



reading/language arts; and Mrs. Joyce Colbert, teacher specialist. In October of 1992, Mrs. Brenneman made a motion to discuss the teaching of reading in the Montgomery County Public Schools. In August of 1993, the members of the Board discussed this topic and asked for a continuation of that discussion. They had listed the issues raised and provided a brief narrative about each one. He had also shared with staff Mr. Ewing's question which was received yesterday. Staff would respond orally, and the superintendent would follow up with a written response.

Dr. Vance commented that in reading MCPS had taken an eclectic approach and used a number of alternatives, options, and various methodologies. They had included information on strategy-based instruction and ESOL students. They had tried to indicate the extent to which the MCPS approach to the teaching of reading was research based. In all the years he had been in education, the debate about how to teach reading had been raging, and he suspected the debate would outlive him.

Dr. Villani explained that they had several staff members and guests in the audience and, as appropriate, they would come to the table to speak. The purpose today was to continue discussion and provide responses to questions. Dr. Sullivan had information on Montgomery College and the success of MCPS students. Dr. Clewell would expand on the material in the paper before the Board particularly on strategies used for dealing with students who were less than on grade level in reading and for students who were accelerated in their reading skills.

Dr. Sullivan reported that she had spoken with planning and research staff at Montgomery College. Each year this staff provided a student profile report which provided information on student placement in English, reading, and mathematics. She asked if this information could show those students who came from MCPS. At this time, the College was looking at their data to provide MCPS specific information. In the spring they hoped to have information on students, their courses, and their needs. This information would be shared with the Board.

Dr. Clewell stated that she would focus on remediation, monitoring the progress of readers, reading approaches in Montgomery County, and ungraded classes. She called attention to the publication entitled, "State of the Art," which was just issued by the U.S. Department of Education. The report addressed 10 research findings advocated for all schools in the United States. These findings paralleled the information in the MCPS report provided to the Board. She had provided a copy of the flip chart from the International Reading Association which was used by teachers for instructional strategies appropriate for all students. The last booklet was entitled, "Becoming a Nation of Readers," and was a guide for parents. This spoke to what parents could do to prepare their children for kindergarten.

The first question was how they evaluated the program for at-risk readers in MCPS. Dr. Clewell reported that they had continuous monitoring in terms of teacher observation, diagnosis, and SIMS reports which could track the progress of students. There were several outstanding programs in terms of examining the effects on at-risk readers. The first was the Summer Institute for Achievement (SIA), which was directed at Chapter 1 students. Approximately 2,000 to 3,000 students attended that summer school from 1989 to 1991. The focus was to teach the thinking strategies and problem-solving related to reading and mathematics. Students used reading texts and math problems to practice those strategies. The goal of the program was to help students move up to grade level. She displayed a chart which showed that SIA students gained twice as much as non-SIA students in math and reading.

Dr. Clewell reported on another program, Students Achieving Independence in Learning (SAIL), which was a supplemental program in schools in the upper county. The focus was on the primary grades for students to be able to learn decoding and work out word meanings using real books. Teachers could communicate progress to parents very easily using the SAIL approach. The effects on student achievement were of high quality. The November issue of the Elementary School Journal was exclusively based on the MCPS strategies-based instructional programs. These two programs were significant because they related to the Gordon report which stated that if they were going to have any kind of a lasting effect on at-risk students they had to give students the tools, the cognitive thinking skills, in order to be successful. These programs demonstrated that strategies could be taught and that students were learning.

Dr. Clewell stated that another program was the Reading/Writing Connection Program for Blair cluster students and Chapter I and ESOL students. Students thought of themselves as authors, used books as mentors, wrote on topics of their choice, and they shared their work with other students. At beginning of the year a student might only write 13 words in his composition, but at the end of the year he was writing 83 words in that same amount of time. Teachers also looked at the quality of the writing and saw an increase in ideas being expressed.

In MCPS views on remediation had changed. In the past, teachers had concentrated on the deficit and zoned in on it. Students would be given a lot of exercises to practice. While students became more proficient in identifying main ideas, they were not necessarily better readers. Now they were looking at the whole child. Rather than talking about remediation, they were talking about intervention or acceleration. They looked at what the child brought to school. For example, children were reading books relating to their background knowledge. Students looked at how they themselves could become competent readers.

Dr. Clewell said that in order to read you had to use clues from your head and clues from the text in order to understand and develop an interpretation. Whole language, prior knowledge, and the ability to use strategies were emphasized. Students at risk were supported by reading specialists who worked with groups of students in the classroom or in pull-out programs. In the pull-out programs, students were not labeled but received approaches where they used real writing and real reading. One approach was an adaptive reading recovery program with the goal of developing fluency in early readers.

Mrs. Colbert explained that reading recovery differed from the traditional remedial programs. It began early and provided intensive one-on-one support with a teacher working directly with one student. It focused on the strength of the student as opposed to the deficits. It immersed the students in writing and reading rather than drill. The instructional program was adapted to the needs of the child. She shared a video tape of a student and teacher at Rolling Terrace ES.

Mrs. Colbert reported that the teacher monitored the progress of the student and provided positive praise. She did not focus on mistakes. The teacher helped the student use the strategies in the context of the story. Another priority of the program was fluency. The extra support from the teacher helped students develop fluency so that they viewed themselves as real readers. The belief was that this extra push would enable students to read on grade level. The program focused on making the neediest students successful. Important elements were the clear structure and the repetitive nature of the instruction. Reading specialists and classroom teachers received training by observing trained reading recovery teachers. They had programs at Rolling Terrace, Bel Pre, Daly, New Hampshire Estates, Oak View, Sherwood, and Woodlin.

In regard to below level and above level readers, Dr. Clewell explained that they did not use a single test score to define a reader. They used many different indicators at each grade level. Teachers kept track of the number of words the child could read successfully. They looked at the number of core books, the kinds of writing done by students, kinds of reading students did at home, and the kind of self selection when students chose books. They also looked at whether students could think critically about what they read and used this information to discuss their own interpretations. This information provided students with the information as to whether or not the student was learning to read across a wide variety of types of reading and relate that to writing. Below level students would be characterized as those not able to do that with conceptually appropriate books at that grade level, but they might have those strategies and strengths using other kinds of materials. An above grade level reader would be one who could read books conceptually above and provide

evidence for this kind of thinking. They were from basic to proficient to above proficient to students reading at the next grade levels. They were now looking for specific ways to help document student growth along a continuum. The new assessment program would help teachers define those strengths.

Dr. Clewell stated that the question had been raised about the MCPS approach to teaching reading. There were two ends of the spectrum: phonics advocates and whole language advocates. MCPS was taking the middle of the road approach. Students had to engage in reading in order to make meaning. They needed instruction in phonics because this was one tool for becoming a fluent reader, but they also needed specific instruction in thinking strategies to give them opportunities to read in real books. At Rolling Terrace, students who were the neediest were using low level books and phonics skills. These were interesting books and not basal stories with controlled vocabulary and a limited number of sentences. Teachers had found that these books did not generate motivated, fluent, strategic readers. They were giving many opportunities for modeling, coaching, and watching students as to how they internalize those strategies. She reported that by taking this route they had some measurable positive effects showing that it had made a difference with at-risk readers. Training for teachers had been positively received, and this went along with current theory and research. The arguments against this approach was that it would force educators into camps and lessen the choices that students would have for the kinds of materials that they would be reading. It would also result in a lack of accountability for the curriculum and show that MCPS was not in tune with the latest theory and research.

Dr. Clewell introduced Dr. Barbara Caviness from the Chief Council of State School Officers and instrumental in defining the consensus project for the national assessment of educational progress in reading/language arts. Dr. Caviness stated that she was impressed with their outline of the Montgomery County program. It was an informed program, taking into consideration the best thinking about reading. It was also thoughtful and wise because it took into account the diverse population in the school system and a diverse set of ideas on the part of parents and the public about what was good for children. Dr. Vance added that last evening he had had an opportunity to review the results of the MCPS performance on the state accountability test in reading. He was delighted to see how well their youngsters continued to do. Over the past decade, there had been an incredible improvement for MCPS in these scores.

Mrs. Brenneman said she had a number of questions on enrichment and the ungraded school. There were also a lot of questions that Mr. Ewing raised in his memo as well as questions from the August 30 discussion. She had asked how many hours the University of

Maryland required in reading, and the response was three hours. She asked how many hours MCPS required in reading. Dr. Clewell replied that MCPS did not require anything more than the state which was three hours.

Mrs. Brenneman cited the example of a new teacher teaching first grade. She wanted to know how this new teacher decided which strategies to use and how she assessed her students in reading. She recalled that in the budget they had eliminated all high school reading teachers, and she asked about the child coming into the system in high school without knowing how to read. She said that Dr. Vance had stated previously that reading at a fourth grade level was no longer acceptable, and she wanted to know what they considered to be an adequate grade level for reading.

Dr. Clewell replied that teachers began to assess student reading and writing by observing students reading. They had core books and opportunities for students to read and discuss oral readings. Teachers looked at student writing in relation to reading, and the MCPS Program of Studies helped teachers to do this. At Grade 2, students would tell about the story, at Grade 4 students would summarize and relate ideas to their own understanding, and at Grade 6 that summary would have a little analysis of what the author did.

Dr. Vance suggested that they ask principals who were present to comment on new teachers and multicultural and economically disadvantaged students. He also asked about in-service and pre-service initiatives in reading.

Ms. Joanne Busalacchi, principal of New Hampshire Estates ES, stated that the most important thing a principal did was to provide support. Their school-based reading specialist worked with new teachers in August. The objectives of the curriculum were reviewed, and the core books were reviewed. The reading specialist went into the classroom and worked with the classroom teacher to get a handle on where students were and what skills they had. The reading specialist stayed with that teacher until it was felt the teacher could be on her own. The teacher also worked with her team mates which was another example of human support.

Dr. Timothy Riggott, principal of Piney Branch ES, added that he paired his new teachers with a teacher at the same grade level. This gave them a day-to-day contact when they did their planning at the beginning of the week. They also had a very intensive in-school training program, and three or four times a month they worked with staff on different parts of the curriculum. He had eight or nine brand-new classroom teachers this year, and a number of them had made contacts with other people in the school system to share ideas.

Dr. Vance remarked that the questions raised by Mrs. Brenneman were important and related to getting a budget adopted by the Board and then by the County Council. He hoped that the Board and staff would raise these questions with the Council. They had to emphasize the importance of funds for staff development and the importance of funds for a support network in the central office for reading teachers and reading specialists. The school system had to supplement the sparse training teachers received in college. He asked staff to speak to the situation in the high schools now that they no longer had reading teachers. Dr. Villani replied that they were trying to address reading deficiencies through the other content areas, interdisciplinary instruction, and grouping practices. He believed they had not fully recovered from the loss of those positions three years ago.

Mr. Abrams asked about test scores in the high school, and Dr. Villani replied that their functional reading scores had gone up.

Dr. Clewell stated that Mrs. Lois Bell, principal of Summit Hall ES, would speak to ungraded primary schools. Dr. Clewell reported that there was increased interest in ungraded schools. Kentucky was looking at alternative assessments and ungraded classes as opportunities for students to be able to interact with students in other than their chronological age level. The research seemed to suggest that this model worked best when instruction was done heterogeneously, and there were opportunities for students to be able to develop their strategies. In MCPS they had ungraded primaries in the late 1960's and early 1970's.

Mrs. Bell reported that she had been in North Chevy Chase ES, and she thought that ungraded education had worked well in that setting. Families had to elect to send their children there. The project was terminated when they went to grade level reorganization. She believed that the primary non-graded approach addressed what they were about today. She called attention to an article on outcome-based education and developmentally appropriate practices. The article stated that from an outcome-based education perspective and a developmental perspective, ungradedness provided a better way to meet student needs. This approach solved the retention problem and supported child development beliefs because children progressed through curriculum at different paces. She thought that back in 1973 they really had the right idea because they allowed children to move through the curriculum at their own pace.

Dr. Vance thanked Mrs. Brenneman for her insight in asking the Board to schedule this topic. Mrs. Fanconi thanked staff for the presentation. Dr. Vance commented that given the comments this was just another signal about the extent to which the past four years had made considerable reductions in resource levels which threatened the infrastructure of the school system. At some

point in the future it would be reflected in the performance of children.

Re: UPDATE ON MATH AND SCIENCE  
RESOLUTION

Mrs. Gemberling explained that they tried to update the Board on each point of the math/science resolution. Today they would hear from Dr. Villani regarding curriculum changes as a result of the additional requirements for students. She commented that it was not just the movement of the fourth credit of math for graduation but it was also the attempt to move the level of these credits, in particular, beginning the algebra sequence in ninth grade. The other side of the resolution was staff initiatives and the extensive training requirements for staff. Initially, she had believed this training could take place easily; however, when they looked at the realities of which teacher had what preparation, it was a significant undertaking. They would also talk about partnerships with universities and their need to seek external and internal ways to provide this training.

Dr. Elfreda Massie, associate superintendent, reported that they had spent countless hours to implement the math/science resolution. Personnel and OIPD had formed joint committees to implement the resolution, and they had summarized some of their major efforts in the memo before the Board. She introduced Mrs. Sandra Sengstack, certification specialist; Mrs. Rose Ray, systemwide training specialist; and Dr. Timothy Riggott, principal of Piney Branch ES.

Mrs. Sengstack commented that the guidelines committee established a list of acceptable course work to meet the math/science requirement. In 1993, they reviewed 3,000 teacher files by looking course by course at 9,000 transcripts. They also reviewed the same information for approximately 250 new teachers. After completing the reviews, they sent the information to teachers with a letter explaining specific course work that was needed. Principals also received copies of the letters, and appeal information was included in the letters. Some teachers submitted course descriptions which allowed MCPS to credit them for math/science. Based on the file reviews, 34 percent of teachers met the requirements, 66 percent had some course work needs, and of the new teachers hired, 27 percent had met the requirements and 73 percent needed additional course work. The resolution required that by FY 1994 one fourth of the new teachers should meet the requirements; therefore, they had met this goal. Typically most teachers needed one or two courses, and typically these were probability/statistics and physics/chemistry. This information was entered into the computer system to monitor those needing course work. They were tracking it in the same way as the multicultural and reading methodology requirements mandated by the Board.



Mrs. Ray reported that they began to look to local colleges and universities and work with them to review existing courses and establish new courses that would meet the requirements. They wanted to ensure there would be a correlation between MCPS requirements and what colleges were doing to prepare teachers in their teacher training program. They started working with Hood College and Johns Hopkins University. Hood had an existing program in math and science for elementary school, and it was a 30 credit master's program. The MCPS math content connection in-service course was now accepted as a course in their master's program. At present there were 21 elementary teachers enrolled in this program. The Johns Hopkins program was a new one which match the MCPS priorities, and at present 29 teachers were enrolled with 200 more expressing interest in the program. These courses were team taught with MCPS and Hopkins staff.

Dr. Riggott explained that last spring he had been asked to help put the Hopkins program together and later on to teach in the program. This fall they began with physical science course with the goal of sharing as much of that content with the teachers as they could during the 15-week course. Another goal was to show teachers how they could take that information and use it in their classrooms. They began with atomic structure and basic states of matter. Then they moved into light and sound and finally Newtonian physics and theories of relativity. They tried to keep the lecture segments to a minimum and emphasized teacher involvement. They had obtained all the new science kits, and each of the teachers had an opportunity to review these and present them to the entire class. The major activity of the class was a debate in which groups of teachers got together, prepared a debate on a physical science topic, and presented that to the class. The results of this were one of the most satisfying products he had seen in his 20 years of education.

Dr. Riggott said that in addition to the debates and the kits, they had students participate in a wide variety of activities. One of the activities that was the most popular was the application of the odyssey of the mind problem. This was a six-hour course and many of the students were taking another course. They felt it was important to cover their goals and keep the course at a graduate level. He believed that teachers would be able to take this science knowledge into their classrooms.

Mrs. Ray reported that the resolution had had an impact on staff time in Personnel Services. All the records had to be reviewed, and this required staff time to develop guidelines. They had to hire three-week temporary clerical support to send letters out to all current teachers and to principals. Additional clerical support was required to review transcripts, to develop in-service

courses, and to submit these courses for MSDE approval. With the recent negotiated agreement with MCEA, MCPS had to offer all the courses through in-service. Next year \$60,000 had been set aside for course development and instructors; however, no funds were allocated to support additional staff functions to implement and monitor these courses. Dr. Massie indicated that they had invited over 44 colleges and universities to meet with them to hear about MCPS requirements.

Dr. Villani commented that a large number of staff had been working on math and science and were in the audience in case of questions. Their specific activities were listed in the memorandum before the Board. Dr. Sullivan was excited about collaborative efforts around the state with colleges and universities. She had about five appointments to meet with deans to help them restructure their education programs to prepare their students to meet the MCPS requirements.

Dr. Gerald Consuegra stated that they had been working to revise the elementary programs in math and science. Their programs were developmentally appropriate, consistent with the early childhood policy, and multicultural. Programs emphasized concrete experiences, data collection, and problem solving. They were making a real effort to make math and science relevant to everyday life. They were asking teachers to consider previous conceptions that children brought to the classroom and to have children construct their own understanding of science. The program was interdisciplinary, which provided ample opportunity to support reading, writing, and social studies.

Dr. Consuegra related that the elementary math revision was consistent with NCTM standards. Their underlying goal was to prepare students for algebra. A great deal of teacher training was necessary, and the math content connection project helped teachers gain a better understanding of advanced mathematical concepts, learn a variety of instructional strategies, and make applications to everyday life. All teachers would be trained in that project by the end of next year. They also had teacher training in the math power project. The science program had been revised, and the revisions were consistent with the previous science task force report. They had developed new instructional objectives that had been presented to the Council on Instruction. They had been field testing and would adopt exemplary science materials. Their objective was to provide early positive experiences so that children would have the skills, knowledge, and a positive attitude about science to prepare them for high school. Again, a great deal of teacher training was necessary. They were doing a lot of training with the National Science Foundation project. By the end of 1996 all teachers would be trained. He emphasized that the science materials center was a critical component to this revision. Following training, teachers were sent materials to implement the new program. After

using the materials, the teachers returned to materials to the center where the materials were replenished at minimal cost to be used by another set of teachers.

Mrs. Gordon said they had talked about algebra being the gateway to other higher level math courses. There had been emphasis on the double-period algebra, and she wanted to know if they were tracking students who successfully completed algebra with the support of the double period to see if they were successful in other higher level courses. Dr. Villani replied that they were tracking these students with DEA. The rate of success for students taking pre-algebra in ninth grade and algebra in tenth grade did not differ from those taking double-period algebra in ninth grade. Mrs. Gordon asked if students went on to take additional math courses after taking double-period algebra. Dr. Villani replied that they did have data on this and could share it with the Board. He indicated that students were extending themselves into the mathematics program through Algebra 2/trig at approximately the same rate as students did when they did not take double period.

Mrs. Gordon reported that she had observed the math power program this summer. She wondered if they had done follow up to see if teachers were using the strategies gained from the summer program. Dr. Sullivan replied that they would have a more comprehensive report on math power that would come to the Board. She indicated that teachers were using these skills in math and had generalized these skills across other subjects. Dr. Larson would be preparing a follow-up report to show progress of students from the Math Power. Mrs. Gordon pointed out that some schools had been very successful on the recent CRTs, and she wondered if those schools would be sharing their strategies. She hoped that they would do this.

Mr. Abrams recalled that 66 percent of current elementary teachers needed to enhance their certification in mathematics, and he wondered if all of this could be met through in-service. Dr. Massie replied that it could be done; however, they were looking at options with colleges and universities so that teachers would not be limited to only one way to meet the requirement. Most teachers needed only one or two courses, and less than 10 percent needed four or more courses. Mr. Abrams asked if funds beyond the \$60,000 would be necessary and, if so, what was the order of magnitude. Dr. Massie replied that this was an estimate, and it depended on how they wanted to pursue this. There was an ideal way, but there were not enough funds. She believed \$60,000 was a low figure, but she did not have accurate information to say what this figure would be.

Ms. Gutierrez said she was delighted to see that they had started aggressively on this issue. This weekend she had been in Los Angeles as part of an advisory board looking at math and science

enrichment programs for Hispanic students. They had spent a day reviewing the curriculum, training, and evaluation. She commented that none of these could be viewed in isolation. At some point she would like to get that same kind of understanding in math and science area and in reading/language arts. In her estimation, curriculum was the driver. She would be interested in knowing more about curriculum changes that had been made in content. She had hoped to see the delta -- what they had done before, what they had changed, and what they were doing now. She thought other Board members would be interested as well.

Ms. Gutierrez commented that she would strongly recommend to the superintendent that they establish a baseline and provide this information to the Board. She would like to know where they were now, how many students were taking algebra, how many were taking geometry, and how many students were being successful. They should see which students, old and new, were changing. Was the new curriculum making a difference? In the baseline she would like to see the number of teachers that had been trained and pre- and post-impact on the students. She did not know whether the 1993 cohort would show some of this impact.

On staff development, Ms. Gutierrez thought efforts to outreach to universities were excellent. However, she thought there might be some faster and easier ways to begin to offer in-service courses. Teaching a statistics and probability course in-house should be their first priority because those courses were not generally available. She suggested getting someone currently teaching this at Montgomery College. She hoped they were looking at less costly opportunities to enhance education. She thought that doing real science experiments would cure phobias about math and science more than learning how to teach. She did not see any evidence of their looking at MCPS teachers to provide their experience and recommendations. Dr. Villani replied that most of the training done with teachers was done by other MCPS teachers. Ms. Gutierrez suggested having an advisory board to look at MCPS curriculum. Dr. Sullivan explained that this was an ongoing process. Mrs. Fanconi asked that staff provide Ms. Gutierrez information about her questions, and Dr. Vance assured her that staff would be in contact with Ms. Gutierrez. Ms. Gutierrez asked that Board members receive continuing updates on this subject rather than waiting for an agenda item.

Mr. Ewing reported that on Saturday several Board members had attended a symposium, and in the course of the symposium a person stated that MCPS had not been on the cutting edge since 1967. He had said to that person privately that when it came to math and science, there was no doubt that MCPS was on the cutting edge. If they were successful or reasonably successful with all of the initiatives they had undertaken, they would have brought about a real revolution in education. He thought they were doing remarkably well because it was only two years ago that the Board

adopted the resolution. He said that staff had done a great deal of work. He asked about how much of a job they had to do in terms of quantifying what numbers of teachers needed how many courses so that the Board knew what the requirement was so it could budget to support this requirement. He hoped they could get that kind of information as soon as possible and on a continuing basis.

Mr. Ewing was distressed that the University of Maryland had not been as responsive as he thought they would have been. Initially they had received a lot of support from the president of the University. He hoped that staff would pursue this vigorously. He asked what had been the reaction of the Maryland State Board of Education and its staff to the MCPS initiatives. Dr. Villani replied that MSDE had been very supportive of MCPS curriculum initiatives. They had shared MCPS materials throughout the state, and 14 other systems had asked for copies of math power lessons. Dr. Massie added that the state viewed Montgomery County as the leader in the area of certification requirements. The state had accepted all courses MCPS had submitted for in-service course approval and was referring other school systems to MCPS for advice. Colleges and universities were calling her for information as well. Mrs. Gemberling commented that she had received a call from the superintendent who wanted to know how Montgomery County had gotten its Board to do this.

Mr. Ewing was pleased to see the book, Benchmarks for Scientific Literacy, published by the American Association for the Advancement of Science. Dr. Wayne Moyer had told him it was a good report and would be distributed to secondary schools. The book talked about what students ought to know at certain levels and put it in understandable and non-technical English.

Dr. Cheung commented that he, too, was pleased with the efforts of staff regarding the science and math policy. The only way to learn about math and science was to try to apply as much as possible. In looking at the current workplace, people were using more statistical analysis and probability. Another initiative was to emphasize and integrate science, math, and technology. Teachers had to be trained to use computers in various analyses because the real world was using computers, not calculators. Dr. Villani reported that he had been working with the director of the National Center for Educational Statistics to involve MCPS as one of four school systems across the country on teaching statistics through using NCES tools. They hoped to start this next year and hoped it would extend from high school to middle school to elementary school. Dr. Cheung said there was another area they needed to look into. The world was becoming a global market, and they had to look at teaching foreign languages to children. He would have asked the question as to whether the principles and concepts of teaching reading could be applied to teaching foreign languages.

Mrs. Fanconi thanked staff for their presentation. She was concerned that people in Montgomery County did not know about the areas where real strides were being made. They had had to cut their travel budget for a number of years, and they had lost some ground in terms of being able to communicate with colleagues across the nation to gain from their experience and share what MCPS was doing. She thought they had to continue to do this because there was a great deal to be learned, and they could not assume they knew it all in Montgomery County. In the areas where they were making real strides, they must take the opportunity to disseminate this information.

Re: ANNOUNCEMENT

Mrs. Fanconi announced that the Board had met in closed session to discuss personnel issues.

Re: PUBLIC COMMENTS

Robin Henig, representing gifted and talented students at Drew ES, appeared before the Board of Education.

RESOLUTION NO. 3-94                      Re: PROCUREMENT CONTRACTS MORE THAN  
\$25,000

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

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:

COB			
C94-044	Tires and Tubes		
	<u>Awardees</u>		
	Friends' Tire and Fleet Service	\$	3,072
	Goodyear Commercial Tire		242,539
	Merchants Truck and Auto		<u>8,097</u> *
	TOTAL	\$	253,708
94-08	Speech Therapy Services for Students with Disabilities		
	<u>Awardees</u>		
	Berman, Peverly and Associates	\$	84,700 *
	The Chesapeake Center, Inc.		<u>144,375</u> *
	TOTAL	\$	229,075

94-09	Office/Reception and Dining Area Furniture for New and Modernized schools <u>Awardee</u> Douron, Inc.	\$ 100,000	*
30-93	Audio and Video Equipment Parts - Extension <u>Awardees</u> Allegheny Electronics, Inc. Collins Electronics, Inc. Fairway Electronics Company Harco Electronics, Inc. Kunz, Inc. Marine Air Supply Company, Inc. Mark Electronics Supply, Inc. Metropolitan Audio Visual Corporation Professional Products, Inc. Southern Business Communication of DC Steinberg Electronics Nelson C. White Company, Inc. Wolsten, Inc. TOTAL	\$ 6,550 3,850 5,500 350 1,650 1,400 400 3,900 2,400 5,500 4,400 2,700 100 38,700	*
32-94	Electrical Supplies and Equipment <u>Awardees</u> Advent Electric, Inc. Allegheny Electronics, Inc. Allied Sales Corporation/Thermalink Atlantic Boddicker Electric Supply, Inc. Branch Electric Supply Company Davis Instruments Del Electric Supply Eastern Wholesale Electric and Supply Company Grainger Ideal Electrical Supply Corp. Lee Electric Company of Baltimore City Mark Electronics Supply, Inc. Maurice Electrical Supply Company, Inc. Mouser Electronics, Inc. Noland Company C.N. Robinson Tri-County Electrical Supply Co., Inc. TOTAL	\$ 980 1,029 4,490 17,024 120,413 1,150 14,352 2,419 19,126 17,943 608 1,700 25,670 1,520 1,439 22,796 353,228 605,887	*
35-94	Paperback/Prebound Paperback Books <u>Awardee</u> Perfection Learning Corporation	\$ 190,000	

43-94	Cafeteria Disposable Supplies		
	<u>Awardees</u>		
	Acme Paper and Supply Company	\$	58,321
	Calico Industries, Inc.		2,875
	S. Freedman and Sons, Inc.		4,831
	Kahn Paper Company, Inc.		185,504
	Marstan Industries, Inc.		12,146
	Monumental Paper Company		2,597
	Smelkinson Sysco		1,923
	Webco Packaging, Inc.		55,480
	TOTAL	\$	323,677
45-94	Industrial and Technology Education Hand Tools		
	<u>Awardees</u>		
	B&W Equipment and Supply Corporation	\$	1,360
	L.A. Benson Company, Inc.		9,479
	Brodhead-Garrett Company		1,583
	Carey Machinery and Supply Co., Inc.		14,895
	Columbia Industrial Hardware		1,105
	Diamond Tool Company		6,765 *
	Frederick Trading Company		790 *
	Graves-Humphreys Company		893
	McKilligan Supply/Division of Kipper		669
	Midwest Tech Products and Services		5,026
	Noland Company		32,263
	Posner Industries, Inc.		1,121
	Powerhouse Tool and Supply, Inc.		1,000 *
	Satco, Inc.		1,158
	Sears Industrial, Inc.		3,507
	Snap-On Tools Corporation		5,190
	Techni-tool, Inc.		439
	Thompson and Cooke, Inc.		3,223 *
	Wharton Supply, Inc. of Virginia		11,469 *
	TOTAL	\$	101,935
47-94	Door Hardware, Closers & Exit Devices		
	<u>Awardees</u>		
	Door Closure Service Company, Inc.	\$	7,690 *
	Southern Lock and Supply Company		1,293
	Taylor Security & Lock Company, Inc.		70,822
	TOTAL	\$	79,805
50-94	Media Center Supplies		
	<u>Awardees</u>		
	Brodart Company	\$	15,184
	Chaselle, Inc.		11,644
	Gaylord Brothers, Inc.		5,675
	Interstate Office Supply Co.		17,618 *
	Kunz, Inc.		3,817
	Southern Business Communications of DC		5,596
	University Products		1,158



January 11, 1994

	Vernon Library Supplies, Inc.	5,982	
	Nelson C. White Company, Inc.	<u>3,220</u>	
	TOTAL	\$ 69,894	
51-94	Microscopes		
	<u>Awardees</u>		
	Associated Microscope, Inc.	\$ 4,750	
	Benz Microscope Optics Center, Inc.	20,775	
	Parco Scientific Company	30,734	*
	Triarch, Inc.	<u>2,680</u>	
	TOTAL	\$ 58,939	
300-94	Cable Television Network Installation for Luxmanor, Stedwick, and Summit Hall Elementary Schools		
	<u>Awardees</u>		
	Netcom Technologies	\$ 19,788	
	B & W Communications	<u>7,800</u>	
	TOTAL	\$ 27,588	
301-94	Challenge Grant Elementary School Learner Package for Harmony Hills Elementary School		
	<u>Awardee</u>		
	Jostens Learning Corporation	\$ 146,288	
	MORE THAN \$25,000	\$2,225,496	

\* Denotes MFD Vendors

RESOLUTION NO. 4-94            Re:    PURCHASE OF SCHOOL BUSES

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

WHEREAS, It is necessary to purchase 85 additional buses to meet state requirements because of age, and accommodate increased enrollment; and

WHEREAS, It has been determined that extension of bid numbers 47-92 and 51-93 for the purchase of 85 school buses is cost effective, authorized by the terms of the bid, and in the best interest of MCPS; and

WHEREAS, Patco Distributors, Inc., has agreed to extend the contract with a 3.5 percent increase permitted under the terms and conditions of bid no. 47-92 for the purchase of an additional six (6) 69-passenger school buses; and

WHEREAS, District International Trucks, Inc., has agreed to extend the contract with a 1 percent increase permitted under the

terms and conditions of Bid No. 51-93 for the purchase of an additional seventy nine (79) 36-passenger school buses; and

WHEREAS, Financing for these acquisitions will be presented to the Board of Education for approval at a later date; and

WHEREAS, If a cooperative master lease/purchase agreement with the Montgomery County Government through the Montgomery County Revenue Authority is not finalized and approved by the Board by March, 1994, MCPS shall issue an invitation to bid to acquire preferred municipal financing from qualified financial institutions to fund the lease/purchase of 85 school buses; and

WHEREAS, In order to receive the 85 additional buses before the opening of school next fall, it is necessary at this time, as has been the practice in prior years, for the Board to authorize the acquisition of 85 additional buses included in the superintendent's FY95 operating budget; now therefore be it

Resolved, That contingent on the approval of adequate financing in its FY95 operating budget, the Board of Education extend the contract awarded under Bid No. 47-92, Purchase of School Buses, to Patco Distributors, Inc., for an additional six (6) 69-passenger school buses costing \$392,676.00; and be it further

Resolved, That contingent on the approval of adequate financing in its FY95 operating budget, the Board of Education extend the contract awarded under Bid No. 51-93, Purchase of School Buses, to District International Trucks, Inc., for seventy-nine (79) 36-passenger school buses at a cost of \$3,695,304.00.

RESOLUTION NO. 5-94                      Re:    GRANT OF RIGHT-OF-WAY AT DR. MARTIN  
LUTHER KING, JR., MIDDLE SCHOOL

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

WHEREAS, The Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission (WSSC) proposes to realign a water main as a part of the widening of Frederick Road (MD#355) along the frontage of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., Middle School; and

WHEREAS, The realignment of the water main requires that the domestic water line serving the school be relocated and the connection to the main line be reinforced; and

WHEREAS, The proposed grant of right-of-way of 1.200 square feet, and an adjacent temporary construction strip, ranging from 5 to 10 feet, will not adversely affect any land anticipated to be utilized for school purposes and would benefit the school community; and

WHEREAS, All construction, restoration and future maintenance will be at no cost to the Board of Education, with WSSC and its contractors assuming liability for all damages or injury; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the president and secretary be authorized to execute a right-of-way agreement with the Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission for the land required to realign the water line onto the Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., Middle School site; and be it further

Resolved, That a fee of \$216.00 be paid to MCPS by WSSC for the subject right-of-way.

RESOLUTION NO. 6-94            Re:    ACCEPTANCE OF ASHBURTON ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

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

Resolved, That having been duly inspected on December 21, 1993, the modernization and addition to Ashburton Elementary School now be formally accepted, and that the official date of completion be established as that date upon which formal notice is received from the architect that the building has been completed in accordance with the plans and specifications, and all contract requirements have been met.

RESOLUTION NO. 7-94            Re:    ACCEPTANCE OF THURGOOD MARSHALL ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

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

Resolved, That having been duly inspected on December 20, 1993, the Thurgood Marshall Elementary School project now be formally accepted, and that the official date of completion be established as that date upon which formal notice is received from the architect that the building has been completed in accordance with the plans and specifications, and all contract requirements have been met.

Mrs. Gordon assumed the chair.

RESOLUTION NO. 8-94            Re:    ACCEPTANCE OF CLARKSBURG ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

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







	<u>Category</u>	<u>Amount</u>
2	Instructional Salaries	\$ 3,518
3	Other Instructional Cost	8,500
10	Fixed Charges	<u>282</u>
	TOTAL	<u>\$12,300</u>

and be it further

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

RESOLUTION NO. 14-94      Re:    RECOMMENDATION TO SUBMIT AN FY 1994  
GRANT PROPOSAL FOR THE ELEMENTARY  
SCIENCE SUPPORT PROJECT

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

Resolved, That the superintendent of schools be authorized to submit an FY 1994 grant proposal for \$360,000 to the Howard Hughes Medical Institute, through the Montgomery County Public Schools Educational Foundation, Inc., for the Elementary Science Support Project; and be it further

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

RESOLUTION NO. 15-94      Re:    RECOMMENDATION TO SUBMIT AN FY 1994  
GRANT PROPOSAL FOR THE TIGER  
SPECIAL EDUCATION PROGRAM

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

Resolved, That the superintendent of schools be authorized to submit an FY 1994 grant proposal for \$223,400 to the U.S. Department of Education, under the federal Technology, Educational Media, and Materials for Individuals with Disabilities Program, for the Technology Initiatives for Generating Educational Resources (TIGER) special education program; and be it further

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

RESOLUTION NO. 16-94      Re: RECOMMENDATION TO SUBMIT AN FY 1994  
GRANT PROPOSAL FOR A RECREATIONAL  
PROGRAM FOR STUDENTS WITH  
DISABILITIES

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

Resolved, That the superintendent of schools be authorized to participate in an FY 1994 grant proposal to the United States Department of Education, submitted by the Montgomery County Recreation Department (MCRD), in association with the Autism Society of America, under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, for a recreational program for students with disabilities.

RESOLUTION NO. 17-94      Re: RECOMMENDATION TO SUBMIT AN FY 1994  
GRANT PROPOSAL FOR THE MIDDLE  
SCHOOL LEADERSHIP TEAM PROGRAM

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

Resolved, That the superintendent of schools be authorized to submit an FY 1994 grant proposal for \$115,790 to the United States Department of Education, under the Fund for the Improvement and Reform of Schools and Teachers, for the Middle School Leadership Team program; and be it further

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

RESOLUTION NO. 18-94      Re: RECOMMENDATION TO SUBMIT AN FY 1994  
GRANT PROPOSAL FOR THE COUNSELOR  
TRAINING PROGRAM

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

Resolved, That the superintendent of schools be authorized to submit an FY 1994 grant proposal, in association with the Family Support Center, Inc., for \$101,905 to the United States Department of Education under the Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act, to expand and enhance the counselor training program; and be it further

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





Resolved, That the county government be requested to submit a letter to the state supporting this study by January 21.

RESOLUTION NO. 21-94 Re: MONTHLY PERSONNEL REPORT

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

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

RESOLUTION NO. 22-94 Re: EXTENSION OF SICK LEAVE

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

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 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>
Lyons, James B.	Computer Operator I Data Processing Operations	30

RESOLUTION NO. 23-94 Re: DEATH OF MR. MELVIN A. DUTTON, JR.  
BUILDING SERVICE WORKER (ICB) IN  
COMMUNITY USE OF SCHOOLS AT COL.  
ZADOK MAGRUDER HIGH SCHOOL

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

WHEREAS, The death on January 1, 1994, of Mr. Melvin A. Dutton, Jr., a building service worker (ICB) in Community Use of Schools at Col. Zadok Magruder High School, has deeply saddened the staff and members of the Board of Education; and

WHEREAS, In the short time Mr. Dutton had worked for Montgomery County Public Schools, he demonstrated competence as a building service worker; and





January 11, 1994

WHEREAS, Mrs. Sabbagh had been a loyal employee of Montgomery County Public Schools and a member of the cafeteria staff for four years; and

WHEREAS, Mrs. Sabbagh's pride in her work and her ability to work effectively with students and co-workers were recognized by her staff and associates; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the members of the Board of Education express their sorrow at the death of Mrs. Nuha Y. Sabbagh and extend deepest sympathy to her family; and be it further

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

RESOLUTION NO. 28-94 Re: PERSONNEL APPOINTMENT

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

Resolved, That the following personnel appointment be approved:

<u>Appointment</u>	<u>Present Position</u>	<u>As</u>
Laura Siegelbaum	Acting Assistant Principal Watkins Mill ES	Principal Beverly Farms ES Effective: 2-1-94

RESOLUTION NO. 29-94 Re: PERSONNEL APPOINTMENT

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Dr. Cheung seconded by Ms. Gutierrez, the following resolution was adopted unanimously:

<u>Appointment</u>	<u>Present Position</u>	<u>As</u>
Felicia E. Lanham Tarason	Principal Polk ES Alexandria City Public Schools Alexandria, VA	Principal Wheaton Woods ES Effective: 1-12-94

RESOLUTION NO. 30-94 Re: PERSONNEL APPOINTMENT

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



early intervention. Since their last report to the Board, the plan had focused on the expansion of training, the implementation of the cluster model, the role of the behavioral support teacher, the role of the counselor/consultant, the expansion of the data base, and the expansion of interagency support as well as expansion of direct services to students. Each area was addressed in the paper submitted to the Board.

Ms. Jasperse stated that the beginning of the school year had been exciting and challenging. The training effort had been one of their major emphases. They were expanding their efforts to do systemwide training. They had trained special education resource teachers, special education bus drivers and assistants, and all of the Intensity 4 SED staff. They had done training in general education facilities and special education facilities. Topics included mental hygiene issues for staff, fostering of attitudes that were inclusive, and whole school climate. They wanted to have staff working for success for all students, both coded and non-coded. They had focused on training in successful consultation models, effective instructional strategies, and behavior management. Their training had gone far beyond the cluster model programs; however, the cluster model programs had increased in number and in excellence. They now had cluster models in eight elementary schools, and this was a significant factor in their being able to reduce the number of students moving to more restrictive settings.

Ms. Jasperse called attention to the statistics in the report before the Board on students in the cluster model programs and also in their remaining singleton programs. Their unit had been involved in collecting some preliminary data based on 60-day reviews and consultation with programs. This year they had been able to successfully place a number of students into the elementary cluster model programs who had been previously recommended for an intensity 5 program.

Ms. Jasperse stated that the unit in collaboration with Office of Special Education would continue to combine the remaining singleton classes at the elementary level into cluster model programs. They would begin the conversion of some of the Mark Twain satellite programs at the middle school level into cluster model programs beginning in the 1994-95 school year. They had to consider the role of the behavioral support teachers, both in implementing initial best practices and program designs and also in continuing consultation and staff training of the entire building staff. The coordinator's responsibilities had increased and expanded with the direct supervision of intensity 5 programs and consultation and support to principals. Mr. Paul was also involved with community interagency and mental health organizations. He was also involved in the training efforts.

The counselor consultant continued to coordinate special education with school counseling services. A major thrust had been to implement conflict management strategies for all students, not just SED students. This included peer mediation, direct social skills instruction, and conflict resolution programs. This year the data base was a major focus, and they were piloting the data base. Three schools were involved in this process, and they had begun updating student information from their original data collection, beginning initial training efforts at the school-wide level, and working towards the goal of linking student outcomes to specific services and strategies.

Ms. Jasperse reported that the SED specialist was expanding her role. She continued to provide direct therapy and case management to a limited number of students. She, too, was involved in training efforts as well as referral procedures. She was the link between MCPS and private mental health professionals and interagency professionals. Ms. Jasperse stated that a major focus of the year had been early prevention and intervention. Another major thrust had been to continue to implement the SED comprehensive plan in a way that touched all students and all staff. Many students not coded SED were experiencing significant emotional or behavioral problems, and the staff working with them also had needs in terms of training, program models, and best practices. In this broad scope, they had included interagency collaboration. A grant had been developed with Parents Supporting Parents to do some direct and on-going parent training, and similar efforts had been established through the University of Maryland.

Mrs. Fanconi reported that she had the privilege of presenting some of the statistics on this program at the National Federation of Urban-Suburban School Districts, and people there felt that the statistics were quite impressive when they could return students from more restrictive to least restrictive environments and could reduce the movement of students to more restrictive placements and the number on home instruction or in hospitals. She had heard there was now a waiting list of schools for training. Dr. Fountain replied they trained 73 out of 179 schools. About 45 of the 73 had been completely trained including bus drivers, cafeteria workers, support staff, etc. Ms. Jasperse added that a number of schools had requested training and a number of schools had asked for additional training. They felt extremely successful about the number of schools they had been able to reach as well as collaborative efforts with other units to provide this training.

Mrs. Fanconi had a concern about data collection. The initial data collection had been extremely time consuming because they had to review records of students who were not coded. They had discussed ways of updating that information, and she wondered if they had come up with a way of making this easier. Dr. Joy



Markowitz, research and evaluation specialist, replied that in the spring of 1992 they did go to every single school. They were not updating the data base that comprehensively. They did not have the staff or the funds to do that. They were focusing on the three pilot schools, and they were updating information on those schools only. Thus far, they had not had to do extensive record reviews because they had focused and streamlined their data collection. They were collecting data in the pilot schools on strategies and services that were being implemented to address student needs. Now they were looking at a way to fit their data collection into the ongoing computerized data collection occurring at schools through SIMS. Mrs. Fanconi asked that she be provided with the original grant because she thought the data collection piece was very important.

Mr. Ewing noted that in the memorandum before the Board there was mention of the over-representation of African-American students at Twain and in SED placements. He asked what specific actions were being taken to deal with that issue. Dr. Fountain replied that they now had an equity assurance officer. He believed that the work they were doing in early intervention and prevention was beginning to make a difference. In their Success for Every Student Plan they had one approach to keep children out and the other approach was to look at students who were perhaps mis-identified and get them out of special education. They hoped to increase the effect of these with some help from the equity assurance officer. Dr. Vance commented that he had high hopes for the efforts of the equity assurance officer. They had selected an outstanding, capable, and high energy person. She would be working with Dr. Fountain, reporting to the superintendent, and having conversations with the executive staff. Mr. Ewing assumed that from time to time they would receive information about the effects of this effort, and Dr. Vance assured him that they would.

Mr. Ewing recalled that over the years they had had situations in which the courts had assigned students to several facilities for MCPS SED students. He assumed that this was continuing. Dr. Fountain replied that it was not so much at Mark Twain as it was at RICA because RICA was a state facility with the educational piece being provided by MCPS. There were beds set aside for student assessments directed by the courts. In other instances students from other counties were placed through social services into MCPS programs. Sometimes they did not have all the information on these students. He met with judges several times a year to discuss these very issues.

Mrs. Gordon was very pleased with the training aspect. She had visited several of the cluster schools, and she was especially pleased that the training was taking place across the school and not just with the professional staff or just the special education staff. These students did interact throughout the day

with other students and with other staff members. She knew the program was expanding to the middle level, and she wanted to know if they were expanding programs within clusters that already had an elementary cluster model school so that there would be some continuity. She was pleased with the level of commitment at the local schools as well as through the central office to help these students achieve the skills they needed to be integrated back into the regular classroom.

Mrs. Fanconi requested information on how many children were placed by judges and their length of stay over the last two years at RICA and whether or not those slots had remained full. She also asked that the data on page 3 of the report be broken out by race. She inquired about similarities between the expansion of the cluster program and the next topic. For example, there were training components and community outreach. Ms. Lebowitz replied that the SED model focused on those children identified for special education. In the next presentation they would reach beyond that to address the broader area of students.

Dr. Cheung strongly supported prevention and early intervention for these students. He asked about conflicts between their current policy on weapon possession and disciplinary procedures for regular and special education students. He asked whether the procedures applied equally to both. Dr. Fountain replied that the policy did, but the procedure for dealing with special education students differed. If a coded student were involved in a violent act, the student would be suspended but within the first five days the student must have a manifestation ARD to determine whether the disability had anything to do with the offense. He hoped that they would be able to assign a case manager to the student, the day that student was suspended.

Mrs. Fanconi thanked staff for the presentation. She believed that getting these services into the classroom was where they would be able to address the over-representation of the African-American male. Dr. Vance complimented staff under the leadership of Mr. Paul and stated the cluster model was attracting widespread support.

Re: INTERAGENCY SERVICE DELIVERY MODEL  
TO ADDRESS STUDENTS WHO EXHIBIT  
DANGEROUS BEHAVIOR

Dr. Vance introduced Mr. Charles Short, director, Department of Family Resources; Mr. Bennett Connelly, chief, Division of Children, Youth, and Families; and Mr. Ed D'Aiutolo, director, Department of Alternative Programs. Dr. Vance reported that the Board had received the introduction of the topic and the history of original task group and the creation of the interagency commission.

Dr. Vance said he would like to share a letter he recently received from the co-chair of a advocacy group for young African-American students. He read the following:

"Thank you for a copy of the recommendations which were presented to the Board of Education on the establishment of a program to address the needs of adolescents who exhibit dangerous behavior. I have shared this information with members of the African-American Parents Community Education Consortium, and we concur that programs must be designed to meet the needs of those students who challenge the system as well as those who conform to its structure. The steering committee and the program development committee are to be commended for their inclusion of various state and county agencies whose decisions directly impact communities. Acts of violence are occurring frequently both in Montgomery County and in surrounding communities. Thus, these unacceptable acts of behavior are no longer restricted to the inner-city but have permeated the boundaries of previously ensconced safe havens. If the educational plan for the center is implemented as designed, the targeted population should benefit from increased services and instruction. For it is criminal that home instruction is limited to six hours a week for those who need it most.

"We have some questions about the students selected for the center. What measures will be taken so that center is not limited to African-American males as they are currently over-represented as suspended or expelled students? Will female students be enrolled? If so, will the classes be mixed or separated by gender? What accommodations will be made for talented and gifted pupils, ESOL students, or special education participants who may be physically challenged or learning disabled?

"An element of trust must be developed among the various team members. Reluctant students and parents should understand that this program will offer a different approach. Representatives of the agencies must be sensitized as to the skepticism, hostility, or fear that the target population may exhibit. Parents should be willing to have their adolescents participate. What options are offered to those parents who do not wish to comply? Who will have the final word? Perhaps early dialogue between parents and some agency representatives, but not one parent surrounded by an intimidating number of personnel, would encourage joint planning.

"Staff training must be intense and supportive. Ideally volunteers for such a setting would promote the educational goals and positively, than those who feel too threatened by

the unpolished or misplaced talents of the pupils. How will staff be selected from the existing pool?

"If students are grouped heterogeneously as they are in Montessori programs, perhaps their self esteem will improve and each one can teach another participant. Small groups of students can be phased in over a few days so that routines might be developed and practiced more easily. Instructional groups should vary in size.

"The monitoring and our review process should be a sincere team effort. Safety measures as well as cost and time must be linked to transportation plans. Once a site has been identified, parents of the affected population should be involved so that the general public will not be subjected to the harassment the District of Columbia train riders were exposed to. Exit follow-ups should occur so that students will feel less tempted to revert to unacceptable behavior. As the project expands, participants should be monitored through high school in the county. Upon the completion of high school, a transition team should be in place to encourage integration into a relatively unsheltered world.

"If a grant does not yield the necessary funds, please tap other resources, for everyone agrees that corrective measures must be taken now. In summation, we support the effort to rectify a cancerous system of violence and to replace it with the human development of humanity. Please feel free to include us in future plans. Yvonne B. Brown"

Dr. Vance stated that he wanted to share this with the Board and the public to give them a sense of a deep concern and the high level of sophistication parents and community had concerning this initiative.

Mr. Short commented that this was an eloquent presentation. While they were not able to answer all Ms. Brown's questions, they were committed to working with her to answer these questions. He expressed his pleasure at being before the Board and said that of the many projects the executive branch did with MCPS, this was one of the most important. He had been referring to it in his notes as Project Rescue. They really were talking about saving children who were 11, 12, 13 years old and for whom expulsion was not a humane option. They had an obligation to educate these children first and rescue them from whatever they were going through.

Mr. Short reported that the beginnings of this project went back to an unprecedented meeting called by Dr. Vance which brought together county government, state's attorney, police, recreation, and education to talk about these children who brought weapons to

school, who were violent, and for whom there were few real options. Dr. Vance said he needed help, and a number of people began work to try to craft an educational treatment program. Many of the individuals who worked on this proposal over the summer were in the audience. He was fully committed to this program, and they would have a citizen advisory committee and they would see that the program improved as they served more students.

Mr. D'Aiutolo stated that they met in May and June to develop different recommendations for a model and direction. In early December they developed the model they would present to the Board today. This model was designed to intervene with students ages 12 to 16 who had been suspended and recommended for expulsion due to weapons and/or other violent acts. They tried to focus on middle schools because of the lack of programs. The program would serve 18 students at a time, and they anticipated a rotation twice a year to serve 36 students. In addition to that, case management would pick another 24 students. This intervention would provide services to a minimum of 60 students a year.

Mr. D'Aiutolo explained that they first looked at how the problem would fall out in Montgomery County. They looked at home instruction data from the 1992-93 school year, and there were 51 students fitting the profile. They also knew that violent behavior was the result of a variety of social, emotional, academic, and family problems. The treatment had to address all aspects of the student's well-being, which meant that the schools could not do it alone. When a student was suspended for weapons or violence, a referral would be made for case management. For the first five days, the student would receive services through case management. At the hearing level, the student could return to school or an additional suspension with a recommendation for expulsion. If the student were recommended for expulsion, they were proposing the student be placed in the center for assessment.

Mr. Connelly reported that they did not want the student out on the street or at home by themselves. They wanted to bring in the case manager to work with the child and the family. The case manager would provide the tutoring and the connection to services. Mr. D'Aiutolo added that the goal of the center was to provide an interagency alternative to expulsion and/or home instruction. The center would have an emphasis on academics, life skills, conflict resolution, physical fitness, counseling, and some type of parenting skills. There would be an individualized plan for each student in the program, and there would be a support and treatment system for each student when they left the program. There would be a collaborative team of service providers to work with the children and their families.

Mr. D'Aiutolo remarked that if things went well they looked to see improved ability for the student to function in the regular school setting and improvements in the self esteem of the student. The student would have an improved ability to deal with conflict, stress, and crises. They should have the ability to solve problems in a constructive way and have improved interpersonal skills, academic achievement, and attendance.

The referral to the center would happen at the hearing officer level if the recommendation for expulsion were supported by the field officer. The hearing officer would look at the severity of the incident, the danger of the student to himself and/or others, the history of the violent behaviors, the age of the student, and the school history of the student. There would be input from the pupil personnel worker, principal, parent, center assessment team, and the case manager. The hearing officer would decide if the student could be returned to school or be assigned to the center.

Mr. Connelly introduced Mr. Mark Shriver who was with a program called Choice which was an intensive case management program. Mr. Shriver worked in several counties in the state and was based in Baltimore County. The Choice program would be part of the center program through a grant from the Maryland State Department of Education. Choice would provide case managers who would work with the student seven days a week and would have contact with the students and their families two or three times a day.

Mr. Shriver explained that Choice started in January, 1988 working with students at risk of dropping out of school and children in need of supervision. They now worked with juvenile delinquents, students at risk of being taken out of their homes for delinquency, neglect and abuse, and for students coming out of locked institutions. They hired young college graduates who worked in a team of three with close supervision from a team manager. They worked five days a week, 8:30 to 5:30, and they had caseloads of between nine to ten students each. Case workers worked every third evening and every third weekend. This provided coverage seven days a week. They were doing behavior modification and stabilization as well as case management. They were not professional counselors, but they did well at developing relationships with students and their families and getting access to services for them. They set short-term and long-term goals for the student with the input of the parent so that everyone knew what was expected.

Mr. Shriver reported that when they recruited people they explained that it was a lot of work. These people went through a series of interviews and rode out in the evening with case workers. He believed they hired a very high quality person who made a 12- to 14-month commitment. They went on to other positions in the government or to graduate school. A number of

them stayed on as supervisors within the Choice program. The Choice program was funded through an interagency agreement by the Department of Juvenile Services, the Department of Mental Health and Hygiene, Department of Human Resources, and MSDE. Referrals came from all four of those agencies. They got students on the prevention level to students coming out of a locked facility. They had worked in Baltimore City, Baltimore County, and Prince George's County.

Mr. D'Aiutolo stated that the student would have a series of assessments done, and the case manager would coordinate those assessments. They would maintain the student's academic standing while in the program. There would be an individual learning plan, and at a minimum the student would be taught English, math, social studies, and science. There would be flexibility to allow some instruction in life skills and there would be guest teachers from business and the community. They were proposing a school day that was eight-hours long with a half day on Saturday. Students would be enrolled for one semester, and MCPS would use home instructors to provide instruction. This would reduce cost and give them more flexibility with the hours of instruction. They were proposing hiring three home instructors for the 18 students to give 30 hours of instruction per week. There would be a physical activity component with daily physical education and some high adventure activities. The counseling component would be woven throughout the fabric of the program. It would provide individual, group, and family counseling, and they proposed purchasing these services from a private provider. Parent support would be provided by the Department of Family Resources. Mr. Connelly added that Project Family Outreach was an integral part of many schools in the county, and they did parent education and support groups for students.

Mr. D'Aiutolo reported that they had looked at sites for the program and had not come up with a specific site. Students would be evaluated every nine weeks with the expectation that the student would move on to another placement in 18 weeks. When students were identified to exit the program, there would be a review of how the students had met the identified outcomes and their ability to function in a regular school. At this point, students could return to a school or another alternative setting. When the student returned, there would be a transition plan to make sure the linkages to community resources were maintained.

Because this would be a pilot, they had an evaluation component built in. They would work with DEA and evaluation units in county government to develop a plan to evaluate the program. Mr. D'Aiutolo stated that regarding the budget, MCPS could redeploy \$157,531 and would need new money in the amount of \$144,000. He noted that more than 56 percent of funds to run the program would come from existing funds. The cost per student would be about \$8,900 per year.

Mr. Short said they had already met with Senator Levitan and two delegates to brief them on this program and had received a very favorable hearing. Senator Levitan had had an opportunity to speak to the governor about this program, and Mr. Short hoped that some additional state commitment would come to the county for this program. Dr. Fountain added that they would have an implementation committee which would consist of not less than 15 members who would be business and community oriented.

Mrs. Fanconi said that after Board members had raised their questions they would need to give the superintendent a sense of whether or not he should develop a budget for this program; however, final action would not be taken until budget adoption. She asked whether there would be time for community input by letter between now and the time the implementation team was appointed, and Dr. Fountain assured her there would be.

Mr. Abrams asked whether six or 18 Choice staff would be required for 60 participants. Mr. Connelly explained that 60 students would be served in 12 months, and they were planning on 30 every six-month cycle; therefore, there would be three Choice staff for every 30 students. Mr. Abrams asked whether the program was a one-shot opportunity in terms of an alternative or whether some students could repeat the program. Mr. Short replied that fundamental to the program was their commitment to the child. If it took 19 or 20 weeks, they would do what they needed to do to work for that child; however, their goal was to get the student out of the program and into the regular school as soon as they could. They had not talked about a situation where there was a second offense, but he did know that MCPS had few other options for these students. Mr. Abrams noted that there were some attractions to this program that might make it a preference program. Mr. Short replied that if a student really needed the support of a program running from 9 to 5 and on Saturday mornings, they would be glad to have that child. However, this was a good question, and the implementation committee would look into this.

In regard to the teachers, Mrs. Brenneman asked if they would be looking at the home instructors for certain experience or just taking from the pool and equating the hours and the money. Dr. Fountain replied that it was the latter. Mrs. Brenneman asked whether there was a cutoff time for the program. Mr. Short replied that a student could not attend for two or three years.

Mrs. Brenneman thought that the report and presentation were excellent. She could not recall such cooperation among agencies since she had been on the Board. She appreciated the idea of parental input and involvement. When she had visited the Phoenix program, the parent piece was an extremely important one. She was also impressed by the transition and follow-up once the child left the program. However, she was worried about the budget.



She saw a strong commitment on the part of all agencies, but she wanted to see this continuation of all agencies, but the budgets had to be committed for the duration. Dr. Fountain assured her that they would also be looking for state, local, and federal monies.

Ms. Gutierrez thought the proposal was dynamite, and her first question was when could the program start. Dr. Fountain replied that they had an outside date of September 1, and Mr. Connelly added that the Choice program could start earlier. Ms. Gutierrez asked if they were talking about a school for the location. Dr. Fountain replied that it would not be in a school, but it might be in a closed school.

Ms. Gutierrez asked whether or not Choice had been evaluated. Mr. Shriver replied that there was an ongoing evaluation funded by the Abel Foundation, and the preliminary evaluation appeared to be encouraging. Ms. Gutierrez asked how long students stayed in the Choice program. Mr. Shriver replied that in Choice students were phased out, but if two or three months later something happened, the student could come back into the program, if appropriate. He explained that this was a short hard-term punch for a student, and their first goal was to phase the student out of the program. They stressed strong responsibility from the youngster and his or her family.

Ms. Gutierrez asked about drug-related incidents, and Mr. Connelly explained that this child would be tied into one of the current county programs dealing with drug abuse. Even if the child were to go into a detox and a rehabilitation center for 30 days, a case manager would still be involved and hope that the child would come back to the center. This was not a separate alternative school. It was an interagency initiative to work with the whole family and child to put the child back into the regular school within nine to 18 weeks, or sooner.

Ms. Gutierrez asked if they had any Spanish-speaking counselors, and Mr. Shriver replied that they did not have any in Baltimore. Their staff was 65 percent black, and 50/50 males and females. He indicated that in Montgomery County they would recruit for Spanish-speaking counselors.

Mrs. Gordon asked whether there would be a requirement that the parent must make a commitment before the child could go into the program. Dr. Fountain hoped that the parents would participate, but they would not kick a child out if the parents did not participate. Mr. Shriver added that the Choice behavior plan relied heavily on input from the parent or guardian.

Mrs. Gordon asked whether special education students would be involved in this or whether they were not eligible or had a different kind of component in dealing with these students. Dr.

Fountain replied that usually they did have placements for students with disabilities. Most of the students on long-term home instruction had not been identified as disabled. Mrs. Gordon recalled that they had discussed the behavior being a result of the handicapping condition or their disability. It was possible that a student had a disability which was not related to their behavior. She would not want to see any student not have the opportunity for this kind of intensive program. Dr. Fountain thought this would be determined during the assessment.

In regard to program evaluation, Mr. Ewing said it was difficult to see how a thorough and systematic evaluation could be done for \$1,700. In the paper the Board received in advance of the meeting, there was on page 24 an evaluation statement that indicated there would be an oversight evaluation team composed of county agency representatives, center staff, parents, students, and community members. This committee would meet at least monthly to evaluate program effectiveness. He asked whether this was still an element of the overall evaluation plan. Dr. Fountain said that the 15-member oversight committee was one piece. The \$1,700 was the school system's part of the evaluation, and the county was also interested in evaluation. In addition, there would be an evaluation through the Choice program piece of this. All of this would give them a comprehensive look at the program. Dr. Vance added that they had not defined or refined the evaluation component.

It seemed to Mr. Ewing that they should know in advance of the start of the program that there was an evaluation plan in place and that the Board had seen it and was satisfied with it. It was important to be clear about the frequency of evaluation reporting and what the degree of public accountability would be. People would place great hopes on this program, and at the same time there would be a considerable amount of anxiety on the part of the public about this program. A good evaluation was essential as an evaluation of the overall strategy. In addition, it was important to make certain that this was not a program populated exclusively by black males. In the course of the evaluation, they needed to look at the nature of the composition of those involved in it in terms of gender, racial, and ethnic group. He believed this was a good program, and they should go ahead with it; however, they needed an evaluation plan in place before they opened their doors.

Dr. Cheung thought this was an outstanding program with all the interagency involvement. He agreed with Mr. Abrams that the child might not appreciate the five and a half day program, but a lot of parents might wish their children attended a five and a half day program. They had talked about prevention and early intervention, and he wondered how they would take care of that group before these students committed crimes. He also assumed that the program would grow as the population grew and changed.

Mr. Short hoped that the program would not grow. He said there were community-wide efforts against violence, and the school system could not solve this problem by itself. It would take a recommitment by everyone beginning with parents. He thought that government needed to take less responsibility. He said that the country was fed up with violence, and while it might take a few years they were on the road to less violence.

Dr. Cheung hoped that Mr. Short was right; however, by law, the school system had to educate children. They had to work together because these children did need an education and early intervention before reaching the stage of the center. Mr. Short replied that there were a large number of collaborations beyond this one. He thought they were getting smarter in the human service business by recognizing they needed to cooperate among different agencies and with the public and private sector.

Dr. Vance stated that as far back as 1905 Dr. DuBois at the University of Pennsylvania had in his history of the Philadelphia negro predicted the inability and unwillingness of the broader Philadelphia community to accept them. This was the time of the first wave of black immigrants from the South. Dr. Vance thought that Mr. Short was on target in his comments. To be successful they needed this high level of interagency cooperation.

Mrs. Fanconi said that in the report there was the statement that adolescent violence was indeed a community problem and one that must be addressed by a concentrated, coordinated, and collaborative interagency response. In terms of the educational program, she would like to see that it worked with the SED cluster model dealing with early intervention of students with behavior and emotional problems. She thought that the cost was very reasonable in terms of the cost of a jail cell which was \$22,000 a year. Clearly, if they did not make significant efforts with these children, there would be a cost to society, monetarily and emotionally.

Mrs. Fanconi said she would like the task force to look at a business setting. There could be some real advantages to a setting where there could be mentoring and some job opportunities. She did not see a great deal in the paper about student buy-in and parent buy-in, and she hoped that they would look at existing alternative programs and the importance of this aspect. They might consider having the student apply to the program, and they might want to look at an application to get out of the program. She felt that the half-day on Saturday could be a component that could continue once the student went back into the regular education setting.

Mrs. Fanconi asked for a paper on how the home instructors would work because in one place it said there would be 18 instructors. She had a great deal of concern about placing any teacher as an

administrative placement in a program like this. It seemed to her that the success of alternative programs came from a real commitment of staff and director to the project. She hoped they would look very carefully at how to recruit the staff and the center director. She noticed that the paper talked about a staff sensitive to the educational, economic, and cultural diversity of the target population and willing to explore non-traditional approaches. She hoped they would have a similar statement about the school staff working with these students. She thanked all of the agencies and asked whether there was consensus for Dr. Vance to go ahead and make further plans. It was the consensus of the Board that Dr. Vance should proceed. Mr. Ewing asked that the Board receive a formal resolution on the project and an evaluation plan, and Mrs. Fanconi agreed. Ms. Gutierrez inquired about the rationale for the high cost of transportation and the relocatable classrooms when the location had not been selected.

Re: BOARD/SUPERINTENDENT COMMENTS

1. Dr. Vance regretted that the FY 1995 Operating Budget presentation had been cancelled because of the weather. He believed the proposed budget would allow the school system to respond to an expected enrollment increase of 3,400 students and to cover increased costs for inflation and a negotiated pay increase for teachers. It was a minimal, but nonetheless it was a budget recommendation that sought to maintain the quality of MCPS. His request exceeded the Council's affordability limit by \$15.2 million. He was committed to working with the Board to secure the resources needed for students. He provided the public with a calendar for Board hearings, worksessions, and budget action. The final budget action would take place on February 8 and be submitted to the county by March 1.
2. Dr. Vance reported that five MCPS students on a seven-member team representing Maryland had won second place in the Panasonic Academic Challenge. The students were: Steven Chien, a graduate of Blair and a student at Harvard; Chris Danielian and Martin Duke, graduates of Quince Orchard and students at M.I.T.; Daniel Paskowitz, a graduate of the IB program at Richard Montgomery and a student at Harvard; and James Rogers, a 12th grader at Blair. He also complimented their coaches: Kevin Keegan, an English teacher at Rockville HS, and Michael Kravitz, a chemistry teacher at Blair.
3. Dr. Vance remarked that tomorrow he would be visited by Mr. W. Wilson Good, the U.S. secretary of education's regional representative. Prior to this position, Mr. Good was mayor of Philadelphia from 1984 to 1992.
4. Mrs. Brenneman said that yesterday she took a ride on a school bus. She quoted from a letter she had sent to Bob Allison, the school bus operator. She realized the pride he took

in his work, and she had noticed the affection the children felt for him. This supported her view that bus drivers needed to have those "people skills" because they were the first MCPS employee in contact with students. She thanked him for being dedicated to his job and for being a positive influence for children.

5. Mrs. Gordon complimented principals, staff, and Giles Benson and his staff for the excellent job they did in moving schools over the winter break. Staff worked through the snow storm, and the schools were ready to go on time. Normally this process took the entire summer.

6. Mr. Ewing reported that on January 8 he had attended an MCEA symposium on a wide variety of discussion topics. He thought it was excellent. The keynote speaker talked about initiatives which threatened the support of the public schools. There was also a very good session on Wheaton and the Challenge grant. He believed the Board should have a discussion on how high schools were organized for a delivery of services. He stated that MCEA deserved great credit for offering the symposium.

7. Ms. Baker stated that last Thursday representatives from 10 high schools met with Board members. They discussed self segregation, school security, and the budget. She thanked Dr. Cheung, Mr. Ewing, Mrs. Brenneman, Mrs. Fanconi, and Mrs. Gordon for attending. Yesterday she had attended the monthly MCR meeting where they discussed the operating budget and MCR testimony. They also voted to support a candlelight vigil to protest violence which was sponsored by the Einstein SGA. She invited Board members to attend the vigil on January 24, at 8 p.m. at the CESC.

8. Mr. Abrams reported that at Richard Montgomery HS there was some concern about the use of computers and whether computers funded under federal grant funds could be used for other purposes. He asked staff to look into this.

9. Mr. Abrams asked that the Board receive an update and continuing updates on the difficulties or progress being made regarding admission to college and the class rank issue. Dr. Vance thought that these were being provided, but he would double check to make sure the Board was receiving them.

10. Mr. Abrams asked for an assessment of the Bell Atlantic proposal and how this fit with the Board's technology plan.

11. Ms. Gutierrez thanked Maria Malagon who had provided her with a tour of four schools to look at the ESOL programs. She recommended that Board members visit this program. She was extremely delighted to see efforts being made at New Hampshire Estates ES. Dr. Vance suggested that Board members let him know

when they wanted to visit programs and projects because he would be delight to arrange these visits.

12. Mrs. Fanconi said the Board had received a letter from the National Association of Minority Contractors commending MCPS on their innovative approaches to financing and bonding which provided assistance to minority contracts. She commended the staff and Bob Weston for his work in procurement of constructive services for MCPS.

RESOLUTION NO. 32-94 Re: CLOSED MEETING - JANUARY 24, 1994

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

WHEREAS, The Board of Education of Montgomery County is authorized by the Education Article of the Annotated Code of Maryland and Title 10 of the State Government Article to conduct certain meetings or portions of its meetings in closed session; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Board of Education of Montgomery County hereby conduct a portion of its meeting on January 24, 1994, at 7:30 p.m. to discuss personnel matters, matters protected from public disclosure by law, and other issues including consultation with counsel to obtain legal advice; and be it further

Resolved, That this meeting be conducted in Room 120 of the Carver Educational Services Center, Rockville, Maryland, as permitted under Section 4-106, Education Article of the Annotated Code of Maryland and State Government Article 10-501; and be it further

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

RESOLUTION NO. 33-94 Re: MINUTES OF NOVEMBER 22, 1993

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

Resolved, That the minutes of November 22, 1993, be approved.

RESOLUTION NO. 34-94 Re: MINUTES OF DECEMBER 8, 1993

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

Resolved, That the minutes of December 8, 1993, be approved as corrected.

Re: REPORT ON CLOSED SESSIONS -  
DECEMBER 8 AND DECEMBER 15, 1993

The Montgomery County Board of Education met in closed session on Wednesday, December 8, 1993, from 7:10 p.m. to 7:30 p.m. The meeting took place in room 120 of the Carver Educational Services Center, Rockville, Maryland.

The Board met to consult with staff regarding contract negotiations with MCCSSE and MCAASP. In attendance at the closed session were Stephen Abrams, Carrie Baker, Larry Bowers, Fran Brenneman, Carole Burger, Alan Cheung, Blair Ewing, Carol Fanconi, Thomas Fess, Katheryn Gemberling, Bea Gordon, Ana Sol Gutierrez, Marie Heck, Philip Rohr, Paul Vance, Bud Westall, Mary Lou Wood, and Melissa Woods.

On November 22, 1993, by the unanimous vote of members present, the Board of Education voted to conduct a closed session on December 14, 1993, 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, December 14, 1993, from 9 a.m. to 10 a.m. and from 12:45 p.m. to 2:15 p.m. The meeting took place in room 120 of the Carver Educational Services Center, Rockville, Maryland.

The Board met to discuss site selection for the Northwest area high school and middle school and for the Northeast area high school. The Board voted to support the monthly personnel report and the superintendent's recommendation for the equity assurance officer. The Board also discussed compensation for special education counsel.

The Board postponed the EEOC report and agreed to meet with the new Human Relations staff for lunch on January 11. The Board reviewed applicants for Board committees and confirmed these appointments in open session. They also discussed appointments to Board subcommittees and membership on various Board affiliations. They consulted with counsel on BOE appeals and on responses to correspondence regarding a principalship.

In attendance at the closed session were Stephen Abrams, Carrie Baker, Fran Brenneman, Judy Bresler, Alan Cheung, Blair Ewing, Carol Fanconi, Katheryn Gemberling, Bea Gordon, Zvi Greismann, Ana Sol Gutierrez, Marie Heck, Elfreda Massie, Brian Porter, Philip Rohr, Roger Titus, Janice Turpin, Paul Vance, Joseph Villani, William Wilder, Mary Lou Wood, and Melissa Woods.

Re: A MOTION BY MRS. BRENNEMAN  
REGARDING THE FAMILY LIFE UNIT  
(FAILED)

A motion by Mrs. Brenneman that the Board hold a discussion on the implementation of the family life unit failed with Mr. Abrams, Mrs. Brenneman, Dr. Cheung, and Mr. Ewing voting in the affirmative; Ms. Baker, Mrs. Fanconi, Mrs. Gordon, and Ms. Gutierrez voting in the negative.

Re: AMERICAN SIGN LANGUAGE

On December 14, 1993, Ms. Baker moved and Mr. Abrams seconded the following:

WHEREAS, The Americans With Disabilities Act is now being implemented and more interest is being shown by the public regarding the rights of and accommodations for those with disabilities; and

WHEREAS, Many deaf and hard-of-hearing people use sign language as a means of communication; and

WHEREAS, More people should have an opportunity to study sign language in order to converse with the deaf; and

WHEREAS, Three MCPS high schools now offer American Sign Language as an elective; and

WHEREAS, Fairfax County gives foreign language credit for courses in American Sign Language; and

WHEREAS, If foreign language credit were provided, more students would enroll in American Sign Language, thus, facilitating better communication with the deaf and hard of hearing; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the members of the Board of Education take the necessary steps to permit MCPS students to receive foreign language credit for American Sign Language.

RESOLUTION NO. 35-94      Re: AN AMENDMENT TO THE PROPOSED  
RESOLUTION ON AMERICAN SIGN  
LANGUAGE

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

Resolved, That the proposed resolution on American Sign Language be amended to ask the superintendent to comment on the efficacy



of offering foreign language credit for American Sign Language and, if affirmative, take the necessary steps.

RESOLUTION NO. 36-94 Re: AMERICAN SIGN LANGUAGE

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

WHEREAS, The Americans With Disabilities Act is now being implemented and more interest is being shown by the public regarding the rights of and accommodations for those with disabilities; and

WHEREAS, Many deaf and hard-of-hearing people use sign language as a means of communication; and

WHEREAS, More people should have an opportunity to study sign language in order to converse with the deaf; and

WHEREAS, Three MCPS high schools now offer American Sign Language as an elective; and

WHEREAS, Fairfax County gives foreign language credit for courses in American Sign Language; and

WHEREAS, If foreign language credit were provided, more students would enroll in American Sign Language, thus, facilitating better communication with the deaf and hard of hearing; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Board of Education ask the superintendent to comment on the efficacy of offering foreign language credit for American Sign Language and, if affirmative, take the necessary steps.

RESOLUTION NO. 37-94 Re: ADVISORY COMMITTEES

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education schedule an agenda item to deal with the issue of what the rules are for the appointment and service of advisory committee members.

RESOLUTION NO. 38-94 Re: INTERAGENCY COORDINATING BOARD

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education request the superintendent to review the financial situation with regard to the Interagency Coordinating Board and its impact on the Board's budget and to make recommendations to the Board during the Board's consideration of its budget and in the course of that to determine if there is, in his judgment, one or more other options that ought to be considered for the operation of this function.

RESOLUTION NO. 39-94            Re:    BOE APPEAL NO. 1993-27

On motion of Mrs. Gordon seconded by Ms. Baker, the following resolution was adopted unanimously:

Resolved, That the Board of Education adopt its Decision and Order in BOE Appeal No. 1993-27, a tuition waiver.

Re:    A MOTION BY MR. ABRAMS REGARDING  
THE PERKINS ACT (FAILED)

A motion by Mr. Abrams to ask the superintendent to discuss with Regional Administrator Good tomorrow a waiver of Section 235 of Title 2 of the Perkins Act as it relates to limitations on the use of equipment purchased with funds to permit the use not only after regular school hours but during idle time at the school failed with Mr. Abrams, Mrs. Fanconi, and Ms. Gutierrez voting in the affirmative; Ms. Baker, Dr. Cheung, and Mr. Ewing voting in the negative; Mrs. Brenneman and Mrs. Gordon abstaining.

Re:    A MOTION BY MR. ABRAMS REGARDING  
THE PERKINS ACT (FAILED)

A motion by Mr. Abrams to prohibit the superintendent from raising the Perkins issue with Mr. Good failed for lack of a second.

Mrs. Gordon took the chair.

1. Mrs. Fanconi moved and Ms. Gutierrez seconded the following:

Resolved, That the Board of Education have a discussion at the next annual MFD report on MFD contracting to include how they increase competition, increase minority participation, information on both construction and procurement, and statistics broken out by minority, female, and disability contractors.

Mrs. Fanconi assumed the chair.

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education set a time to review possible options for alternative certification for teachers.

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education schedule time to discuss variations and options on how the high school is to be organized including but not limited to the model that is now being used at Wheaton High School.

4. Ms. Gutierrez moved and Mr. Ewing seconded the following:

Resolved, That the Board of Education schedule discussion and review of implementation of policies that encourage the hiring of women in non-traditional positions in MCPS.

Re: ITEMS OF INFORMATION

Board members received the following items of information:

1. Items in Process
2. Construction Progress Report
3. Resource Conservation Plan for FY 1995
4. Monthly Financial Report

RESOLUTION NO. 40-94      Re: ADJOURNMENT

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education adjourn its meeting at 6:35 p.m.

---

PRESIDENT

---

SECRETARY

PLV:mlw