

Re: SCHOOL INSPECTIONS

Mrs. Fanconi agreed to inspect Forest Knolls ES on August 12.
Mrs. Gordon will inspect Oakland Terrace ES on a date to be determined.

RESOLUTION NO. 505-94 Re: PROCUREMENT CONTRACTS MORE THAN
\$25,000

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

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

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

S-42058	Removal/Disposal of Hazardous Wastes <u>Awardee</u> Clean Ventures, Inc.	\$ 61,000
Q72099	Motor Vehicles for the Department of Facilities Management, Security Unit <u>Awardee</u> Sheehy Ford, Inc.	\$ 29,214
92-03	Provide Primary In-Patient Chemical Dependency Treatment for Eligible MCPS Employees - Extension <u>Awardees</u> Circle Treatment Center Maryland Treatment Center Melwood Farm Treatment Center Montgomery General Hospital TOTAL	\$ 33,750
061494	Emergency Asbestos Abatement at Lucy V. Barnsley ES <u>Awardee</u> Potomac Abatement, Inc.	\$ 30,870
124-92	Uniforms for the Division of Food Services <u>Awardee</u> Fashion Seal Uniforms	\$ 32,191

103-94	Processed Meats <u>Awardees</u>	
	JP Foodservice, Inc.	\$ 5,468
	Mazo-Lerch Company, Inc.	5,000
	Sandler Foods-Contract Division	27,020
	Shane Meat Company	8,293
	Smelkinson/Sysco	<u>18,183</u>
	TOTAL	\$ 63,964
106-94	Frozen Foods, Fish and Eggs <u>Awardees</u>	
	Carroll County Foods, Inc.	\$ 45,523
	Dori Foods, Inc.	15,223
	Hearn Kirkwood/Gilbert Foods	1,336
	Karetas Foods, Inc.	3,650
	Mazo-Lerch Company, Inc.	14,748
	Sandler Foods - Contract Division	<u>27,722</u>
	TOTAL	\$108,202
116-94	Fresh Donuts <u>Awardee</u>	
	Montgomery Doughnut Company, Inc.	\$ 55,100
124-94	LAN/WAN Communications Equipment for the Department of Technology Planning and Data Operations <u>Awardees</u>	
	The Future Now, Inc.	\$ 26,280
	System X, Inc.	<u>109,808</u> *
	TOTAL	\$136,088
	MORE THAN \$25,000	\$550,379

* Denotes MFD vendors

RESOLUTION NO. 506-94 Re: BID NO. 119-94, LEASE/PURCHASE OF
COLOR LASER PRINTER EQUIPMENT

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

WHEREAS, The Board of Education of Montgomery County received Bid No. 119-94, lease/purchase of a color laser printer, to be used for the needs of the Department of Technology Planning and Data Operations to replace a printer that does not have color capability; and

WHEREAS, Xerox Corporation is the lowest responsible bidder meeting specifications to provide a four-year lease/purchase arrangement; and

July 25, 1994

WHEREAS, The Board of Education has determined that it is in the public interest, and the cost is within the current budget, to obtain the laser printer through a lease/purchase arrangement with Xerox Corporation subject to cancellation in the event of nonappropriation; and

WHEREAS, Xerox Corporation has agreed to provide the color laser printer in accordance with the lease/purchase terms and nonappropriation condition set forth in the bid specifications; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Board of Education of Montgomery County award Bid No. 119-94, for a color laser printer and financing to Xerox Corporation totalling \$251,966.50, for a lease/purchase financing agreement in accordance with the terms and conditions of the specifications; and be it further

Resolved, That the Board of Education president and the superintendent of schools be authorized to execute the documents necessary for this transaction.

RESOLUTION NO. 507-94 Re: AWARD OF CONTRACT - ROSEMONT
ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

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

WHEREAS, The following bids were received on June 30, 1994, for the modernization/addition to Rosemont Elementary School, with work to begin this summer and be completed by August 1, 1995:

<u>Bidder</u>	<u>Amount</u>
Hess Construction Company, Inc.	\$4,224,000
Henley Construction Co., Inc.	4,371,500
SIGAL Corporation	4,404,000
Kimmel & Kimmel, Inc.	4,405,300
CCI/Ortenzio Company, Inc.	4,470,000

and

WHEREAS, Hess Construction Company, Inc., has completed similar work successfully for Montgomery County Public Schools, including Thurgood Marshall Elementary School; and

WHEREAS, The low bid is slightly higher than the architect's estimate of \$4,200,000, with construction contingency funds available to cover the overage; now therefore be it

Resolved, That a \$4,224,000 contract be awarded to Hess Construction Company, Inc., for the modernization/addition to

July 25, 1994

Rosemont Elementary School, in accordance with plans and specifications prepared by Garrison-Schurter, Architects.

RESOLUTION NO. 508-94 Re: AWARD OF CONTRACTS - DAMASCUS
MIDDLE SCHOOL #2

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

WHEREAS, Sealed bids for various subcontracts for Damascus Middle School #2 were received on July 7, 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; now therefore be it

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

Low Bids

Elevator

Otis Elevator Company	\$ 27,600
-----------------------	-----------

Gymnasium Equipment

Modern Door and Equipment Sales, Inc.	52,023
---------------------------------------	--------

Operable Walls

Modern Door and Equipment Sales, Inc.	<u>74,613</u>
---------------------------------------	---------------

TOTAL	\$154,236
-------	-----------

RESOLUTION NO. 509-94 Re: ASBESTOS ABATEMENT - GEORGIAN
FOREST ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

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

WHEREAS, The following bids were received on June 20, 1994, for asbestos abatement work associated with the modernization/addition to Georgian Forest Elementary School, in accordance with plans and specifications prepared by the

July 25, 1994

<u>Bidder</u>	<u>Amount</u>
Gebaut Samen Development Corporation	\$38,020
Busy Ditch, Inc.	39,900

and

WHEREAS, Gebaut Samen Development Corporation has completed similar projects successfully at various schools, including Strawberry Knoll and Travilah elementary schools and Quince Orchard High School; now therefore be it

Resolved, That A \$38,020 contract be awarded to Gebaut Samen Development Corporation for the sanitary sewer conversion at Brooke Grove Elementary School, in accordance with plans and specifications prepared by the Department of Facilities Management.

RESOLUTION NO. 513-94 Re: SITE SELECTION FOR NORTHEAST AREA
HIGH SCHOOL

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

WHEREAS, The approved FY95 Capital Improvements Program indicates the need for a new high school to serve the east county by September 1998; and

WHEREAS, The Board of Education, after considering 29 alternative locations for the future school, prefers a privately-owned site in the Cloverly area located on the south side of Norwood Road, west of New Hampshire Avenue (MD 650); and

WHEREAS, The Site Selection Advisory Committee included this site on its list of sites that would be suitable for construction of a high school and serve the long-term needs of the eastern area of the county; and

WHEREAS, Montgomery County Public Schools and Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning staff have made a preliminary evaluation of the site and found it to be satisfactory from an environmental perspective and adequate to meet educational program requirements; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Board of Education select a 95-acre portion of the Robey Tract located at Norwood and Johnson roads for the September 1998, occupancy of the Northeast Area High School; and be it further

July 25, 1994

Resolved, That an Agreement of Sale for the purchase of the site be executed by the president and secretary for a sales price of \$2,961,000.

RESOLUTION NO. 514-94 Re: AWARD OF CONTRACT - GEORGIAN FOREST
ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

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

WHEREAS, The following bids were received on July 18, 1994, for the modernization of Georgian Forest Elementary School, with work to begin this summer and be completed by August 1, 1995:

<u>Bidder</u>	<u>Amount</u>
Hess Construction Company, Inc.	\$4,432,900
CCI/Ortenzio Company, Inc.	4,486,300
Henley Construction Co., Inc.	4,559,000
Metro Pace Construction, Inc.	4,902,000

and

WHEREAS, Hess Construction Company, Inc., has completed similar work successfully for Montgomery County Public Schools, including Thurgood Marshall Elementary School; and

WHEREAS, The low bid is slightly higher than the architect's estimate of \$4,400,000, with construction contingency funds available to cover the overage; now therefore be it

Resolved, That a \$4,432,900 contract be awarded to Hess Construction Company, Inc., for the modernization of Georgian Forest Elementary School, in accordance with plans and specifications prepared by Anderson, O'Brien/Soyejima, Architects.

RESOLUTION NO. 515-94 Re: CHANGE ORDER OVER \$25,000 -
HIGHLAND VIEW ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

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

WHEREAS, The Department of Facilities Management has received a change order proposal for Highland View 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: Highland View Elementary School

Description: Highland View Elementary School is currently undergoing a modernization. The gymnasium roof was newer than the classroom building and was not scheduled to be replaced until 1996. A price to replace the gymnasium roof as part of the modernization has been negotiated with the contractor that is consistent with current costs. This change order is to accelerate the gymnasium roof replacement to minimize future disruption to the school operation.

Contractor: Caldwell & Santmyer, Inc.

Amount: \$48,043

RESOLUTION NO. 516-94 Re: MAINTENANCE PROJECTS AT VARIOUS SCHOOLS

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

WHEREAS, Sealed bids were received on July 1, 1994, to replace the corridor and gymnasium lockers and the locker room pedestal benches at Cabin John and Tilden middle schools; and

WHEREAS, The vendors have raised questions concerning delivery dates and quantities; and

WHEREAS, Facilities staff members will work with the appropriate vendors to clarify these issues; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the bids to replace the corridor and gymnasium lockers and the locker room pedestal benches at Cabin John and Tilden middle schools be rejected; and be it further

Resolved, That the specifications be modified and the project rebid at the earliest possible time.

RESOLUTION NO. 517-94 Re: AUTOMATED TELEPHONE ENROLLMENT SYSTEM FOR THE DIVISION OF INSURANCE AND RETIREMENT

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

WHEREAS, Montgomery County Public Schools plans to offer an Employee Benefits Plan open season in November 1994; and

WHEREAS, The Division of Insurance and Retirement proposes to conduct a positive enrollment/re-enrollment of all employees at that time; and

WHEREAS, Staff has explored two different approaches to obtain automated enrollment capability and determined that the service bureau approach is cost effective and offers the greatest opportunity for success; and

WHEREAS, Such a service bureau is available and within the scope of an existing contract, RFP #92-15, with Alexander & Alexander Consulting Group, Inc.; now therefore be it

Resolved, That contract RFP #92-15 be amended to include use of the Alexander & Alexander Consulting Group, Inc., service bureau for employee benefits plan enrollments during the November 1994 and 1995 open seasons at a total cost of \$143,450.

RESOLUTION NO. 518-94 Re: MARYLAND STATE BOND REQUIREMENT

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

WHEREAS, The Montgomery County Board of Education currently provides bonding coverage for the superintendent of schools in the amount of \$500,000 with the Board of Education named as payee; and

WHEREAS, Section 6-110 of the Education Article of the Annotated Code of Maryland requires local boards of education to provide bonding coverage to the state of Maryland on behalf of the county superintendent of schools with the state of Maryland names as payee; and

WHEREAS, The Montgomery County Board of Education must set the amount of bond; now therefore be it

Resolved, That a bond in the amount of \$10,000 be executed on behalf of the superintendent of schools with the state of Maryland named as payee.

RESOLUTION NO. 519-94 Re: UTILIZATION OF FY 1995 FUTURE
SUPPORTED PROJECT FUNDS FOR
IMPROVING THE MATHEMATICAL POWER OF
ALL CHILDREN AND TEACHERS (PROJECT
IMPACT)

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Mr. Abrams 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 1995 Provision for Future Supported Projects a grant award of \$83,908 from the National Science Foundation through the University of Maryland, for the program, Improving the Mathematical Power of All Children and Teachers (Project IMPACT), in the following categories:

	<u>Category</u>	<u>Positions*</u>	<u>Amount</u>
2	Instructional Salaries	.5	\$65,193
3	Other Instructional Costs		12,500
10	Fixed Charges	—	<u>6,215</u>
	TOTAL	<u>.5</u>	<u>\$83,908</u>

*.5 Secretary, Grade 12
(plus other part-time salaries and training stipends)

and be it further

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

RESOLUTION NO. 520-94 Re: PRESENTATION OF PRELIMINARY PLANS -
NORTHWEST AREA HIGH SCHOOL

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

WHEREAS, The architect for the new Northwest Area High School has prepared a schematic design in accordance with the educational specifications; and

WHEREAS, The Northwest Area High School Facilities Advisory Committee has approved the proposed schematic design; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Board of Education approve the preliminary plan report for the new Northwest Area High School developed by Samaha Associates, P.C.

RESOLUTION NO. 521-94 Re: PERSONNEL APPOINTMENT

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

Resolved, That the following personnel appointment be approved:

<u>Appointment</u>	<u>Present Position</u>	<u>As</u>
Wayne R. Fleeger	Asst. Principal Rosa Parks MS	Principal Richard Montgomery HS Effective: 7-26-94

RESOLUTION NO. 522-94 Re: PERSONNEL APPOINTMENTS

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

Resolved, That the following personnel appointments be approved:

<u>Appointment</u>	<u>Present Position</u>	<u>As</u>
Dennis S. Leighty	Asst. Supervisor for Spec. Svs. One Central Plaza Field Office	Supervisor of Special Ed. Svs. Dept. of Spec. Ed. & Related Services Grade 0 Effective: 7-26-94
Vickie Strange	Admin. Asst. Office of Special & Alternative Ed.	Supervisor of Special Ed. Svs. Dept. of Spec. Ed. & Related Services Grade 0 Effective: 7-26-94

RESOLUTION NO. 523-94 Re: PERSONNEL APPOINTMENT

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

Resolved, That the following personnel appointment be approved:

<u>Appointment</u>	<u>Present Position</u>	<u>As</u>
Debra S. Munk	Asst. Principal Sherwood HS	Coordinator, Secondary English Div. of Curr. Coor. & Implementation Grade N Effective: 8-1-94

RESOLUTION NO. 524-94 Re: PERSONNEL APPOINTMENT

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

Resolved, That the following personnel appointment be approved:

<u>Appointment</u>	<u>Present Position</u>	<u>As</u>
Michael J. DeBoy	Asst. Principal Southwestern SHS Baltimore City	Asst. Principal Montgomery Blair HS Effective: 7-26-94

RESOLUTION NO. 525-94 Re: PERSONNEL TRANSFERS

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

Resolved, That the following transfers be approved:

<u>Transfer</u>	<u>From</u>	<u>To</u>
J. Richard Stevenson	Asst. Principal Stone Mill ES	Asst. Principal Rachel Carson ES Effective: 7-26-94
Maxine Counihan	Asst. Principal Gaithersburg HS	Asst. Principal Walt Whitman HS Effective: 7-26-94

RESOLUTION NO. 526-94 Re: PERSONNEL REASSIGNMENTS

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

Resolved, That the following personnel reassignments be approved:

<u>Reassignment</u>	<u>From</u>	<u>To</u>
Patricia P. Dixon	Leave	Asst. Principal Summit Hall ES Effective: 7-26-94
E. Donna Kozar	Principal E. Silver Spring ES	Asst. Principal Maryvale ES Effective: 7-26-94
Gwendolyn W. Page	Principal Fields Road ES	Asst. Principal Stone Mill ES Effective: 7-26-94
Dorothy Jackson	Principal Sligo MS	Asst. Principal Seneca Valley HS Effective: 8-1-94
Marion Bell	Acting Principal Office of Special & Alter. Ed.	Asst. Principal Robert Frost MS Effective: 7-26-94

Re: REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON MINORITY
STUDENT EDUCATION

Mrs. Lee Ingram, co-chair of the committee, explained that a draft copy of their report had been printed, and they were supplying Board members with a final copy.

Mr. Charles Sye, co-chair of the committee, introduced Mr. Harold Aikens, chair of the student achievement/participation subcommittee; Mr. Tom Evans, chair of the community outreach subcommittee; Dr. Emma Munoz-Duston, co-chair of the affirmative staffing group; and Mr. Edgar Gonzalez, student achievement and participation. Mr. Sye stated that their group was diversified, and they felt very fortunate to have had an opportunity to interact with each other in preparing the report. They had many things in common, and their experience on the committee had enhanced them. The committee recommended to the Board that the Board try to instill this kind of diversification in other committees. The report fulfilled the Board's charge to review the Montgomery County minority action plans and to submit recommendations.

Mr. Gonzalez stated that his issue dealt with Success for Every Student outcomes. Their first issue dealt with high school academic achievement indicators. They commended the school system for positive improvements that had been made in the areas of the Maryland functional tests, but they also recognized there were still unsatisfactory levels of performance and large

disparities in outcomes between African-American and Hispanic students when compared with white students. He reminded them that the Maryland functional tests were measures of basic skills, and the gaps were larger and much less progress had been made, and in some cases changes in the opposite direction had occurred in the more challenging activities such as completion of algebra 1 by grade nine or percentage of students taking the preliminary scholastic achievement tests and their scores. They had concerns about enrollment in honors and advanced placement classes.

Mr. Gonzalez reported that Hispanic and African-American students were at the top of the charts in suspension rates. When compared with other students, the rates for African-American and Hispanic students were four and five times as large. They recommended the Board focus on accountability and who was responsible for these things, who was monitoring this, and who was making adjustments for better results. They asked the Board to focus on controls, not on plans. Their second issue dealt with trends in academic achievement of elementary and middle school students. The disparity rates were alarming to the committee. For example, in the math CRT scores in some instances two out of every three Hispanic or African-American students were not meeting the CRT standards. He also reported that 24 out of 25 schools were not meeting the CRT standard of 75 percent.

Mr. Gonzalez said that another issue was consistency of reporting. Under the Cody administration they had the California Achievement Tests, and during the Pitt administration they had the use of stanines. When they understood stanines, they now had Success for Every Student and other types of measures including the functional tests and others. There was a lack of continuity, and the community got confused as to whether or not progress was being made. The committee was recommending a core set of measurements be developed that would not change with the superintendent. The fourth issue was a recommendation that indicators be portrayed in a clearer format. For example, if they looked at the SES report, one summary page had 160 pieces of data. They were suggesting charts and graphic displays.

Mr. Aikens stated that in relation to outcome measures they felt multiple indicators were needed to assess skills. CRTs were limited because they did not measure if someone was above or below grade level. They thought more standardized tests and other measures of reading and math skills were needed, especially at the elementary level. In regard to SES, they found there was a current theme of low expectations by everyone including Board, administrators, teachers, students, and parents. It was believed that unless people were truly motivated they would not do any more than what was expected of them. Prior to the Brown decision, he had attended segregated public schools where black teachers expected a lot of students and got a lot out of them. Now there were lower expectations. Some of this might be due to

different priorities, insensitivity, or even racism. Whatever the reason, they needed to raise expectations.

Mr. Aikens commented that the next issue was lack of accountability under SES. This was one of the biggest problems they had found. They had looked at the plan and the deadlines, and a lot of these deadlines had slipped or were not met. The annual reports dealt with aggregate gross statistics as opposed to a status report on individual tasks. He called attention to Appendix A and a list of questions the committee sent to the school system. When the committee received some responses to their questions, some responses were inadequate but some were very good. This made them think that certain things were not being done, and more accountability was needed in SES.

Mr. Aikens remarked that SIMS was one of the best tools in this school system or any other school system because it could be used for individual students and trends for individual students, groups of students, ethnic groups, teachers, etc. The committee thought that with better coordination of data this could be very effective in looking at schools to see where things needed to be fixed and where things were working well. He thought they needed to require all teachers and administrators to learn how to and to use SIMS. This would allow earlier intervention for children with problems. Their last topic was grouping practices. He thought they needed to improve expectations and opportunities with respect to grouping practices, and they needed to move students in and out of groups when appropriate and to assure there were no inappropriate placements. Mr. Aikens stated that they were on the right track but at the rate they were going they were not going to reach the station.

Dr. Munoz-Duston reported that along with Dr. Wai-Yee Chan she was co-chair of the subcommittee on affirmative staffing. Their work focused on two main areas, staffing practices and the racial and ethnic balance of advisory committees to the Board. They had found many problems all along the hiring process. There were issues with the materials and the efforts utilized in the recruitment process, retention, and minorities in administrative and supervisory positions. Their committee was particularly concerned with the lack of role models at the high school level and with the issue of next-to-no minority counselors in schools. They felt particularly strongly about the issue of principals, assistant principals, and counselors at the high school level. In regard to the advisory committees, data showed this committee was the only one that was both racially and ethnically balanced. Her committee members valued their differences but they also appreciated a common bond between them. The committee encouraged the Board to respect, tolerate, and celebrate diversity the way their committee did.

Mr. Evans stated that he was the chair of the community outreach committee. They had three major points which were the need to inform parents, extended day care, and multiculturalism. There was still a need to inform parents in MCPS, especially those who were low income and minority. They felt that more participation and input from minority parents would enhance MCPS so that it might be a more enriching place for minority students and other students. Some efforts had been made on this, but more work was needed to bring all cultures together to receive input before policies were adopted. There was a need for extended day care that would utilize other agencies. They felt that, given what was happening in the middle schools without sports, MCPS could make an impact by extending the school day by providing homework supervision, enrichment programs, remediation, tutoring, mentoring, and sports. This could be done through the Recreation Department and the business community.

Mr. Evans explained that they had examined what was currently being used regarding multiculturalism. They felt some things were being done, but more needed to be done. They lived in a very diverse county, and it was time to get away from Black History Month or Hispanic Week. They need to have a real mix of culture reflected in their curriculum and in the schools. They must devise a way to bring MCPS into the 21st century. Dr. Kibong Kim suggested that MCPS should use a new multi-culture character building course, People of the World Through Story Telling. Students could learn about love, kindness, loyalty, achievement, honesty, friendship, family, community, self respect, respect for others, etc. These stories did not reflect any religious value, but the committee felt it was time to incorporate something like this course with its values into the curriculum.

Mrs. Ingram reported that the committee had held a brain storming session, and messages flowed out of their group. They were trying to communicate a sense that achievement levels of minority children were still not acceptable. They realized the school system had made some good progress, but the school system must do a better job of raising the levels of achievement, closing the gaps between ethnic groups, and increasing the participation of minority children in advanced level courses. The lack of accountability was a very real issue and was linked to problems in the performance of minority students. They were concerned that many Success for Every Student tasks were not being accomplished. They were concerned that SES outcome measures did not include comprehensive ones in reading and mathematics, especially at the elementary level. They needed to recognize problems in reading and math early so that intervention could occur. They were concerned that the school system was not tracking trends adequately concerning minority students. In order to ensure more accountability, they recommended that a minority achievement watchdog be established. This person could

monitor what was going on in minority student education and report directly to the superintendent.

Mrs. Ingram said they were concerned that the MCPS workforce and curriculum did not reflect the demographic changes which had occurred in their schools. More could be done to balance the staff and make the curriculum a multicultural one and to ensure that decision making reflected multicultural viewpoints. They could not say enough about the need for changes in attitudes and behaviors on the part of some MCPS employees. Racist remarks and negative remarks by teachers or principals could have long-lasting harmful effects on children. They heard about this in the committee because the children of members were receiving these negative comments. High expectations for minority children must be realized. Finally, they felt a sense of urgency that problems in minority education needed to be addressed now. They asked for the Board's leadership in making this a top priority. In 1990, Dr. Gordon stated, "If not here, where? If not now, when?" The committee felt strongly that MCPS could be and should be in the forefront of change in minority student education.

Mrs. Fanconi expressed her pleasure with the amount of work and thought that went into the committee's report. Frequently the Board did not receive as much back-up material as this committee had provided.

Mr. Abrams joined in the president's commendation. In regard to the extended day activity and the restoration of middle school sports, he agreed with the recommendations. He thought the Board had had well intentioned efforts to remove some of the competitive nature of sports and look for other alternatives, but he believed that replacements for those programs had not come into fruition. He liked the idea of trying to engage other entities to participate, particularly in the recreation area. However, he still thought that most of this would have to be within the school system in a restoration of interscholastic activities at the middle school level. He hoped this would be pursued in subsequent budgets.

In regard to the People of the World curriculum, Mr. Abrams said that when he looked at that he saw something different. He saw folklore and mythology as a way of communicating universal values. He had been struck by how many more similarities there were in organizational development and folklore than dissimilarities. In fact, the virtues of multiculturalism would show more of how people were the same rather than how people were different. He heard some fear on using values that were learned from religion. He was not going to suggest changes in the relationship of church and state because it was one of the things that made American unique. However, he was not so sure that the quest for knowledge precluded them from learning the educational value that came out of the mythology in comparative religions.

Today in the world they were observing how fragile civilization was. When the governance of civilization broke down, they had a reversion to a very primal instinct behavior as evidenced in Bosnia and Rwanda. Civilization was a mechanism to raise humans to a higher level. He thought that the educational system was a place to try to convey some universality in those values, and he would not want to limit them in terms of precluding any sources to integrate this into the curriculum. Mr. Evans agreed that there was room to develop something of this sort, and he took a personal interest in seeing the cultures, traditions, and mores shared with students. However, in the last decades they had stayed away from this because of the concept of separation of church and state.

Mrs. Ingram regretted that Dr. Kim could not attend this evening. He had told the committee that in the Korean schools values were taught, and he did not understand why these value were not taught in MCPS. The committee thought that the idea of values was worth putting back on the table for Board consideration.

Mrs. Gordon was also impressed with the report and how thorough it was. She thanked the committee for the positions it had taken on other issues that had come before the Board so that the Board didn't hear from the committee just once a year. She agreed with the committee about the make-up of the Board's advisory committees, and she asked the committee if they would serve as a resource and contact in generating interest in committee service. There were parts of the community that were reluctant to become involved unless they had some kind of personal contact. Dr. Munoz-Duston replied that she had taken a very active role in trying to encourage that. They were recommending that the Board publish a brochure about committee service. Mrs. Gordon thought they could work with the committee on this issue. She had some questions about the Board's procedure for advisory committees and how committees were used.

In regard to the CRTs and grade level, Mrs. Gordon recalled that with the old CRTs students could take above grade level or below grade level tests. Mrs. Gemberling replied that they should be having a much more comprehensive view of the CRTs and should be able to do longitudinal and comprehensive tracking of students over time. The range and reporting process on the revised CRT would allow enough range within the grade level testing itself. Rather than looking at above and below grade level, they were looking at a proficiency standard which was higher than just being on grade level. A question had come up about top-ranked students, and the standards committee had added a new "exceeds with excellence" category. Using that higher standard, fewer than 3 percent of students tested scored above that mark. When DEA went back and measured, they did have a good range on the test. Another change in the reporting was that the student would have an annual report which would show the range in that

proficiency standard over a two to three year period. This would give them a sense as to whether a student was making a proficiency standard at grade four versus grade five versus grade six and what that range was. They did put this to a uniform scale which they had not done on their first run which was part of their re-evaluating and revising their reporting of the CRT tests. She agreed that they had had to change the assessment program, but the state had changed their mandated tests. However, MCPS had the CRT as its test and would not have to give it up or change it no matter what the state changed.

Mrs. Fanconi reminded Board members that while their inclination was to try and get responses now, the superintendent would be providing a response to the report. She asked that the Board focus on issues specific to the report and not have staff respond.

Mr. Ewing said it was a very careful and very thoughtful report. He appreciated the fact that the committee recognized there had been some progress, but he was also very much in agreement with its conclusion that greater progress was needed. It was no denigration of the report to note that the issues raised echoed those made earlier back to 1989, but he could take them back another decade and more. The question was why they had not done better. He thought there were many answers to that. He said that the major answer was that the problem had not yielded easily to anyone's efforts. This might be a function of the efforts not being adequate or well designed, but it might also reflect how difficult it was to come to grip with what was going to be effective to address this issue. He thought the committee had gone about it the right way. They had identified the issues and made some recommendations. The committee had raised some questions, and he felt that their list of questions on SES was excellent. He hoped that the Board would get answers to those from the superintendent as soon as possible.

Mr. Ewing stated that his question had to do with costs. It was easy to say they had not made more progress because of budgetary limitations. He was not sure this was true, but it was also the case that costs were involved in the committee's recommendations. They were suggesting research and evaluation be improved, that staff development be improved, and that recruitment be expanded. They were suggesting that MCPS do more monitoring and measure student performance more effectively. None of those was without cost. It was also easy to say that funds could be shifted from one thing to the other to meet these costs, and this was true. However, he would argue that MCPS was hard pressed in those areas already. The Board had proposed more money for research and evaluation, for staff development, for recruitment, etc., but the Council County cut these items repeatedly. He thought this was a serious problem and would hope that superintendent would give the

Board some cost figures. He also hoped that the committee would assist the Board with the Council at budget time.

Mr. Ewing commented that accountability was a troubling matter, and the committee was right to raise this as a key issue. One could say that the superintendent was accountable or the Board was accountable, or both. It was also true to say that every single employee of the school system was accountable, that parents were accountable, and that students were accountable. The issue was to whom did they link outcomes? To what offices, to what persons, to what institutions? This was a tough question, and they did not have any answers to it right now. They could hold everyone accountable, but the question was who was chiefly accountable for what. If the committee had an answer, he would like to hear it.

Mr. Ewing was troubled by one issue in the report. The committee had talked about the importance of measuring student performance in the early elementary years, K-2. While he agreed with that, they also had an early childhood policy that suggested this kind of academic measurement at that age was unreliable and probably inappropriate. He asked whether the committee had thoughts about that. If they did not have some sense of how students were doing in the early years, it might be late when they were assessed in the third grade. On the other hand, if they were unable to find reliable measures for those early years, they might have wasted some time and energy.

In regard to high expectations, Mr. Ewing said they were right to say this was absolutely essential. They had been saying this for 20 years, and they had not solved this. Some years ago they required all teachers to take a course in black culture and history which caused an enormous backlash and helped to contribute to the election of a Board of Education determined to move as rapidly backwards as it could go. Fortunately it only lasted four years. The fact was they had to work on this issue, but they had to look for a formula that did not antagonize teachers and the community. He thought it was a great report and that the Board ought to move on it, but there were still some tough problems they had raised for which there were no solutions.

Ms. Gutierrez complimented the committee on an extremely informative and good report; however, this report was very similar to the ones the Board had had for previous years. Four or five years ago the same things were being said. She felt frustrated that these issues continued to be the same issues. In the past four years, there were areas where they had improved in the overall system as they had planned better. Success for Every Student was giving them a framework in which to keep their eyes on many issues. She thought the committee was right when it said it was time to stop planning and start measuring outcomes and results. The question to the Board was how to make those

effective changes to make those outcomes different. The Board had to act now in a real sense. She believed they had lost the focus they had after Dr. Gordon's report which provide the Board and the system with an understanding of what the issues were.

Ms. Gutierrez said that their challenge was to look beyond the plans and link the plans to real action. Actions could be slow or a true re-engineering of what MCPS did. Mr. Ewing had raised some very philosophical questions, but this was not going to get them where they needed to be. There were specific things the Board needed to do. They had policy and budget as instruments, and the superintendent had management, structure, and hiring as his instruments. These needed to be looked at on a daily basis not just annual when the Board received the committee's report. How did they make this happen? It was clear to her they needed these issues before them in a much more acute way. She thought they were out of focus with minority achievement, and they were in greater focus several years ago. They had some better bases because they had looked at educational load to better understand what was happening in the schools. She felt that the answer was in the classroom with each student. The Board had the kind of knowledge and action areas that could help make that a better experience. They knew if they allocated less students to each teacher, they could begin to make a difference. They knew a lot of these things, but they needed to begin to act on them. She accepted the report, but she thought the Board should not ask for another report before getting results from what they had before them. As a minimum, they needed to answer the committee's questions as soon as possible.

Mrs. Ingram had the feeling of hopelessness about it, and the committee had included an example of algebra 1 in eighth grade as a hopeful note. She suggested taking each of the issues and look at what could be done on a small scale and be built on. For example, someone had the vision to start the double-period math course. It was rethinking and believing that a person could make a difference. When Mrs. Gemberling had been principal at Kennedy High School, people were amazed at what she did with computers in that school. Mrs. Gemberling cared about this and it pervaded that high school. Mrs. Ingram asked what would happen if people really cared and understood that minority education was helping all children. She believed that everyone would benefit if they took on this as a cause.

Dr. Cheung congratulated the committee for an outstanding report. It made him very proud because he was a former committee member. He thought they had gone a long way, and there was hopefulness. In this report they had more data, more information, and some analysis of the data. Having better data helped in terms of accountability and planning. They needed information to change and improve. He, too, was impressed with the questions they had raised on Success for Every Student. They had also proposed some

ideas about "People of the World." They had talked about when people were going to learn about philosophy, and they had not talk about philosophy in terms of humanity. Joseph Campbell had talked about myths, and it appeared that all cultures developed similar things including religions. They needed to emphasize this. They needed to talk about character because "values" meant something else to some people. Character included being respectful, being trustworthy, being fair, being responsible, and being a good citizen. This was not just good for minority students but for all students. He saw a lot of hope in the committee's report.

Mrs. Fanconi thanked the committee for their report.

Re: STUDENT GROUPING PRACTICES
COMMITTEE REPORT

Dr. Vance stated that he was pleased to present the report of the committee on student grouping practices. Over the last 18 months, this committee addressed each of the objectives in their original charge. They examined current literature and research, gathered data, reviewed policies, and visited schools. He believed the report comprehensively addressed the issue of student grouping. Their seven recommendations reflected their careful and considered work. If there was one notion undergirding this report, it was that in the process of good instructional planning, student grouping was only one element to be considered. There were other elements and emphases that played a seminal part in designing and implementing instructional efforts for students, and what happened afterwards in the day-to-day mix of classroom instruction and support would have the most effect on a student's achievement. Questions of equity, flexibility, types of grouping, and staff training efforts on grouping were all secondary to the fundamental idea that grouping decisions in MCPS should promote student learning, enhance self esteem, and encourage positive social interactions among students. While grouping of students might be one element in the formula for success, it was still incumbent on them to develop the most comprehensive approach possible to instructional planning. He introduced Ms. Vera Torrence and Mr. Robert Wassmann, chairpersons of the committee.

Ms. Torrence stated that the committee was pleased to have the opportunity to present their report. Over the last 18 months, they had worked to complete the charge given to them in February, 1993. This charge was a specific task identified in the Success for Every Student plan. Their plan for the evening was to provide a very brief overview of the report, share their process, and present information about the complexities surrounding this controversial topic. She introduced Mrs. Kafi Robinson Berry, one of the chairs of the subcommittee on practices. This committee visited 23 elementary and middle schools and talked

with principals and school staffs to gather information about existing grouping practices. They coordinated a survey of teachers, students, and parents. Mr. John Smith chaired the research subcommittee which reviewed current literature and research regarding the effects of instructional grouping practices, defined a set of working definitions, and shared articles and sources of information with the entire committee. This committee also compiled a bibliography of materials which could be found in the appendix to their report. Dr. Renee Brimfield chaired the policy committee which reviewed eight existing MCPS policies and regulations, considered the relationship between these policies and actual practices and made specific recommendations for the Board to consider.

Mrs. Torrence explained that even though their large committee was divided into subcommittees they each felt an ownership of the entire report. Throughout the process, subcommittees reported back to the large committee for input and advice. All felt they had contributed significantly to the entire report. They also appreciated the guidance and advice they received from the MCPS executive staff over the last 18 months.

Mrs. Torrence reported that the committee had examined the criteria for placing students in instructional programs. They had reviewed related MCPS policies and regulations as well as current research and literature. They had visited select MCPS schools, and they had gone into the field to talk with teachers, students, counselors, parents, and principals. Tonight they were presenting their final report which included seven very specific recommendations. The pervasive spirit of the committee had been to tackle this very complex and emotional issue in an objective and professional manner. They had sought to gain an in-depth understanding of existing practices and current research and to consider the varied implications surrounding grouping practices. They developed a process to allow open communication of diverse views and identification of areas of consensus. At times they sought outside sources to meet with them and clarify concerns. Tonight they were bringing a report that did not give one simple answer. Rather, they had attempted to provide a report that gave recommendations, offered rationales, and included supportive statements from the literature. Every effort had been made by the committee to provide the Board with a report that was clear, helpful, practical, and informative.

Mr. Wassmann explained that at the heart of their report was the ideal of providing an equitable, excellent, and challenging education for every student in MCPS. Their vision statement stood behind each and every recommendation. They believed that all grouping decisions in MCPS must promote student learning, enhance self esteem, facilitate positive social interactions, and build a strong school community. Their first recommendation addressed the issue of equity. They believed that all children

could learn. Grouping practices must ensure that each student had that opportunity to develop to his or her potential. This assurance of equity was the moral, ethical, and legal responsibility of their school community.

Mr. Wassmann stated that their second recommendation provided for a variety of grouping situations to be found in every school. There was not one particular grouping strategy that would provide the best education for all students in all circumstances. They wanted to make clear at the outset they were not valuing one type of grouping practice over another. It was their view that a more effective strategy would be to employ a variety of grouping strategies, each used at a particular time for a specific purpose. High expectations for all students should characterize all groupings. Their third recommendation encouraged frequent and regular evaluations of student groupings so that the educational program had the flexibility needed to meet students' changing needs, skills, and interests. Students were constantly changing, and grouping practices should be prepared to recognize and respond to these changing conditions and be ready to offer to each student the appropriate group at the appropriate time.

Mr. Wassmann commented that their fourth recommendation encouraged schools to eliminate any unintentional tracking occurring in the schools. They must ensure that this divisive and damaging school practice did not occur in MCPS. Although they were making recommendations for the entire school system, their fifth recommendation stated that they believed there must be local school decision making regarding the placement of students in groups. However, schools must receive a consistent message to guide them in their decisions. They believed their report provided a sense of direction and consistency needed to ensure expanded expectations and opportunities for all students. Their sixth recommendation spoke to the responsibility of the student. They must make clear to students and their parents that their actions and behaviors contributed greatly to determining the groups to which they were assigned in school. All too often this important factor was not stressed enough. This was one lesson students must learn.

Mr. Wassmann explained that the seventh recommendation stated that if the benefits of this report came to fruition their staff must receive on-going professional development in the area of grouping practices and their effects. However, they did not recommend that this staff development be in isolation as yet another add-on. They believed this development would be most effective if it were included in a coordinated, comprehensive staff development plan. It would be ideal if grouping practices could be addressed in staff development areas such as educational technology, gifted and talented, human relations, and mathematics. Following their recommendations, the Board would find specific implications for MCPS policies and regulations.

Recent policies such as middle school education and educational technology were consistent with their recommendations and needed no revisions. However, they did make specific recommendations for other related policies and regulations to make them more consistent with the recommendations in the report.

Mr. Wassmann emphasized that these recommendations were made by committed and caring educators and community leaders desiring to do what was best for all children. Their overall desire was equity and excellence for all.

Mrs. Fanconi thanked the committee. She was pleased that the report had been distilled to make it clear and concise.

Mrs. Brenneman said she enjoyed reading the report and seeing the list of participants. She noted that they had stated they did not advocate a certain kind of grouping but rather a variety of groupings throughout the day. However, in their report they said that students should spend a majority of the day in heterogenous settings. This seemed to be at odds with what they were saying. Mr. Wassmann replied that they had struggled with that line and carefully chose the word "majority." They felt this was not in conflict. In the school there would be a variety of grouping practices and they did not feel there should be a particular type of grouping all the time in any school. It seemed to Mrs. Brenneman that they were not advocating for any kind of grouping except in the report they were advocating for heterogenous grouping a majority of the time. It seemed to her there was a stronger emphasis on heterogenous grouping than other kinds. Mr. Wassmann explained that they were not saying try all different kinds of grouping. They were saying that the decisions should be made thoughtfully, and they were not saying that in all cases there was going to be one type of grouping that would meet the needs of all students in the school.

Mr. Smith added that it was a controversial matter on the committee. There was a publication called "The Good Common School" which detailed erroneous assumptions of tracking which was one form of ability grouping. The first was that students of varying abilities learned best in homogeneous groups. The research showed that students assigned to the middle or low track performed poorly in homogeneous groups. This caused the committee to spend a lot of time in trying to determine whether or not it would be useful to make the statement in the report. The second erroneous assumption was students with lower abilities would be protected from unfair competition when grouped with children of similar abilities. If they looked at homogenous and heterogenous grouping, they had to look at the best things to be done relative to ability grouping. It was clear to them that most youngsters should be involved in heterogenous settings for a majority of the day.

Mr. Wassmann commented that they wanted to avoid situations where students on a lower track would have no way of getting out of that track. In the middle school, if students were grouped homogeneously across the board in three or more levels in every subject, that situation would occur. They wanted to make a statement to prevent that from happening. They wanted local schools to have input on how those students were grouped. They felt that if schools grouped homogeneously for the majority of the day, this would create a situation where tracking would occur. It was happening now, and they had seen this in school visits.

Mr. Smith felt that it went back to the equity question. If a youngster was going to be involved in a school day for five days a week and consistently found himself or herself in a situation in which there was no way for the youngster to get out of that grouping, they were preventing that youngster from access, opportunity, and so forth. They came up with a view on how determinations were made.

Mrs. Brenneman said she understood about focusing on the child at the low end. She asked about honors classes in high school and whether or not they were recommending a change from current practice. Ms. Torrence replied that at school they were trying to create a community. Whatever they planned for their children in school was the society they would have 12 or 15 years later. The committee felt very strongly that children needed to have an opportunity to work with youngsters of all abilities and all learning styles. As a committee member, she had learned a lot from the research. It was easy to concentrate on homogenous and heterogenous, but there were a lot of things in between. There were a lot of other ways to group that had some good results. In Montgomery County they tended to get into the two terms, and the committee tried to open up the discussion to include other ways so that students could have social interactions in an educational setting. Mr. Wassmann added that the committee had focused on elementary and middle, but they wanted all schools entering high school to have that option.

It seemed to Mr. Abrams that they were not precluding magnet programs. Their fourth recommendation was to eliminate grouping decisions and practices that resulted in long-term unintentional tracking. He assumed that they did not have objections either to short-term or intentional tracking decisions, such as gifted and talented programs at the elementary and middle school level. Ms. Torrence did not think that was their intent. They were trying to look at school practices that did result in tracking although the practice did not start off with that intent.

Mr. Abrams asked whether there was any discussion of motivational grouping. This would be using a different decision model by playing on interests of students, particularly at the middle

school level. Ms. Torrence replied that there was a lot of discussion about motivation and learning styles. He was thinking about experiences out of the Harlem schools where it was almost a lottery for special programs where it was not ability grouping but a motivational grouping. Ms. Torrence said they had found information on success of children. The report said that 25 percent was based on their ability, 25 percent on the schooling and the parenting power, and 50 percent was based on motivation and interest. She thought that their sixth recommendation addressed this. Mr. Abrams asked if they addressed this with special programs aimed at tapping into motivational elements. Ms. Torrence explained that they wanted to bring to the forefront that education was not only what they did to the child, education was what the child brought to the setting. They had to let children know that there were consequences when the motivation waned.

Mr. Abrams asked whether they would look at a motivational grouping. Ms. Torrence replied that as a school principal she would. Mr. Abrams asked whether it would be better to try to match a student with the kind of teacher who would draw out that child's learning pattern or should the child be exposed to a full range of teaching approaches. Ms. Torrence thought it would be better to give children an opportunity to have a wide range. The most powerful teacher was the teacher who had a whole repertoire of skills and tools and was extremely creative in adapting and modifying for that child. She also pointed out that the learning styles of children were not the same for all subjects or all day long.

Mr. Abrams inquired about the implications of technology on grouping and whether technology would render the whole exercise moot. Mr. Wassmann replied that he did not think so. He noted that if he had 28 students and five computers, he would have to group. He hoped to receive instruction about making up groups when he did receive the computers. Mr. Abrams explained that he was leaving to the circumstance of an educational workstation for every student.

Mr. Smith reported that another important reason for the sixth recommendation was that students needed to know that they influenced their placement. The committee felt that it was extremely important to note that because if students did not realize this, then it was someone else's responsibility that he or she was not doing as well as they ought to.

Dr. Cheung remarked that this was an outstanding report. It was concise and had research to back it up. The recommendations and the approach were action oriented which would enable the Board to act on them. When a child learned, he or she was affected by teaching, family, society and community, and peers. Which part failed when a child did not succeed? They knew that children had

different intellectual abilities, learning styles, and behavior aspects. Some of these measurements were available before students were grouped. Some measurements such as behavior and motivation were not there. He asked if the committee had thought about how to identify those children with abilities for which they had no objective measurements. Ms. Torrence replied that this was something classroom teachers did on a daily basis.

Dr. Marie Petrenko commented that sometimes they looked at grouping myopically. They had to look at the motivation and interest of the child and the ability of the teacher to be diagnostic. One of the experts suggested a revolving door type of grouping. A child would work on a project, finish the project, and go back to the heterogenous group. This replaced the grouping of the so-called magnet. It depended on how the teacher diagnosed the child, and teachers diagnosed the levels of thinking, content, knowledge base, and conceptual materials.

Dr. Cheung felt that this report provided evidence that they needed an individual student profile in order to do the grouping. The student would carry this from grade to grade, and it would have information about intellectual abilities and learning styles. The teacher should include the diagnoses so that they would become part of the problem. Dr. Petrenko commented that a teacher would record his or her hunches if good diagnostic teaching was being done. If a person diagnosed teaching, they should be assessing the responses and documenting them.

Ms. Gutierrez echoed the compliments from her fellow Board members. It was a thorough job of looking at a subject that they sometimes looked at in simplistic terms. The Board and public should see this was a subject matter with multiple dimensions and concepts. She was delighted that participants had learned from the process. She thought they all needed open minds, but sometimes people tended to fall victims of myths. The committee had done an excellent job of putting the Board at a point where they were now capable of taking some important next steps. She commented that the report was a good model to follow as they looked at difficult issues. She commended the committee for looking at policies, doing site visits, and examining data and research.

Ms. Gutierrez urged this committee to join with the minority education committee in order to move forward from their recommendations. The grouping committee had added a structure to its report which was very important. She asked if the committee had some suggestions about next steps. She wanted to know how they went about identifying and taking action on current practices. For example, did they audit or take some action to eliminate bad practices. She asked about budget implications. For example, they might offer four or five different levels of classes from remedial to advanced or only two levels of enriched

instruction. Achievement might not improve under the first case, and the second case might make better use of resources. They had to look at the linkages to achievement, curriculum, training, and management. These should be next steps for the Board to take. She did not know how much longer the task force would continue, but she hoped the Board could continue to call on them as a resource.

Ms. Torrence replied that they had started the first step which was to do a self study. The second was to review the research. These were significant steps accomplished by the committee. The third thing was a common message that needed to go to schools and students. As a committee, they felt they had taken three big steps.

Mr. Smith commented that he was among a small minority of people serving on the committee who were not tied to the school system. He thought that whoever had put the committee together had done a masterful piece of work. Some of them came with agendas and had to change them. The committee members battled it out, and Ms. Torrence and Mr. Wassmann had provided tremendous leadership.

In response to Ms. Gutierrez, Mr. Smith quoted from a report that changing tracking would require more than the community, more than commonly accepted strategies for improving schools. These efforts must include extensive school district critical reflection on, an extended dialogue about values that assumptions that underlie tracking and grouping practices. They needed teaching and generous experimentation with school organization. Mr. Smith stated that nothing was going to happen overnight. The committee thought they were opening the door. He felt that the group had had a very difficult job, but they had produced a pretty good document in his view.

Mrs. Fanconi remarked that she had only one criticism of the report. It would have been very useful for Board members to have had the benefit of the dialogues that occurred at committee meetings. She felt it would be useful to the Board to take them through what the discussions and arguments had been. She would urge the superintendent to bring this information when he had a task force as provocative as this one.

Mr. Ewing stated that he was pleased with the report. The report made a fundamental policy point which was that policy needed to ensure that they did not have practices that limited student access to educational opportunity that would help them be more successful. The system needed to ensure that there were practices that enabled students to have access to those opportunities. If the Board and community agreed with this, they could go from that point. He supposed it would be possible to find bodies of research on either side of the issue. He was not

sure that the policy point was necessarily the outgrowth of research. It was a choice that needed to be debated.

Mr. Ewing said this raised for him one question that he would pose. Among the kinds of access they wanted to guarantee was access to educational opportunities for the highly able student. Granted those opportunities were not necessarily to be found only in homogeneous grouping, whether temporary or not, and he assumed that when they thought about those students they thought in terms of their opportunities as well. It was not so much denying other students that opportunity but ensuring that these students had the opportunity. He was unclear about what the report had to say about the policy on the gifted and talented. When they returned to this issue, he would like to talk about gifted and talented and what impact the proposed policy position would have on these students. Dr. Brimfield replied that they would take the gifted and talented policy a step further to acknowledge that many of these students were not in special programs. They had to look at these students in regular classrooms and how to meld the two populations. Their proposal did not speak to special programs in special places.

Mrs. Fanconi noted that she would not be on the Board after December, and she hoped that the changed Board could have the value of hearing the committee's presentation. She felt that this topic needed to have real emphasis. She described the lasting effect on one of her daughters who was told in second grade that she was not very bright but was now pursuing her Ph.D. Mrs. Fanconi said this illustrated how powerful teachers' opinions of children were and how much that affected the motivation and ability of children in later life. They had to get the issue of the motivation factor across to teachers and parents. This was a critical issue, and they had to deal with this because they could not afford to lose a single child. A child who was a late bloomer might not seem to be a high achiever in high school but would take off in college or graduate school. Mrs. Fanconi reported that the Board had placed high importance on staff development, but they were unable to fund it. This was an area she believed the superintendent must address in the coming budget. Time was money, and anytime they allowed teachers enough time to do the differentiated instruction they were talking about here, it meant a huge budget item not only in terms of the training that was needed but also in terms of allowing teachers that opportunity.

It seemed to Mrs. Fanconi that the grouping practices report applied to special education students and those not identified as special education but needing some kind of accommodation in order to achieve at their highest level. Howard County had a model with some inclusion where they had two hours set aside in the middle of the week where the regular education teacher and the special education planned their differentiated instruction for

the coming week for all of the children included in that grade level. This was expensive; however, these teachers believed they would need less time next year to do the planning and would not need two hours every week. She believed they had to move away from absolutes and look at the flexibility needed in order to begin some of these things.

Dr. Brimfield called attention to the statement in their report that it was not grouping of students that made the difference, it was the instructional and educational activities provided. Simply placing students in groups without adjusting instruction had little impact. She added that it was also the message teachers sent in a variety of ways. It was more than just the label they had to attend to. Mrs. Fanconi thanked the committee for their report.

Re: BOARD/SUPERINTENDENT COMMENTS

1. Mr. Ewing commented that the issue of year-round schools was related in an interesting way to academic achievement of disadvantaged students. Mr. Rosenfeld sent Board members a letter saying there was no credible evidence of any consistent and significant academic achievement gains caused by year-round schools. In Oakland, California they reported it had a statistically significant negative effect on disadvantaged students. Mr. Ewing remarked that one of the things that was interesting about educational research was that people marshalled data to prove the point they wanted to make. Year-round schools were particularly subject to this problem. He hoped that as the Board continued to discuss this issue they would demand and read the evidence that existed on all sides of it.

2. In regard to Bethesda-Chevy Chase High School, Mr. Ewing reported that a group in that community had written the Board a letter calling for action for B-CC High School. He thought there were some very serious problems there, but he was not sure they were more serious than problems in other schools as a result of budget cuts. He hoped that the Board would take seriously what the B-CC group was suggesting. He thought that the group should be commended for its efforts to identify those problems.

3. Mr. Ewing noted that there was an information item on policy and regulations on graduation requirements and among other things it spoke to math and science graduation requirements. Some of what he thought was policy had been placed in the administrative regulation. For example, the requirements regarding the identification in math and science courses the provision of instruction of the nature, purpose, and character of math and science were in the regulation. He was not in agreement with what they had here. It seemed to him that some of these things ought to be in the policy, and he would be making some specific suggestions along these lines.

Resolved, That such meetings shall continue in closed session until the completion of business.

Re: REPORT ON CLOSED SESSIONS - JULY 12
AND 13, 1994

On June 28, 1994, by the unanimous vote of members present, the Board of Education voted to conduct a closed session on Tuesday, July 12, 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 Tuesday, July 12, 1994, from 9 to 9:55 a.m. and from 12:45 to 1:20 p.m. The meetings took place in room 120 of the Carver Educational Services Center, Rockville, Maryland.

Board members met to vote (confirmed in open session) on the monthly personnel report and personnel appointments for principalships of Farmland ES, Gaithersburg ES, Stone Mill ES, and Oakland Terrace ES, and the coordinator of the Eastern magnet program as well as the coordinator of elementary mathematics. They also voted on the transfers of assistant principals to Montgomery Village MS, Tilden MS (two positions), Pyle MS, Clemente MS, and Galway ES.

Board members decided that they should have a closed session discussion on the principal selection process as well as an open session discussion.

The Board reviewed contracts for outside legal counsel and requested rate increases. Board members expressed concern over mounting legal fees and asked about cost control measures. The members of the Board present voted to grant the requested increases and inform the attorneys there would be a program of cost control of legal fees and services.

At noon, the Board reviewed the EEO report. Board members asked for information on the location of the cases to see if there were patterns in a cluster or a region. Board members received an update on the purchase of the Kay tract. Mr. Ewing suggested the possibility of a special public meeting on August 2 or 3 to discuss the size of Blair High School.

Board members adjudicated BOE Appeal No. 1994-5 and voted unanimously (those present) to defer. They approved their decision and order on BOE Appeal No. 1994-7. Board members reviewed T-1994-2, a transfer appeal, and decided that they wanted to have the Board attorney review the policies and issues regarding transfers this season before adjudicating this appeal.

In attendance at the closed session were Steve Abrams, Larry Bowers, Fran Brenneman, Alan Cheung, Blair Ewing, Carol Fanconi, Tom Fess, David Fischer, Phinnize Fisher, Kathy Gemberling, Bea Gordon, Zvi Greismann, Ana Sol Gutierrez, Oliver Lancaster, Elfreda Massie, Deanna Newman, Brian Porter, Phil Rohr, Paul Vance, Joe Villani, Bill Wilder, Mary Lou Wood, and Melissa Woods.

On July 12, 1994, by the unanimous vote of members present, the Board of Education voted to conduct a closed session on Wednesday, July 13, 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, July 13, 1994, from 7:30 p.m. to 9:50 p.m. The meeting took place in room 120 of the Carver Educational Services Center, Rockville, Maryland.

Board members met to review the transfer process with its attorney and requested a package of material to help them in adjudicating appeals. The Board then adjudicated BOE Appeal No. T-1994-2.

The meeting continued with a review of a draft document on the superintendent's evaluation.

In attendance at the closed session were Steve Abrams, Judy Bresler, Alan Cheung, Blair Ewing, Carol Fanconi, Tom Fess, Ana Sol Gutierrez, Mary Lou Wood, and Melissa Woods.

RESOLUTION NO. 528-94 Re: PRINCIPAL SELECTION PROCESS

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education have a full discussion of the principal selection process from the time a vacancy is confirmed in a school to the time the principal is appointed by the Board of Education; and be it further

Resolved, That this discussion include the participation by the community, the superintendent, the staff, and the Board of Education and their roles.

Re: A MOTION BY MR. EWING ON THE CHI CENTERS TRANSPORTATION CONTRACT (FAILED)

The following motion by Mr. Ewing failed of adoption with Dr. Cheung and Mr. Ewing voting in the affirmative; Mr. Abrams, Mrs.

Re: NEW BUSINESS

The following item of new business was raised:

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

Resolved, That the Board schedule consideration of the following resolution:

Resolved, That through SIMS and the ISM computer package, at the end of each marking period each school will be able to calculate, by grade, the average percentage of expected progress of students below, on, and above grade level; and be it further

Resolved, That the percentage of expected progress is the number of ISM levels a particular student mastered during the current reporting period, divided by the number of ISM levels a "typical" child is expected to master.

Re: ITEMS OF INFORMATION

Board members received the following items of information:

1. Administrative Regulation on Requests for Accommodation/ Modifications
2. Policy and Regulation on Graduation Requirements

RESOLUTION NO. 532-94 Re: ADJOURNMENT

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education adjourn its meeting at 11:55 p.m.

PRESIDENT

SECRETARY

PLV:mlw