

NUMBER: 48-1990  
STATUS: APPROVED  
PLACE: ROCKVILLE, MARYLAND  
DATE: NOVEMBER 28, 1990  
TEXT:



was a problem of diversity and a problem of pluralism in that in earlier periods they had had greater consensus with respect to the purposes, the values, and the goals toward which schooling was directed. As the population diversified and as they had become increasingly democratic, all of them were working toward more than a single goal. For example, he had grown up in rural North Carolina and had attended a segregated school and had learned how to live in that community. However, he had also learned how to live in the community of the Ivy League. A part of what they were about was trying to help people fit into a society where they had to play many roles and meet many standards despite the fact that they were a very diverse group.

Therefore, they had the problem of diversity and pluralism in a school system with a great reputation for dealing with a relatively homogeneous population and a population with a narrow range of goals, purposes, and values. The surface problem was the problem of differential levels of achievement among minority and, he suspected, class groups.

Dr. Gordon reported that the second chapter was a review of the literature. They were trying to show what was happening around the country in relation to the education of minority groups. The reason for doing that was to look at how Montgomery County was doing against that background. They ended up concluding that a lot of the best practices around the country were replicated in Montgomery County. One could not say that it was for a lack of ideas that the problem existed.

The following chapter looked at the status of minority achievement in the county. There was nothing new in the chapter because everyone knew that if one looked at the scores, the Asian American and European American students tended to score the highest with a segment of the Asian American population being in serious academic trouble. Then they had black and Hispanic groups scoring about a standard deviation below the Asian Americans and European Americans. From there they went on to several small studies they did and the recommendations grew out of the perceptions from those studies.

Dr. Gordon recalled the movie, "On Golden Pond," where the grandfather and the grandchild were trying to cope with new situations with both of them trying their best. There were many times as he talked to people in the county, looked at data, and visited schools that he thought of that scene because it seemed to him to be metaphoric of the situation in the county. They had a stable and proud school system that was aging. They had newcomers who were very different, and they had different situations. The world was changing, and everyone was struggling. Some folks not making it in the system were frustrated and were critical of what was going on. The problem was exacerbated by

the fact that some of the people in the system were also frustrated. Some of the worst times in Dr. Gordon's career were when he had not received the response he wanted from his students. He sensed this sense of frustration in some teachers. Dr. Gordon said that he suspected that if Dr. Pitt had asked for only one recommendation, he would have cited staff development. It seemed to him that one of the things the system had to do was to recognize the staff they were working with would be the staff they had for a while. The job of the system was to bring these people to the point where they could help do the job that had to be done. Staff had told him frequently that they were under some pressure to increase test scores for minority students. However, they did not know how to do this and no one was telling them how to do this, and they began to blame the folk they were supposed to be helping. People did not blame themselves, but rather they blamed the children, their homes, or the principal. Dr. Gordon emphasized that they had to help people to stop struggling so much with each other and enable them to struggle with the problem.

Dr. Gordon commented that there were a lot of issues that came up in the course of their study that they did not get a chance to deal with. He thought they ought to be on the future Board's agenda. He repeatedly heard people talking about the crisis in the development of African-American boys. Some people even called them an endangered species. They were not able to look at that problem very carefully, but they agreed that it was a real problem. The first thing to do about it was to better understand it.

Dr. Gordon remarked that the second was a much more subtle problem. This was the personal social development of minority females. He had heard this from the Asian American, Hispanic, and African American communities. He even heard it when he was talking with the very few native American folk he spoke to. The young girls were doing reasonably well academically, but there was a worry about their personal social development. Being a minority woman in a majority situation presented special problems.

Dr. Gordon reported that Dr. Cheung had some excellent statistics on the third problem which was the recruitment and retention of minority staff. This was clearly a real problem, and one only had to visit schools to see that problem. He had spoken with the personnel people who were very much aware of the problem; however, it was not an easy problem to solve.

The last problem was treated only briefly in the report. There was a pilot study called, "Correlates of High and Low Achievement." In their little pilot study, they looked at a variety of students, and they tried to look at economic status. However, the system did not collect data on economic status, and

they could not pursue that. The question they were asking was why some children from roughly the same kinds of background made it and others did not. The other piece of it was why children from different backgrounds showed disproportionate failure or disproportionate success. This required a much more extensive study than this study. The good news was that the U.S. Department of Education and its new center for research on inner city schools seemed to be interested in picking up the cost of that piece.

Dr. Gordon stated that one could argue that a large measure of the problems were problems of schools and of teaching. Because he came down so heavily on the issue of staff development, he did not want them to think he was prepared to let schools and teachers and administrators off the hook. After some 45 years of studying public education, he was convinced that just as professional educators could not abdicate their responsibility for education, learners and the parents of learners could not abdicate their responsibility for learning. There were a number of things impacting students that they had to begin to pay much more serious attention to.

In his introductory chapter, Dr. Gordon said he got old fashioned and called their attention to the fact that learners had bodies. Fundamental to all behavior was something they called "biology." They knew that folk who came out of life situations in which nutrition and health care have been impaired ended up not functioning very well. In a county as affluent as Montgomery County, they might think of that as not a problem, but there was a small segment of the population that represented the first generation. He suspected there was a slightly larger group of folk who were only one generation away from it. There was a book which stated that if one looked at the health of children born of mothers who were born in poverty, one would see evidences of that early impairment in these youngsters. Another colleague of his thought that youngsters who experienced illnesses not properly cared for contributed heavily to the children who showed slight behavior disorders. Sometimes these were not enough to disturb classes or to have the children identified as learning disabled. They were probably not among the group of over-represented black and Hispanic children in special education. These were the students who were functioning just on the margin of adequacy because of these subtle insults to their bodies. Therefore, Dr. Gordon thought they had to be concerned about the health of those they dealt with. They had to be concerned with those who had become victims themselves or their parents were victims of substance abuse.

Dr. Gordon reported that a few years ago he had worked in New York regarding schools for gifted students. He had met with a group of parents who were complaining about the amount of work their children were receiving. One mother said her son had to

spend one hour every night studying. This brought home to him that these parents had not had a very rich and extensive academic experience and might not be able to properly socialize their youngsters to serious academic work. Anyone who had been to an academic high school or an academic college knew that a student had to spend three to six hours a night to keep up. If the parents felt the children were working too hard, the children thought the same. Part of their problem was the academic socialization of the youngsters they had to serve.

Dr. Gordon said there was a section in the report where he discussed this issue very gingerly. He had been asked about looking at the differential in achievement between black and white youngsters when their incomes were roughly the same. He did not have income data, but putting together what he had been able to discern from a number of other studies around the country and from group interviews with parents, he suspected that one of the things they might have going was that they had parents who might have been so busy nurturing their economic needs that they had been less nurturing of the academic needs of their children. There might be some parents with high incomes who had not been exposed to high level academic demands. While their aspirations and expectations for their children might be high, he had not been able to study the way in which these parents translated these expectations into active support for the academic development of their children.

Dr. Gordon explained that toward the end of the report there was a statement that when they looked at a special group with a problem it might be a precursor to systemwide problems. Yale did not admit a large number of minority students. Most of their students were majority and relatively affluent. Some of his students at Yale were experiencing the same kinds of problems he suspected might be a part of the explanation for the difference between their relatively high income minority students and their relatively high income majority students. The homes of these students had not necessarily been oriented toward the kind of support for academic development that high achievement required. When they began to aggregate their data for achievement, they had a segment of the population from which they should be getting a relatively high level of achievement but from whom they were not getting it. This pulled the mean for that total group down; therefore, they might not be getting from the more affluent sections of the minority population the level of achievement they needed to bring the scores for that total group up to a point relatively comparable to the majority group.

In regard to what was going on around the country and how it related to Montgomery County, Dr. Gordon said there were several enrichment programs in the county not unlike other programs around the country. There were a few places around the country where those kinds of interventions were being done with great

effect. If one were to look at them as a group, one could not turn to that range of intervention and point to a solution of the problem. He indicated that the quality of these efforts across the country and he feared within the county was quite uneven. Mentoring and tutoring were excellent devices for upgrading the performance of students, but there was a technology for doing that. There was a knowledge basis that informed it, and in most of the programs around the country, and he suspected in a lot of the programs in the county, they selected people to be mentors and tutors and told them to tutor. These people knew nothing about it and the knowledge base that informed that activity.

Dr. Gordon explained that a few years ago he had been research director for Head Start, and it became clear to him quite early that there were all kinds of things going on that were called Head Start. When they evaluated them, they found all kinds of results, both good and bad. He thought they had the same thing in Montgomery County, and again he came back to the need for staff development. If they were going to have mentoring programs, they had to make sure that people knew how to mentor.

Dr. Gordon was not so certain about remediation. As he reviewed the literature on remediation, he noted that remediation slowed the process down, simplified the task, and tried to make it easier. There was a project at Stanford called, "Accelerated Learning." The theory was that if a student was behind they did not slow down learning. They enriched and speeded up learning because otherwise the student would never catch up. Therefore, they had to take a careful look at remedial and tutorial programs. They had to ask what happened in that tutorial program.

Dr. Gordon did not find a heavy emphasis on guidance. He had referred to a paper he wrote to the American Psychological Association some 20 years ago which talked about what the guidance field ought to be. He did not have any clear indication that the guidance services delivered in MCPS were of that vintage. If they were there at all, they were of a much older vintage. Yet it was clear to him that these youngsters were in desperate need of guidance services. He would go beyond guidance to what he called advocacy. He was suggesting they think about having student ombudspersons, who had the responsibility for ensuring that the system worked for the individuals in it. They had the superintendent, deputy, associate superintendents, and principals to run the school system. However, they did not have anyone whose primary responsibility was to protect the interest of the individual students.

Dr. Gordon reported that in a number of school districts around the country there was a fairly heavy use of computers. While he did not object to computers, he thought that if they were going to be used in education they should be used to manage pupil data

rather than to replace human efforts in teaching. The process of learning was such a personal process that he would rather keep the humanistic element in it. However, he did not have time to keep up with all the data on his students and with all of the data on educational materials that were available. Computers could do that, and they should forget about the use of the computer for instruction and use it for managing data. His second recommendation spoke to data. As he looked around the country, there were places that didn't do very well with their students because they had little information on them. The places that were able to monitor their students did very well.

Dr. Gordon was delighted last year when the Board agreed to start a school-based student management program in 23 schools. He urged that the Board implement this in all schools, certainly in those schools with youngsters who were at risk. If the people on the line who were responsible for those children did not get that information, the children suffered. He cited the example of the system in operation in the Pittsburgh public schools.

Dr. Gordon said they had looked at cooperative learning. He called attention to a paper out of the University of Pittsburgh's Research and Development Center which stated that in school they penalized people for cooperating in learning. They called it cheating. However, when someone was out on a job and didn't know how to work with other people to solve problems, he or she was lost. Slavin from Stanford University had developed a technology for guiding cooperative learning. In the schools where he had been able to implement this, they found that learning for all youngsters increased. Unfortunately it did not necessarily close the gap between students' scores. However, they did seem to get more efficient learning. Montgomery County had at least one cooperative learning project, and he was delighted to see it.

Dr. Gordon was pleased to see that the curriculum people were very hard at work at multicultural education. In his report he had criticized that program because it had not made much progress with Asian-American and Hispanic-American culture although they had made strides with African-American culture and history. In his recommendations he suggested to the Board that this was a program that was going to need a lot more resources and a lot of support. They were headed into the middle of a major national controversy. There were folk who thought that the culture that happened to reach its peak in Northern Europe in the 14th to 18th century was the core of human knowledge. Stanford University had broken out of that mode of thinking and had been criticized for it. The alternative position was that the knowledge of human societies was far richer than the knowledge of Europe. It had enabled the United States to peak as the most productive area of the world until the emergence of Japan and Germany. He believed that their rebirth was a result



of their being forbidden to dissipate their resources on armaments. The two nations that chose to have that battle, the United States and the Soviet Union, were in economic difficulty. The Soviet Union was about to collapse, and the United States was holding on because it had a trillion plus in debt. The people struggling with the curriculum were going to be up against the folk who had reservations about the extent to which the curriculum was expanded.

Dr. Gordon suggested that the Board was going to have to develop the kind of criteria by which the integrity of that canon could be judged. If one thought of the integrity of the canon as requiring comprehensiveness of knowledge, then one could not ignore what was going on over in Asia in the 5th century or what was happening in Africa in the 2nd century. Without turning one's back on Euro-American culture, they should expand it and amplify it to incorporate the variety of other strains. They had to recognize that even what they honored as European culture had its roots in other cultures. There was a recent book which talked about the origins of European culture and knowledge in Africa. What had peaked as the greatness of Western culture was the greatness of human effort. He called this an "inquiry culture" or a culture that forced them to inquire about things. The work that the staff was engaged in would require the special attention of the Board of Education. He believed that MCPS was making one of the better efforts being made around the country in this work. California and New York were taking steps to revise their social studies curriculum.

Dr. Gordon remarked that they probably had heard a great deal about higher order thinking skills. There were only a few spots across the country where it was being developed in a rational and a very productive way. He saw signs in Montgomery County of efforts in this direction. He did not see a careful study of the recent developments in cognitive science which these kinds of efforts required. It was one of those areas where there were a lot of people doing things that they called higher order thinking skills or critical thinking, but they needed to introduce the knowledge base into the program. About five or six years ago he set about to teach critical thinking in a high school in New York. He was trying to teach students those skills that people who were efficient in their thinking used. He was able to help youngsters learn those skills, but the problem was getting youngsters to transfer those skills. If he taught them executive skills in planning and evaluating in a biology course, they would forget to use those skills in algebra. They were beginning to understand that there were not only skill factors involved here, but there were dispositional factors involved. If one was not disposed to think in a certain way, teaching the skill did not work. He did not know what Montgomery County was doing in this area, but if they were following the common pattern, they were teaching the skills but this wasn't the

solution to the problem. People taught skills because they did not know how to teach dispositions. He believed that dispositions were learned very early in life. They had to figure how to change the disposition of a 10 or 11-year old to critical thinking skills.

Dr. Gordon pointed out that they had a section of the report on documentation and review of programs directed at ethnic minority students. They looked at the variety of activities that were going on in the county. They found a lot of things to applaud, but time and again he had either reported to him by his staff or by MCPS staff that the glue integrating these pieces was not there. Unfortunately, even within a particular school they found that there were isolated efforts with no school-wide coordination. There was a sense that most people did not feel that they really had to account. They felt that the superintendent was expecting to see some changes in test scores, but even if the scores were not completely there, nothing was going to happen. He had addressed this in his recommendations. He said it was difficult to figure out how one implemented a real program of accountability in a system that was sensitive to the rights of staff. Somehow they had to find a way to make these people feel they were responsible. If they didn't do it, there would be some consequences.

In the ESOL program, Dr. Gordon said there were two issues they encountered frequently. One should be of real concern to the Board. People looking at ESOL were worried that that program seemed to be viewed by the administration as a language program. Whereas, the staff people saw the students' needs as a comprehensive development program. People working in the program were spending as much time addressing the developmental needs of students as they were the language needs of students.

The impression was that if the non-language needs were to be addressed, they were to be addressed as an extra rather than as a part of the official program. ESOL staff repeatedly told him that language did not develop in isolation. Unless there was a comprehensive program available with a comprehensive support system, the targeting of language would be less productive. There was the other issue of the place of language and culture maintenance along side new language mastery. The literature he read implied that youngsters who got into trouble academically and were not proficient in English tended not to be proficient in their indigenous tongue either. Youngsters who tended to do well academically and who were not proficient in English were proficient in their indigenous tongue. An expert from Stanford argued that the most effective way to deal with the language problems of non-English speakers was to strengthen the indigenous language and build a second language on it. This was a policy issue. He recommended that they convene some of their staff to think through the Board's policy again.

Dr. Gordon stated that in the preliminary report a great deal of attention was given to the perceptions of folk in the community. He reminded the Board that the existentialists told them that as important as reality was, people's perceptions were even more important if they were trying to understand their behavior. It seemed to him that they could not ignore these perceptions whether they were real or not. There were folk who felt that somehow the system was not prepared to support and honor and sometimes even respect them.

Dr. Gordon said that the first of his recommendations focused on the attitudes and the behaviors of teachers. He was proposing that it might be time for the Board to consider re-defining its criteria for working in the system. There was professional competence, and they might want to be specific about the kinds of things they expected of people. The other was the human relations issue or the capacity to control one's own feelings in the interests of the deliverance of one's professional responsibilities. In Mississippi, he was talking to a man who was talking about his daughter's teacher. The man said that the teacher was a racist, but she was a good teacher and did not show it to his daughter. He was not concerned about this woman's racial attitudes, but rather what she did in the classroom and the way in which she treated his child.

Dr. Gordon was not convinced that their efforts in human relations were the most appropriate way of tackling this problem. One of the reasons he had left the ministry was the realization that preaching did not stop people from sinning. He was not sure that trying to help him understand someone better and feel better about his or her ethnicity was the issue. It seemed to him that the issue was that if he had been hired to do something, he had to deliver it regardless of the race of the person to whom he had to deliver it. If he could bring himself to the point where he felt better about the person, fine, but his professional responsibility was to deliver what it was he was supposed to deliver no matter what color the individual was. It seemed to him that the Board ought to have its staff understand that. Teachers did not have to love their students, but they had to respect them and teach them. If you give teachers that responsibility and put that kind of pressure on them, then you had to teach staff how to do it.

Dr. Gordon was convinced that some staff, and they were not all white, did not know how to do it. All of them needed to know enough about what it meant to teach and how to teach, and enough about the stuff they were teaching to be able to use it creatively and effectively. Again, from his own teaching experience, the times that he got into trouble was when he was trying to teach something he was not sure of. Teachers had to know content. He thought that at least 50 percent of their staff would be with them for the next ten years. They had to do

something with the staff they had. Therefore, they needed more staff development to help teachers understand the content. They had to help them understand the professional aspects of teaching, and they had to understand that as professionals they could not afford to let their personal feelings get in the way.

Dr. Gordon reported that the first set of recommendations had to do primarily with staff development. Next he had a whole slew of recommendations relating to the school itself. He had endorsed their effort at student data management. They were right on target, but their efforts needed to be expanded. He had a recommendation on what kind of data they ought to keep. While he understood the sensitivities involved in the collection of income data, he was greatly handicapped in trying to understand what was going on by not having those data. They had to find a way to collect those data and protect the confidentiality of it. However, there was an equally sensitive area. He was proposing that they collect and maintain data concerning what happened in classrooms and by which teachers. Principals needed this data to supervise and correct. However, in labor union dominated systems this was difficult to deal with. He knew that the union in Montgomery County was very sympathetic and had pledged their support. The Board needed to negotiate with the union the kind of information they needed to collect and utilize in relation to teachers. This meant that someone in addition to the teacher might have to be in classrooms to collect those data.

Dr. Gordon explained that his wife was a pediatrician, now retired, and when one of her patients died she had to appear before her colleagues to explain why she had lost that child. He did not know of any school in the country that required teachers to stand before their colleagues and explain why a child failed, but maybe they needed to get to that point. In his report he suggested that the first line of accountability ought to be professional accountability to each other. There was no way the superintendent and deputy could be in every classroom in the county to see what teachers were doing. There had to be a spirit within the professional staff that made it unacceptable for people to act unprofessionally.

In his recommendations relating to accountability, Dr. Gordon also said there ought to be administrative authority to move in in the case of persistent abuse and do something about it. In the first version of his report, he had recommended termination. He may have softened that somewhat.

Dr. Gordon said he had talked about the guidance program and the ombudsperson program. He was recommending that in each school where there was at least 25 percent ethnic minority population that they think about something called a student academic enhancement program. Some students came to school out of environments that had not necessarily taught them how to be good

students. One could blame home or blame community and forget about it, or one could say it was the school's responsibility. Schools had to teach how to be a good academic person, and they did know how to teach people to do that. If they had students without these skills, they had to have a program to provide this. One problem they were going to encounter was whether they replaced something in the curriculum with this or add on to the school day. It might be for the population of youngsters at risk the school had to lengthen the time for which the school was available to these students.

Dr. Gordon knew that all of this would cost money, and he had not worried at all about costs. However, it might be wiser for the Board to think about the problems and the needs and then come back to the issue of costs. If they began with the issue of costs, they would never get to the overall picture of what needed to be done. If they began to recognize what the critical needs were, they might find it easier to go back and look at the things that they were currently doing to see how much of it was ritual and how much was essential. He believed they would find a lot of things they did because they had always done it that way, but they didn't necessarily have to do it that way. They could reallocate their resources, which would be their first step prior to asking for additional resources.

Dr. Gordon said he was suggesting they look at the human relations program. There were a lot of people who seemed unhappy when they were pulled out for training. They did not have the resources to formally evaluate that activity. He thought this money might be used in a more effective way. For example, the human relations office might concentrate on helping schools making themselves more hospitable places for diverse populations. They would not try to teach people how to feel better or feel differently toward folk, but they were getting them involved in doing things that were likely to make the climate seem more hospitable.

Dr. Gordon recalled that in the 1954 court decision Kenneth Clark, a social psychologist, had filed a brief. He made the point that very often when one changed the climate and the behaviors of folk, they changed the attitudes more quickly than a direct attack on the attitude. He suggested that in human relations efforts they get people involved in doing things that reflected the goals of the human relations efforts which might be more productive than talking at them.

Dr. Gordon had suggested that the relationship between a number of the communities and the schools serving them needed attention. It might be that the human relations people ought to be taking a greater responsibility there. He saw the whole area of human relations as a critically important one, and he was suggesting that if attention were given to it, it might be used

in different ways than the present effort to teach people about human relations.

Dr. Gordon was impressed that at the public hearings about 180 people showed up. Brian Porter, the director of information, had the collection of statements that people submitted. Dr. Gordon was still pouring over those statements, and this was a rich source of information. One of the most impressive things was the degree of support for this school district and for this initiative. There were people there who were critical, but the great body of folk were applauding what the Board was doing. He pointed out that they had spokespersons from the teachers' union and their union for administrators and supervisors. Both publicly pledged support for this effort.

When Dr. Gordon was in New York, he had been involved in a "More Effective Schools" effort which was sponsored by the union, the PTA, the supervisors' union, and the Board of Education. When the Board got into financial trouble and wanted to change the program, the unions went out on strike. They said this was their professional effort to improve education in New York City. One of his recommendations in Montgomery County was that the Board meet with the unions to try to bring together that coalition that would work with their minority advisory committee to come to the Board with a set of priorities supported by that committee and the unions supported. They should also get the support of the parents and have the Board endorse the program. This was important because they saw many people who were participating reluctantly in current programs because they did not understand them.

Dr. Gordon reported that he did have a recommendation that suggested they work harder at bringing parents, community, and school together. He discouraged too heavy an emphasis on what they generally thought of as parent participation. He was convinced that it was not just the participation of parents that made the difference. It was the congruence of parental values, purposes, and expectations and school values, purposes, and expectations. When he was growing up, there was no point in complaining about school because his mother was going to say the same thing the teacher said. If they could begin to regain that kind of cohesiveness of community, home, and school, they would improve the support for education particularly in a county as widespread as this one and with busy parents. To make sure parents showed up at the school for an activity might be as useful as finding ways to make sure there was congruence between what home was expecting and what school was expecting.

Dr. Gordon pointed out that home was increasingly less available to a lot of children. It did seem that the school was going to have to have some things to compensate for the functions of parents. His solution for that was something he called the

"personalization of the school experience." When they began to talk about personalizing the school experience, they had to begin talking about reducing the number of children for whom each teacher is responsible. It would be impossible for him to personalize the experiences of 150 students.

Dr. Gordon said that in this section he had come back to the issue of middle class minority parents. He recommended that they invite a group of those parents in with some staff people to constitute a small task force to explore what was going on. From his discussion with some of these parents, he thought they might welcome this. In some cases it would be difficult for the school to do something with these parents unless they could change the feelings of these parents.

Dr. Gordon indicated that he had identified five areas of change. The first was changes in what teachers did and the way they felt. He talked about changes in the institution. Another was changes in the nature of the school. There should be changes in family and community. In addition, there should be changes in what the students did and the expectations they brought to school.

There was one change in the institution that he wanted to talk about. He had concluded that they did not have answers to a lot of the problems they were dealing with. Therefore, he was recommending that the excellent staff they had in the Department of Educational Accountability ought to be used more. While he did not think they were underworked, he thought they might be underutilized. He would like to see them become the "Office of Evaluation, Research, and Development." Any major industry in this country invested about 7.5 percent in research and development. Montgomery County ought to have a major research and development going here. The leader of the effort ought to be a person who sat with the Board from time to time. This was the yeast of the system. This office ought to have people out in the field seeing what the problems were that teachers were running into and then creating in laboratory settings the kinds of experiments that were designed to answer them. The final element in the set of recommendations on the institution was the very heavy investment in research and development.

Dr. Gordon explained that research and development didn't necessarily have to come out of their tax levy money. There were foundations that were investing heavily in education. They were interested in identifying school districts that were themselves seriously interested in research and development efforts.

Dr. Gordon stated that John Ogbu was a cultural anthropologist at Berkeley. He had devoted a lot of his time to the study of black and Hispanic populations in the United States. In his book, THE NEXT GENERATION, Ogbu called attention to the fact that all of the things that were right or wrong in school could amount to

little in their effect on youngsters unless they recognized and did something about the context in which youngsters experienced schooling and developed their expectations. Ogbu suggested that the black and Latino children he studied in California as early as the fifth and sixth grades knew that if they managed to finish high school their chances of being unemployed were about 50 percent greater than white children. Ogbu claimed that if these youth did get employment they would earn about 25 percent less. He ventured that there was a correlation between those expectations with respect to the rewards they would get and their investment in schooling. He argued that the investment in schooling was diminished by about the same percentage as they perceived the differential in their reward structure.

Dr. Gordon said that Ogbu had another notion. He argued that they had so associated serious academic work with white folks that a lot of black youngsters avoided those behaviors because they were afraid of being thought of as acting white. He had talked to black young men who told him they had to sneak away from their gangs in order to do academic work. If Ogbu was right about these perceptions, they had to do something to change the perceptions and expectations of these young people. This might mean that the Board had to move into some radically new and different arenas. The Board might have to be actively involved in post-high school jobs and continuing education opportunities for these students. Even more challenging for them was to do something with the media. He had once proposed that television and the newspapers be responsible to boards of education because they had such a tremendous influence on young people. Children spent more time watching television than they spent in school. This was a powerful educational influence, and it seemed to Dr. Gordon they had to begin to worry about the extent to which they could bring that educative institution under the supervision of the people who were responsible for education.

Dr. Gordon commented that looking at special problems they might be looking at the problems that were going to face the entire society in the next century. This was in part because of the changing demographics, and in part, because they knew that school was not working for a large number of majority students. The Board might have to constitute itself as a continuing study group that worried about the implications of these changes in society and the nature of schooling.

Dr. Gordon stated that he had started his report with the following statement, "If not here, where? If not now, when?" He believed that in a district as strong as Montgomery County, with its resources, and its leadership they could do something here. He did say, "If not here, where?" He ended up saying, "If not now, when?"



Dr. Shoenberg thanked Dr. Gordon for his presentation. He explained that Mrs. Praisner had sent her regrets. She had an engagement which had been scheduled prior to the scheduling of Dr. Gordon's report. Mrs. Fanconi was home ill and under a doctor's care. She had sent her regrets. Dr. Shoenberg asked that Board members restrict themselves to two questions.

Dr. Cronin recalled the night the Board had interviewed Dr. Gordon and had asked if he had any questions. Dr. Gordon had said to the Board, "If you are not serious, don't hire me." This made Dr. Cronin realize that they were at a risk situation. Dr. Gordon had given them some good directions, and Dr. Cronin appreciated this. In regard to staff development, Dr. Cronin could see competency in field, competency in pedagogical science, and competency in ethno-cultural bias. He thought that Dr. Gordon had probably underestimated the power the union. He asked what Dr. Gordon was looking for in ethno-cultural bias that could be reduced to something that a principal could use in a classroom to observe and, if necessary, to discipline.

Dr. Gordon replied that one of the responses they received from a number of teachers who claimed to be sympathetic to diversifying the material in the curriculum was that they could not find it. This was something that could be taught. It could be provided through technical assistance. His own preference for staff development wasn't that they pull teachers out for instruction but that they provide more hands-on assistance. If he were developing a program on ethnic and cultural diversity, he would have a team of folk who visited with teachers and helped them prepare lesson plans. These people could help teachers identify curriculum materials and introduce them to different perspectives and sources. He had a great deal of respect for the way in which people taught each other. Therefore, he wanted to make time for teachers to consult with each other. He pointed out that in the Pittsburgh schools the time for staff development was built into the work time of teachers.

Dr. Cronin commented that putting some teeth in these requirements for teachers would have to be fleshed out. Dr. Gordon replied that when his supervisor criticized him and give him suggestions for improvement, he would hope that for a lot of them that would mean something.

Dr. Cronin remarked that Dr. Gordon had recommended a student academic development enhancement program. He felt that the Board would need to have more information on staffing, preparation for the program, and how that would function in the school. Many of their schools were at 25 percent minority enrollment. Dr. Gordon replied that he had a paper on that subject that he would be glad to share with the Board. To flesh out all of this, Dr. Gordon said he would have to leave Yale and work full-time on this. However, he could provide the Board with some references.

Mr. Ewing observed that this was an excellent diagnosis of what ailed the patient. He thought that the prescription was equally impressive. Dr. Gordon had left them with a great many tasks yet to be formulated which was not unexpected. He thought Dr. Gordon's suggestion that the Board ought to constitute itself as a continuing study group on this subject was an excellent idea particularly with regard to the issue of making sure that they focused not only on what needed doing now to address the problems of students having difficulty in the schools but also how they could draw the lessons from that for the whole school system. His question was based on some anxiety about how to go about this.

Mr. Ewing was sure that Dr. Gordon had heard many accounts of past history. Mr. Ewing had been on the Board some years ago when the Board resolved to make staff development mandatory for all teachers. They had required a course called H.R. 18, and he and Dr. Fountain had attended the course together. He thought it was an excellent course. The requirement engendered a vast amount of opposition and contributed to the election of a Board of Education that took them to a period of retrogression for four years. He was concerned that they not cause another negative reaction in the community, not that he expected one necessarily. He was intrigued by the suggestion regarding the more effective schools project which gave them a model they could look at in terms of how to involve and provide ownership for everyone. He commented that the present leadership of the teachers' organization was quite different now. Then the teachers' organization had taken great exception to what the Board was doing and endorsed candidates who became the majority on that Board. He asked if Dr. Gordon could provide some information on ways in which the more effective schools program was done to avoid the backlash problem.

Dr. Gordon replied that he had been drawn into that activity after it had started. He had been asked to evaluate the program. It was his impression that there were two or three people who took the lead who happened to have been in key positions. It was about the time when Al Shanker was moving into national leadership and saw the route to that through professional leadership in his own profession. He was one of the people who sparked this idea. The superintendent there was very politically astute, and he and Al Shanker were in agreement. The woman heading up the United Parents Association saw herself as an educational leader rather than as the protector of a particular domain. This meant that there were three interesting and unusual people on the scene at that particular time. It also occurred at a time when the minority community and the teachers' union were very close. There were at least two books on the program and reams of material in the archives of the New York City Board of Education.

Mrs. DiFonzo stated that she would like to pick up on something Dr. Gordon spoke about earlier to get him to clarify his statement. When he talked about New York and getting assorted groups together to talk about parent involvement and parental commitment to children, she thought she heard him say it was not the PTA that should be involved in this. Dr. Gordon explained that often when they talked about parental involvement they meant having parents involved in the PTA or volunteering in the school. He thought that those more obvious manifestations of involvement were not as important as the commitment, convictions, and values of parents. It was at that level they needed to work rather than trying to get them to join the PTA or visit the school. However, joining the PTA or visiting the school could help with that. It was possible to have parents visit the school and still have distance between what those parents thought schooling was about.

It seemed to Mrs. DiFonzo that Dr. Gordon was talking about parents becoming active participants in their children's education as opposed to merely joining the umbrella organization. Dr. Gordon agreed. He said that one of the most effective ways he had seen involved a group of welfare mothers in Philadelphia. There were community workers who made the rounds of the homes to talk to parents about what was going on in school. As much as he liked that model, he thought that school people themselves ought to be getting into these homes. Teachers should visit the homes and develop communication to help parents better understand what teachers were about. He stressed that he was not anti-PTA. He felt they needed a strong PTA to be part of this coalition he had proposed.

Mrs. Hobbs commented that she was particularly fascinated by the response from students. She knew that they had interviewed students ranging from fourth to twelfth grade. She was interested in knowing what type of setting the interviewers used. Was it a group situation or one-on-one? How many students total and how many adults made up the interview panel at any one time?

Dr. Gordon replied that most frequently there were two adults involved and groups of students or one adult and groups of students. At least one adult was young enough to relate to the students. The size of the groups ranged from three or four to 12. Some interviews occurred in the school, some occurred out on the grounds, and some occurred in the cafeteria. Three meetings were convened in private homes. There were perhaps a dozen individual interviews.

Mrs. Hobbs recalled that during the hearings there were many strong requests for Dr. Gordon to prioritize the recommendations. She asked whether the recommendations were in priority order or whether he did not choose to prioritize. Dr. Gordon stated that he did not want to establish priorities. The Board had an advisory group that needed the respect of the Board. One way to

show that was to turn to them and let them advise the Board on what they thought the priorities ought to be. Secondly, he thought he had a reasonably good feeling for what was going on in the county, but he was a visitor. He felt that local people might do that better. When he was asked to take on the task, some people thought that he was the savior and he was not the savior. If he had to say the one thing he would do, he would concentrate on developing his staff.

In regard to the impact of television, Mr. Chang was reminded of the superintendent's A&S conference at which a professor from Harvard was speaking about the "get rich quick mentality" fostered by the entertainment industry. He wondered how they could lobby such a huge organization like national television. Dr. Gordon replied that it had to start somewhere. He realized that a resolution from the Montgomery County Board of Education would not change what CBS did. However, perhaps some other school districts would join them or they could get the support of the secretary of education. It seemed to him that it was too powerful an educational source to leave in the hands of commercial interests.

Mr. Chang's second question concerned the issue of extracurricular activities. He knew that they had to work on their staff development and minority hiring; however, he wondered whether it was also important to focus on the hiring of sponsors or coaches for activities because in some sense they were greater role models for the students. Dr. Gordon had debated whether or not he would look at athletics and deliberately chose not to. In his hierarchy of problems, he thought this was not one of their most urgent problems. He thought Mr. Chang was right that it would be good if a variety of ethnic and cultural groups were well represented in that domain. He thought this would happen with respect to black and Hispanic folk anyway because there was so much talent there.

Mr. Chang said the Board had just made a change in the academic eligibility requirements for students. He asked how Dr. Gordon thought this might affect minority students. Dr. Gordon replied that he had agonized over that one because athletics had been the vehicle for upward mobility for a large number of minority folk, but he also worried that it had been a deceptive one. He would favor the policy and, if anything, he would raise it higher. Before people were encouraged to spend the amount of time required for athletic excellence, they ought to have their intellectual and academic competence provided for.

Mrs. Brenneman explained that she happened to teach at one of the local colleges and right now she was dealing with freshmen who did not need that grade point average and who were very interested in playing football. They were so interested in football that they were not focusing on their classes. They

might wind up failing the classes and not play football the following year. She agreed with Dr. Gordon on the grade point average. Dr. Gordon commented that both Georgetown and Notre Dame were outstanding in their capacity to take athletes, educate them, and graduate them.

Mrs. Brenneman quoted from the report, "as the students of color not enrolled in the magnet must witness daily the gross inequities between their experience and those of their white magnet enrolled counterparts. The 'school within a school' model must be seriously examined, and the effort to expand magnet resources to serve the entire school body must be strongly supported." She asked how he would go about doing that.

Dr. Gordon said that of all the things that he had commented on in the report he had received the most responses around magnet schools. He thought it would be a mistake to do away with magnet schools. A lot of people thought that he was coming out against them; however, there were problems with magnet schools. The problem with magnet schools was that they were rooted in the concept of ability grouping. If they had a mathematics magnet and they were committed to heterogenous grouping, they could have a school concentrating on mathematics but all students would be involved and brought to the point of excellence. They might have to do some special things for students from time to time. His staff was criticizing those schools where they had a mathematics magnet in the school and brought in high achieving mathematics students. The students normally going to that school did not participate and that was resegregation. If one pushed the heterogeneous grouping issue, unless they did it well they then threatened the purpose for which the magnets were created. He was willing to violate the commitment to in-class integration in order to protect the integration of schools because it would be a serious mistake if they chased the white middle class out of the public schools. He would love to see more schools take a more inclusive approach to their magnets.

Dr. Cheung stated that he would like to recap some of the things said about maximizing the learning of children. He had talked about developing outstanding teachers who know why they are teaching, what to teach, and how to teach. He had talked about the changing of behavior and attitude of students and their expectations and perceptions of learning. He had talked about parental involvement and about the school's developing a positive environment to learning. Dr. Cheung thought that one thing was missing. One of the points for education was for a career and a vocation. He asked about the role of private industry and public agencies in terms of public school education. They were involved in training and educating their staff and their work force. They hold their workers accountable after the training. They had a great body of knowledge in terms of education and training. He had not seen anything in the report about how they could be

brought into the school system to be part of the overall strategies.

Dr. Gordon said that Dr. Cheung had raised an important point which was not addressed by the report. He did not mean to suggest there was not a role for industry, but it was not a high item on his agenda because he placed such a great emphasis on the value of general education as opposed to vocational or technical education. It seemed to him that the day in which the public schools ought to invest heavily in the development of specific technical and vocational skills was past because skills training was so temporary. The demands of industry and commerce were changing so rapidly that any skill taught for two or three years would be outdated in another five or ten years. Since industry appeared to be better at that kind of training, he thought the schools should develop intellect rather than skills. However, most people felt that public education ought to turn people out with a marketable skill. He would rather that the emphasis be placed on turning out people who knew how to learn skills, unlearn them, and relearn them.

Dr. Cheung explained that he was not talking about just vocational skills. In the 21st century, they would be living in an information and knowledge society. Most of the workforce today was involved in knowledge and information. The private sector was looking for an educated information worker. They would provide the direction in terms of where education was going to go in the future because of the type of people they were going to employ. Dr. Gordon said that Dr. Cheung would have better ideas here, and he would agree that these businesses should be utilized.

Ms. Gutierrez commended Dr. Gordon on his magnificent effort and the care with which he had taken on this task. She thought it was well beyond the scope of the charge given to him. She saw this as establishing a benchmark that told them where they were now in more than just facts and figures and, more importantly, told them where they needed to go. Dr. Gordon rightly had told them that they themselves needed to find the formula on how to get there. Their situation was unique, but they had the opportunity to do something here that was not possible elsewhere. Dr. Gordon had held out a challenge to the Board, the parents, the community, and the county officials. He was asking them to stretch well beyond what they felt comfortable with. Ms. Gutierrez asked if Dr. Gordon could help them with models or information about successful efforts.

Dr. Gordon replied that he could not give them a contemporary example of a district that had taken this initiative. Back in the late 1950's and early 1960's there was a community that had the unique advantage of a new population coming into a well established community. The young families took education quite

seriously, and some of the ablest people ended up on the Board of Education, and the rest of the local government took their lead.

Ms. Gutierrez shared his optimism and the belief in the power of ideas. She hoped that Dr. Gordon would be around to help the Board.

Mr. Goldensohn recalled that after interviewing Dr. Gordon he had said to some other Board members that he had thoroughly enjoyed the interview and had felt like he had spent a couple of hours in a graduate seminar. The way Dr. Gordon had made his presentation this evening had reminded Mr. Goldensohn of that. He hoped MCPS would make copies of the videotape of this meeting available to area offices and the Department of Human Relations so that citizens, students, parents, and teachers could listen to the presentation. He also hoped that the Board would use this as a reference tool.

Mr. Goldensohn suggested that the Board and executive staff might want to set up a one- or two-day workshop with Dr. Gordon. He thanked Dr. Gordon for his work. He said that one of his prime concerns was that in their effort to try and do the right thing and help the people who needed help they not create any pressure for backlash. He thought that communities with low socioeconomic levels and underachieving majority children would see themselves as fitting the target pattern and would request assistance. He knew that the system would help them, but he did not want to create a backlash on one side every time they did something for another side. The goal of the Board was to educate every child to the best of their individual capabilities. He did not want even one or two people complaining that someone was getting something that they were not. Montgomery County was hard on itself. They were not bad at all in what they were doing. Their children did quite well because it was a superb school system, but it was not perfect.

Dr. Shoenberg noted that there were some comments in the report but less than Dr. Gordon would have liked about socioeconomic data. He wanted to be able to tease out from the data those factors affecting minority student achievement that were attributable to those students being a part of a particular ethnic or cultural group as opposed to those factors which might relate to socioeconomic status. It had been heretofore rather difficult to talk in those terms, even if one could do the teasing out. He asked if Dr. Gordon would talk about some examples of particular kinds of things that if they could make those distinctions more readily they would do differently. Secondly, as Dr. Gordon travelled around the country did he find people more willing to talk in those kinds of terms.

Dr. Gordon indicated that he was surprised when Dr. Frechtling had told him she did not have good SES data. He said that many

of the school districts in which he had worked had had reasonable estimates of those data. It was his impression that some communities were more willing to deal with aspects of those data than Montgomery County seemed to be.

Dr. Gordon suspected that a lot of the problem of underachievement was more a function of economic status and resource availability including parental time than ethnic background. If they had had the income data, they could have pinned that down. One of the things they could do was mount an effort with low-income parents, independent of ethnicity, to help them better cope with the educational support demands. If one could begin to make the political statement that low income and educational proficiency were fairly incompatible, it might begin to make a difference, but society didn't want to hear that.

Dr. Gordon had a friend who had been analyzing achievement data from 1950 to 1985. Based upon some computer simulations, he was going to publish a paper on what would have happened in this country if they had had an income maintenance program from 1950 to 1985. According to his projections, the terrible data they were getting from schools would not be there. It looked like the decline in the effectiveness of schooling was correlated highly with the decline in incomes of families. If that were true, they should be saying to the political and economic community that this was not simply a pedagogical problem. This was an economic problem. He was not hopeful that they would be able to deal with this. They had known for 45 to 50 years that if they increased people's income, they could decrease the birth rate. In the parts of the world where they worried about overpopulation, they had not been willing to take an economic approach. In India if they raised the income level of the average Indian family to the level in the United States, they cut the birth rate about 50 percent. They fiddled with family planning when one of most effective ways would be economic. Dr. Gordon said that the biggest advantage of the economic analysis was to help to tease out the educational problems from the economic problems.

Dr. Shoenberg commented that knowing the answer to that question did not absolve them of any particular kind of effort that they would make. It might help them to redefine the question in more useful ways. He hoped that they could go on and do some of that kind of analysis and get a redefinition of the question that would be useful to them. It would allow them to deal with those racial and cultural problems in their own terms and the socioeconomic problems in their own terms and not confound the two. Dr. Gordon thought this would help to address their correlates on success and failure.

Dr. Pitt recalled that about a year ago he made a recommendation to the Board to bring an outside expert in to take a look at what they were doing. As superintendent, he was committed to not to



try to influence the outcome. He appreciated Dr. Gordon's insights, and he hoped that they had opened a relationship that would continue.

Dr. Shoenberg thanked Dr. Gordon for his patience, stamina, and wisdom. Dr. Gordon indicated that he would be more than willing to come back for another discussion. Dr. Shoenberg hoped that there would be an opportunity for a public forum and more Board discussion.

Re: ADJOURNMENT

The president adjourned the meeting at 10:55 p.m.

-----  
PRESIDENT

-----  
SECRETARY

HP:mlw