

NUMBER: 31-1990  
STATUS: APPROVED  
PLACE: ROCKVILLE, MARYLAND  
DATE: JULY 10, 1990  
TEXT:

APPROVED  
31-1990

Rockville, Maryland  
July 10, 1990

The Board of Education of Montgomery County met in regular session at the Carver Educational Services Center, Rockville, Maryland, on Tuesday, July 10, 1990, at 10 a.m.

ROLL CALL            Present:  Dr. Robert E. Shoenberg, President  
  in the Chair  
  Mr. David Chang  
  Dr. James E. Cronin  
  Mrs. Sharon DiFonzo  
  Mr. Blair G. Ewing  
  Mr. Bruce A. Goldensohn  
  Mrs. Catherine E. Hobbs  
  Mrs. Marilyn J. Praisner

Absent:  None

Others Present:  Dr. Harry Pitt, Superintendent  
                                Dr. Paul L. Vance, Deputy Superintendent  
                                Mr. Thomas S. Fess, Parliamentarian

#indicates student vote does not count.  Four votes are needed for adoption.

RESOLUTION NO. 421-90        Re:  BOARD AGENDA - JULY 10, 1990

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

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education approve its agenda for July 10, 1990.

Re:  ANNOUNCEMENT

Dr. Cronin announced that he would have to leave the meeting during the morning session but would return for the afternoon session.

Re:  GOAL SETTING

Dr. Shoenberg stated that they had several issues for discussion this morning.  They had information on improving the teaching/learning process.  As background for discussion on the locus of decision making, they had the report of the PSAC group which would probably be part of a larger discussion of that whole issue later in the fall.  The second question had to do with the organization of instruction and the question of deploying staff in different ways and the question of a longer school day or longer school year.  The third issue had to do with uses of technology.

Dr. Pitt noted that there was an article in the Washington POST on the school pilot issue. He was generally in favor of the recommendations in the report of the PSAC committee, but he had held off making specific recommendations until they received the report of the induction committee. Most interest nationally was on the flexibility project, but the Commission on Excellence had a number of thrusts including new teacher induction. He felt that they had had outstanding success in this area. He wanted to wait for that report and make recommendations tied to the two reports.

Dr. Shoenberg said he would like to voice a concern and get a response. He had been in favor of their going on with the school flexibility pilots and involving more and more schools. He was also aware of the fact that it took a long time for schools to understand what they were doing and to understand how the process worked so that some products of the process could begin to emerge. He did not want to appear to be asking too much, too fast. He did have a concern about local school autonomy in Montgomery County. It seemed to him to be far more likely to be a conservative force than a progressive force. The articles he had read about local decision-making were of two kinds. The first kind did not do very much because there was a lot of process and not much product. The second kind operated in situations where there was a general shared community feeling that the situation was desperate and some kind of radical departure needed to be made. In Montgomery County it was his feeling that they did not have any schools where the situation was desperate and a restructuring of the way they did business was needed. However, he believed there were some areas where they needed substantial changes, but he did not see those changes as the kinds that were going to be made through this particular strategy. He was concerned that if they adopted this strategy they were not going to get the kinds of changes that they needed to make.

Dr. Cronin stated that in the case of Rosemary Hills they had not defined what the decision-making was to be. The community there found that it was an extremely large process to put into effect, and it required a considerable amount of parent and faculty time. This was something they had to approach cautiously to see if the community itself understood what it was buying into and could put the time in on it.

Mrs. Praisner commented that these were interesting points. In the last two years she had participated in a variety of national conferences related to change in education and restructuring and flexibility. They had to remember that they were not alone in a lot of this. In one conference there were 15 representatives from different states and the leadership of the National School Boards Association, and they had spent a morning trying to define "restructuring." The problem was they had not come to closure

with what they defined as local school-based management or flexibility or restructuring. These three phrases were used interchangeably within Montgomery County as well as nationally. The next steps should include coming to closure on definitions. Most of the research had not been done uniformly. Interestingly the Dade County advocate for local school decision-making was now the superintendent in New York City and looking to centralize decision-making back to the superintendent. In this case it was a personnel autonomy, not a curriculum autonomy. They were talking about two different things, but it got back to the overall definition of what was to be achieved. As a country, they had not come to grips with how much was a national issue and how much was a local school issue, given the structure of school systems nationwide. It was hard to have a national definition of flexibility. They had to create one for Montgomery County. This spoke not only to next steps but also to some of the questions that were part of the discussion and part of what Dr. Shoenberg was talking about. For example, were there issues that were significant that would come out of a local school making decisions as opposed to some higher bureaucracy making decisions? She thought they would find a little bit of both.

Mrs. Praisner thought they had to have more discussions with the committee and discuss the other pieces of the recommendations that came out of the Commission on Excellence. She said they had to come to closure as far as Montgomery County was concerned. She was very supportive of what had gone on so far. However, they had to communicate what it was that they were doing for the general public, for the parent community, and for the staff. They had to continue to relate this to students and to the success of those students. They also had to communicate that it took a long time to do whatever it was they were doing. They also needed some kind of meaningful evaluation, and they were in the process of doing that. She noted that eight of the nine pilots wanted to continue, and there was a recommendation from the committee to go beyond this and to move to the Board's taking a more definitive position. If the Board were to, and she was supportive of this, they had to come to closure as to what that was. Local decision-making might take different forms at different schools, but there had to be a more formal definition.

Dr. Pitt indicated that they would be back to this issue in the fall. Mr. Ewing shared Dr. Shoenberg's concern. It seemed to him that there was a danger in talking about local decision-making as if the issue were whether or not to grant local schools autonomy in making decisions. This was misleading and was not what either the pilot schools had pursued nor what the Board intended nor what they ought to allow.

\*Dr. Cronin temporarily left the meeting at this point.

Mr. Ewing stated that the locus of decision-making issue was one of deciding what functions were appropriately performed by whom and at what level. From a policy point of view, the issue was not whether local schools would pursue certain objectives or what objectives they would pursue, but they would achieve objectives. The schools needed to focus on what degree of flexibility they required in local circumstances to make decisions that would cause them to meet those objectives. He thought this needed to be clear to PSAC, to the Board, and to the community at large. The danger with autonomy was that people would choose the status quo which would then become a barrier to making change that needed to be made. There were things which the locus of decision making could address. There were things it could not address and should not attempt to address. Overall school system policy was still the Board's to make with the advice of the superintendent and his staff and schools and others in the community. This could address the issue Dr. Pitt and the Board have been willing to open up which was the issue of what kinds of things could be devolved to local schools in the interest of increasing the ownership by professionals, parents, and school system staff.

Mr. Ewing pointed out that MCPS was not a unique school system in that it was highly hierarchical which was typical of American education. Again, Dr. Pitt had suggested there might be things they could do to alter that to some degree and permit schools to make some decisions. This could be addressed by the mechanism, but substantive reform was unlikely to be addressed by this mechanism very much. It had not been addressed very much by the pilot schools. In Dade County there were some substantive changes. It seemed to him the real issue with school-based management was what could schools do that previously schools did not get to do, and what could school communities do together that previously school communities did not do together. He stated that if it were feasible for them to agree on some definition, they ought to do so relatively soon before they opened the matter up for additional schools to enter. It was fine to allow an initial nine schools to pilot something, but he wouldn't want to do that with another set of schools. They should have in place a set of directions on which the Board could agree.

Dr. Shoenberg thought that this was what PSAC was telling the Board in their report. He felt that it was a logical progression of things.

Dr. Pitt remarked that he did not disagree with anything he had heard. He commented that American society tended to grab on to something to solve world problems in three days with a new approach. There were places in education where the situation was very, very bad, and where there had to be radical surgery. Business people were saying they should not spend more money in education. Better use should be made of existing funds. The best way was to get rid of the bureaucracy and to let the school

run its show. If the school did not do it right, new people should be installed. As superintendent, he did feel they needed to raise the psychological status of teachers. Teachers needed to feel they did have something to say about the education of children in terms of the decisions that were made. He thought that this was what the Commission on Excellence was trying to say to some extent. Parents needed to be involved in that process. He thought that the idea of local school flexibility made sense. There were a number of decisions that could be made at the local level that did involve teachers. However, schools in the study were finding that they needed more time. The question was how much time they should give to relieve people from their basic jobs to do other things. As superintendent, he was arguing they ought to lower class size and put more aides in the classroom rather than reduce periods that people taught. He believed the major focus was that the local school ought to be more flexible in the decisions that could be made, and the administration ought not to be totally directive. This was very different than saying that every school was autonomous. He was in favor of giving that local school more opportunity and teachers being involved in having a say in what went on at their schools without taking time away from the teaching process. He believed that teachers would make good decisions, and that students would benefit because they felt they were really involved.

It seemed to Dr. Pitt that the problem was how to take this and have quality judgments about whether students really learned more. He was not sure how they could get to that point. Some of this had to be based on their judgment as to what motivated people in terms of better operations. Dr. Shoenberg noted that they would have an opportunity to come back to this in the fall in a larger context. Dr. Pitt added that they had said they were going to pilot something. This was supposed to be a true pilot which was an experiment. Therefore, people had the right to say the experiment did not work. If they were going to have some experimenting, they had to give people flexibility and the leeway to say it did not work right.

Dr. Shoenberg stated that the next item was the organization of instruction. This was one he had put on the list because there was a particular issue he wanted to address here. When the Holmes group and the Carnegie task force came out with recommendations several years ago, they included a recommendation on the idea of a lead teacher. He thought this was an interesting idea, particularly in the elementary school. One of the ways in which they might enable themselves to address individual students' needs better and to have more flexible ways of grouping students was to begin by having a person who was a manager of instruction. This would be a classroom teacher in the classroom directing a small number of people as a manager of that classroom. They were starting to move in that direction with the aides they were putting into the elementary classrooms. He saw

it as a way of getting out of a model which he continued to see as needing modification. This was the one teacher with 25 students in one classroom. In this model they made one adult in the classroom responsible for dealing with the individual needs of those 25 youngsters. That person had to work with one group while the rest of the class did something else.

Dr. Shoenberg liked the notion of a lead teacher with progression of teachers along a scale in something of the same way they had progression of faculty members in a college or university. He was talking about graduate assistant, instructor, and various ranks of professor. He thought the idea of a lead teacher might be something reasonable to consider and a way of their getting more adults into a school without increasing their costs extraordinarily. In other words, they would have a small team of instructional personnel responsible for a somewhat larger group of students. They had done that sort of thing with team teaching and the open classrooms, and there were various degrees of dissatisfaction with that on the part of teachers, parents, and students. He was interested in exploring the notion of a lead teacher, and he wanted to see how other people might feel about that or other kinds of restructuring that would give them an opportunity for more flexible group of students and more flexible dealing with individual student needs.

Mr. Ewing thought that this was an interesting idea. There were some variants on this that had some attractiveness as well. He pointed out that parents had high expectations and there was an explosion of knowledge coupled with pressures to push the beginning stages of learning down further and further. It might be that they would need a lead teacher as a manager of instruction as well as specialists rather than aides. He was thinking about math and science in elementary schools. They were doing some of this in the magnet schools. For example, East Silver Spring had a math room with a math specialist and a science specialist. The teachers and students used these resources. This was still undergoing assessment and might or might not end up being the best model. However, it was a model that was worth considering because of the fact that most elementary school teachers had relatively little background in science and math. They were doing some things in this area to increase the knowledge and capability of teachers, but it might be if they wanted to make rapid change they might need to employ some other mode.

Dr. Pitt agreed that they were doing a number of things. The complexity of the program was such that it was very difficult for one teacher to teach everything they wanted children to learn. At the upper elementary grades they had some regrouping of students and some specialized teaching. With the loss of their teacher specialists, this was even more critical. However, this got into the whole issue of child growth and development and the

concept of how many different adults they could expect a little child to deal with.

In regard to the lead teacher, Dr. Pitt said he worried about the development of a school bureaucracy that rivaled the central office. On the other hand, the idea of teaming of specialization made some sense. The idea of paraprofessionals in a room was a good idea. The teacher would have to learn some management skills. The other issue they had to look at was the cost of whatever they did. He expected they would have limits on spending; therefore, personnel had to be utilized in the best possible way. He did think they would move to more specialization at the elementary level, but they had to keep the whole child in mind.

Dr. Shoenberg agreed with Mr. Ewing that there were lots of other ways to deal with this. He would like to see them explore Mr. Ewing's suggestion. His question did have to do with costs and increasing costs. He asked whether it made sense for them to have one certificated teacher responsible for every 25 students. They staffed that way, but he wondered whether they had to structure that way. He asked whether there were ways that they could achieve more flexibility in dealing with different kinds of students that were no more costly than their present structure. This also offered an opportunity to teachers to be able to stay within the classroom and have changing roles as they matured in their careers. He commented that not everyone needed to have their own professional growth signalled by progressively more prestigious jobs. There were some people who would stay in the classroom and would like to have that experience and increasing skill and wider reaching responsibilities.

Dr. Pitt remarked that there were a number of ways to restructure the elementary school, and there were a variety of models around. The most difficult part of that process was the parents who had great concern about changing the structure of that school. The bottom line was that they were going to have to find a way of adding specialized skills to the elementary school without adding an additional math specialist to each school. One way was to have people specialize and regroup students. Another way was to use people without teaching degrees and pay them differently.

Mr. Ewing said that another issue was the high school and its structure to deliver educational services to students. That was an issue of whether they wanted to make changes of a kind that spoke to the integration of disciplines as well as to changes in the rigidity of the scheduling process. Over the years they had done some things to look at that issue, but this was another issue that needed attention. There were national models like theSizer model, and the Board had funded a modest ongoing effort at Einstein. He thought that those approaches at the high school level were important for them to consider, too. He remarked that



the high school in terms of its structure was probably the most conservative institution in American education. Making changes in the high school would be difficult for reasons having to do with parents and their concern over making sure that every base was touched and every course taken that could lead to guarantees of college admission of the highest order. It was also the case that the Board had not committed itself to any extensive changes here, and that was an important agenda item for them.

Mrs. Praisner thought that the high school was the most rigid of structures because of the Carnegie credits, the disciplines, and the mindsets of individuals within the schools. She said that this was the area where they met the most resistance for change because of the views of parents that they did not want experimentation or flexibility. Parents wanted a guarantee that what was in their high school was the same as what was in every other high school because this would guarantee access to college and to success. Therefore, when the Board had tried to encourage some experimentation or some look at organization, this had been met with resistance because of comparisons with neighboring schools. This brought up the issue of how they explained that success was also possible in another mode. This afternoon they would be discussing state requirements. She felt that they were still dealing with an educational system that was defining success in ways MCPS was going to have to agree to.

Mrs. Praisner commented that change at the high school level was more difficult than change at the middle school level. They had converted schools to middle schools and had had the recommendations of the middle school task force. She thought that perhaps the middle school level was where they should focus in order to meet the future. They should look at reorganization here and encourage flexibility. This was the marriage of the elementary and the secondary without the limitations of the secondary. Perhaps this was where they should look to encouragement and involvement and try other structures. This might provide them more opportunity, and this was an area that did lend itself to that look. She also thought that people would be more receptive in this area.

Dr. Pitt reported that he had pushed people privately to look at the Sizer model and some of the other models around. He said that when they started on statewide posting of scores school by school, there would be stress. Another approach was occurring at two places, Blair and Richard Montgomery. In the Blair magnet they were integrating mathematics and science. They were working with resource teachers across the county trying to do some of that. He suggested that they might start with an integration of subject matter which would cause the structure to change. In the IB program, there was an integration of English and social sciences into programs that made more sense in relation to how students learned. The smaller change might be to move toward the

integration of academic subject matter, which might be a more successful approach.

Mrs. Katheryn Gemberling, associate superintendent, reported that tomorrow there would be an all-day symposium for mid-level principals, resource teachers, and counselors. The topic was to be interdisciplinary models. After discussing the program, they decided to invite high school resource teachers as well. There would be discussions on interdisciplinary teachings which would expose high school teachers to some of the options.

Mrs. Praisner pointed out that the magnet at Eastern was an excellent interdisciplinary model. She believed that if they focused at the middle school level, the expectation once they got to high school was going to be a demand for the continuity of what they saw at the middle school level.

Mrs. Praisner said that in the articles provided Board members there was information on grouping and tracking. Several years ago when they went to the honors program, she was one of two Board members at that time who wanted to continue the piloting for a little longer. She had had a concern that they not stop at the honors levels with the infusion of the instructional organizations but also the methods of organization and instruction that seemed to her to still not have worked their way into other classrooms. If they encouraged interdisciplinary instruction, she was concerned that the three examples they had used were magnet examples. They were not the regular classroom, average child experience in Montgomery County. If they didn't get out of that model, they were going to be feeding the tracking and the grouping concerns that were in the articles. For this reason, she would argue that the middle school level was the place to start. She also thought that they needed to look at early childhood education from Head Start to Grade 3 as one group rather than a graded structure. They needed to make sure their thrusts in this area went beyond the magnet experiences.

Dr. Pitt expressed his agreement with Mrs. Praisner's remarks. He did not think one group of students could profit from this more than another group. They were talking about organizing the world in some organized way that made sense. For example, it was difficult to talk about Shakespeare and not recognize the time in which he lived. It was a fallacy to assume that students had to be honors-type to be exposed to that kind of program. Mrs. Praisner stated that she was not saying this was only for this type of student. She was saying that whether it was a pilot or an organization or an initiative they started it in the honors and magnet level, and the question was how were they carrying what they had learned to the regular classroom. They had started to do some things for math and science teachers to pick up on what they had learned through the Blair magnet, and she was suggesting there was more that needed to be done.

Mr. Ewing thought it was important for them to focus on the elementary school and the middle school for the reasons stated by Mrs. Praisner. At the same time he did not think this was inconsistent in any way with addressing the high school as well. It was his understanding that what they were doing with county math and science teachers in summer workshops conducted by Blair teachers was to demonstrate to them not that they ought to take the Blair curriculum and attempt to use it with other students but rather to show how math, science, and computer science are related to one another and can be taught in an interdisciplinary, coordinated, and coherent fashion. One of the advantages they had in Montgomery County was they typically gave teachers of the gifted and talented a great deal of flexibility in developing the methods they would use. One of the things they ought to benefit from was the knowledge they gained about instructional methods that were likely to be useful for all students. He thought they would maximize this benefit by making sure they distilled those lessons effectively and make those approaches available as they were appropriate. He was not suggesting they wanted to "dumb it all down" for the average student. He was suggesting that the things they did for gifted students probably were more appropriate for most students than most people thought they were. Therefore, in the process, they might raise expectations of themselves as educators and of students in the classroom. This was part of what they needed to do with regard to the high school, but not the only thing. He thought there were a whole range of things to go about addressing high school issues and maybe a way of doing that was to demonstrate the virtues of different approaches. By using this process they could avoid promoting increased tracking which was something they ought to struggle against to the extent that they could.

Mr. Goldensohn said that if at the high school level they were going to change the style of teaching to interdisciplinary instruction, teaming, and coordinated courses he thought that one of the ways to get that accepted by more people was to start the process as early as possible. If students grew up with one class/25 students, this was what they would be most comfortable with in high school. One of the advantages of the middle school was getting those children in a different mode of thought for when they got to high school. As they had added so many larger elementary schools in the past few years with enrollments in the 600 to 700 range, Mr. Goldensohn asked whether they were getting more schools that were going into a teaming approach in the upper primary grades than they did when all schools were in the 300-400 range. Mrs. Gemberling agreed that the flexibility possibility existed at the larger schools. She was not prepared to say that there was a definite pattern to that. She thought they would find the pattern correlated more around the philosophy of the principal and the community. Newer schools tended to try some of the newer things because there wasn't that established set for the community. She could look into this structure with the area

associates. Mr. Goldensohn suggested that it would be interesting to follow that over the next couple of years particularly in the clusters that had several schools in that category and look at the change going into the middle school and the high school because of those large schools.

Dr. Vance reported that the tendency in large elementary schools had been more towards the model that Mr. Ewing and Dr. Shoenberg were addressing earlier. They had more specialization in the fifth and sixth grade. Teams tended to select out those teachers who had advanced training or particular expertise in the various disciplines. They usually grouped and regrouped the youngsters during the school year contingent upon their progress. The initiatives towards coordination depended a lot upon the principal's sense of that and expertise in that area of instruction. Mr. Goldensohn had seen combined classes with two teachers interrelating language and social studies. He felt that for fourth and fifth graders to learn that way was extremely advantageous. Dr. Pitt stated that almost every elementary school had moved toward more specialized approaches at the upper grade levels. Obviously, the larger schools had more flexibility, but over the last five or six years he had seen schools move in this direction. Mr. Goldensohn thought it would be interesting to follow that over the years because there had been complaints about the larger schools, and this flexibility in his mind was a plus.

Dr. Pitt commented that there were experiments going on where the same teacher took a group of youngsters for three years. This depended on the kinds of students and the needs of those children.

Dr. Vance pointed out that some administrators had children in the school system, and some of these conversations made them nervous. It bothered him that they were moving on the assumption that an interdisciplinary approach or what was happening to gifted and talented youngsters or magnet schools had been proven to be the most successful approach. He said that one Board member had raised questions about proof regarding their next discussion on minority education. He would pose the same questions here. Those having children in gifted and talented courses might raise questions about whether the difference between what pedagogy was going on in those classes and other classes was only a question of quantity.

Dr. Shoenberg said there was one situation where they did have some proof, and that was the Summer Institute where they did seem to have some pretty good evidence. He suspected that a lot of individual teachers dealt with the issue of learning styles very

effectively while others did not. School systems nationally had a predominant style through which they asked all students to learn most of the time. He thought they needed to pay a whole lot more attention to learning styles. He suspected there were students who did learn well in the self-contained classroom, but there were other students who learned better in less structured situations. They needed to provide equal opportunity for those two things to go on. There were some students who learned better where skills were tackled sequentially, but there were some students who learned better by dealing with a problem holistically. Different teachers taught best to different learning styles. Having one teacher with one group of students for three years might produce a group of students who did well because they had a compatible learning style. Other students might have three unfortunate years.

Dr. Shoenberg commented that what they were talking about here was not only the way they organized curriculum and the school day, but the way they organized modes of instruction. They needed to develop a repertoire which was broader than individuals and schools normally employed.

Mrs. DiFonzo reported that when her son was in the second grade parents were so pleased with the 2-3 combination class that they asked the principal to carry the class over to a 3-4 combination with the same group of students. Three or four youngsters were opted out by the teacher or the parents. The class continued the following year, and in the third year the teacher ended up teaching Grade 5. These three years for her son were three of the most secure, productive, and best years of his thirteen years in MCPS. Over the years her children had been in double classrooms, split classrooms, and departmentalization setups. For one youngster, departmentalization worked very well. For another, it was an absolute disaster. No particular methodology or style was going to be right for every single student. The question was how they determined what that youngster's learning styles were and match that youngster up with a teacher whose strength was to allow that youngster the opportunity to thrive and grow. This was the challenge, not the particular pedagogy or a Board dictating what they were going to do.

Dr. Carl Smith, associate superintendent, stated that one of the things that made the high school such a conservative institution was the Carnegie credit system and highly prescriptive graduation requirements. Both of those things worked against experimental approaches. It did seem to him that one of the real ways to reform high schools was to think more in terms of options at that level. Most of the time when they thought of reform, they thought it had to be all that way for all students. They tended to think of the high school as one unitary structure which did not work very well when they were talking about reform. They had a lot of students who learned very well in a comprehensive high

school, but they had a significant number of students who did not. Those were the students who got lost and those were the students they tried to deal with in external alternative programs.

Dr. Shoenberg said he would take issue with part of what Dr. Smith had stated. This was the kind of modal way of dealing with students in the high school where some students could be successful within that mode which might not allow other students to develop fully. There were students who would tolerate anything. Sizer pointed out that there was a kind of pact that teachers and students made with each other that they would not hassle each other. He thought that went on far more often than they would like to admit. They probably needed to do some mutual hassling in some other modes so that the many students who were in the mode of passive, minimal tolerance for school could have a better experience. When these students got to college, professors complained about the unreflective and parochial attitudes. He thought that as a school system they should be able to do more about this so that students were not as parochial. A lot of that involved instructional strategies and styles. It might not have anything to do with the organization of the curriculum, although he felt that some reorganization of the curriculum would help shake up the system.

Mrs. DiFonzo remarked that they needed to keep in mind that what drove the curriculum and the structure at the high school level was the test. When they had talked about better ways to approach foreign languages, they came up with the fact that parents and students wanted students to pass the test. Therefore, the curriculum and methods of instruction could not be changed.

Dr. Pitt pointed out that all of them were talking in the same vein, but when the chips were down, they said they had to evaluate what children learned. They did that by archaic methods they had not improved on. Society ended up saying that an educated person was someone who could pass a test. People could be trained to do that, but not educated to do that. He would be told that the test scores showed that students were not learning; therefore, he would respond by saying they had to get those test scores up. This was an issue that was inherent in their culture, all of which drove the educational system.

Mrs. Gemberling stated that whatever they were talking about in terms of restructuring at whatever level all boiled down to the school's deciding how they were going to do what it was MCPS wanted them to do if they knew what "it" was. This was where flexibility could come in. If the student outcomes were still very finite, they would get that kind of instructional program out of necessity. They had to decide what they wanted for their students at each level, what was the outcome they were asking students to produce. They had to look at ways of measuring this

going beyond the very minimal paper and pencil test. If they did not get beyond that, the other forms would not come around.

Dr. Shoenberg pointed out that they had not gotten to the third item which was technology. He was not concerned because they had some very good planning done by Bev Sangston in this area. He hoped that they would have some version of her plan available for discussion at the retreat. Mrs. Praisner said the question was how they used technology in order to achieve the goals that they wanted. At the state level, the question was going to be numbers of computers and numbers of students. They would not be talking about how teachers and students could use computers but rather numbers.

Dr. Shoenberg said they had not talked about the longer school day and the longer school year. The latter was part of the state superintendent's recommendations. He suggested they deal with this for a few minutes during the afternoon discussion. He thought they were going to have to come to terms with this notion in some way or another. He thanked Dr. Kenneth Muir who was staying on after retirement to help with the Board retreat.

Re: PRELIMINARY UPDATE ON PRIORITY 2 -  
SUMMARY REPORT ON MINORITY  
EDUCATION INITIATIVES

Dr. Shoenberg stated that they had some materials for discussion. Dr. Pitt explained that the report summarized what they were doing. Mr. Ewing had raised the issue of minigrants and how they knew minigrants were working. Dr. Pitt explained that the minigrant was an opportunity for a local school to do some flexible things within a structure. The minigrants had to be used for Priority 2 which wasn't the case when they first started minigrants. He had changed that in the last two years. What happened was that schools would say they had a number of students who needed improvement in achievement or other areas, and they would design a tailored program using research or previously successful practices. There were a number of programs having to do with tutoring afterschool, and some schools had programs on Saturdays. In those cases, they did see results. However, those results were not easily detailed in a CAT test score because it was more judgmental. For example, a teacher might say youngsters were succeeding in the math program when they were not before. It was difficult to make that kind of determination on the basis of scientific data based on the length of the program and the kinds of focus the local programs had. Dr. Pitt thought that the minigrants were worthwhile, but evaluation almost had to be done on a local basis. The goals of each grant had to be approved by the area in terms of what was needed for that particular school.

Dr. Paul Scott, director of minority education, reported that the document before the Board described the range of practices,

initiatives, and programs that had been developed in response to the needs of minority students. He had described the plan in great detail to the Board last June. The present report provided a brief summary of their efforts to date and, secondly, to set the stage for future development and expansion.

Dr. Scott explained that the report was divided into instructional programs, community outreach, monitoring, and human resources. For example, the instructional program section described many of their initiatives in the area of mathematics and science, the expansion of ESOL programs, and the expansion of the successful practices project. It described the Summer Institute for Achievement which, although not solely a program for minorities, had this as a particular focus. In the community outreach section, it described many of their efforts which were part of a follow-up to last year's public hearings on minority education. There were community dialogue meetings which used the 1988-89 accountability report as a springboard for discussion. In some instances, specific initiatives grew out of these meetings such as the Hispanic hotline which had been implemented in the fall.

Dr. Scott stated that the monitoring section spoke to many procedures put in place to oversee efforts with the management planning process being the cornerstone of that effort. This year there was also a conscious effort to make a shift in the major focus of his role from guiding the development of each of the components of the plan to monitoring their implementation. The primary responsibility for monitoring rested with the associate superintendents. The human resources section focused on those areas related to affirmative action. It noted the links made with historically black colleges and the expansion of that effort as well as staff development initiatives which were becoming increasingly important in efforts to meet the needs of minority students.

Dr. Scott indicated that they would be presenting their annual accountability report in August on the achievement of black and Hispanic students. They would be presenting a preliminary paper to the Board on the needs of Asian students. They would re-examine their accountability goals in view of the changes instituted at the state level in the testing program for 1990-91 and their new emphasis on accountability. Finally they would be receiving Dr. Gordon's assessment of their efforts to date and his recommendations.

Mrs. Hobbs pointed out that the report stated that Dr. Gordon would be presenting his report in November. When the Board had interviewed Dr. Gordon, the Board made it clear how critical timing was. The Board had expected to receive his report by August 31. They had received correspondence from Dr. Gordon explaining that he had a two-week delay in what he was planning



to do. As a consequence of a two-week delay, they were now facing a two-month delay. She had asked for an explanation over a month ago and had never received it. She asked why they would not be receiving his report until November.

Dr. Vance replied that he was not aware that Mrs. Hobbs had requested that information. He thought the superintendent had shared with the Board copies of Dr. Gordon's letter which enumerated his reasons for requesting the delay and the conditions under which he would be willing to continue to serve an extended period. Dr. Gordon had told him that he was overwhelmed with the availability of data and information. He and his staff had tried to accommodate everyone who wanted to meet with the team. Both of those initiatives slowed the process.

Dr. Pitt said that he had sent the Board Dr. Gordon's memo. He pointed out that MCPS did not manage Dr. Gordon. Staff was working with Dr. Gordon but was not directing him. The delay was because Dr. Gordon wanted to have public hearings, and he felt it was not appropriate to have those during the summer. Dr. Gordon planned to send in a draft report on August 31. Dr. Pitt felt that Dr. Gordon was doing things his way which was important to the integrity of the study.

Mr. Ewing pointed out that the paper stated that the actions described in the report were directly related to recommendations received from the community and particularly to the recommendations from the advisory committee on minority education. The reaction of the advisory committee in a meeting with some Board members was that they were not clear about or comfortable with the level of implementation of its recommendations. He recognized there was an expectation that they would have a status report on recommendations in the fall, but he would not want them to be in the position of asserting that they were implementing when it was not clear to him or most of the members of the advisory committee what it was they were implementing.

Dr. Vance replied that he had met with Dr. Scott and Dr. Moone and the group. It seemed to him that their preoccupation was not so much with staff's initiatives but what they saw as a lack of initiative and response from Board members in terms of how the report was received and what directions were given as a consequence of it. He did not want Dr. Scott, executive staff, and others to get into a conflict mode with the Board's advisory committee.

Mr. Ewing said the Board had a set of recommendations, and it was true that the Board took no action. He thought they did this deliberately and also incorrectly. He believed they should have taken action to adopt some or all of those recommendations.

However, it would have been well for the report to say that the Board took no action and left to the superintendent the initiative to implement such of the recommendations as he saw fit to implement and then list the recommendations. He thought the report should have been clearer on that issue.

Dr. Pitt replied that they had implemented a number of the recommendations, but there were some they had not. Dr. Vance and Dr. Scott had been in direct communication with the committee. They could specifically delineate those they had implemented. Dr. Scott recalled that at the close of the meeting Dr. Shoenberg had mentioned that in the fall the Board could consider reviewing the status of those recommendations.

Dr. Scott explained that the Board advisory committee report was divided into four major areas which followed the minority achievement plan and included student achievement, affirmative action, community outreach, and the identification of successful practices. One recommendation was that they take a strong emphasis on early childhood education. Dr. Plumer had been appointed as coordinator of early childhood education and was focusing on establishing a coordinated policy and programs for the school system. Another recommendation was to explore alternative achievement indicators other than test data. Mrs. Gemberling and Dr. Frechtling had been working on that issue and were scheduled to report to the Board on July 23. In the successful practices area, there was a recommendation around monitoring and encouraging schools to use a data base system similar to the one used at Kennedy High School. They were in the midst of a pilot which was cited in the report as "school-based information monitoring system." They were piloting this in 24 schools, and principals had already received training. Dr. Pitt recalled that this had been a big issue with the Council, but they were willing to supply the funding.

Dr. Scott reported that a very specific recommendation was for an outside consultant, and they had done that. Other recommendations related to affirmative action and simplifying the application form. The form had been simplified and was awaiting final review. In addition, they had simplified that whole process through the Department of Personnel. They were publishing announcements of job openings in language minority newspapers. There was a recommendation to do more minority recruitment, and they were now recruiting in colleges with high minority populations. They had met with employee and community groups regarding promotional opportunities. Community outreach had been a major focus of the Department of Human Relations. In his role of monitor, Dr. Scott had been keeping track of those recommendations.

Dr. Shoenberg remarked that Mr. Ewing thought it was wrong of the Board not to take some kind of formal action on the report. He

did not think it was wrong, and he would like to say why. There were a large number of recommendations in the report and most of them were operational recommendations. They were not policy recommendations. It would not be proper for the Board to adopt a statement that said they thought that all of the recommendations were appropriate operational strategies. This was not the Board's decision to make. It was the superintendent's decision. At the time the superintendent indicated that he was going to take the range of suggestions and recommendations under advisement and to begin to move on some of those that he thought were valuable. The superintendent had moved on a large number of the recommendations, and the Board had received some accounting of that.

Dr. Shoenberg noted that some of the other recommendations were in regard to programs that the Board had already indicated it was going to adopt or where the implementation was underway. When the Board received the report, the Board indicated that there was value in the recommendations and spent a lot of time talking about the report. It seemed to him the majority of what was in the report was not suitable for Board action because they were operational recommendations which were referred to the superintendent. In addition, the Board had received a staff response to the report of the committee. The Board's discussion of the recommendations had revealed a strong consensus in support of many recommendations.

Mr. Ewing pointed out that on the last page of the Priority 2 report it stated, "notwithstanding the overall success of the efforts identified in this report, the questions of systemwide effectiveness and comprehensiveness in minority education remain unanswered." He was concerned about the first few words of that sentence. It seemed to him the sentence was saying that things were working, but on the other hand not so fast, maybe they were not. With the exception of a few programs, he did not know how they were judging success. He knew that Head Start had been systematically evaluated and, in any event, was not totally a minority education program. Chapter I had been evaluated and, again, was not totally a minority education program. In his judgment in MCPS they had a scattering of programs, many of which were very attractive, had reasonable goals, and were plausible in the kinds of results they were intended to produce. However, they did not know whether these programs were successful or not. They could assert that they were, and in a few cases they had evidence but for the most part they did not. He thought it was an exaggeration when they said "overall success" and cited no evidence of any kind. He did not think it was the right thing to say about this package of activities which was consistent with his general criticism of what they were doing in this whole arena. They did not have a comprehensive approach. They did not have a systemwide approach, and they did not have an approach that was raising and answering the question in a systematic way

as to what they had that was being effective and producing results. Until they had that kind of program, he would be uncomfortable with this kind of report which stated that they had overall success.

Dr. Pitt thought that two people could read that sentence a little differently. He thought the question of how effective they were on a systemwide basis was a difficult question to answer because they had to ask "in terms of what." They had not reached the goals they had established. He knew of no place in the country reaching those goals. They had schools in Montgomery County that had come close to those goals. He differed with Mr. Ewing on the effectiveness of specific programs. It took ten years to gather the data on Head Start. They had gotten into this about two and a half years ago. They were expected to come up with a high degree of success in a very short period. The question was how they measured that success. Test scores were inadequate measurements. They could show short term results in specific programs. They had tried to set up 10 or 12 goals and measure how close they came to those goals each year. He did not know how they measured success over a two or three year period. It would take five to eight years to know whether they had really been successful with this group of young people. He thought it would take a significant amount of time to get at some of this, and in the meantime people were very impatient. They wanted their children to achieve now, and he could not blame them. For this reason, he had asked for some outside help and advice on where to go on this and what they ought to do.

Mr. Ewing commented that he did not disagree with anything Dr. Pitt had said. He thought Dr. Pitt had made his case. The report should have used the words Dr. Pitt had just used. Dr. Pitt said he would have said, "notwithstanding the success of efforts specifically." They could find successes, but the term "overall" was debatable. He was not accepting the argument that they had not made a number of focused efforts with specific children and were able to show these things worked. The question was whether they could work systemically. Mr. Ewing said the issue was they ought not be claiming overall success for these efforts when they did not have the evidence to sustain that. Dr. Pitt agreed.

In regard to recruitment and employment, Dr. Pitt noted that they had 13 goals and had met 12 of those goals. One of the goals was to employ, promote, and retain minority administrators. Their goal was to move to a 20 percent gain, and they had actually appointed 40 percent minority which was a significant gain. Principals and administrators had an important impact as role models. He was concerned that they had only hired 14 percent minority faculty rather than their goal of 19 percent. He expected that goal to be met or exceeded this year and that every effort must be made to do that. He also would like to see more

diversity in minority administrators because they had done better with African Americans than with Asian and Hispanic.

Mr. Chang asked whether coaches were included in the 19 percent goal because coaches were role models. Dr. Pitt explained that the coaches were faculty members. Mrs. Praisner pointed out that in some cases they had coaches who were not teachers in the school system. Dr. Vance pointed out that the number of coaches from the outside was increasing each year. Dr. Pitt said that the issue of hiring coaches was a separate issue because they were having difficulty in recruiting coaches. Mr. Goldensohn pointed out that this was Mr. Chang's first official meeting as a member of the Board.

Re: EXECUTIVE SESSION

The Board of Education met in executive session from 12:10 p.m. to 2:05 p.m. to discuss appeals and calendar. Dr. Cronin rejoined the meeting during executive session.

\*Dr. Shoenberg temporarily left the meeting, and Mr. Goldensohn assumed the chair.

Re: PUBLIC COMMENTS

Judy Koenick appeared before the Board of Education.

RESOLUTION NO. 422-90 Re: PROCUREMENT CONTRACTS OVER \$25,000

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

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

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

87-20 Computer Maintenance - Extension

AWARDEE

United Computer Systems, Inc. \$ 61,000

30-89 Ice Cream and Novelties - Extension

AWARDEE

Briggs Ice Cream Company \$ 475,000

146-89	Snack Foods, Chips and Popcorn- Extension		
	AWARDEE		
	Smelkinson/Sysco	\$	151,620
147-89	Bread and Rolls - Extension		
	AWARDEE		
	Schmidt Baking Company	\$	232,000
148-89	Fresh Donuts - Extension		
	AWARDEE		
	Montgomery Donuts	\$	69,536
149-89	Health Room Supplies and Equipment - Extension		
	AWARDEE		
	Amzura Enterprises, Inc.	\$	10,356*
	Apothecary Products, Inc.		313
	Chaston Medical and Surgical Products (Division of National Development Corporation)		3,535
	Cole Medical, Inc.		19,623
	Foster/Murray-Baumgartner		291
	Gamma Medical System, Inc.		24,826
	William V. MacGill and Company		250
	Maryland Enterprises		372
	Medix Products Corporation		5,485
	Micro Bio-Medics, Inc.		30,785
	Mine Safety Appliance Company		240
	Monumental Paper Company		3,565
	National Health Supply Corporation		1,766
			-----
	Total	\$	101,407
45-90	Fruit Juices/Drinks for Vending - Extension		
	AWARDEE		
	Service America Corporation	\$	229,000

## 137-90 Custodial Supplies

## AWARDEE

Airchem/Capitol Supply, Inc.	\$	54,419
Antietam Paper Company		3,144
Baer Group, Inc.		2,134
Calico Industries, Inc.		128,282
Consolidated Maintenance Supply, Inc.		22,397*
Crown Supply Company		5,307
District Supply, Inc.		27,188*
Fischer-Lang		9,821
Joseph Gartland		55,600
Institutional Buyers Mart, Inc.		1,516*
J & R Supply Corporation		715
Lynn Ladder and Scaffolding Company, Inc.		6,780
Maryland Enterprises, Inc.		35,817
Monumental Paper Company		284,044
Noland Company		14,056
P & L Products, Inc.		256
Pyramid School Products		22,830
Frank W. Winne and Son, Inc.		429
		-----
Total	\$	674,735

## 151-90 Frozen Foods

## AWARDEE

A.W. Schmidt and Son, Inc.	\$	2,677
Annapolis Produce and Restaurant		2,346
Baer Foods, Inc.		56,252
Carroll County Foods		17,900
Granny's Kitchen		12,200
Institutional and Industrial Food Specialties		10,005
Kraft/Feldman Foodservice		10,970
Manassas Frozen Foods		20,866
Smelkinson/Sysco		3,441
		-----
Total	\$	136,657

152-90 Milk, Milk Shake Mixes, Cottage Cheese, Yogurt and  
Fruit Juices

## AWARDEE

Shenandoah Pride	\$	1,290,518
------------------	----	-----------

165-90 Processed Cheese; Cheese Food

AWARDEE

Kraft/Feldman Foodservice \$ 62,320

TOTAL MORE THAN \$25,000 \$3,483,793

\* Denotes MFD vendors

RESOLUTION NO. 423-90 Re: BID NO. 132-90, MICROCOMPUTERS

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

WHEREAS, On June 12, 1990, the Board of Education approved an award to ACC Business Machine Center for Bid No. 132-90, Microcomputers, in the amount of \$1,083,209; and

WHEREAS, ACC Business Machine Center does not comply with mandatory vendor specifications for being an authorized and registered IBM Advanced Product Dealer; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education rescind its award to ACC Business Machine Center and awards Bid No. 132-90, Microcomputers, to the HLA Connecting Point Computer Centers in the amount of \$1,171,672.

RESOLUTION NO. 424-90 Re: PROPRIETARY LEASE/PURCHASE OF SPECIALIZED MICROFILMING EQUIPMENT

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

WHEREAS, It is necessary at this time and in the public interest for the Board of Education to acquire specialized microfilming equipment for Central Records to film student records and required office materials under a lease/purchase agreement to meet the present needs of the public schools; and

WHEREAS, The nature of the required equipment is linked with existing Bell & Howell equipment that is incompatible with other brands, thus making it a proprietary purchase; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education of Montgomery County approve the use of a lease/purchase agreement with Bell & Howell Acceptance Corporation for the acquisition of specialized











WHEREAS, All construction, restoration, and maintenance will be performed at no cost to the Board of Education with Potomac Edison Power Company and its contractors assuming liability for all damages or injury; and

WHEREAS, This right-of-way for installation and future maintenance of electrical facilities will benefit the new school; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the president and secretary be authorized to execute a Right-of-Way Agreement to the benefit of the Potomac Edison Power Company for the land required to install underground electrical facilities at the future Damascus cluster elementary school on Cutsail Drive.

RESOLUTION NO. 432-90      Re:    GRANT OF RIGHT-OF-WAY TO POTOMAC  
EDISON POWER COMPANY AT DAMASCUS  
ELEMENTARY SCHOOL AND DAMASCUS HIGH  
SCHOOL

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

WHEREAS, The Potomac Edison Power Company has requested a right-of-way for the relocation of electrical facilities in connection with the widening of Ridge Road (MD 27) adjacent to Damascus Elementary School and Damascus High School; and

WHEREAS, This right-of-way includes placement of an anchor guy wire on an existing utility pole adjacent to Bethesda Church Road and installation of a junction compartment on the northeast property corner of the Damascus Elementary School site; and

WHEREAS, This right-of-way also includes relocation of four existing poles adjacent to Ridge Road (MD 27) and installation of one manhole on the northwest property corner of the Damascus High School site; and

WHEREAS, All construction, restoration, and maintenance will be performed at no cost to the Board of Education with Potomac Edison Power company and their contractors assuming liability for all damages or injury; and

WHEREAS, The proposed right-of-way will not affect any land that could be used for school programming and recreational activities; and

WHEREAS, This right-of-way for installation and future maintenance of electrical facilities will benefit both schools, by undergrounding existing overhead facilities adjacent to the Damascus Elementary School, and improving sight distance and

access at both schools by allowing the road improvement to proceed; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the president and secretary be authorized to execute a Right-of-Way Agreement to the benefit of the Potomac Edison Power Company for the land required to place and maintain utility poles and ancillary electrical facilities at Damascus Elementary School and Damascus High School.

\*Dr. Shoenberg rejoined the meeting and assumed the chair.

RESOLUTION NO. 433-90 Re: PRESENTATION OF PRELIMINARY PLANS -  
MEADOW HALL ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

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

WHEREAS, The architect for the new Meadow Hall Elementary School has prepared a schematic design in accordance with the educational specifications; and

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

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education approve the preliminary plan report for the Meadow Hall Elementary School addition developed by Hayes, Seay, Mattern & Mattern, Inc.

\*Dr. Cronin temporarily left the meeting at this point.

RESOLUTION NO. 434-90 Re: MONTHLY PERSONNEL REPORT

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Mrs. Praisner seconded by Mr. Goldensohn, 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. 435-90 Re: EXTENSION OF SICK LEAVE

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

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

July 10, 1990

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

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

NAME	POSITION AND LOCATION	NO. OF DAYS
Luckey, Beverly	Media Assistant Twinbrook ES	15

RESOLUTION NO. 436-90      Re: DEATH OF MRS. IRENE P. GOODROE,  
CLASSROOM TEACHER AT DUFIEF  
ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

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

WHEREAS, The death on June 11, 1990, of Mrs. Irene P. Goodroe, a classroom teacher at DuFief Elementary, has deeply saddened the staff and members of the Board of Education; and

WHEREAS, In the four years that Mrs. Goodroe had been a member of the staff of Montgomery County Public Schools, she provided a rewarding learning experience for her students; and

WHEREAS, Mrs. Goodroe was respected by the staff, student body and community as a challenging teacher and true professional; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the members of the Board of Education express their sorrow at the death of Mrs. Irene P. Goodroe and extend deepest sympathy to her family; and be it further

RESOLVED, That this resolution be made part of the minutes of this meeting and a copy be forwarded to Mrs. Goodroe's family.

RESOLUTION NO. 437-90      Re: DEATH OF RAUL R. JONES, ESOL  
TEACHER AT WOOD ACRES ELEMENTARY  
SCHOOL

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

WHEREAS, The death on June 26, 1990, of Raul R. Jones, an ESOL teacher at Wood Acres Elementary School, has deeply saddened the staff and members of the Board of Education; and





July 10, 1990

NAME	FROM	TO
Margaret Egan	Principal, Interm. Div. of Academic Skills	Classroom Teacher Location to be determined Will maintain salary status; to retire 7-1-91
Gladys Magwood	A&S Teacher Lake Seneca ES	Instructional Asst. Location to be determined Will maintain salary status; to retire 7-1-92

RESOLUTION NO. 440-90      Re:   PERSONNEL APPOINTMENTS, TRANSFERS,  
AND REASSIGNMENTS

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

RESOLVED, That the following personnel appointments, transfers, and reassignments be approved:

APPOINTMENT	PRESENT POSITION	AS
Kenneth Garrison	Principal Trainee Whetstone ES	Principal Whetstone ES Effective: 7-11-90
Sherri K. Rindler	Asst. Principal Cresthaven ES	Principal Stone Mill ES Effective: 7-11-90

TEMPORARY REASSIGNMENT FOR THE 1990-91 SCHOOL YEAR

NAME AND PRESENT POSITION	POSITION EFFECTIVE JULY 11, 1990	POSITION EFFECTIVE JULY 1, 1991
Philip Sheridan Acting Director Div. of Adult Ed. and Summer School	A&S Teacher	10-month teacher
John Schneider Former Principal White Oak IS	A&S Teacher	Principal

APPOINTMENT	PRESENT POSITION	AS
Marion L. Bell	Acting Adult Ed. Specialist Div. of Adult Ed.	Director Div. of Adult Ed. & Summer School Effective: 7-11-90

APPOINTMENT	PRESENT POSITION	AS
Richard Bishop	Admin. Intern B-CC HS	Asst. Principal B-CC HS Effective: 7-11-90
Ann Burrill	Admin. Intern Damascus HS	Asst. Principal Damascus HS Effective: 7-11-90
Margaret Donnellon	Admin. Intern Pyle MS	Asst. Principal Pyle MS Effective: 7-11-90
Carole Goodman	Admin. Intern Magruder HS	Asst. Principal Magruder HS Effective: 7-11-90
Carrie Miller	Admin. Intern Quince Orchard HS	Asst. Principal Quince Orchard HS Effective: 7-11-90
Durinda Yates	Admin. Intern Farquhar MS	Asst. Principal Farquhar MS Effective: 7-11-90
REASSIGNMENT	FROM	TO
Paul Scott	Director of Minority Ed.	Supervisor of Elem. Instruction, Area 1 Admin. Office Effective: 7-11-90
TRANSFER	FROM	TO
David Chalfant	Asst. Principal Hoover MS	Asst. Principal Earle B. Wood MS Effective: 7-11-90
Madeleine Coleman	Asst. Principal Earle B. Wood MS	Asst. Principal Hoover MS Effective: 7-11-90
John Paicos	Asst. Principal Banneker MS	Asst. Principal Springbrook HS Effective: 7-11-90
John Nori	Asst. Principal Magruder HS	Asst. Principal Gaithersburg IS Effective: 7-11-90

July 10, 1990

TRANSFER	FROM	TO
Rosalva Rosas	Asst. Principal Frost IS	Asst. Principal Springbrook HS Effective: 7-11-90
James Atha	Asst. Principal Brown Station ES	Asst. Principal Diamond ES Effective: 7-11-90
Jesse Beard	Asst. Principal Whetstone ES	Asst. Principal Clopper Mill ES Effective: 7-11-90
Donald Jackson	Principal DuFief ES	Asst. Principal Beall ES Effective: 7-11-90
Walter Tozier	Asst. Principal Goshen ES	Asst. Principal South Lake ES Effective: 7-11-90

Re: CONSTRUCTION PROGRESS REPORT

Mr. Richard Hawes, director of the Division of Construction, reported on the status of new schools and school modernizations. They would have occupancy by the scheduled dates for Westbrook, McNair, Stedwick, Whetstone, Burnt Mills, Cloverly, and Key. Occupancy of Rachel Carson and Sequoyah Elementary Schools was going to be very tight, and he agreed to provide the Board with follow-up reports on these schools. Mr. Goldensohn requested information on what it would take to put water coolers in the relocatable classrooms at Summit Hall Elementary School.

Re: NATIONAL AND STATE EDUCATION GOALS

Dr. Shoenberg reported that a number of national goals for education had been developed as the result of a conference involving the National Governors Association, the president, and the Department of Education. Through the Sondheim Commission and the state superintendent of schools, some goals had been developed for Maryland along with a process for helping the state meet those goals. The Board had been asked by the governor to make suggestions about how the state should organize to meet the national goals and how those goals should be framed in terms of state activity. He pointed out that in a sense the activity of the state superintendent had already framed some of those goals, but the Board did need to respond to the governor. Ms. Melissa Bahr, staff assistant, had prepared a paper which compared national goals, state goals, and the strategies proposed by Maryland. The superintendent also had a video tape that had been prepared for principals to indicate what was happening with the state strategies. He asked Ms. Bahr and Dr. Richard Towers,

director of the Department of Alternative and Supplementary Education, to come to the table. Dr. Pitt suggested that Mrs. Katheryn Gemberling, associate superintendent, should be involved in the discussion as well.

Dr. Pitt thanked Dr. Shoenberg for his summary and pointed out that things were moving rapidly on the state level with the state Board of Education's adoption of many recommendations. He said that at the national level they were still in the talking and philosophical stage, but at the state level implementation was going on. Dr. Shoenberg suggested starting with the national goals. Dr. Cronin asked if staff could point out where MCPS would stand if a national goal were adopted right now.

The first national goal was that all children in America will start school ready to learn. Dr. Shoenberg pointed out that the state had some things they were going to do to find out if students were ready, but both the state and national goals did not have a definition of "ready to learn." He suggested that the Board point out in its letter to the governor that operational definitions were a little hard to come by. Mrs. Gemberling commented that the state was looking to have a statewide instrument and, while MCPS did screening of Head Start children, she knew of no single instrument to give to students to say they were ready for first grade.

Dr. Shoenberg noted that there was a series of articles in the POST about Virginia schools and the number of students who were flunking kindergarten. Dr. Pitt explained that in Montgomery County they tried to prepare youngsters so that when they got to first grade they were ready to read. He would guess that if a test were given today that Montgomery County would score fairly high; however, the goal here was for the year 2000 and he would guess that it might be more of a problem then. At present most of the ESOL population started school in the first through fourth grades rather than kindergarten. He pointed out that MCPS now had a greater emphasis on early childhood programs to help children get ready and they were expanding Head Start.

Dr. Cronin commented that the goal was "ready to learn," not "ready to read" which encompasses a much broader range of skills than a simple reading readiness test. Mrs. Gemberling commented it was unrealistic to think one single instrument could be used. Right now they used age in terms of readiness for first grade. Kindergarten was a voluntary program, and they could never fail a student or require a student to repeat kindergarten. Dr. Shoenberg pointed out that one of the state strategies would require kindergarten.

Dr. Towers said that even while the state was asking for response to these goals and strategies, the state was already asking LEAs to come up with data to support the state goals in addition to

the Maryland School Performance Plan. Dr. Shoenberg said the one issue was how much attention to local input the state people really wanted to pay. The real issue was the degree to which the state Board and the state Department of Education were preempting and controlling local forms of schooling.

Mr. Ewing pointed out that the state estimated that kindergarten enrollment would go up by about five percent if kindergarten were mandatory. He assumed it would not have that much of an impact in Montgomery County, and Dr. Pitt agreed because very few Montgomery County children did not attend some kind of kindergarten program.

Mr. Ewing understood that they did not fail kindergarten students, but he wondered what they knew about what first grade teachers had to say about how ready students were for a variety of learning experiences. Dr. Pitt replied that they did have transitional first grades. These were for children who were not ready for first grade or for children who moved into the county and had not had a kindergarten experience. Typical first grades contained a wide range of students from those ready to read to those reading on a third or fifth grade level. Some children did not have prereading skills, social abilities, or long enough attention spans and probably needed some transition before entering a full first grade. First grade teachers also varied in terms of their own perceptions of these ranges.

Mrs. Gemberling said that in conversations with principals of the primary schools they had talked about making sure first grade teachers were looking for readiness to read or to do math rather than the expectation that the child would enter first grade reading and doing math. They had to give the child the opportunity to get ready. Dr. Pitt said they had to convince the state about these issues. In some states they had very structured programs, and in order to get promoted out of kindergarten, the child had to pass certain requirements. In Montgomery County they were trying to assure that children had the skills they needed to succeed in school. This was what Head Start did. He would not like the state to have a very structured program that flunked a lot of children.

Ms. Bahr reported that one of the strategies suggested to the state was to have K-3 automatic promotion rather than prescreening and testing prior to the first grade. The state Board thought this was too directive to the LEAs, but she thought there was a possibility of this reappearing on their agenda.

Mrs. Praisner thought they needed to respond to the governor. She also thought they should raise questions that needed to be raised at this point as she knew the superintendents were raising in their meetings. However, local boards had not had the opportunity to raise questions with the state. She had felt this

way about the Sondheim Commission report, and she felt that it was imperative to have firm definitions. There needed to be a philosophy of what they meant before they started. In this particular case she was concerned about the narrowness of the way that it was being defined by the measurement and by the state strategy. For example, when they looked at early intervention services these were defined as the use of state and federal funds for special education and vocational education. They should involve other agencies such as family services, and they needed to make clear that there were interrelationships with other agencies and other funds.

Mrs. Praisner pointed out that the proposal for mandatory kindergarten did not make reference to the impact on school facilities. The state had a relationship to costs associated with mandatory kindergarten from the standpoint of space that they were not looking at. She kept coming back to funding as she looked at all of this. There were only two counties in Maryland providing full-day programs systemwide, and they were two of the poorer countries, Garrett and Caroline. Yet, by definition, those were the school systems for whom the proposals were being made. Montgomery County had to raise the issue of services within kindergarten, the length of the kindergarten program, and the space issue. They also had to create some way of raising the implications for and the perspective of the local board of education.

Ms. Bahr reported that the goals themselves had been adopted by the state Board as well as the performance program as a concept. The strategies had not been adopted. There would be a public hearing on state strategies on July 24 which would be an appropriate time to raise concerns. She had provided Board members with copies of the state strategies as well as the Board paper on goals. The strategies paper did outline some of the costs and did talk about interagency cooperation and coordination. Mrs. Praisner pointed out that in that document they did not include the impact of adding kindergarten on school construction which in Maryland was a state cost. Their cost in the report was a per pupil cost implication, not a space implication.

Dr. Cronin commented that although these might be fine standards and laudable goals, they had a cost and that cost was going to be borne by certain areas of the state. For example, there was a recommendation for one computer for every ten students, but the Maryland State Department of Education was recommending shared funding using a formula to equalize wealth. He wondered what county was expected to provide the funds.

Ms. Bahr reported that the state was also going to put forward a lot of these programs separately in their own budget. For

example, they expected to include a fund to purchase computers; however, this would be on an equalization formula.

Dr. Shoenberg said that the next goal had to do with the high school graduation rate. The national goal was 90 percent, and the state goal was 95 percent by the year 2000. The Maryland measure was the percentage of students completing a high school. He asked about the contradiction between high school graduation and earning a diploma. He wondered whether students had to stay in high school and complete the requirements by age 18, or up to the age of 18, or before they reached 18. Ms. Bahr explained the strategy was diploma or certificate or age 18. Dr. Shoenberg asked about students at Longview who received a certificate of attendance at age 21 and whether they were included in the 95 percent. Dr. Towers did not think that the state had thought this out in terms of special populations.

Ms. Bahr said that the state had discussed the difference between measuring entering freshmen and exiting seniors within a four-year period. There were students who attended night school rather than dropping out, so the state was talking about completion rather than a four-year period measurement. Dr. Shoenberg thought that the state was going to have to come to some kind of definition on how they did the count.

In regard to the 1984 changes in graduation requirements that provided for a higher level graduation degree, for only so many credits within a year, and the option of a certificate or diploma, Mrs. Praisner asked if they had an MCPS assessment of the effect of those changes that they might want to use in testimony. Mrs. Gemberling was not aware of any formal study that had been done since the requirements went into effect. Mrs. Praisner thought they needed to know the effect of the last change on the school system. She pointed out that in the state strategies it talked about how students had to earn 20 credits with four of them earned in the senior year. The paper then stated that this inflexibility hampered youth. It seemed to her the pendulum was starting to swing. In 1984 MCPS had stated that it had problems with the requirements, and now the state was beginning to look at this. Montgomery County now needed to say that maybe the state should be cautious about other changes.

Mr. Ewing assumed that they now exceeded the national goal and the state goal. He asked about the effect of the state strategy for compulsory school attendance to age 18. Dr. Pitt thought there would be an impact. He pointed out that there would be a state task force to review this issue. He would like to see flexibility for students including night school. Mr. Ewing asked if the age requirement would increase the number of students attending and the percentage graduating. Dr. Pitt replied that the issue was how many people passed their subjects which was difficult to say. They would have to set up programs in the

schools to support students who were not making it. Just telling a student he had to attend school wasn't going to get that student through school. They had to devise a strategy to support that student who had not succeeded or who was having great difficulty. He thought they would end up developing more alternative programs for students, and he was not sure that was not a good idea. Dr. Cronin thought that while the strategy might lower the drop-out rate, it would increase the truant rate. The strategy did not take into account those students who had to earn a living.

Dr. Shoenberg said the next goal was on student achievement and citizenship. One of his problems was that the measures were not measures of achievement, particularly the SAT. However, there were some other measures listed, and he asked about the status of those. Dr. Towers replied that the statewide criterion referenced tests were yet to be developed, and they did not know what the standard for satisfactory performance would be. If the state was talking about minimum requirements, they would use the functional tests. They already had standards in terms of the percentage of students who would pass that. In terms of past performance, MCPS was in the satisfactory range, and there were few that they had reached excellence on. Ms. Bahr pointed out that the requirement was for Maryland to rank in the top five states in the nation and, of course, they could not use the statewide CRTs for a national comparison.

Dr. Shoenberg asked whether the assessment plan for the Sondheim report including teams of teachers visiting schools had found its way into the state plan. Ms. Bahr replied that it did when they got into the state's response to Sondheim as far as school accreditation. However, there wasn't anything they could tie into in the strategies unless it was coming through the performance program that was going to incorporate different types of measures of student achievement.

Dr. Towers reported that in Sondheim and the statewide CRTs they were emphasizing higher order intellectual skills, integration of various subjects, having measures of knowledge, skills, and processes in reading and math and writing, language use, science, social studies, etc. All of this was not necessarily measured in some of the national assessments which made it hard to understand how comparisons would be made nationally.

Dr. Shoenberg thought they felt more comfortable with the whole tone and thrust of Sondheim than either the state superintendent's goals or the national goals which by nature were fairly simple. He said that any comments they made had to emphasize that there were things that were measured and assessed, not by looking at test scores or by counting bodies, but by having some knowledgeable person coming in to look at what was going on. To allow only countable things to be measures of



assessment would be to lose an incredible opportunity for improving people's understanding of what went on and ought to go on in schools and would be incongruous with the full purpose of schools.

Dr. Cronin asked for a definition of "school data based areas." Dr. Shoenberg indicated that they needed a definition here or another term because it made no grammatical sense whatsoever. Dr. Pitt remarked that MCPS might end up being the supplier for most of the data for the state because they were the most advanced technically in some of these areas, and the state had already asked for their help. It seemed to him that the state was saying that these were basic kinds of things they expected and that they assumed local school systems would have many other goals. However, counties would have to focus on the state mandates, which was a kind of a Catch 22.

It seemed to Mr. Ewing that the whole goal area was extremely fuzzy, vague, and general. He also thought it did not provide adequate, accurate, useful, and sensible measures. He did not know how the state expected to compare itself to the top five states in the nation if the other 45 states did not adopt the same measures. As far as international comparisons, he did not think that other countries used the SAT. Other countries did not have high schools like American high schools, and there would be no points of comparison.

Mrs. Gemberling was concerned about use of the SAT because only a selected population took the test, and they would be comparing individual schools. In Montgomery County they encouraged students to stretch themselves and try to go on to higher education. If the school's rating depended on its SAT scores, they might be more selective as to who took the test. She said the highest SAT score was in South Dakota where about three percent of the students took the test.

Dr. Pitt reported that he and other superintendents had met with the state superintendent on a number of occasions, and he thought Dr. Shilling was listening to them. There seemed to be an intent to look at some of the testing they were using and modify some of it. While the state Board had adopted the goals, Dr. Pitt thought there would be some modifications in the implementation of the goals.

Mrs. Praisner asked if the program data-based areas had been adopted, and Ms. Bahr replied that they had by resolution in April. Mrs. Praisner pointed out that they would have to start reporting these either in 1991 or 1992, and she was wondering about the relationship of these for ninth grade and the MCPS eighth grade plan. Dr. Towers replied that they had been asked for a head count in terms of numbers of youngsters by that grade level who had post-secondary plans. Following that, a documented

twelfth grade plan would be phased in. However, there was some question as to how useful this was going to be. MCPS was already doing much of that now, but the rest of the state was not. Mrs. Praisner suggested that this was an issue for public testimony. In areas where MCPS had experience, they would raise some questions.

Mrs. Praisner had some concerns about the relationships of information to the outcome question measures. She had spent some time looking at the whole issue of mobility. Mobility was a phenomenon that occurred in every school, depending on how it was defined, because students came in and went out every year. Communities had come to the Board requesting extra help because they had a "high mobility" school; however, no one had ever defined what was meant by high mobility and what was the effect of mobility on the school.

Dr. Towers reported that all of the items would have operational definitions that were being collected and transmitted to the state for inclusion in the November report. They had a manual that the state staff had put together which contained some operational definitions for the items they were collecting now. Next year they would have operational definitions for 1991. Mrs. Praisner suggested that the Board be provided with copies of the manual. She also thought they should testify on these definitions. Dr. Towers commented that it was one thing to come up with a policy, but when it was operationalized in terms of how it would be reported, the decision had been made and that was not the part the policy makers were usually asked to comment on. The bureaucracy usually came up with operational definitions, and LEAs did not have much opportunity for input.

Dr. Cronin called attention to the national goal which stated that U.S. students will be first in the world in mathematics and science achievement. To him, the state strategy was just a conglomeration of words. The state did not tell him what it intended to do about teacher training, revising policies, assisting students, etc. Ms. Bahr called attention to the next page which was a laundry list of state strategies that did not fit the national or state goals. Mr. Ewing pointed out that the national goal on math and science was unclear in that it did not specify levels of achievement, and the state goal of increasing by 50 percent the number of students going to study math and science after high school did not mean they would achieve a first in the world in math and science.

Mr. Ewing observed that in the Sondheim report there was a list of factors thought to influence student achievement including wealth per pupil. He did not think wealth per pupil by itself was a good measure unless it was combined with tax effort. Ms. Bahr called attention to the equitable funding issue. In addition, the state strategy report had some charts talking about

the interrelationship between wealth per pupil and other facts including the passing rates on the functional tests.

Dr. Pitt explained that cost per pupil was very complicated. One of the major costs per pupil had to do with teacher salaries, and they could not equate teacher salaries totally because they had to do with the cost of living. A good teacher could elect to live in other parts of Maryland at a much lower cost than he or she could live in Montgomery County. They could not say one system paid \$7,000 per student and another \$4,000 more per student and assume that meant a student received \$3,000 more education. Mrs. Praisner stated that the point was there were lots of resources available beyond just the salary of teachers. For example, in the case of the ratio of computers to students, they could find four of the lower quartile school systems with the better ratio of students to computers. This might relate to population numbers or initiatives, but there were a variety of choices that had been made within those jurisdictions. The point was they had to be careful about making assumptions.

Dr. Pitt pointed out that another example might be a school system concentrating all their resources on the competency tests and forgetting about the variation in young people. He felt that a county school system had to serve all children and serve the range of children. Mrs. Praisner called attention to the charts about enrollment with special needs and/or added program costs. They had raised the point with the Linowes Commission with the state Board that this list might not be all of the items that needed to be compared. They might consider making up a chart listing other characteristics. In addition, it might be interesting to look at mobility as it related to some of those other characteristics.

Dr. Towers said that Sondheim made an assumption that the vital core of student information was affected by certain other factors. These unquestioned factors were put into the Maryland School Performance Program. Mrs. Praisner said it was her point that they might want to look at things other than wealth per pupil, staffing, instructional time, etc. Dr. Pitt agreed and cited the example of ESOL. About two years ago there were about 8,000 to 9,000 ESOL students in Maryland, but about 5,000 of them were in Montgomery County. Montgomery County had made an enormous commitment to ESOL in terms of basic programs and programs that really tried to do something for these students. If that cost were removed, it would reduce costs of MCPS considerably, but they had made a commitment here. The problem was that other places might not have made this commitment to ESOL.

Board members viewed a videotape narrated by Dr. Towers which explained to principals what was going on at the state level.

Dr. Pitt pointed out that Montgomery County already published their functional test data by local school and by race and sex. They would continue to publish this information; however, the state requirement for publishing would be new for other counties. He noted that about 19 of the counties in the state were probably going to give the new state normed standardized test in addition to the CRTs which would take about nine hours to administer. The state was sampling 250 students per grade, and in some of the smaller systems there were only 250 students per grade. Therefore, these counties would give the tests to all of their students. In Montgomery County it would not be a majority of students.

Dr. Pitt stated that in regard to minority education the CRTs would have to be adapted, and they would not have the data right away. For the first year, the data would be general. The only thing that would be changed was reporting test scores by race in all instances. Previously, they had not done this in certain situations because of the small number of students in some schools. This would be a problem for other school systems as well.

Dr. Pitt commented that Dr. Towers had done an outstanding job in working with the state. Mrs. Praisner asked that Board members be provided with copies of the state manual. Dr. Shoenberg asked Ms. Bahr to draft a response to the governor which could be shared with Board members. Ms. Bahr suggested that the Board testify on the state standards at the public hearing on August 28. Dr. Pitt thought that Montgomery County would be very close to "satisfactory" in most areas. He was bothered about the 95 percent goal, and he suggested that the state include references to the improvements school systems would make and local schools would make. He had tried to make this point in discussions with the state superintendent. Mrs. Praisner suggested that they also testify at the July 24 hearing on state strategies.

Mr. Fess pointed out that the state Board of Education was having meetings on funding issues. He suggested that the Board might wish to have an update after the next state discussion. Mrs. Praisner asked that Board members be provided with the National School Boards Association response to the national goals. Dr. Shoenberg thanked staff for their work.

Re: MOTION BY MR. EWING TO ADOPT A  
POLICY ADDING EXPERIENCE AND  
ADVANCED EDUCATION WHEN HIRING NEW  
TEACHERS

The following motion by Mr. Ewing failed of adoption with Mr. Chang, Mr. Ewing, Mr. Goldensohn, and Mrs. Hobbs voting in the affirmative; Dr. Cronin, Mrs. DiFonzo, Mrs. Praisner, and Dr. Shoenberg voting in the negative:

WHEREAS, The Montgomery County Public School system each year employs a large number of newly hired teachers; and

WHEREAS, Montgomery County needs to employ the best available teachers to provide excellent education for all students; and

WHEREAS, It is important that the county employ a substantial number of highly experienced, highly educated teachers, in the interest of ensuring that the best available teachers are employed; and

WHEREAS, It is also important to bring into the school system a substantial number of teachers who may be highly qualified, but who lack experience and advanced education, in order to achieve balance in the teaching staff and to bring fresh new perspectives to bear on teaching; and

WHEREAS, The county now does not include experience as an explicit factor in the formula it uses for evaluating those it is considering hiring as teachers; and

WHEREAS, There is a need to ensure that the large pool of highly educated, highly experienced teachers is tapped and those that meet MCPS requirements are sought out and hired; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the superintendent be requested to bring to the Board for its approval one or more options for adding experience and advanced education as specific elements in the formula for hiring new teachers; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education declares that it is the policy of the Montgomery County Public Schools that experienced and highly educated applicants for teaching positions shall be given more weight in hiring than those with lesser experience and education, unless there are specific reasons for a determination that advanced education and experience should not be weighted as highly; these reasons might include the need to employ specific categories of teachers to meet other objectives of the school system; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education expresses its concern that the very substantial numbers of new teachers employed in elementary schools should receive substantial preschool-year training, beyond that now being offered; this training should be offered in such areas as: the Montgomery County curriculum, early childhood educational techniques appropriate to Montgomery County, and the management of aides and other teachers within the classroom, since the

expectation is that in the future every classroom teacher in the early elementary years will need to manage other teachers or aides.

RESOLUTION NO. 441-90      Re:    APPROVAL OF REVISED PSYCHOLOGY 2  
CURRICULUM

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

WHEREAS, The public school laws of Maryland specify that the county superintendent shall prepare courses of study and recommend them for adoption by the county board (THE ANNOTATED COST OF THE PUBLIC GENERAL LAWS OF MARYLAND, EDUCATION [Volume], Sec. 4-205); and

WHEREAS, The public school laws of Maryland also state that the county board of education, on the written recommendation of the county superintendent, shall establish courses of study for the schools under its jurisdiction (IBID., Sec. 4-110); and

WHEREAS, The PROGRAM OF STUDIES is the document that contains the prescribed curriculum elements, including instructional objectives, of all MCPS curriculum programs and courses (MCPS Regulation IFB-RA Development and Approval of Curriculum and Supporting Materials); and

WHEREAS, Excellence in curriculum can be maintained only by continuing attention to the need for curriculum change; and

WHEREAS, The Council on Instruction, charged by the superintendent with considering recommendations for curriculum change, has recommended approval of the revised curriculum for Psychology 2; and

WHEREAS, The superintendent recommends that the Board of Education approve this revision; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education approve the revised curriculum for Psychology 2 for inclusion in the MCPS PROGRAM OF STUDIES, to become effective for the 1990-91 school year.

Re:    BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS

1. Mr. Ewing reported that three individuals in the Hodges Heights community had complained to him about community school evening activities at Takoma Park Intermediate School. Dr. Gail Ayers of the Interagency Coordinating Board was aware of this issue, and the superintendent was on top of this issue. This was

likely to be an issue elsewhere. When there was trouble, the school system got blamed. Explanations referring people to the ICB were regarded as cop-outs and a failure of the school system to deal with the issue. It underscored his view that the community school program ought to be run by the school system. Dr. Pitt indicated that he had called Dr. Ayres who had given orders to the building coordinator to let people know they must move out of the parking lot after their activities were completed.

2. Dr. Cronin said he had been approached by community members wanting to know why there was not more space at Oak View in order to expand the program there. He had referred them to their civic association and the County Council.

3. Mr. Goldensohn asked for some clarification of what was happening to the gifted and talented program and support staff from the area office. He wanted to know how the budget cuts had affected the centers as well. He asked for this information in writing. He wanted to see the changes in staff relative to gifted and talented as to who was doing what in the centers and in gifted and talented support in general.

4. Mr. Goldensohn stated that in 1988 they had had discussions about a special program for the upcounty. In a memo, Dr. Pitt had stated that they ought to wait until 1990 before deciding whether a special program was needed upcounty. In the memo, he said that if projections held up he would recommend that planning begin in 1991 with the opening of the program in September, 1992. Mr. Goldensohn asked that this issue be put on the Board's list of items to be scheduled. He noted that there was an article in the newspaper about the special program at Poolesville, and he wondered if the two issues were related. Dr. Pitt explained that in the capital budget the Board had approved a special program for Poolesville which was separate from the issue of a special upcounty program.

5. Mrs. Hobbs reported that some Board members had attended the superintendent's A&S conference on June 29. She had attended a session on "Looking at Montgomery County Family Trends and Supports," which was presented by Chuck Short and Odessa Shannon. Mrs. Shannon had asked whether there was any way of finding out how many students in the 16 to 19 age bracket were working full time or part time. Dr. Pitt thought they might be able to get some of this information from the survey on graduates. Dr. Vance indicated that he had monthly meetings with Mrs. Shannon and would discuss this request with her. Dr. Shoenberg felt that this would be useful information for the school system to have for its own uses.

6. Mrs. Praisner offered congratulations to Kevin Keegan and the Rockville High School team that scored in the national tournament

July 10, 1990

of academic excellence. She asked if they would continue next year with their Mr. Keegan's program on the MCPS cable station. Dr. Vance replied that they would and strongly supported the program.

RESOLUTION NO. 442-90 Re: EXECUTIVE SESSION - JULY 23, 1990

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

WHEREAS, The Board of Education of Montgomery County is authorized by Section 10-508, State Government Article of the ANNOTATED CODE OF MARYLAND to conduct certain of its meetings in executive closed session; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education of Montgomery County hereby conduct its meeting in executive closed session beginning on July 23, 1990, at 7:30 p.m. to discuss, consider, deliberate, and/or otherwise decide the employment, assignment, appointment, promotion, demotion, compensation, discipline, removal, or resignation of employees, appointees, or officials over whom it has jurisdiction, or any other personnel matter affecting one or more particular individuals and to comply with a specific constitutional, statutory or judicially imposed requirement that prevents public disclosures about a particular proceeding or matter as permitted under the State Government Article, Section 10-508; and that such meeting shall continue in executive closed session until the completion of business.

RESOLUTION NO. 443-90 Re: BOE APPEAL NO. 1990-22

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

RESOLVED, That BOE Appeal No. 1990-22 (a transfer matter) be dismissed at the request of the appellant.

RESOLUTION NO. 444-90 Re: BOE APPEAL NO. 1990-19

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

RESOLVED, The Board of Education adopt its Decision and Order in BOE Appeal No. 1990-19 (a transfer matter).

\*Dr. Shoenberg announced that the fifth vote was Ms. Serino's. This appeal had been acted upon during her term on the Board.



## Re: NEW BUSINESS

1. Mr. Ewing moved and Mr. Goldensohn seconded the following:

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education directs the superintendent to develop for Board consideration a policy on plagiarism that covers both students and employees (teachers, principals, administrators, and so forth); and be it further

RESOLVED, That such policy would define plagiarism, give guidance on how to avoid it, and provide serious penalties for it.

2. Mr. Ewing moved and Mr. Goldensohn seconded the following:

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education schedule a discussion of the Richard Montgomery High School class rank report and the issues involved; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the superintendent's pilot not go into effect until after the discussion is held, and that the superintendent be asked to spell out precisely what the pilot entails, e.g., how it would work, how long it would last, and what it would mean for students and teachers, among other questions.

3. Mr. Ewing moved and Mrs. Hobbs seconded the following:

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education schedule a discussion of moral and ethical values and issues in education, and a review of the options for teaching moral and ethical values and issues successfully in Montgomery County schools.

## Re: ITEM OF INFORMATION

Board members received Items in Process as an item of information.

## Re: ADJOURNMENT

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

-----  
PRESIDENT

-----  
SECRETARY

HP:mlw