of sod on pallets and a rebid has become necessary; now therefore be it

Resolved, That Bid 98-86 and Bid 103-86 be rejected; and be it further

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

	NAME OF VENDOR(S)	AMOUNT
77-86	Cafeteria Disposable Supplies	
	Kahn Paper Co., Inc.	\$15,661
	Leonard Paper Co.	383
	Monumental Paper Co.	16,495

	TOTAL	\$32,539
104-86	Canned Pineapple	
	Continental Foods, Inc.	\$35,125
	GRAND TOTAL	\$67,664

RESOLUTION NO. 174-86 Re: REVISIONS TO AUDITORIUM AND ADMINISTRATIVE AREA HEATING AND AIR

CONDITIONING - WHEATON HIGH SCHOOL

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

WHEREAS, The mechanical systems in certain areas of Wheaton High School were not included in the recent modernization project; and

WHEREAS, Sealed bids were received on February 26, 1986, for revisions to auditorium and administrative area heating and air conditioning at Wheaton High School as indicated below:

BIDDER	LUMP SUM
1. Arey, Inc.	\$109,109
2. Charles W. Lonas and Sons, Inc.	129,300
3. Welch & Rushe, Inc.	181,000
4. M & M Welding and Fabricators, Inc.	181,067
5. American Combustion, Inc.	192,363

and

WHEREAS, Arey, Inc. has successfully completed projects of this type for MCPS and its bid is consistent with staff estimates; now therefore be it

Resolved, That a contract be awarded to Arey, Inc., for revisions to auditorium and administrative area heating and air conditioning at Wheaton High School for \$109,109 in accordance with plans and specifications prepared by the Department of School Facilities in conjunction with Morton Wood, Jr., Engineer.

RESOLUTION NO. 175-86 Re: SHERWOOD HIGH SCHOOL (AREA 1) -
PARTIAL REROOFING

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

WHEREAS, Sealed bids were received on March 6 for the partial reroofing of Sherwood High School, as indicated below:

BIDDER	LUMP SUM
1. J. E. Wood & Sons Co., Inc.	\$31,526
2. Orndorff & Spaid, Inc.	39,925

and

WHEREAS, The low bidder, J. E. Wood & Sons Co., Inc., has performed

satisfactorily on other MCPS projects; and

WHEREAS, Low bid is within staff estimate and sufficient funds are available in Account #999-42 to effect award; now therefore be it

Resolved, That a contract for \$31,526 be awarded to J. E. Wood & Sons Co., Inc., to accomplish a reroofing project at Sherwood High School, in accordance with plans and specifications entitled, "Sherwood High School Partial Reroofing," dated February 18, 1986, prepared by the Department of School Facilities.

Re: INSPECTION DATE FOR SPRINGBROOK

The inspection date for the Springbrook High School Gymnasium Addition was set for Wednesday, March 19, at 8:15 a.m. Dr. Shoenberg will attend.

* Mrs. DiFonzo rejoined the meeting at this point.

RESOLUTION NO. 176-86 Re: FURNISHING AND ERECTING 22 RELOCATABLE MODULAR CLASSROOM BUILDINGS

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

WHEREAS, Sealed bids were received on March 7, 1986, for furnishing and erecting 22 relocatable modular classroom buildings including foundations at various locations throughout the county as indicated below:

BIDDER	BASE BID
1. Commercial Modular Systems, Inc.	\$ 933,152
2. Gelco Space	1,397,924

and

WHEREAS, The low bid from Commercial Modular Systems, Inc., is consistent with the cost estimates; and

WHEREAS, Funds have been requested as a supplemental appropriation to the FY 1986 Capital Budget; now therefore be it

Resolved, That a contract for \$933,152 be awarded to Commercial Modular Systems, Inc., contingent upon approval by the Montgomery County Council of the FY 1986 Capital Budget supplemental appropriation for furnishing and erecting 22 relocatable modular classroom buildings, including foundations at various locations in accordance with plans and specifications entitled, "Relocatable Modular Classroom Buildings," dated February 22, 1986, prepared by the Department of School Facilities.

RESOLUTION NO. 177-86 Re: MONTHLY PERSONNEL REPORT

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

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

RESOLUTION NO. 178-86 Re: PERSONNEL REASSIGNMENT

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

Resolved, That the following personnel reassignment be approved:

NAME	FROM	TO
Melvin A. Dann	Classroom Teacher	Assignment to be determined Will maintain salary status and retire July 1, 1987

RESOLUTION NO. 179-86 Re: EXTENSION OF SICK LEAVE

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

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.

NAME	POSITION AND LOCATION	NO. OF DAYS
Katz, E. Joyce	ESOL Teacher Montgomery Blair HS	30
Randolph, Bonnie	Bus Operator Long Term Leave from Area II	30

RESOLUTION NO. 180-86 Re: PERSONNEL APPOINTMENTS

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

Resolved, That the following personnel appointments be approved:

APPOINTMENT	PRESENT POSITION	AS
Pritam Arora	Vice President/Partner Design Engineering, Inc. Fairfax, Virginia	Site Administrator Dept. of School Facil. Grade G Effective 3-12-86
Carmenza M. Stephenson	School Psychologist D.C. Public Schools Washington, D.C.	School Psychologist Area Admin. Office Grade G Effective 3-24-86

RESOLUTION NO. 181-86 Re: AMENDED FY 1987-92 CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PROGRAM

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

WHEREAS, The Interagency Committee for Public School Construction has recommended, and the Board of Public Works has approved \$5,283,000 in FY 1987 for capital projects for the Montgomery County Public Schools; and

WHEREAS, The Governor of Maryland has proposed an additional \$6,249,000 in FY 1987 for capital projects for the Montgomery County Public Schools; and

WHEREAS, Local funds are required in addition to the allocations received from the State of Maryland's Public School Construction Program; and

WHEREAS, The Board of Education's FY 1987-92 Capital Improvements Program must be amended to reflect the actions of the Board of Public Works, actions by the Board of Education on the 15-Year Comprehensive Master Plan for Educational Facilities, and recent information on each capital project; and

WHEREAS, There is a need to accelerate construction of new elementary schools in the Gaithersburg-Germantown areas to assure that facilities will be available when needed; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Board of Education amends its FY 1987-92 Capital Improvements Program, including the Capital Budget Request, which is amended to \$102,679,000, of which \$11,532,000 is to be provided by the state and \$91,147,000 is to be provided by the County, as detailed on the recapitulation sheet; and be it further

Resolved, That the superintendent be authorized to fast track projects, where practicable, in order to implement the project completion schedules desired by the Board as indicated in the FY 1987 Capital Budget Request; and be it further

Resolved, That the county executive be requested to recommend approval of these actions to the County Council.

Re: REVISION OF LONG-RANGE FACILITIES
POLICY

Board members, staff, and representatives of MCCPTA discussed a proposed revision of the Board's long-range educational facilities policy. The new version called for involvement of the community in the spring rather than in the summer. The Board's proposed work session had been moved from October to the first week in November to give the Board an opportunity to select alternatives. Board members expressed concern about the timing of the process with the Board's heavy schedule in November and Board elections every other year. Dr. Cronin asked that this item be scheduled on the Board agenda for possible action on March 24. He suggested that Board members should submit their comments in writing prior to that meeting.

Re: STAFF RESPONSE TO THE CITIZENS MINORITY
RELATIONS MONITORING COMMITTEE

Dr. Cronin stated that the CMRMC report came to the Board during the summer, and they now had the staff response dated December 10. Dr. Cody said that staff was available to respond to questions. In terms of issues in this report and in the work of the Board's advisory committee on the education of minority students, they had a whole series of programs going on in the school system. Part of these were under the heading of Priority 2, and others such as the employment of teachers which was separate. They had special education initiatives. All of these were on a tracking system, and the Board would be provided updates. They were planning another quarterly report on specific tasks in April.

Dr. Lois Martin, associate superintendent, stated that in reading this she had picked up a quote from the CMRMC which said they recommended "a frank, open, and comprehensive discussion of the problem facing some students." She commented that these were interesting times, and one of the things that was troublesome was trying to show change in many of the continuing problems facing school systems regarding minority student education. She felt that one of the very positive and exciting things about being in MCPS was the quality of the concern about this and the willingness of everyone to be concerned and to share in working these things through. She explained that this was on her mind because her office's self-study on Priority 2 was scheduled for Friday. She reported that she had given a presentation to the local assistant superintendents for instruction last fall on efforts in minority achievement and shared some of the history of these efforts. Many people told her that they appreciated such a frank presentation. She was called by the head of the planning committee for next fall's conference for the Council of Educational Administrative and Supervisory Organizations in Maryland and was invited to make a presentation. Some people had said that minority achievement and participation was not the issue, but rather

the issue was poor children. She had explained that this was not her topic from the previous meeting and shared information with the planning organization. She said that again MCPS was in the forefront, and many of them were very concerned and would like to see more progress faster. However, they felt fortunate to be working in a setting in which the concern was so widely shared.

Mr. Ewing was pleased that they were moving in the direction of having regular reports on how they were doing. He thought that in some ways the CMRMC and staff reports were a bit like ships passing in the night in that the issues in some respects that they raised were not always the issues that MCPS addressed. He thought there were issues in the CMRMC report that the staff response addressed in ways that seemed to him to be some combination of defensive and complacent. He did not think they were complacent. He felt that there was a lot of concern and a lot of commitment, but the report sounded complacent and defensive, which was an odd combination. He winced when he read statements such as "if there were easy solutions, we would have found them and applied them." He did not think they should be saying that kind of thing. He thought they should be saying that these were tough questions and there weren't easy solutions. He still felt that even in their quarterly reports they had not yet been able to be clear enough about the strategies and the results that the strategies were accomplishing. He was still uncomfortable that there was not a coherent narrative statement in one place that listed the strategies that they were following and the results that they expected to achieve. It would list the steps they were taking in each of these areas to get these results. He thought that this could be helpful in that it would suggest some organizational emphasis that perhaps wasn't altogether there.

Mr. Ewing stated that he did not fault the level of commitment in the school system to the achievement of minority students. He thought that top management and Board members had a very high level of commitment. He was concerned that they still did not seem to be as crisp and clear and focused as he thought they ought to be on this problem. He did not think they were going to make as much progress as they ought to make as fast as they ought to make it unless they began to address it in that fashion. He did not think they could rely altogether on things that had an indirect impact. There was heavy emphasis on training, which was important, but which was an indirect impact. There was heavy emphasis on minigrants, and again they were often indirect. He saw less in the way of strategies that focused exactly on instruction itself. He said that his problem was that he was not getting a clear picture of what they were about.

Dr. Cronin commented that the two ships passing both had their lights off and neither one knew that the other was out there. He said a report came out in late summer to the Board from the CMRMC, and the school system responded which seemed to be the sum and substance of the communication between the two ships. He thought there should be better communication between the staff and the CMRMC so that they could understand the kind of information they wished to hear and the staff could understand their comments and perhaps bring the ships

closer together.

Dr. Cody said that perhaps they had not been as clear either verbally or in writing as they needed to be. He thought there was a fairly clear strategy, well understood in the school system. It was tied specifically to outcomes in terms of student achievement and participation in activities related to data that was generated and provided to the schools. It was a local school-based strategy with locally generated plans to improve minority achievement and participation in the instructional program and in instructional and support activities. It was monitored by the area offices and reviewed by outside PRAT teams. The student suspension issue was principally a local school-based plan, but personnel employment was not. He would not claim that all pieces of the instructional effort concerning minority achievement were locally based. He was commenting on the perception that the approach had been indirect. He considered mini-grants and staff development as supplemental to the key strategy. He said that there was a fairly clear perception within the schools of the approach to this. It came out of the firm conviction that the best solution to the problems of improving the achievement and participation of minority students were those that were generated by the staff at the school level who had the most direct contact with the students.

Dr. Lee Etta Powell, associate superintendent, stated that from her perspective they had the best that an organization could afford in terms of top-down planning and bottom-up strategy development. The Board had presented the conceptual framework, and they had an institutional commitment and the institutional goals that were established three years ago. She thought the school system had been wise in making sure that all of the planning was not generated from the top because if that were to occur they could very easily present a lock-step plan for all schools. However, each school did have its minority achievement plan which was closely monitored by the area office. On the other hand, each school had been able to respond to the dynamics of the specific community and the specific needs of the school by developing their own strategies for implementation. She said that perhaps they had not been as efficient as they might have been in identifying on paper the many things that were happening in schools. The paper did not reflect a lot of the tutoring that was going on for youngsters during the day and after school, and it did not reflect the involvement of many people in working with the youngsters. If they looked at test scores and where they were now as compared to where they were when they started Priority 2, there had been a definite and steady improvement. She thought it was a result of all of those finite efforts going on in the local schools.

Dr. Floyd said that the superintendent was right because as he read the response document it was sprinkled throughout with some elements of strategy and some places where accountability for that strategy was pinpointed. In regard to the two ships sailing in the night with their lights off, he thought it depended on where the ships were sailing and for what purposes. The document stated that the CMRMC did not give sufficient credit to action taken by the school system

to alleviate the difficulty. He would submit that in his opinion the CMRMC did not see that as its function to praise the system for what it was doing. He thought that the system's goals were clearly stated and they were sailing toward equity, and the CMRMC probably saw its responsibility to monitor and to let the system know when it was not delivering. He said that the report itself pointed out in rather precise detail some areas in which they were still not delivering.

He suggested that maybe over time the strategies they were working on would go a long way toward making that picture better. He said that until they were able to see some more concrete movement toward equity they should not expect people to come in and pat them on the back. Dr. Cronin stated that they did have to demonstrate where they had succeeded. Dr. Floyd pointed out that it was not the CMRMC's job, it was the school system's. Dr. Cody commented that they did not view the document as laying out the whole strategy which might be one of the problems. It was a response to general concerns of the committee.

Dr. Shoenberg remarked that they were getting themselves into the same problem as the two documents. He said that neither side had adopted the rhetorical strategy that was likely to achieve the ends that it wanted. He thought that the CMRMC had adopted a rhetorical strategy that produced a defensive response represented by the document. That defensive response encouraged a rhetorical strategy, and this had gone on year after year. He did not think that it had much to do with the content of what either was trying to say, but he did not think that either was using the rhetorical strategy that was going to get the results that it wanted. The CMRMC report served to discourage people who felt they were pedalling as fast as they could by the best lights that they had. The minority citizens of the community were impatient to see results achieved and did not respond well to defensiveness. He wished that both sides would reconsider their strategies. A further improvement would be to separate minority issues from poverty issues in ways they had not done very well. There were some things that happened to minority students that happened because they were a minority. There were other things that were a result of the fact that black and Hispanic minorities were disproportionately from impoverished families. He suggested it would help them at some point to begin to sort those things out.

Dr. Shoenberg pointed out the comment about an ACES procedure. He noted that even the most sophisticated families in Montgomery County who were involved in special education situations felt that they had to have a lawyer to represent them. It was hard to see how that process was going to become less forbidding, and it was particularly going to seem unfair to people who were themselves not well educated and who could not afford legal counsel. He pointed that out as an issue that had to do with affluence.

Mrs. Slye remarked that the set of responses with regard to special education gave her a little bit of concern as well. The responses dealt with how they planned to deal with how parents perceived the system. A lot of responses indicated that they were moving in the

right direction, but Dr. Shoenberg's point was well taken. Overall she was concerned that there was nothing about assessing the LD project as to whether or not it had effectively reduced the disproportion between numbers of minority youngsters in special education placements or not. She said that this was the kind of information that she found helpful. Dr. Cody explained that the document prepared for the retreat on that strategy did not have benchmarks. The special education initiatives were strategic documents and strategic plans that were in place. Mrs. Slye stated that in responding to something they should recap some of the specific things that were part of the strategy.

Dr. Cronin thought it was a question of having available information which could have been pulled in here to make it more clear about the success they had had.

Mr. Ewing said it was important to think about what they were doing in some historical perspective. They started with goals with respect to minority student achievement in a formal way three years ago. The fact that they were not able yet to specify which strategies worked and in what ways but they were able to point to some test results was not surprising. He thought they could make that point without being defensive. At the same time they could not go on forever talking about the processes in which they were involved. The public did not care about process as much as it did about outcomes. He shared that view. If that was all they talked about, they would never be able to persuade the public that they were doing anything about the problem except holding meetings and training people. He did not disagree that they ought to have locally generated ideas, but there were other steps. There had to be accountability. He was not clear what it was that they did in School X that produced Result Y that made a change in the lives of those students. If he did not know this, then the general public did not know it either. He would never know unless he was told.

Dr. Martin cited the example of the Functional Math Test which was uppermost in their minds when they started Priority 2 and the Functional Writing Test. They could give the Board a tremendous listing of what was working. They had prepared guides on what worked, and they had had A&S meetings with panels of resource teachers from the schools that had shown the greatest improvement telling what they did specifically. They had found a need for a predictor instrument on the Functional Writing Test to single out students for special attention. The Council on Instruction approved a recommendation for some specific half-credit courses which had been successful. One of their dilemmas was to find the time to tell people about these activities while they were doing this. She reported that she had been with this for ten years and her first job as an associate superintendent was to chair a committee on the academic achievement of black students. The committee had 12 goals including addressing the expectation of teachers, students, and parents. She commented that this developed into a model of "how not to do it." Later they had a priority where every school was going to establish a plan for improving minority achievement, and again this

did not quite connect. She agreed that this time around going school-based first had made a big difference although it still had not got them there. She thought they had the right order of things. The challenge to them was to tell more people what they were doing. Mr. Ewing commented that it was not what they were doing, but what results they got and why they got them.

Dr. Cronin suggested that they set their own benchmarks and have a report showing how they met them. At some point the process would be a descriptor toward the success. Dr. Cody reported that last September they had had a special report and a meeting with the Board on a status report on minority education in Montgomery County which was information from the preceding year. He thought that perhaps they should update that, and he explained that one of the problems just identified had to do with Hispanics and their lack of progress. Dr. Cronin commented that this report made it appear that they were doing nothing. He suggested addressing this every September. Mrs. Praisner explained that one had to understand the history of the Citizens Minority Relations Monitoring Committee. She thought that after their ordeal the CMRMC respected its independence and its right to comment and raise issues of concern. She said that these issues were not inconsistent from what the system was doing and trying to address. The problem was the cycle they got into of trying to put on paper and schedule time to respond to written reports rather than addressing either the strategies they were using on a continuing basis or of addressing these issues from the standpoint of reporting on the activities and the successes. She pointed out that it was not just this report, it was the Board's advisory committees. They received a piece of paper and responded to that paper, and then they waited for another year. This did not allow for the kind of discussion that Board and staff wanted to have. To focus on the tone of the document was not to focus on what they should be spending the time discussing.

Dr. Pitt explained that the staff was asked to respond to committees and react to the points raised in their reports. He said the fact was there had been a number of strategies developed that seemed to be working, but there were others that probably were not working. The area superintendent had kept a very direct focus on monitoring what was going on and getting feedback from it and involving the community through the PRAT teams. He thought the timing and the report did not reflect what was happening. He did think the September annual report focused on this and suggested that next time they talk about the kind of things Mr. Ewing had mentioned.

Dr. Shoenberg reminded the Board that the Board had requested this response, but the tone and information might not have been what the Board requested. He noted that they had an unfortunate habit of asking for information and results well before the time when they should expect information and results. He said that an annual update on test scores was appropriate, and they should ask about particular strategies that seemed to work. For these strategies to take hold and have some kind of cumulative effect might take more time than they allowed. They were impatient to get results, and he suggested

they needed to recognize that and ask that others recognize that before they lacerated themselves.

Dr. Cody reported that a question had come up about Hispanic students because there did not seem to be any test score improvement for Hispanics. This seemed to be a serious problem, and they were wondering about the fact that it was a changing population that had not been in the county very long. He had graphs showing a steady increase in students passing the Project Basic tests, except this last year there was no increase in the percent of Hispanic students passing the test as compared to the previous year. He had asked DEA to do an analysis of the pass rate of black, white, Hispanic, and Asian students as a function of the number of years they had been in MCPS. He reported that the results were very dramatic. Dr. Cronin asked that this be scheduled as a part of an agenda.

Re: BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS

1. Mrs. Praisner reported that she had attended the Elementary Principals conference, and she was excited about the sessions where individual schools and principals shared their strategies and programs for addressing different issues. One was involving ESOL parents to work in the schools, and another was using computers to work with some of the financial record keeping. She cited the minigrant use at Whetstone which had increased parent participation, association, and identification with that school. She reported that other principals were taking notes of these successful strategies.
2. Mrs. Praisner said that she had attended the AASA conference and had heard excellent speakers including a presentation on the Florida law and program for principal selection where there were defined principal competencies for selection and evaluation. She had heard a presentation on research on factors contributing to student success and a study of parent/home variables. There was a presentation on how Pittsburgh was using research to improve their system and a discussion on how special education students were draining funds from regular students. She heard a presentation on the classroom of the future where each student would have a computer and where a teacher could record attendance and deliver the lunch count. Mesa presented its plan for determining program priorities. Finally she had an opportunity to attend an awards ceremony where 19 school districts including Montgomery County received awards for staff development programs. She recognized Dr. Len Orloff, whose presentation brought down the house.
3. Mrs. Praisner said that as they had looked at the principal selection process she had raised a question about the issue of the assistant principal. She suggested that they had to focus on that role in the school system.
4. Dr. Floyd reported that AASA was an important opportunity for members of school boards to interact with and study contemporary items dealing with roles and relationships between boards and administrators to get a regional and national perspective on that.

He said they needed to keep themselves informed about concerns that administrators had nationally. He had participated in a presentation on a guide for politics in local school districts where there were changing political and cultural relationships in school governance. There was another presentation on how superintendents dealt with multiple community perceptions of the superintendency. He found the session entitled "Too Many School Board Members Want to Play Administrator" very interesting.

5. Dr. Cronin said he had attended sessions on superintendent and board relationships. One said specifically they could not know how well their relationships were going if either side did not evaluate itself. If they were going to evaluate the superintendent, the Board should evaluate its own goals, objectives, and modes of working. He said the major point was that when you attended these meetings you began to realize that your own people were doing a good job and found out that other people were copying what MCPS was doing.

6. Mr. Ewing stated that he had a memo with a number of topics. He was concerned about fire alarms in Blair High School and other schools. He raised this to consider what was going to happen when they built more schools with fire alarms that everyone could pull. He thought that surely there had to be a more reasonable solution and suggested they might have to go to the legislature or the County Council on this issue. Dr. Cody agreed to provide the Board with an update because he thought the matter had been settled.

7. Mr. Ewing said that he had heard from a woman who had said that she had been in touch with many people in the school system over the last 15 years. She was proposing that MCPS offer adult education courses designed for the handicapped but not for the severely handicapped. He urged the staff to look at Mrs. Wilson's proposal.

8. Mr. Ewing reported that Mrs. Becker at White Oak had called him to say that there was a wonderful program there involving intergenerational volunteers. She asked that Board members visit the program on Tuesdays and Thursdays from 3:15 to 4:15 p.m.

9. Mr. Foubert reported that the finalists for the student Board member seat were Andy Herscowitz from Churchill and Eric Steinberg from Whitman. The election would be held on May 15, and he was confident that either one of these students would do a very fine job.

RESOLUTION NO. 182-86 Re: MINUTES OF DECEMBER 16, 1985

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

Resolved, That the minutes of December 16, 1985, be approved.

RESOLUTION NO. 183-86 Re: MINUTES OF JANUARY 23, 1986

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

Resolved, That the minutes of January 23, 1986, be approved.

RESOLUTION NO. 184-86 Re: MINUTES OF JANUARY 28, 1986

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

Resolved, That the minutes of January 28, 1986, be approved.

RESOLUTION NO. 185-86 Re: MINUTES OF JANUARY 30, 1986

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

Resolved, That the minutes of January 30, 1986, be approved.

RESOLUTION NO. 186-86 Re: MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 6, 1986

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

Resolved, That the minutes of February 6, 1986, be approved.

RESOLUTION NO. 187-86 Re: APPOINTMENT TO THE TITLE IX ADVISORY COMMITTEE

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

WHEREAS, The Board of Education determined on July 19, 1977, that a Title IX Advisory Committee should be established; and

WHEREAS, The superintendent suggested that the committee be composed of 16 members, namely:

- 3 Montgomery County Public Schools staff members recommended by the superintendent in consultation with the employee organizations and the principals' associations
- 3 Student members recommended by the superintendent in consultation with the Montgomery County Region of the Maryland Association of Student Councils and Montgomery County Junior Council
- 8 Community members appointed by the Board of Education
- 1 Member either from the MCPS staff or the community (at the Board of Education's discretion)
- 1 Ex officio member from the Department of Human Relations; and

WHEREAS, Currently there are two community vacancies existing on the committee; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Board of Education appoint the following person, effective immediately, to serve on the Title IX Advisory Committee for a two-year term ending June 30, 1988:

Susan R. Christen, Business and Professional Women's Organization
Bethesda-Chevy Chase

RESOLUTION NO. 188-86 Re: APPOINTMENTS TO THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE
ON MINORITY STUDENT EDUCATION

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

WHEREAS, The Board of Education determined on September 13, 1983, that an Advisory Committee on Minority Student Education should be established; and

WHEREAS, The Board directed that the committee be composed of 21 members, namely:

- 4 Montgomery County Public Schools staff members recommended by the superintendent in consultation with the employee organizations and the principals' association
- 3 Student members recommended by the superintendent in consultation with the Montgomery County Region of the Maryland Association of Student Councils and Montgomery County Junior Council
- 14 Community members appointed by the Board of Education; and

WHEREAS, Currently there are 9 (nine) vacancies on the committee, namely:

- 1 representative from MCEA
- 1 representative from MCCSSE
- 5 community members
- 2 student representatives

now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Board of Education appoint the following persons, effective immediately, to serve on the Advisory Committee on Minority Student Education for a two-year term ending as indicated below:

William Earl Best (June 30, 1988)
Luis Cardona (June 30, 1988)
Leonard Ranasinghe (June 30, 1988)
Themba Sono (June 30, 1988)
Edith Williams (June 30, 1988)
Jessica Dunkley (MCCSSE) (June 30, 1988)
Bettye J. Whitney (MCEA) (June 30, 1988)
Huong Mai Tran (staff) (reappointment) (December 31, 1987)
Verna Dickerson (reappointment) (December 31, 1987)

Maurice S. Moore (reappointment) (December 31, 1987)
Harold Szu (reappointment) (December 31, 1987)
Paul S. Young (reappointment) (December 31, 1987)

and be it further

Resolved, That the Board of Education appoint the following students, effective immediately, to serve on the Advisory Committee on Minority Student Education for a one-year term ending June 30, 1987:

Kenrik Duru, Blair High School
Chan Park, Richard Montgomery High School

RESOLUTION NO. 189-86 Re: STATE GUIDELINES ON THE APPEALS PROCESS

On motion of Dr. Shoenberg seconded by Mrs. DiFonzo, the following resolution was adopted unanimously:

Resolved, That staff be requested to prepare for the president a statement incorporating the Board's views on the appeals process for delivery at the State Board of Education hearing; and be it further

Resolved, That the Board's attorney be requested to prepare an alternate form of the state bylaw.

RESOLUTION NO. 190-86 Re: BOE APPEAL NO. 1986-3

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education dismiss BOE Appeal No. 1986-3.

RESOLUTION NO. 191-86 Re: BOE APPEAL NO. 1986-4

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education dismiss BOE Appeal No. 1986-4.

RESOLUTION NO. 192-86 Re: BOE APPEAL NO. 1986-8

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education adopt its decision and order in BOE Appeal No. 1986-8.

Re: ITEMS OF INFORMATION

Board members received the following items of information:

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

Re: ADJOURNMENT

The president adjourned the meeting at 5:30 p.m.

President

Secretary

WSC:mlw