

WHEREAS, The school cafeteria and the service provided by its personnel to students, faculty, and other staff are an integral part of the operations of Montgomery County Public Schools; and

WHEREAS, The more than 11 million meals that are served annually to Montgomery County school children under the National School Lunch and School Breakfast Programs are testimony of the valuable contribution made by school food services personnel each year; and

WHEREAS, School food and nutrition service personnel deserve to be recognized for their dedication and continuing commitment to feeding and educating students and offering a variety of nutrition service to the community; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Board of Education does hereby recognize a selected group representative of food and nutrition service personnel in honor of the ninth annual "Salute to School Food and Nutrition Service Personnel" day in Montgomery County Public Schools; and be it further

Resolved, That this resolution be included in the minutes of this meeting.

Re: ADMINISTRATIVE REGULATION ON SEXUAL HARASSMENT (ACF-RA)

Dr. Vance invited Ms. Judy Bresler, Board attorney; Dr. Oliver Lancaster, director of the Department of Human Relations; and Dr. Joseph Villani, Dr. Elfreda Massie, and Dr. Phinnize Fisher, associate superintendents; to come to the table. The Board had received a memorandum and materials on the administrative regulation on sexual harassment. When the policy was adopted by the Board in November, 1992, it sent a strong signal to Montgomery County and other school systems that sexual harassment of any kind would have no place in schools among students or staff members. The policy was one of the few in the nation and placed a school system on record as identifying the problem and striking at it vigorously.

Dr. Vance reported that MCPS had engaged in a system-wide education effort to address the attitudes that led to sexual harassment. They had addressed the issue of gender equity in athletics. They had a collaborate effort with Montgomery College to have staff training with the resources of both institutions. As they did with their Success for Every Student plan, their first objective was changing the attitudes and environment that might foster bias, harassment, gender-related violence, and interpersonal conflict. By bringing together PTA groups, central office staff, local school personnel, and students, they believed they had created a framework for sexual harassment prevention.

Dr. Vance indicated that the Department of Educational Accountability was in the process of developing instruments by which they could obtain more data on an analysis of sexual harassment problems system-wide. The Office of Instruction and Program Development had been assisting schools with training and curricular materials on sexual harassment. He had appointed a Commission on Sexual Harassment, and they had held a public hearing on April 26 at which personal testimony was given on incidents of sexual harassment among students and staff members.

He was convinced at the beginning of this initiative and remained more convinced, especially after hearing the testimony, that they must continue to face this problem head on. It was not a problem unique to or created by school systems. It was a problem directly linked to prevalent social and cultural attitudes, behaviors, and expectations. Because MCPS was responsible for educating children, it fell to MCPS to address those attitudes and issues. It also fell to them to train and educate employees on ensuring a healthy and supportive work environment. He believed that MCPS had made a significant start in this regard. The regulation was designed to bring more specificity and definition to the issue. The regulation outlined the procedures by which students and employees might bring a complaint. The regulation also provided for different ways information on sexual harassment procedures could and should be disseminated. He believed that the regulation strengthened an already powerful policy tool.

Ms. Bresler explained that law began with language, and sometimes the language was extremely straightforward in its statement. For example, the First Amendment was straightforward, but they had now spent a hundred plus years and thousands of cases to finding exactly what the amendment meant and how it operated. Title IX and Title VII as they related to sex discrimination were very straightforward. These said that people should not be discriminated against on the basis of sex. They had had a number of cases under the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission dealing with what that meant in terms of primarily sports equity issues. This area got fairly well defined early on. The law continued to evolve and took new directions and new breath. It was not uncommon in the United States where they had a rule of law and had made great strides in a number of civil rights cases to take a civil rights statute and to interpret those rights very broadly. There had been cases where the Supreme Court had narrowed these laws, and Congress had seen fit to override and opt for a broader interpretation.

In the case of sexual harassment, Ms. Bresler indicated that the evolution of the law went from sex discrimination to sexual harassment. The law had evolved to include sexual harassment as a form of sex discrimination, and this was a fairly recent development in the law. Up until a year ago, there was not a lot of guidance from the courts and the Office of Civil Rights. The

Equal Employment Opportunity Commission was the first to get a handle on it. They came out with a fairly extensive regulation dealing with employment relationship that defined and discussed sexual harassment and gave it some definition. The Office of Civil Rights, U. S. Department of Education, was less explicit in giving guidance. In fact, they put out a brochure which talked about staff to student sexual harassment, but it did not address student to student or peer harassment.

Ms. Bresler explained that people often got in front of the law, and then Congress passed a law which responded to the demands of the public. Agencies found themselves in the position of implementing those laws before there was judicial guidance. A year ago the Board of Education was ahead of a lot of the evolution by adopting a policy. The school system was beginning to hear some complaints even before the Board took final action on the policy that materials were out-dated. Even after the Board adopted its policy, staff had difficulty in obtaining quality materials. Now materials were beginning to be available.

Ms. Bresler reported that OCR itself had gone through an evolution. MCPS had worked with OCR to refine appeal procedures to be sure they met legal standards and complied with the law. She had attended a conference a week ago when a representative from OCR cited the procedures adopted by MCPS as being very clear and in compliance with the law. OCR was now looking at peer to peer harassment issue, and they now had an operational definition. OCR had changed its direction into one emphasizing education rather than litigation. OCR would come into a district and examine procedures even before they turned to an investigation of a specific complaint. Ms. Bresler commented that education was the key. If ever there were ways of changing attitudes in the work place, it was in the field of education. Staff would inform the Board on what steps had been taken in MCPS.

Dr. Lancaster stated that dealing with the regulations had been helpful for staff. The regulations had provided them with direction and focus, and the legal dimensions had been important to them. They had taken no step without including references from their legal unit and other attorneys. He said that, in responding to the sexual harassment policy, he had been impressed the policy implementation blend. All MCPS leaders had worked together to make sure the policy worked. They had done this in training, identifying resources, education, investigations, and in trying to get ahead of the issue.

Dr. Lancaster explained that in the beginning they were doing more responding. Now they were much more proactive and were working toward prevention. They were taking sexual harassment more in perspective, and they were looking at basic respect and acknowledgement of appropriate behavior and inappropriate. They

looked at these in relation to racial bias, hate/violence issues, and interpersonal disruptions as well.

Dr. Lancaster said that in restructuring the Human Relations Department, the role of the committees and the liaisons would help in the prevention mechanisms. In dealing with the climate in each school, office, and unit, they felt that in the coming year they would deal with the prevention motif and the proactivity in a much more productive way than they had in the past. He hoped that in the future they would get ahead of the game. He felt that there was now a sense of security. A year and a half ago people were somewhat uncertain about whether or not to report, discuss, or even address issues of sexual harassment. Now people were much more comfortable in reporting incidents and discussing the issues surrounding the matters of sexual harassment. One of the things that had helped in doing that was the guidelines. They had spent a lot of time meeting with principals, staff, and students to revise those guidelines, and the guidelines before the Board were the updated ones. These provided definition, direction, and focus in dealing with issues of sexual harassment.

Dr. Lancaster thought that their greatest advantage was the addition of the compliance officer. She had started her work in January and had done a lot of planning and training. She was focusing on whatever resources there were available inside or outside in efforts to implement the Board's sexual harassment policy. She and the Department of Human Relations operated as facilitators and did a great deal of consulting on and clarifying of issues around sexual harassment. They did assessments and reviews and training. In addition, they had done a lot in identifying resource materials that would be useful to use. They had become a central depository for information, data, and materials related to sexual harassment. They were working with DEA in order to computerize their work.

Dr. Lancaster commented that sexual harassment was not a school problem. It was a community problem, and it was clear to them as they moved ahead that they had to do much more community outreach. They had to work with families, civic organizations, and businesses and tap more resources to make a greater difference. They wanted to create an atmosphere both inside and outside the schools so that sexual harassment could not exist and thrive.

Dr. Villani reported that in OIPD they began by training all their staff to establish a common base of understanding and commitment among staff in OIPD so that each unit could then look at its own operation and find ways to support schools in the implementation of the policy. On the opening day of school, several bilingual staff members went on Radio Mundo to raise the issue of sexual harassment in the community, and staff had been

back on several occasions.

The School Improvement Training Unit had done training in 24 schools on sexual harassment awareness and prevention, most recently at Blair High School. In the Guidance Unit, counselors had been trained with the guidance leadership staff, and each counselor had received some support materials. Physical education staff did training last summer with the physical education resource teachers and the athletic director on sexual harassment and gender equity issues. They had continued that training during the school year this year. Every coordinator in Academic Programs provided awareness issues around sexual harassment and gender issues in each content area as he or she met with resource teachers. The Department of Educational Media and Technology had been very active in working with other units including the Department of Human Relations to identify the materials that schools might use in training staff and students.

He cited, "What is Sexual Harassment," a tape that was made available to all schools as an excellent resource.

Dr. Massie reported that in the regulation there was a very specific role for the Office of Personnel Services. They conducted investigations related to sexual harassment complaints.

She said they had been involved prior to the adoption of the policy, and they had worked closely with the Department of Human Relations in investigating allegations of sexual harassment. She commented that this had been a learning experience for all of them. As a result of the policy, they went back and reviewed the procedures they used to conduct investigations, and she believed they had improved the process. She said that this was not an easy issue because sometimes they investigated complaints and did not know initially whether or not it was sexual harassment. They took every complaint they received seriously and used the same investigation procedure.

Dr. Massie explained that a critical piece of the investigation procedure was the training and the follow-up they conducted after the conclusion of the investigation. There were times they found that staffs needed to be involved with training, and at that point they involved resources from the School Improvement Training Unit, from the System-wide Training Unit, and from the Department of Human Relations. They had worked very closely with Dr. Lancaster's office in reviewing materials because there were not a lot of materials that applied to schools or even to staff.

They were doing a lot of training with the Office of Personnel Services and with other offices. It was one of the issues that no one office was responsible for, and therefore they had to have ongoing communication and updated training. They had not completed the training, and they had plans to train and provide information to principals, directors, and staff throughout the school system.

Dr. Fisher stated that they really took this policy seriously, and after the adoption of the policy, and even before, they began the implementation. The first level of training was a countywide session for all administrators including all special education administrators. When she used "principals" or "all" she was talking about regular and special education. At the first countywide session they focused on the definition, changing of attitudes, prevention, reporting procedures, and recognition. At the next session, they went forward with additional training in small group sessions. They reviewed the law and looked at cases.

She felt very comfortable in saying that principals were sensitive to and knowledgeable about these issues. Most schools have had training related to sexual harassment. At their May cluster meetings with principals they would find out whether additional materials were needed.

Dr. Fisher said that training would continue to look at small group issues. In the Office of School Administration, they received calls and collaborated immediately with the Office of Personnel Services. They discussed the situation and determined the steps that they should take, but they were also working on prevention efforts to make sure all schools were receiving training including how to stop sexual harassment and change attitudes. Some principals had already invited their communities in for assemblies. Their next steps would be to continue the education portion as well as monitoring compliance to the policy.

Dr. Vance reported that it was their intent to present the Board with a gestalt. The issue was not were they fulfilling the policy, but it was a question of the degree to which they had been successful to date and reasonable expectations for the future. When they received the report from the superintendent's Commission on Sexual Harassment, they would be back to the Board with additional recommendations for modifications to the policy.

Mrs. Fanconi thanked the staff for a good overview. She remarked that the good news was the Board was committed to do everything they could to assure that these procedures were followed. The not-so-good news was that they did not put in any lag time between adoption of the policy and implementation. She hoped that future policies would contain a section from the superintendent recommending how long it would take to implement the policy appropriately. They moved very quickly into a new area that they were not prepared to fully implement.

Mrs. Brenneman asked whether they were talking about training all staff and, if so, how did they train bus drivers. Dr. Lancaster replied that about a year ago Transportation started doing sessions with bus drivers. He said that more had to be done for bus driver training as well as for all support services personnel. Mrs. Brenneman reported that when she met with support services staff they raised questions about staff

development and including the entire school staff in any training that had to be done.

Mrs. Brenneman asked about the involvement of other agencies in this training. Dr. Lancaster replied that they did work with other agencies such as the Center for Equity Studies and had formed coalitions with other school systems. MCCJ had had sessions on sexual harassment, and people in the metropolitan area had been able to come together to share knowledge. The Commission for Women was a major partner as well as the Commission on Human Relations. In addition, a representative from OCR in Philadelphia had spent a day with MCPS staff.

Mr. Abrams noted that the policy had been adopted prior to his joining the Board. Had he been there at the time, he would have raised some questions he would raise now. In the overview, he was struck by the separation. They were talking about the responsibility of the school system as an employer, and the second area was policy being out in front of the law. This was the adaptation of the term, "sexual harassment," and trying to cloak it using legal rationale. The evolution of the law had been in an employer/employee relationship, or in the context of the school system in an employee/student relationship where power was the issue. This was where the derivation of the laws came out that brought them within the sphere of the Office of Civil Rights and Equal Employment Opportunities Commission. He asked whether there was a suggestion that the Department of Education through the Office of Civil Rights was planning to extend that definition of sexual harassment to student-to-student relationships. Ms. Bresler replied that they were. Mr. Abrams asked where they seemed to be going. He thought it had been said that if they adopted procedures they had to make sure their procedures were followed, but not necessarily going to the issue of whether the statutes encompassed the student-to-student relationships.

Ms. Bresler replied that they were saying it was encompassed; therefore, the law required that they have procedures for addressing sexual harassment both for students and for staff. Mr. Abrams asked whether this was student-to-student or in relation to the power relationship of staff harassing. Ms. Bresler reported that she had had a very lengthy discussion with the senior attorney for the Office of Civil Rights. When the Board adopted the policy, she had some reservations about the student-to-student piece because the law was not at all clear that it was this expansive. She had seen only one court case on this issue. They had the letters of finding, and OCR was now looking at definitions and regulations. In her discussion with the attorney, they had noted that Title IX dealt with institutions receiving federal funds. In the programs operated by those institutions, there should not be discrimination based on sex. She had pointed out that students were not their agents

as employees were; therefore, how could their conduct be attributed to the institution receiving the money which was the entity the law applied to. The attorney was not aware of any court cases, but he believed that school systems were in charge of their environment and did operate the buildings and buses. If there were a hostile environment created by student-to-student relationships and it was ignored by the school system, the school system could be deemed to have contributed to this by failing to address it. Therefore, the attorney believed OCR would intervene in complaints of student to student in order to prevent an incident from getting to the point where they could be saying it was being sponsored. OCR was taking more steps to formally recognize this, to define it, and to put out some regulations.

Mr. Abrams explained that he had raised the question because it was a "bit of a reach" in terms of where the law was. They had heard the courts say that the legislators ought to be determining these new rights, or they had heard the arguments that the courts had to intervene and interpret new rights arising out of existing law. What he was hearing here was neither a court nor a legislative body, but rather an office in the executive branch as the one fostering this extension of a theory of right. He would feel more comfortably if this were being done judicially or legislatively. He said that more important was the route being pursued was an educational route rather than a litigation route.

Ms. Bresler stated that when she said education rather than litigation, she was attempting to describe the attitude OCR was taking in the way in which they were going to approach cases. Not that they did not see there was a legal basis for this, but in their approach they were not going to take a complaint, investigate it, and call witnesses with a view toward finding a violation or no violation. OCR would take a complaint and ask whether a school system was in compliance and had working procedures before any investigation would be done. OCR would emphasize that approach to make sure there were mechanisms at the local level for handling these.

Mr. Ewing said that as a Board they needed to be clear that the Board's policy did not proceed from a sense that they were in need of taking action based on some legislative act or some court suit. The policy came from the Board's desire to establish a policy that would cover instances of sexual harassment that occurred in the school setting because the Board thought this was the right thing to do. This had been fairly traditional in Montgomery County. They had done this in regard to issues of integration and desegregation as well. They had not waited to be told they were wrong or in danger of being sued. They had sought to develop a policy that would put them in a position where the likelihood of their being sued was reduced. The Board did this because they believed it was the right way to proceed. The legislature and the courts would be saying something after the

fact. The Board's legal advice had always been to be careful about not running afoul of federal law and regulation or state law and regulation. The Board usually accepted this advice, but at times the Board wanted to do what it thought was right and did it. This was what they had done here, and he thought they had done the right thing. Now they were attempting to make sure the legal considerations were not inconsistent with what the Board had done. He would rather be in this position than scrambling to try to put together a policy after the fact.

Dr. Cheung complimented the staff for their efforts since the Board had adopted the policy. Looking at sexual harassment, he saw this as a symptom of social problems. There had been changes in social values. The Board had to make a policy on how to deal with sexual harassment. They had other policies that dealt with the symptoms of the same social problem such as violence and substance abuse. All of this was a result of the breakdown of relationships between people. This was about respect, self and for others. They would continue to have policy to deal with symptoms, and he hoped they would address through education some of those people values on how to be a good citizen and show respect for each other. He knew that staff and teachers were sharing this and emphasized this. He was invited to get involved with some aspects of this. He asked how they coordinated training on sexual harassment, violence, and substance abuse because they were dealing with the same characteristics and values of people including students.

Dr. Lancaster stated that Dr. Cheung had placed his finger on the core of the issue. They had been addressing each one of these ills independently. In the last year or so there had been a distinct trend in the training sessions that there was this relationship between disrespect and inappropriate behavior whether it was sexual harassment or a racial issue or drugs. He thought this was their biggest challenge. As they were looking at redesigning the human relations policies, they were trying to place things in perspective and deal beyond the band-aid approach and get to the root causes of some issues. He believed that in the next decade their whole training mode would deal with the point brought up by Dr. Cheung.

Mrs. Fanconi wondered about the possibility of applying for grants that would help them look at the whole area of coordination respect for oneself and for other people. As they were looking at the health curriculum, this might be one place they could put some of this. Dr. Vance concurred. He did think it was extremely important that while they were developing a broader perspective including the interrelationship of these issues to each other, they should not sacrifice the specificity. The specifics of the implementation drove the core of the issue which drove them to create the policy. He suspected that in time they might get to that more global approach, but he had seen too

many important issues getting lost when they started dealing with things symbolically and with interrelationships. They tended to forget the original intent and purpose of the policy.

Mrs. Fanconi thought this was a caution well taken, but it alarmed her to see a society where they had the highest percentage of violence against children and spousal abuse. These were power relationships, and sexual harassment was a power relationship. It seemed to her there was an awful lot to learn about how society developed its way of looking at things. They should look at what it meant to harass someone else, whether it was sexual or physical harassment. She had a significant concern about this, and she believed that as an educational organization they had a responsibility to assist their adult employees and students in being able to pull apart the messages that society was giving in order to make some better choices.

Mrs. Fanconi recalled that at a recent hearing an issue was raised that the Board's policy did not allow any discretion. There was no informal system of resolution. The person said they had found that a policy that allowed no discretion drove things underground, and that many times the person being harassed just wanted it to stop and did not necessarily want to file a formal complaint. She asked whether they had thought about a less formal process and focusing on prevention and dealing with the offense at the lowest possible level. The other issue was a situation when an employee did not define an incident as a formal complaint, which allowed the manager to look at other options for resolving the issue. It was clear to Mrs. Fanconi that MCPS was going the full investigative route, and she asked about flexibility.

Dr. Lancaster commented that he, too, was struck by the testimony. He had a conversation with the person and got some materials from her. The person had also discussed prevention as a major issue. As MCPS had introduced the policy and the procedures for sexual harassment, it had been a formal process. He thought they had to re-evaluate to see whether they were at the point where they could deal with the lighter levels of harassment in some less formal way so that people would feel more comfortable. They had been insisting that people use counseling at every level. The Employee Assistance Program had been involved as well as the Guidance Department. He believed it was time to put sexual harassment in perspective and look at other ways of preventing it and helping people to understand what was going on so that they could interact more comfortably with one another.

Ms. Bresler explained that the appeal procedures for students and staff had an informal step in the process prior to the initiation of the formal complaint. This was one of the areas OCR had asked them to refine and put a timeline on it. This was one of the

changes that MCPS made. They retained the informal step, but they did now have a timeline on it. She thought that the minor kinds of things had probably been resolved through that step; however, she did not know because there was less of a paper trail in these cases. It might be that this should be explored and talked about more. Mrs. Fanconi hoped that staff would look into this. Being a woman, she could understand the person who was testifying and said that she just wanted the harassment to stop.

She did not want to ruin someone's career. She just wanted it to stop. As a policy maker, Mrs. Fanconi did not want to drive anything underground. They wanted to be able to allow people to have things addressed and not feel that the only way to have it addressed was a major full court press. Dr. Lancaster agreed to look into this.

Dr. Massie reported that there was a counseling component in the regulation. They frequently got calls from employees who wanted advice and did not want to file a formal complaint. Personnel Services tried to provide guidance and support, and sometimes a Personnel staff member met with the individual to discuss the situation and to explore options. At times, they received feedback that the behavior had stopped.

Mr. Abrams said the bundling of issues in terms of civil behavior was an accurate description, and this represented an evolution in society. A commentator had said there used to be different institutional constraints on individual behavior from the family, the church, and other institutions. This seemed to have melted away, and they now defined everything in terms of a legal remedy.

As they pursued legal remedies, they were absolving themselves of societal responsibility. He had concerns about this in terms of school system's pushing too far given that societal context. It might not have been their intention to create new legal actions, but it had been the result. Some of his experiences on the Board had been the testings of this new policy in terms of how far it went. He had some concerns as to what he saw evolving out of that.

Mr. Abrams stated that a lot of the problems they were talking about were much broader community problems. The primary responsibility of the school system was to provide education to the students in the community. He was struck by the amount of headlines this activity received. The second area that would be in the newspaper was how much money MCPS was spending to send recruiters to go to Puerto Rico to promote their multicultural policies. The Board was not addressing a recent report on core curriculum and whether Americans were spending enough time on core curricula or were loading up the system with too many niceties. The end result might well be that America was falling behind the rest of the world in terms of turning out educated students. When he looked at sexual harassment, he was looking at it in the context of a finite education budget. When he looked

at all the efforts and the training, he wondered how much they were spending for this and what they were foregoing. He hoped that when they evaluated the policy that they would respond to these issues. What were they foregoing in terms of pursuing this? Was MCPS the appropriate entity to take on the task in terms of broader community education on this issue? While he did not want to see any slackening in terms of their employer responsibilities, his concerns tended to be broader educational concerns as to how they were allocating their resources and where they were making these kinds of choices.

Mr. Ewing remarked that he was troubled by what was called moral relativism. People were told that all values were equal; therefore, all decisions about what people and nations did were also equal and not to be judged harshly or loosely and MCPS taught decision-making skills. This was not true. What was true was that education was at its core an ethical enterprise and ought to be. What they were about here was determining what behaviors they regarded as prohibited and subject to punishment.

At some point, without involving themselves in endless discussions of moral relativism versus strong moral principles, they ought to recognize there were realms of freedom of choice they wanted to protect and maintain and enhance. There were realms of elective choice as well as those which involved actions and behaviors that ought to be prohibited and punished. This was an instance today of a recognition by the school system, the Board, and the community, that there were behaviors which had been tolerated and no longer ought to be tolerated. He thought this was an advance in moral understanding, and they had made progress in that regard. They had not done this by maintaining what he would regard as a morally relativistic approach to educational issues, and they should recognize this. At some juncture, they needed to talk about what it meant to be an educational institution with an ethical core and how that ought to be reflected not only in their policies but in their classrooms.

Mrs. Fanconi thanked the staff for the presentation. The Board looked forward to future recommendations.

RESOLUTION NO. 309-94 Re: TENTATIVE ACTION ON POLICY KEA -
POLITICAL CAMPAIGNS AND POLITICAL
MATERIALS

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education take tentative action on Policy KEA - Political Campaigns and Political Issues:

POLITICAL CAMPAIGNS AND POLITICAL MATERIALS

A. PURPOSE

To recognize the participation of students and employees in political campaigns and issues in accordance with the state constitution and election laws (see MCPS Exhibit KEA-EC: Political Committees, Campaign Materials, and Advertising [State Law]) regarding participation in political campaigns, partisan election activities and distribution of political or partisan materials.

B. ISSUE

The Montgomery County Board of Education recognizes the rights of students and employees to participate in political campaigns and issues; the constitutional rights of students and employees and the general public to distribute materials relating to their political views on school grounds; and the right of students to pursue an education conducted in a suitable academic environment free from disruption.

C. POSITION

1. The Board approves the participation of eleventh and twelfth grade students in political campaign activity during school hours with parent consent, approval of the principal or his/her designee, and at the request of the political candidate or organization.
2. Released time may be granted to students for such participation for any three school days during the two-week period immediately prior to a general election.
3. The Board approves the participation of employees in political campaigns and issues as set forth in Administrative Regulation KEA-RA: Student and Employee Participation in Political Campaigns and Distribution of Political Materials and MCPS Exhibit KEA-EC: Political Committees, Campaign Materials, and Advertising (State Law).
4. Printed materials advocating or opposing candidates for public office or other political views may be distributed on school premises under certain conditions.

D. DESIRED OUTCOMES

The outcome for this policy is to ensure that the employees and students of the Montgomery County Public Schools are well informed and guided in their activities regarding the requirements of state election laws and their participation

in political campaigns, partisan election activities and distribution of political or partisan materials.

E. IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGIES

1. The Board directs the superintendent, in consultation with staff, to prepare implementing regulations regarding participation in political activities by employees and students and the time, place, and manner in which printed materials advocating or opposing a candidate for public office or other political views may be distributed on school premises.
2. The Board further directs the superintendent to develop a document incorporating this Board policy with the procedures for distribution to all schools, PTA's, appropriate organizations, individual citizens by request, and the supervisor of elections for distribution to political candidates.
3. The superintendent will develop procedures to implement and publicize this policy.

F. REVIEW AND REPORTING

This policy will be reviewed every three years in accordance with the Board of Education's policy review process.

Board members requested that the superintendent include a definition of the "Board of Education" in the administrative and also include students in Grades 9-12 as participants in political campaign activities with parental consent in C. Position 1 in the policy.

Re: ANNOUNCEMENT

Mrs. Fanconi announced that the Board had recessed for lunch and had had a meeting in closed session.

** Ms. Gutierrez joined the meeting at lunchtime.

RESOLUTION NO. 310-94 Re: AN AMENDMENT TO THE BOARD AGENDA
FOR MAY 10, 1994

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education amend its agenda to add an item on the construction contract for Sally K. Ride Elementary

	Kunz, Inc.	1,662	
	Landon Systems Corporation	8,620	
	Nashua Corp. - Office Products Division	135,919	
	Trico Business Equipment Company	139	
	USI, Inc.	30,300	
	Wordex Corporation	<u>2,970</u>	
	TOTAL	\$ 254,505	
81-94	Office Supplies		
	<u>Awardees</u>		
	Boise Cascade Office Products	\$ 25,600	
	Chaselle, Inc.	15,356	
	Interstate Office Supply Company	<u>5,254</u>	*
	TOTAL	\$ 46,210	
86-94	Color Television Communications		
	Studio Systems		
	<u>Awardees</u>		
	Allegheny Electronics, Inc.	\$ 8,589	
	CTL-Communications Televideo LTD	114,212	*
	Harco Electronics, Inc.	100	
	Kinetic Artistry, Inc.	8,285	
	Kunz, Inc.	<u>2,339</u>	
	TOTAL	\$ 133,525	
MORE THAN	\$25,000	\$ 850,024	

* Denotes MFD vendors

RESOLUTION NO. 312-94 Re: CHANGE ORDER OVER \$25,000 - DR.
SALLY K. RIDE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

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

WHEREAS, The Department of Facilities Management has received a change order proposal for Dr. Sally K. Ride Elementary School that exceeds \$25,000; and

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

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

Project:	Dr. Sally K. Ride Elementary School
Description:	Removal of rock that was uncovered during excavation for the building utilities and foundation based on a pre-determined unit price which was included

int he contract documents.

Contractor: H. A. Harris Co., Inc.

Amount: \$45,732

RESOLUTION No. 313-94 Re: AWARD OF CONTRACT- HERBERT HOOVER
MIDDLE SCHOOL REROOFING

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

WHEREAS, The following sealed bids were received on April 28, 1994, for reroofing Herbert Hoover Middle School that will begin after the school year ends and be completed by August 29, 1994:

<u>Bidder</u>	<u>Amount</u>
1. Orndorff & Spaid, Inc.	\$391,628
2. J.E. Wood & Sons Co., Inc.	426,900
3. Rayco Roof Service, Inc.	428,600
4. Y.S.K. Construction Co., Inc.	515,000

and

WHEREAS, The low bidder, Orndorff & Spaid, Inc., has completed similar projects successfully at various schools, including Rocking Horse Road Center and Fields Road and DuFief elementary schools; and

WHEREAS, The low bid is below the staff estimate of \$400,000; now therefore be it

Resolved, That a \$391,628 contract be awarded to Orndorff & Spaid, Inc., for the reroofing of Herbert Hoover Middle School, in accordance with plans and specifications prepared by the Department of Facilities Management and subject to final action by the County Council on the FY 1995 Capital Budget.

RESOLUTION NO. 314-94 Re: AWARD OF CONTRACT - BROOKHAVEN
ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

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

WHEREAS, The following bids were received on April 21, 1994, for the modernization of Brookhaven Elementary School, with work to be completed by August 1, 1995:

<u>Bidder</u>	<u>Amount</u>
---------------	---------------

1.	The McAlister-Schwartz Co.	\$3,521,012
2.	Henley Construction Co., Inc.	3,562,400
3.	Caldwell and Santmyer, Inc.	3,638,000
4.	William F. Klingensmith, Inc.	3,648,400
5.	Hess Construction Company	3,667,300
6.	Northwood Contractors, Inc.	3,700,700
7.	Kimmel & Kimmel, Inc.	3,745,500
8.	Triangle General Contractors, Inc.	3,836,300

and

WHEREAS, The McAlister-Schwartz Company has completed similar work successfully for Montgomery County Public Schools, including the modernization of Cedar Grove Elementary School; and

WHEREAS, In recognition of increased construction costs, on April 5, 1994, the Board of Education requested a supplemental appropriation for Brookhaven Elementary School; and

WHEREAS, The low bid exceeds the initial construction estimate but is within the revised budget included in the Board of Education's supplemental appropriation request; now therefore be it

Resolved, That a \$3,521,012 contract be awarded to The McAlister-Schwartz Company for the modernization of Brookhaven Elementary School, in accordance with plans and specifications prepared by Gauthier, Alvarado & Associates, Architects, contingent upon County Council approval of the supplemental appropriation request.

RESOLUTION NO. 315-94 Re: AWARD OF CONTRACT - NORTH CHEVY
CHASE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

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

WHEREAS, The following bids were received on April 14, 1994, for the modernization/addition to North Chevy Chase Elementary School, with work to be completed by August 1, 1995:

	<u>Bidder</u>	<u>Amount</u>
1.	Northwood Contractors, Inc.	\$3,310,200
2.	Meridian Construction Co., Inc.	3,312,450
3.	Henley Construction Co., Inc.	3,324,500
4.	The McAlister-Schwartz, Co.	3,330,054
5.	Caldwell and Santmyer, Inc.	3,389,000
6.	William F. Klingensmith, Inc.	3,426,700
7.	Hess Construction Company	3,515,900

8. Triangle General Contractors, Inc. 3,548,200

and

WHEREAS, Northwood Contractors, Inc., has completed similar work successfully for Montgomery County Public Schools, including additions to Galway and Cresthaven elementary schools; and

WHEREAS, In recognition of increased construction costs, on April 5, 1994, the Board of Education requested a supplemental appropriation for North Chevy Chase Elementary School; and

WHEREAS, The low bid exceeds the initial construction estimate but is within the revised budget included in the Board of Education's supplemental appropriation request; now therefore be it

Resolved that a \$3,310,200 contract be awarded to Northwood Contractors, Inc, for the modernization/addition to North Chevy Chase Elementary School, in accordance with plans and specifications prepared by Garrison-Schurter, Architects, contingent upon County Council approval of the supplemental appropriation request.

RESOLUTION NO. 316-94 Re: ARCHITECTURAL APPOINTMENT- FLOWER VALLEY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

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

WHEREAS, It is necessary to appoint an architectural firm to provide professional and technical services during the design and construction phases of the modernization of Flower Valley Elementary School; and

WHEREAS, Funds for architectural planning were appropriated as part of the FY 1994 Capital Budget; and

WHEREAS, The Architectural Selection Committee, in accordance with procedures adopted by the Board of Education on May 13, 1986, identified Wiencek + Zavos, Architects, as the most qualified firm to provide the necessary professional architectural and engineering services; and

WHEREAS, Staff has negotiated a fee for necessary architectural services; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Montgomery County Board of Education enter into a contractual agreement with the architectural firm of Wiencek + Zavos, Architects, to provide professional architectural services for the modernization of Flower Valley

Elementary School for a fee of \$328,300, which is 6.5 percent of the estimated construction budget.

RESOLUTION NO. 317-94 Re: ARCHITECTURAL APPOINTMENT - KEMP
MILL ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

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

WHEREAS, It is necessary to appoint an architectural firm to provide professional and technical services during the design and Construction phases of the modernization of Kemp Mill Elementary School; and

WHEREAS, Funds for architectural planning were appropriated as part of the FY 1994 Capital Budget, and

WHEREAS, The Architectural Selection Committee, in accordance with procedures adopted by the Board of Education on May 13, 1986, identified Walton, Madden, Cooper, Robinson, Poness, Inc., as the most qualified firm to provide the necessary professional architectural and engineering services; and

WHEREAS, Staff has negotiated a fee for necessary architectural services; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Montgomery County Board of Education enter into a contractual agreement with the architectural firm of Walton, Madden, Cooper, Robinson, Poness, Inc., to provide professional architectural services for the modernization of Kemp Mill Elementary School for a fee of \$348,700, which is 6.5 percent of the estimated construction budget.

RESOLUTION NO. 318-94 Re: AWARD OF CONTRACTS - DAMASCUS
MIDDLE SCHOOL #2

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

WHEREAS, Sealed bids for various subcontracts for Damascus Middle School #2 were received on April 21, 1994, in accordance with MCPS procurement practices, with work to begin in a sequence consistent with a predetermined critical path of key dates and be completed by August 1, 1995; and

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

WHEREAS, The low bidders have completed similar projects successfully; and

WHEREAS, The low bids are within the budget estimates, and sufficient funds are available to award the contracts; now therefore be it

Resolved, That contracts be awarded to the following low bidders meeting specifications for the bids and amounts listed below:

<u>Low Bids</u>	<u>Amount</u>
<u>Hollow Metal Doors/Finish Hardware</u> Hess Construction Co.	\$ 231,872
<u>Landscaping</u> Ruppert Landscaping Co., Inc.	51,752
<u>Masonry and Related Work</u> United Masonry	1,698,586
<u>Wood Doors</u> Hess Construction Co.	65,152
<u>Storm Sewer Collection System</u> Gebaut Samen Development Corp.	252,750
<u>Seeding & Sodding</u> Maryland Turf and Environmental Services Corporation	132,060
<u>Wood Flooring</u> Weyer's Floor Service, Inc.	72,872
<u>Resilient Flooring</u> Carpet Fair	105,475
<u>Painting</u> Cochran & Mann, Inc.	86,000
<u>Window Blinds</u> Mileham and King, Inc.	11,080
<u>Bleachers</u> Modern Door and Equipment	45,600
<u>Construction Materials Testing Services</u> ATEC Associates, Inc.	<u>34,000</u>
TOTAL	\$2,787,199

RESOLUTION NO. 319-94

Re: GRANT OF DEED OF DEDICATION TO
MONTGOMERY COUNTY GOVERNMENT AT
ROCKING HORSE ROAD CENTER

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

WHEREAS, The site of the Rocking Horse Road Center was acquired in 1955 for an elementary school, with frontage along Macon Road to be dedicated for future road widening; and

WHEREAS, Macon Road was later widened and improved with a sidewalk, but title was never conveyed from the Board of Education to the Montgomery County Government; and

WHEREAS, The Montgomery County Government is requesting dedication of 0.094 of an acre from the site in order to obtain title to that portion of the site which is maintained as a public right-of-way; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the president and secretary be authorized to execute a deed of dedication to convey 0.094 of an acre, as originally intended, for the improvement to Macon Road.

RESOLUTION NO. 321-94 Re: AIR-MONITORING FOR ASBESTOS
ABATEMENT PROJECTS

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

WHEREAS, On April 20, 1994, the following testing laboratories submitted proposals for asbestos-related industrial hygiene, sits monitoring, and analytical services at various facilities, with work to begin on July 1, 1994, and continue through June 30, 1995, as needed:

Respondents

1. Asbestos Abatement Services, Inc.
2. Aerosol Monitoring & Analysis, Inc.
3. Apex Environmental, Inc.
4. Biospherics, Inc.
5. Environmental Visions
6. Hillmann Environmental Company of Virginia, Inc.
7. National Environmental Corporation

and

WHEREAS, Because of the variable scope of services that may be required, each respondent submitted unit prices on a hypothetical model; and

WHEREAS, The unit prices are reasonable and in line with industry

standards, and the recommended vendor has performed satisfactorily in the past; now therefore be it

Resolved, That a level-of-services agreement in accordance with unit costs stipulated in the Request For Proposals be awarded to Biospherics, Inc., for a cost not to exceed \$275,000; and be it further

Resolved, That the agreement be contingent upon final action by the County Council on the FY 1995 Capital Budget for asbestos abatement.

RESOLUTION NO. 322-94 Re: AWARD OF CONTRACTS FOR VARIOUS MAINTENANCE PROJECTS

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

WHEREAS, Sealed bids for various maintenance projects funded from the Heating/Ventilation/Air-Conditioning (HVAC) Replacement capital project, were received on April 18, 20, and 21, 1994, in accordance with MCPS Procurement Practices, with work to begin July 1 and be completed by September 15, 1994; and

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

WHEREAS, Staff will pursue energy rebates, as appropriate, from the utilities provider; and

WHEREAS, The low bidders are below the budget estimates, and the low bidders meeting specifications have completed similar projects successfully; now therefore be it

Resolved, That contingent upon formal County Council approval of the FY 1995 Capital Improvements Program and the availability of sufficient funds, contracts be awarded to the low bidders meeting specifications for the projects and amounts listed below:

<u>Project</u>	<u>Amount</u>
<u>Chiller and Cooling tower Replacements</u>	
Sherwood Elementary School	
Low Bidder: Calvert Mechanical, Inc.	\$ 49,000

Wayside Elementary School		
Low Bidder:	EMD Mechanical Specialists	69,472
Wood Acres Elementary School		
Low Bidder:	Calvert Mechanical, Inc.	77,000
Poolesville Middle/High School		
Low Bidder:	Interstate Service Co., Inc.	131,342
<u>Boiler and Fuel Burner Replacements</u>		
Stedwick Elementary School		
Low Bidder:	M & M Welding & Fabricators	65,970
Poolesville Middle/High School		
Low Bidder:	GW Mechanical Contractors	265,000
Tilden Facility		
Low Bidder:	EMD Mechanical Specialists	<u>178,623</u>
TOTAL		\$836,407

RESOLUTION NO. 323-94 Re: REJECTION OF BIDS - SHERWOOD HIGH SCHOOL STADIUM LIGHTS

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

WHEREAS, The bids received on April 7, 1994, to install stadium lights at Sherwood High School exceeded the estimated budget by approximately \$20,000; and

WHEREAS, Staff and the Sherwood High School Booster Club believe that measures can be implemented, in conjunction with rebidding at a later date, to reduce the cost; and

WHEREAS, Rebidding will not affect the scheduled completion date; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the bids received to install stadium lights at Sherwood High School be rejected and the project be rebid.

RESOLUTION NO. 324-94 Re: DR. SALLY K. RIDE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

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

WHEREAS, On June 25, 1993, the Montgomery County Board of Education entered into a contract with the H. A. Harris Co.,

Inc., for the construction of the new Dr. Sally K. Ride Elementary School to be completed by August 1994; and

WHEREAS, St. Paul Fire and Marine Insurance Company executed and delivered to the Board of Education a performance and payment bond; and

WHEREAS, Certain disputes have arisen between Montgomery County Public Schools and H. A. Harris Co., Inc., with regard to its performance under the contract, and an agreement has been reached among the Board of Education, the surety company, and H. A. Harris Co., Inc.; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Board of Education enter into an agreement with the H.A. Harris Co., Inc., and the surety company, St. Paul Fire and Marine Insurance Company, to provide for the voluntary termination of the contract with H. A. Harris Co., Inc., and for the completion of the new Dr. Sally K. Ride Elementary School to proceed under the direction and control of Montgomery County Public Schools; and be it further

Resolved, That the Board president and secretary be authorized to execute the final agreements on behalf of the Board of Education.

RESOLUTION NO. 325-94 Re: UTILIZATION OF FY 1994 FUTURE
SUPPORTED PROJECT FUNDS TO EVALUATE
THE NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH
(NIH) SCIENCE ALLIANCE PROGRAM

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

Resolved, That the superintendent of schools be authorized to receive and expend within the FY 1994 Provision for Future Supported Projects a grant award of \$14,028 from the National Institutes of Health (NIH) to continue the evaluation of the Science Alliance Program, in the following categories:

	<u>Category</u>	<u>Amount</u>
1	Administration	\$13,105
10	Fixed Charges	<u>923</u>
	TOTAL	\$14,028

and be it further

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

RESOLUTION NO. 326-94 Re: UTILIZATION OF FY 1994 FUTURE

Maryland State Department of Education (MSDE), in the following categories:

	<u>Category</u>	<u>From</u>	<u>To</u>
2	Instructional Salaries	\$3,651	
3	Other Instruct Costs		\$3,933
10	Fixed Charges	<u>282</u>	
	TOTAL	\$3,933	\$3,933

and be it further

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

RESOLUTION NO. 328-94 Re: SUBMISSION OF AN FY 1994 GRANT
 PROPOSAL TO SUPPORT DEVELOPMENT OF
 THE TECHNOLOGY INFRASTRUCTURE
 PROTOTYPE

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

Resolved, That the superintendent of schools be authorized to submit an FY 1994 grant proposal for \$2,979,200 to the National Telecommunications and Information Administration (NTIA), United States Department of Commerce, under the Telecommunications and Information Infrastructure Assistance Program (TIIAP), to support the development of the technology infrastructure prototype in seven secondary schools; and be it further

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

*Mr. Abrams rejoined the meeting at this point. Mrs. Fanconi temporarily left the meeting, and Mrs. Gordon assumed the chair.

RESOLUTION NO. 329-94 Re: MONTHLY PERSONNEL REPORT

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

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. 330-94 Re: PERSONNEL REASSIGNMENTS

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

Resolved, That the following personnel reassignments be approved:

<u>Name</u>	<u>From</u>	<u>To</u>
Mary Ann Hayes ES	Classroom Teacher Carderock Springs determined	Media Assistant Location to be determined Will maintain salary status To retire 7-1-95
J. Richard Stevenson	Principal Clopper Mill ES	Asst. Principal Location to be determined Will maintain salary status To retire 8-1-95

RESOLUTION NO. 331-94 Re: EXTENSION OF SICK LEAVE

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

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

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

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

<u>Name</u>	<u>Position and Location</u>	<u>No. of Days</u>
Osman, Agnes	Head Start Instructional Asst. Olney Elementary	20

*Mrs. Fanconi rejoined the meeting at this point and assumed the chair.

RESOLUTION NO. 332-94 Re: PERSONNEL APPOINTMENT

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

Resolved, That the following personnel appointment be approved:

<u>Appointment</u>	<u>Present Position</u>	<u>As</u>
Margaret A. Donnellon	Asst. Principal Pyle MS	Principal Pyle MS Effective: 7-1-94

Re: MULTICULTURAL EDUCATION - POLICY ANALYSIS

Dr. Vance asked Dr. Joseph Villani, associate superintendent; Dr. Lucinda Sullivan, director of the Department of Academic Programs; Dr. Pam Splaine, acting director of the Division of Administrative Analysis and Audits; and Ms. Jill Christianson, educational equity specialist, Maryland State Department of Education, to come to the table. Dr. Vance said he was very pleased to introduce the discussion of their policy analysis on multicultural education. There were many who would dismiss the issue of multicultural education as another chapter in the current volume of political correctness. For MCPS, the issue was of central importance. Their county's demographic identity continued to change in a sweeping and comprehensive way. They were multicultural, and they were more diverse than ever. They were educating students for a society and work environment that would reflect the experiences and languages of many different people.

Dr. Vance was proud to say that MCPS began to address the need for a culturally sensitive approach to learning some time ago. More than three years ago, Dr. Edmund Gordon had urged them to transform their curriculum efforts and their attitudes to begin to reflect and acknowledge the cultural, gender, and race differences of their students. Their curriculum development, materials selection, staff development, and student assessment efforts reflected a strong commitment to the goals of multicultural education long before the recent state regulation was formed on this subject. The policy analysis illustrated how that commitment was undergirded by their existing policies and how other school jurisdictions had approached the issue.

Dr. Vance explained that he was recommending they publish the new state regulation in the MCPS policy manual. The state requirement affirmed and supported what they had already begun to do in this area. He proposed that they engage in a concerted

effort to educate the community about what they had done and would continue to do in the area of multicultural education. They would continue to train staff in how to infuse multiculturalism across the curriculum. They would work with local schools to ensure that the state regulation and existing MCPS policies were highly visible in the day-to-day life of their schools. Such efforts would bolster their current efforts to help all students and staff members appreciate the diversity that exists in their schools as a powerful tool for learning and for personal and academic development.

Dr. Villani stated that they would make a presentation which was intended to give the Board a forum for discussing the state regulation on multicultural education. They would start with a recap of what they had been doing in MCPS, provide some illustrations of how they had involved community members to make sure the curriculum met the expectations of their pluralistic community, give an overview of the state regulation, and give Board members an opportunity for discussion.

Dr. Sullivan introduced Ms. Theresa Wright, co-chairperson of the Education Committee of the Hispanic Alliance; Ms. Deborah Baptiste, assistant director of education at the Anti-Defamation League; and Mr. Richard Baxter, Richard Montgomery HS history teacher. Dr. Sullivan stated that educators in Montgomery County and throughout the United States continued to face the unprecedented challenge of an increasingly diverse student body.

Many jurisdictions were in the process of initiating actions to address these issues; Montgomery County articulated its commitment to multicultural education as early as 1989 when they established a vision and a mission. They saw this reflected in the new state regulation, "Education Which is Multicultural."

Dr. Sullivan recalled that Dr. Edmund Gordon in his report praised MCPS efforts in the area of multicultural education. He charged them to move further to address curricula that included a multiplicity of perspectives. He also encourage them not to have curricula that were parallel, separate, or supplements to the original curricula. Montgomery County had already begun to use the "Banks" model which suggested that the most effective approach to multicultural education was in transforming the existing curriculum. Dr. Banks advocated curriculum which presented a truthful and meaningful rendition of the whole human experience.

Dr. Sullivan stated that Dr. Banks suggested that there were several approaches to multicultural education. The level one approach was the contributions approach which focused on heroes, holidays, and cultural elements. Lessons would occur in connection with special occasions such as Black History Month. Level two was the additive approach where content, concepts, themes, and perspectives were added to the curriculum without

really changing the structure of the curriculum. Dr. Banks favored the transformation approach. The structure of the curriculum would be changed to include a multiplicity of perspectives. It presented a truthful and meaningful rendition of the whole human experience. This approach enabled students to confront the diversity of the human experience and gain a richer and more complex understanding of curriculum content. This served both the affective and cognitive goals of schooling. The fourth level was the social action approach where students made decisions on important social issues and took action to reflect their personal responsibility to prevent or reduce discrimination.

In Dr. Gordon's report, he indicated that training was an essential component of multicultural educational reform. Dr. Sullivan believed they had made progress toward systemic training in multicultural education. This summer they had focused their resources on infusing multicultural practices, strategies, and concepts into all curricula and working towards infusing technology. In addition to efforts to transform the curriculum through Success for Every Student, ethnic advisory committees were supporting MCPS efforts by ensuring equitable representation.

Ms. Wright reported that she was an MCPS teacher working with the Hispanic Alliance. Last summer Dr. Richard Wilson asked her to review the Latin American curriculum and to form a group of parents to look at materials. She was happy to be able to help the school system by making recommendations. In her school she invited parents in to talk to students about their countries and their different cultures. She also compared U.S. colonization by the English compared to the Spanish colonization that took place in Latin America.

Dr. Michael Lin said he had organized an advisory committee from the Asian community to review the world study curriculum. They enjoyed the opportunity to provide input, but he felt the task was limited in scope. However, the effort represented the beginning of a major effort in terms of multicultural education for all students. He thought multicultural education had two components. The first was to get to know neighbors in the global village of all foreign countries. The second component was more important to him. This was to get to know whole families in what was a very diverse America. They should know their brothers in the African-American community, the Hispanic community, and the Asian-American community. This would not be easy to achieve, but if this were possible, Montgomery County was the place to do it.

They needed to learn to appreciate their differences as the strength of the nation and to stress the commonality that brought all of them to the United States. He looked to the Board of Education and the superintendent for their leadership and commitment.

Ms. Baptiste explained that she worked with the World of Difference which was an international multicultural education program. They had been working with MCPS since January of 1991, and they had already worked with 1,800 teachers. Earlier this year, she had approached Dr. Sullivan because the World of Difference had a new elementary study guide. They approached MCPS because of the system's commitment to multicultural education, and they wanted people to look at the new program and give honest feedback. She reported that most of the suggestions and comments were put into place for the final printing of the program. She hoped that they would be able to pilot this study guide at a school in Montgomery County because they wanted to see its impact on children and the educators working with these children. Ms. Baptiste stated that they were willing and eager to continue this very good relationship with MCPS.

Dr. Sullivan noted the presence of Dr. James Robinson, African-American Parents Community Education Consortium; General Holmes, chair of the NAACP education committee; and Mr. Win Grant, chief equity assurance officer at the Maryland State Department of Education.

Mr. Baxter reported that a few years ago he had been contacted by Dr. Wilson to look for original source material dealing with black migration and the post-World War II period. Mr. Baxter had been a teacher in MCPS for eight years and noticed that the curriculum and textbooks had changed to add multiculturalism. He described what he had found in the library in New York and the original source materials from people in the Harlem Renaissance. He said that the insights gained from these materials could be included in the regular curriculum to show the real human touch. They were able to gather a wealth of information, and he hoped that at some point in the future MCPS would be able to send more research teams to New York to gather these materials.

Ms. Christianson was pleased that the Board was looking at education that was multicultural and considering what their role was within that. In December, 1991, the state legislature released a report on integrated school curricula concerning African and African-American contributions. A subcommittee of delegates spent their summer speaking to Board members, people in higher education, teachers, and central office staff about the state of African-American content within the curriculum. Their report had four levels of recommendations including local school systems and local boards, Maryland State Department of Education, Maryland State Board of Education, and the Maryland Higher Education Commission. The MSDE role was to look at the state's ethnic and cultural minorities regulations, and they found the COMAR regulations had been on the books since the late 1970's; however, there was not enough accountability in the process.

The state superintendent convened a task force on "Education that is Multicultural." Every school system had a representative, and MCPS was served by Dr. Richard Wilson and later by Dr. Sullivan.

The task force was to revise the state regulations and to look at models to provide assistance to local school systems. In September, 1993, the state Board of Education adopted the new regulations. The state task force was preparing models to look at a needs assessment for the regulation and other variables of support for local school systems. Throughout the development of the regulation, Dr. Wilson was instrumental in the review process.

Ms. Christianson explained that the new regulations required that all Maryland school systems conduct a broad-based needs assessment and implementation plans for five-year cycles. Now the 24 school systems in Maryland were using the COMAR regulations to support locally-identified needs for education that was multicultural. The regulations addressed multiculturalism from a social justice/social action approach. The regulations had built in annual accountability. This was the first time the state had actually defined education that was multicultural. Several states were taking the Maryland definition and adopting it as theirs. Another significant point was the Maryland State Department of Education itself was being held accountable for their products being multicultural. The state regulation addressed curriculum, staff development, and the role of the affective domain in education. She believed the state regulations were exemplary and looked forward to working with Montgomery County.

Mr. Abrams asked whether the state of Maryland was making funds available to local jurisdictions to conduct the needs assessment being mandated by the state. Ms. Christianson replied that there were no funds available; however, the task force had raised questions about the economics of the situation and had provided suggestions about promoting multicultural education without great fiscal implications. Mr. Abrams commented that they often talked about unfunded mandates; however, the state was criticizing the federal government for doing this and turning around to mandate another program for local Boards to implement without funding from the state. Ms. Christianson explained that one positive piece of the new regulation was that it held the state Department of Education itself responsible.

Mr. Ewing thought that the superintendent's recommendations were good ones and the Board ought to support them. It struck him that as pleasant and comfortable as the discussion had been to this moment, when they began to talk about how they were going to do this there would be great deal of debate. In his memo to the Board Dr. Vance had noted that the development of policies and curricula elsewhere had spawned considerable debate about the populations the policies should address. This was no reason to

avoid this issue, but it was important for them to recognize that ideas here were not crystal clear. They had a set of general concepts in the state regulation, and he thought they needed to be quite explicit about what they were doing and to be able to explain to the public, parents, and students what they were doing and what the impact would be.

In that connection, Mr. Ewing said a report had been issued on time and learning from the National Commission on Time and Learning. One of their conclusions was that U.S. students spent about half the time that European and Japanese students devoted to academic content. If MCPS was going to infuse multicultural concepts into the curriculum, they were going to find that some things were being left out. He would argue that infusion was the way to do it to ensure that the existing curriculum was multicultural, but they did have to consider time. He thought students spent far too little time in class and believed that the school year and school day ought to be extended. They needed to do this because there was a vast body of growing knowledge. It would be better if they were able to say to people they were not losing anything, but they would have time to deal with many cultures in a systematic way. This was a theme he would sound continuously because they needed to find the time to do it right.

For example, the world history course was proposed to begin with 1493 and move to the present, but it left out a lot including the history of ancient China, India, Africa, and early America up to 1493. It seemed to him a better solution would be to have a two-year world history and culture course required of every student for graduation. They could deal with political, social, religious, economic, and legal institutions and practices. They tried to do all of that now and found it increasingly difficult.

Mr. Ewing commented that they had not said very much about languages in multicultural education, but they were mentioned in the state regulation. He thought it was essential that they give greater emphasis to foreign language study earlier and throughout school. He was particularly concerned that they avoid the kind of trap into which some communities had fallen. They were perceived to have thought that multicultural education meant the promotion of alternative lifestyles, alternative values, or no values. He did not think this was what the state regulation appeared to be saying nor was it what their own local objectives appeared to be. However, some people saw this as the abandonment of traditional western philosophic values in favor of something else. This reinforced the need to be very clear about what it was they were doing, why they were doing it, and where they were headed with it. They would have to be specific and precise about what they wanted to accomplish. He was very much in support of this approach, but he thought it needed to be recognized that there were great dangers here and they needed to take every possible step to avoid those.

Ms. Gutierrez was delighted that they had before them the initial steps of coming up with a multicultural education policy and approach. She knew that in other school systems there had been problems as people quarreled over the content or the approaches.

From what she saw before them, she thought the approach was a very broad one and a very positive approach. She saw them with multicultural education, not taking away, but adding to. They were looking at the knowledge base they currently had and augmenting it with additional knowledge, and this was the way she viewed multiculturalism. They were all born into one or two cultures, but not all had those perspectives. She thought that through the educational process they could grow in those directions.

Ms. Gutierrez agreed that these were initial steps and would like to know more about next steps. She thought that how they moved forward with this was important, and she did not see it as a one-time shot. She saw this as a dynamic, evolving, on-going effort.

This was just giving them a framework on which to start. This should be an open process, open to review and comment. This probably would help them avoid the pitfalls that other systems had had. She suggested that the Board receive a presentation on the mechanisms. For example, she did not know they were infusing the curriculum with multicultural approaches. She commended the advisory committees for their input on the curriculum, but she was somewhat concerned if this were all they planned to do. Their mandate was to get as much knowledge about multiculturalism into the educational process, and this had to come from many places. While advisory committees were valuable, they gave the perspective of seven or ten people. She thought they had to go outside and look at other models. She wondered if the state hoped to have a network internal to the state as well as external to the state. She suggested that some universities were making innovative efforts in this area. She knew that Stanford University had revised its entire undergraduate curriculum to be more multicultural.

Ms. Gutierrez said it would be important for the Board and the public to understand how materials were reviewed and selected. She would imagine that these were all next steps. She knew that a high level policy did not address this, but it was important that they bought consistent materials reflecting this policy. She asked for staff comments.

Dr. Villani replied that the next steps would be up to the Board of Education. If they were interested in the processes being used, they would be happy either privately or on an agenda to do a presentation. They could go through the process they used in curriculum development and in selecting instructional materials and textbooks. They were following the Banks model, and that was where they were headed with this. It would be their intention to carry out their programming in concert with what was happening at

the state through the state regulation; therefore, they were recommending that the state regulation be published in the MCPS policy handbook. He noted that they were not beginning at ground zero because they had done a lot and had processes in place which took care of many of the issues raised in the state regulation. The resources the state would be providing in terms of assessment would be very valuable. It seemed to Ms. Gutierrez that he was saying they had been doing a multicultural approach in developing their curriculum, but he was also saying it was before the Board now for decision. She asked how this would link to whatever the state was doing. Dr. Villani explained that this was not something the Board had to tell them to do. This was built into their process. He had interpreted next steps to mean what additional regulation they wanted to have. They did have an ongoing process that had been in place since 1989, and Dr. Gordon had commended them for it. There was no need for further direction from the Board for them to continue to carry out that process. If the Board desired them to take some other steps, they would do whatever the Board directed. They believed in Montgomery County they had a process in place that assured the development of curriculum and the delivery of a program which was multicultural and consistent with state and national standards. Ms. Gutierrez said she was trying to see if they had an open process and one where parents could go to a source such as a multicultural resource team. She suggested they could make their current process a little more visible.

Mrs. Brenneman said she was a bit confused by the questioning. For many years they had had discussions about what they were doing in multiculturalism, and they had received many presentations in different disciplines. The question was not whether they should do this because this was something they were already doing. They had requested a policy analysis to see whether they needed a separate policy to say what they were already doing or to use the state regulation which was what the superintendent was recommending. They were not starting from ground zero as to whether or not they should have multicultural infusion because that was discussed years ago. She thought the confusion might stem from the passive voice as to what they could do instead of what they were doing. She had written a memo on the Holocaust and the response stated that this was an important topic that "could be" addressed within the approved curriculum in elementary school, in middle school they "may read," and in high school it was an elective. There was nothing in the reply that said students "will learn" about this. She thought that to a large extent they did do this but probably not systematically in all schools and all classrooms. The reality was they had multiculturalism as part of their curriculum, but the question was whether it was implemented to the extent the Board would like it to be. This got into accountability. They had a lot of policies which included a lot of good statements, but they did not build in accountability to say whether something was actually

happening.

Mrs. Brenneman thought that the superintendent's recommendation was a good one. She also agreed with Mr. Ewing's remarks, but again it got into not just having a piece of paper but having an assurance that something was being implemented. This seemed to her to be the key to the whole thing.

Mrs. Fanconi called attention to the superintendent's recommendations and asked that Board members speak to some of these things if they had problems or thought these were good ideas so the superintendent could move forward.

Mr. Abrams said he wanted to address the state regulation as incorporated into their policy. The superintendent had started out today's presentation by using the term, "political correctness," as attached to multicultural education. In looking back at some of the terminology that was used, it might be viewed as an explanation of why they ran into some of those problems. It seemed to him they had some unique definition of terms in what they were trying to call multicultural education. For example, he had not seen a definition of culture. He then had to figure out what was meant. It seemed to him that cultural groups could include what they would traditionally view as a cultural linkage or some non-traditional views of cultural linkages. They could sort by groups identified by factors of race, ethnicity, region, religion, language, etc. All of these would fall into a traditional definition of culture. Gender, socioeconomic status, age, disability, etc. seemed to fall more within the range of diversity than culture. There might be an attempt to include both in a single definition, but in doing that they ran into problems as to what it was they were trying to achieve. He asked if they were overreaching by what they meant by multicultural education or should they be more specific in terms of the multiple objectives they had. This might lead to a broader public acceptance to what they were calling multicultural education.

Mr. Abrams stated that there were some areas of inherent contradiction. He called attention to the instructional and program guidance on pages four and five where there appeared to be conflicting goals. One promoted groupings of students to reflect cultural diversity and then ensuring that a student would not be denied access to equally rigorous academic instruction on the basis of cultural background. Both were laudable objectives, but they might be in conflict. This raised concerns on the balancing of that issue. He was heartened by what he heard in the original presentations in terms of curriculum review. There was one thing he was concerned about which went back to the use of organizations promoting cultural and ethnic understanding. They had had examples of the positive benefits of that in terms of working through a controlled mechanism in developing a

curriculum and verifying it. However, if that were not properly monitored, they might run into circumstances where for other agendas information was attempted to be brought into the curriculum. He thought the consideration he was looking for was the difference between providing a broad informational base versus providing a forum for advocacy within the context of multicultural education.

Dr. Villani replied that the issue of seeking ways to avoid particular advocacies was addressed by the scope of the review process. They did not use a single source for a review. Before any curriculum came to the superintendent, it was reviewed by the Council on Instruction which consisted of about 40 staff members who looked at curriculum from a wide range of points of view. Each member of the Council was charged with reviewing the curriculum with his or her colleagues. Students on the Council looked at it with other students, and sometimes teachers would take it to parents. Therefore, they did get a wide look at what was being proposed for instructional outcomes in schools and for what the process would be for delivering those outcomes. This would ferret out hidden agendas. For example, when they reviewed the health curriculum there were items in there about which questions were raised. In the refinement process those items were pulled out.

Mr. Abrams commented that this was when they were talking in terms of a curriculum review. They were talking about the use of organizations promoting cultural understanding, and they were looking at bringing additional resources from the community into the schools. He asked how thorough they were in understanding the kinds of presentations students were exposed to. He was pleased about the integration of multiculturalism into the curriculum, but he had some concerns about other tools and the mechanisms for control in those areas. Dr. Villani explained that one of the expectations they had for teachers was they would provide a setting for discussions so students realized speakers had particular points of view. Students should look at issues from a variety of points of view and not accept one point of view because it was presented by someone who sounded like an expert. Teachers did prepare students to be critical thinkers, and he had attended classroom discussions where controversial discussions were introduced by outside speakers. There was a great deal of dialogue and debate between the students and the outside speaker. Good teachers would build on that for subsequent classroom experiences.

Mr. Abrams pointed out that there needed to be a foundation before that method became appropriate. He thought there had to be some judgments made so that this was not introduced at an inappropriate level or an inappropriate age. Dr. Villani explained that at the elementary school level they tried to teach understanding points of view and where people were coming from

when they look a particular position. Ms. Christianson added that even at ages two or three they were seeing biases played out by children. Early childhood education was now being approached from an anti-bias perspective.

Dr. Cheung liked the exhibit and the state regulation on multicultural education. He liked it because it reflected some of the philosophy and work of MCPS staff. He also liked the section on definitions, but he did have questions about the definition of multicultural and diversity. It was important that they clearly define these terms. Mr. Ewing brought up concerns expressed by the superintendent about how some community members might react to this approach. He commented that Dr. Lin had stated the country was becoming a global village, and he believed they were going to interact with a lot people with different cultures, ethnicity, social and economic background, and gender.

Their work force was different, and in the past management was able to manage well because the work force was homogeneous. Now the work force was diversified, and some leaders did not know how to handle this. If they looked a successful people around the world, they would find people with multicultural experience and background and multiple languages. This gave those people a competitive edge. Therefore, it was important for MCPS to look at a broader perspective and look at whether they could continue as though they were educating a very homogeneous population. He was supportive of the proposed state regulation and adoption of its use in MCPS with some clarification of definitions for multicultural and diversity.

Mr. Ewing stated that one of his concerns was to make sure their strategy was such that they avoided the possibility of backlash.

They all knew that the Daughters of the American Revolution were not in the past strong advocates of multiculturalism. On one occasion Franklin Roosevelt went to address them and opened his address by saying, "fellow immigrants!" There was dead silence, and President Roosevelt never repeated that experience. He recalled that in the middle 1970's the Board of Education adopted a policy that said all employees should learn about African-American culture and history and adopted a requirement that everyone should take a course, H.R. 18. He had taken the course and learned a great many things, but that requirement caused an immense backlash which led to the election of a Board majority that quickly eliminated that requirement and set MCPS back some years in their efforts to improve education for all students. He wanted to be sure they approached this in a way that did not cause that kind of experience to be repeated. It would be both a difficult and a delicate task.

Mr. Ewing commented that some people might think they were beyond President Roosevelt's experience or the 1970's, but he was not so sure. He was not saying Montgomery County was inhabited by a huge crowd of bigots, but there was a great deal of residual

anxiety, concern, and even anger over the fact that Montgomery County had become multicultural. He thought the superintendent's recommendations were good ones. The publication of the state regulation would be useful, and then they should undertake a considerable effort to educate the community about what MCPS had already done and would continue to do. He suspected there were people in the room who did not know what MCPS had done and would continue to do in any kind of precise way. They had to get beyond the general statement of philosophy into the kind of things that illustrated what they were doing. He had seen a draft of the world history course which illustrated a multicultural approach. He thought they could produce particular examples that were in place that showed the public what they were doing so that it would become concrete. He thought that the other recommendations were excellent, and they should go forward with them.

Mrs. Gordon thought that the superintendent's recommendations were a reasonable way of addressing this without raising many of the issues Mr. Ewing had just spoken about. She did think they needed to do a better job of talking about the things they were already doing and the positive results. She would support the superintendent's recommendations.

Mrs. Fanconi added her thanks for the presentation. One of the first meetings she had attended on the Board was on this topic. She would like to see some of the materials once the staff had them in a form they were going to be using. She believed the recommendations were certainly appropriate. She suggested that they consider providing curricular materials prior to evening Board meeting or lunch at the day-time meeting so that Board members would have an opportunity to look at curriculum materials. She would be interested in seeing some demonstrations of what they were using at various grade levels, but she realized agenda time was limited. Dr. Vance said they would plan a multimedia approach to get visual and oral reports, perhaps a video tape that Board members could take home. They could share information on a continuing basis particularly as they moved into this arena. Ms. Gutierrez said they had mentioned the idea of a multicultural resource library that would have collections that teachers could look at for ideas. She noted that this was a discussion item, and she had heard consensus to move ahead. She asked about the possibility of taking actions on the superintendent's recommendations.

Re: A MOTION BY MR. EWING TO AMEND THE
AGENDA [FAILED]

A motion by Mr. Ewing to amend the agenda to make the item on multicultural education discussion/action failed with Mr. Ewing, Mrs. Gordon, and Ms. Gutierrez voting in the affirmative; Mr. Abrams, Ms. Baker, Dr. Cheung, and Mrs. Fanconi voting in the

negative; Mrs. Brenneman abstaining.

Re: A MOTION BY MR. EWING REGARDING THE
SIXTH GRADE IN THE CENTER FOR THE
HIGHLY GIFTED AT DR. CHARLES R.
DREW ELEMENTARY SCHOOL (FAILED)

The following motion by Mr. Ewing failed of adoption with Mr. Abrams, Mrs. Brenneman, Dr. Cheung, and Mr. Ewing voting in the affirmative; Mrs. Fanconi, Mrs. Gordon, and Ms. Gutierrez voting in the negative; Ms. Baker abstaining:

Resolved, That the Board of Education authorize the extension of the sixth grade program of the Center for the Highly Gifted currently located at Dr. Charles R. Drew Elementary School for a period until the Takoma and Eastern conversions to middle schools are completed.

Re: A MOTION BY MS. GUTIERREZ REGARDING
THE SIXTH GRADE IN THE CENTER FOR
THE HIGHLY GIFTED AT DR. CHARLES R.
DREW ELEMENTARY SCHOOL (FAILED)

A motion by Ms. Gutierrez that the superintendent's recommendation for housing the Blair cluster center students and other highly able students in Eastern in an interim program failed for lack of a second.

Dr. Cheung left the meeting at this point.

Re: BOARD/SUPERINTENDENT COMMENTS

1. Dr. Vance reported that last week the County Council had approved the construction of a new Montgomery Blair High School on the Kay tract. The debate on this issue was protracted, and people of honest and good intention were on both sides of it. This issue galvanized the community, and in the end many individuals decided to do the right thing and end the debate by supporting the Board's recommendation for the Kay tract. He thanked Mr. William Hanna for his change of heart and his leadership. He acknowledged the work of Mr. Michael Subin, the chair of the Council's education committee, for his leadership in breaking the log jam that threatened to delay the Blair project.

He extended his appreciation to all of the other members of the Council for their thoughtful consideration and public comments.

2. Dr. Vance stated that the Council's education committee had finished its work on the Board's FY 1995 operating budget request. The committee approved a list of items that would equal a reduction of one half of one percent from the total operating budget. The full County Council would review and adopt the final budget tomorrow morning, and he and Mrs. Fanconi would address

the proposed reduction.

3. Dr. Vance acknowledged that 18 MCPS had won full or partial college scholarships in the Project Excellence Program which honored the academic achievement of African-American students in the Washington area. This project was sponsored by Mr. Carl Rowan. MCPS students were among 103 metropolitan area students who won scholarships ranging from \$48,000 to \$120,000 to attend college. In addition, 17 high school seniors won National Merit Scholarships which brought the MCPS total to 25 students this year, which was the largest number in any school district in the state. He congratulated the students for bringing continued distinction to the school system.

4. Mrs. Gordon explained that during the afternoon she had left the Board meeting to attend the County Council meeting. For a good portion of this year the Paint Branch community had been considering safety issues regarding Route 29 after a student was killed crossing there. The community working with her, Mrs. Praisner, and Delegate Coughlin, had come up with some possible solutions. Today the Council tentatively acted to approve some additional funding to build a safety fence along Route 29. She was pleased that so many people had joined together to address a safety, school, and community issue.

5. Mr. Abrams joined with the superintendent's comments with regard to Mr. Hanna. He commended Mr. Hanna not only for his vote but for the leadership and courage that it took to cast that vote. He was impressed by the tenor of Mr. Hanna's comments when the vote was cast. Mr. Hanna's eloquence was probably a lesson to all in terms of how they as elected officials and community leaders had a responsibility in terms of structuring their rhetoric. This should be instructive to all as they approach public policy making. It should be instructive to all in terms of looking at motivation of people who were well intentioned and wanted to be involved in public policy and debate. All had to be sensitive to the labelling of opponents or proponents of issues, and Mr. Hanna had given them an instruction to be somewhat mindful of their level of tolerance and debate. Mr. Hanna had arrived at a decision in a very hard way, but he did it with dignity.

6. In regard to class rank, Mr. Abrams said he had received a memo this week. They had received requests from secondary institutions and scholarship agencies with regard to this year's senior class. A total of 1,124 class ranking were sent out, and he would guess that the senior class had 9,000 or 10,000 students. He would also assume that students had multiple applications; therefore, he was guessing that somewhere under 5 percent of applications required class ranking. It would be helpful if DEA could do some tracking on the relationship between the requests for class rank information and acceptances or

rejections at those institutions and in terms of the financial aid applications. He had assumed with the class rank policy that this would offer MCPS students a better shot in terms of getting into the schools of their choice because it would require the admissions process to take a fuller look at the application rather than applying a clerical cutoff point.

7. Ms. Gutierrez was sorry that she had missed the vote on Montgomery Blair because she was out of town. She was delighted that it had happened, and she hoped they would move forward.

8. Ms. Gutierrez applauded and commended the superintendent's efforts to recruit more Hispanic teachers and to forge a link with educators in Puerto Rico. She had received a call from one staff member telling how successful these efforts had been. The staff planned to interview as many as 400 people and had already identified 20 candidates for a contract offer. The MCPS student population was 10 percent Hispanic, but only 2.4 percent of the teachers were Hispanic.

9. Mr. Ewing commented that discussion on the sixth grade in the center for the highly gifted at Drew had raised an issue about the need to improve program for educating gifted and talented students at the middle school level. He hoped that Board members saw the survey of parents who expressed concern over the lack of adequate middle school programs for the gifted. It seemed to him that in order for this to be addressed, there needed to be some immediate action. He intended to propose a new business item to this effect. He had been dismayed with the superintendent's proposal which was half-developed and unclear, and he was dismayed by inability or unwillingness of Board members to come up with anything else.

10. In regard to Blair High School, Mr. Ewing stated that across the nation one thing that was clear was that school boards had typically neglected schools in communities in areas that were low income and high minority. One of the remarkable things about Montgomery County was how they were often able to change the stereotypes and do something that reversed what most people did.

In this case, democracy triumphed, and the public spoke. The Council eventually agreed, and they would now have a world class school in the poorest, oldest, most heavily minority neighborhood in the county. He believed this was a remarkable tribute to the county and showed they knew how to get things done for those unable to speak for themselves.

11. Mr. Ewing indicated that he planned to send the Board a proposal for a two-year program in world history and cultures that would be required for all students. He expected this to generate a lot of disagreement and debate, but this was an important notion that needed to be discussed.

until the completion of business.

Mrs. Gordon assumed the chair.

RESOLUTION NO. 334-94 Re: MINUTES OF MARCH 9, 1994

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

Resolved, That the minutes of March 9, 1994, be approved.

Mrs. Fanconi assumed the chair.

RESOLUTION NO. 335-94 Re: MINUTES OF MARCH 21, 1994

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

Resolved, That the minutes of March 21, 1994, be approved.

RESOLUTION NO. 336-94 Re: MINUTES OF APRIL 5, 1994

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

Resolved, That the minutes of April 5, 1994, be approved.

Re: REPORT ON CLOSED SESSIONS - APRIL
20 AND 25, 1994

On April 20, 1994, by the unanimous vote of members present, the Board of Education voted to conduct a closed session on Wednesday, April 20, 1994, as permitted under Section 4-106, Education Article of the Annotated Code of Maryland and State Government Article 10-501.

The Montgomery County Board of Education met in closed session on Wednesday, April 20, 1994, from 9:40 p.m. to 12:35 a.m. The meeting took place in room 120 of the Carver Educational Services Center, Rockville, Maryland.

The Board of Education met to consider a proposal by MCEA for a retirement incentive program for employees who were eligible to retire. Mr. Reinert reviewed the legal issues of the proposal. A motion that the Board delay approval of a full program at this time and continue to consider it for not later than July 1, 1995, was adopted.

Board members reviewed and rewrote a proposed letter to Judge Bell and the members of the Juvenile Procedures Review Panel. They also reviewed interrogatories in BOE Appeal No. 1994-1.

In attendance at the closed session were Steve Abrams, Carrie Baker, Larry Bowers, Fran Brenneman, Carole Burger, Alan Cheung, Blair Ewing, Carol Fanconi, Tom Fess, David Fischer, Kathy Gemberling, Wes Girling, Bea Gordon, Ana Sol Gutierrez, Brian Porter, Thomas Reinert, Phil Rohr, Paul Vance, William Wilder, Mary Lou Wood, and Melissa Woods.

On April 14, 1994, by the unanimous vote of members present, the Board of Education voted to conduct a closed session on Monday, April 25, 1994, as permitted under Section 4-106, Education Article of the Annotated Code of Maryland and State Government Article 10-501.

The Montgomery County Board of Education met in closed session on Monday, April 25, 1994, from 7:30 p.m. to 7:55 p.m. The meeting took place in room 120 of the Carver Educational Services Center, Rockville, Maryland.

The Board met to discuss the monthly personnel report and confirmed its vote in open session. The Board received legal advice from its attorney on the football coaches litigation.

In attendance at the closed session were Steve Abrams, Carrie Baker, Fran Brenneman, Judy Bresler, Alan Cheung, Blair Ewing, Carol Fanconi, Tom Fess, David Fischer, Kathy Gemberling, Bea Gordon, Ana Sol Gutierrez, Brian Porter, Phil Rohr, Roger Titus, Paul Vance, Mary Lou Wood, and Melissa Woods.

Re: A MOTION BY MS. GUTIERREZ ON THE
BOARD ROLE IN CURRICULUM REVIEW
(FAILED)

The following motion by Ms. Gutierrez failed of adoption with Mr. Ewing and Ms. Gutierrez voting in the affirmative; Mr. Abrams, Ms. Baker, Mrs. Brenneman, and Mrs. Fanconi voting in the negative; Mrs. Gordon abstaining:

Resolved, That the Board of Education schedule time to review the present role of the Board in curriculum review and approval and consider possible alternative approaches.

RESOLUTION NO. 337-94 Re: STUDY OF LEP STUDENTS

On motion of Mr. Ewing seconded by Dr. Cheung (on April 25, 1994), the following resolution was adopted with Ms. Baker, Mr. Ewing, Mrs. Fanconi, Mrs. Gordon, and Ms. Gutierrez voting in the affirmative; Mr. Abrams and Mrs. Brenneman abstaining:

Resolved, That the Board of Education schedule discussion and action on what it is the Board would like to see included in the study of students with limited English proficiency.

RESOLUTION NO. 338-94 Re: BOE APPEAL NO. 1994-2

On motion of Mrs. Gordon seconded by Ms. Baker, the following resolution was adopted with Mr. Abrams, Ms. Baker, Mrs. Brenneman, Mr. Ewing, Mrs. Fanconi, and Mrs. Gordon voting in the affirmative; Ms. Gutierrez did not participate in the appeal:

Resolved, That the Board of Education adopt its Decision and Order in BOE Appeal No. 1994-2, a tuition matter, to dismiss the appeal at the request of the appellants.

Re: NEW BUSINESS

Board members raised the following items of new business:

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education request that the superintendent bring to the Board within 60 days a comprehensive plan for its approval for a program of gifted education for the students at Drew who will be in sixth grade next year and for mandatory programs for the education of all gifted and talented students at the middle school level in Montgomery County.

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education schedule a discussion of the efficacy of alternating the starting times of elementary schools (reversing the early and late starting times in alternate years).

3. Mr. Abrams moved and Mrs. Brenneman seconded the following:

Resolved, That the Board of Education schedule a discussion of the efficacy of using homework as an indicator of student performance.

4. Mr. Abrams moved and Mr. Ewing seconded the following:

Resolved, That the Board of Education schedule a discussion on patterns of teacher transfers and how this related to educational load.

Re: ITEMS OF INFORMATION

Board members received the following items of information:

1. Items in Process
2. Monthly Financial Report
3. Construction Progress Report
4. Minority-, Female-, or Disabled-owned Business (MFD) Procurement Report for Third Quarter of FY 1994

Re: ADJOURNMENT

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education adjourn its meeting at 5:45 p.m.

PRESIDENT

SECRETARY

PLV:mlw