



Dr. Lancaster stated that since the Commission's report and recommendation, their guidance had directed what the Department had been doing in shaping its mission and in planning its programs. From a mechanical point of view, the restructuring had been completed. However, the 10 recommendations were the things they looked at for how to proceed.

One of the major elements of the recommendations was training of administrators. The Department had not spent a great deal of time in training administrators before the report, but since then they had focused on the training of principals on the sexual harassment policy. They had had some sessions using modules on sexual harassment, and they planned to continue the module approach to training staff. They hoped to use modules with ADA issues, 504, and hate/violence. Their sexual harassment process had taught them a great deal, and what they had learned would be applicable to other activities.

Dr. Lancaster said the Commission had pointed out to them that accountability was a major issue. They had been working with the Department of Educational Accountability to deal with the internal operations of his Department and to develop school and unit climate reviews. They were working on new assessment instruments which should provide them with a foundation for their training and educational programs. This would keep them in a proactive stance.

The Commission also looked at the human relations committee, and he had taken a close look at the design and approach for those committees built on the MCCPTA model. They had been talking to internal and external groups as to whether the design fit the need. The network of human relations committees would probably take up most of the time during the next year because right now these committees did not exist in many offices and units. They did exist in schools, but a number of schools had other mechanisms serving some of the same purposes. They needed to take a strong look at what was successful and was not successful. By next spring, they hoped to come back to the Board to say where they wanted to go with human relations committees. The network would provide them with the feedback and the training opportunities which should make a tremendous difference in the human relations climate in schools, offices, and units.

Dr. Lancaster pointed out that the Commission had directed them to collaborations and partnerships, both internal and external. In the last year, they had worked on improving the relationship between Human Relations and other offices in the county. The Department had been somewhat independent, and human relations had focused within the Department, but human relations was no longer the responsibility of an isolated office. It was everyone's responsibility, and everyone would be held accountable for it. They had accelerated their outreach efforts to governmental

agencies and to the universities. Next year they would be focusing on hate/violence and moving back to working directly with students. The Department used to do that years ago when they had a larger staff and their mission was pointed towards the classroom. They would like to refocus on the classroom, and with four new members of the staff they were able to do that. They were going to try to highlight the area of hate/violence, bias/prejudice, and tolerance.

Dr. Lancaster indicated that the major part of their restructuring had been the new staff, three community relations staff members and a compliance officer. This made all the difference in their efforts to be proactive. To train the new staff, they made arrangements with a university Ph.D. candidate to digest what was happening in MCPS, prepare for the new staff, and present workshops for them. In the past six months, staff members had been building their skills in developing strategies in various dimensions of human relations with local universities, national conferences, and other jurisdictions. The continuing priorities for the Department were sexual harassment, ADA, 504, and concerns about equity, bias, and access. Their major thrust for the coming year would be back to the student focus and the development of community training activities.

Dr. Lancaster commented that the policy analysis had taken up a lot of their efforts. He expressed his appreciation to Dr. Splaine and her staff for the expertise and the supports they had made in moving the Department toward the analysis of its policies. He would be listening closely to the Board in regard to their policy and their suggestions for policy revision. In one of the papers they had commented on the fact that in the 1960's and 1970's the Board was very visionary, and the policy had been extremely useful. He felt that it was now time to take another look at it and bring it up to date.

Dr. Splaine explained that the human relations policy analysis was a little different because rather than looking at one policy or one issue they looked at all policies relating to human relations. There were nine of them, and she called the Board's attention to the annotated list in Appendix D. In Appendix C they had listed the federal and state mandates, and Appendix B provided a chronological sequence related to human relations. They had reviewed each of the nine policies and came up with a series of recommendations. Some policies needed reformatting and updating. Other policies needed discussion about human relations training, accountability, and human relations committees.

Dr. Splaine noted that the first issue was human relations training. Policy GMA, Black Experience and Culture Course, was devoted to human relations training. This policy rescinded the mandatory nature of H.R. 18 and required H.R. 17, and it required one and a half days of in-service training for all employees.

One of those days of training was supposed to take place before the start of school each year. One issue was the timing of this training, and they were recommending that the one and a half days training should remain as a requirement, but the wording should be changed to provide flexibility for when principals and directors conducted that training.

The second recommendation regarding GMA was a recommendation to revise the course content of H.R. 17. The course had too much content to cover in the one-course time period, and the course content did not always transfer back into the classroom. They were recommending that the course be revised and come back to the Board as an information item. The second issue was accountability. At the moment there was no mandate for systemwide accountability in policy. The recommendation was that they add to Policy ACA a mandate for a systemwide program of accountability.

Dr. Splaine said the third issue was the human relations committees. The Commission recommended that the committees be mandated in policy. Dr. Lancaster had indicated that there were many types of committees now, and they thought it would be premature to require committees before they really looked at and reviewed the structure and effectiveness of these committees. At this time next summer, they would have a recommendation for the Board.

Dr. Splaine called the Board's attention to Appendix A which was a summary of the issues in the form of a table. Each of the nine policies was listed with a series of recommendations. After the Board discussion, staff would go back and draft the policies. Six policies needed to be redrafted for Board consideration, two policies needed to be rescinded, and one policy did not need action at this time.

Mrs. Fanconi thanked staff for their presentation. She was not sure how the Board should proceed. Dr. Vance suggested taking the recommendations ad seriatim. Mrs. Fanconi thought they should start with questions regarding the reorganization and then move to the analysis of the policies.

Mrs. Gordon said she had some questions and concerns about the directions the Human Relations office was taking. As she recalled the discussion regarding the report of the Commission, there was much more emphasis on outreach and a proactive stance for human relations. She understood that since they went for some time with no staff much of what they were doing now was following up on issues that arose when they did not have staff to address them. A lot of what they were doing was reactive in terms of sexual harassment which seemed to be the primary focus for the Department. She would like to see a concrete plan of when they would be addressing the other issues that were raised.

One of the recommendations was on training programs, but in Dr. Lancaster's presentation he focused on the sexual harassment training. She thought there were lots of other things that needed to be done in terms of an overall positive climate so that human relations was not responding just to negative actions. She did not doubt that this was going to take place, but she would like to see more of it in the report.

Mrs. Gordon said she was not convinced they needed to mandate the committees, but they all knew there were varying degrees of implementation. She would like to see them really move forward with the model. She was hearing about an evaluation that was taking place, but she wanted to know what the Department was doing to support schools with effective models and to use those as a basis to support schools where this was not happening. She would like to see a more proactive approach addressing things that were out in the community now. They needed to get people thinking about how to interact with one another on a human basis. She was pleased to hear the Department would be working with students.

Dr. Vance stated that Mrs. Gordon had hit a preoccupation of his as he reflected on this issue. He could not agree with her more. He noted that they had 150 formal cases, and there must be another 200 informal cases. They had to move from that into a more global approach. In talking with Dr. Lancaster last week, he told him that he did not think he would ever reflect back on his teaching career. There was a citywide initiative by the mayor and the superintendent of schools to get citizens talking to each other because of changes that were beginning to happen in that city. People were energized to confront the issues publicly, and he had the feeling that this was what was needed in Montgomery County. The school system was not operating in isolation, and they did interact with the police, the Human Relations Commission, Health and Human Services, and other agencies in an effort to resolve problems.

Dr. Lancaster reported that he and Dr. Vance had talked about outreach and the need to get a lot of people to deal with the issues they faced. Although it was not apparent from the report, a lot of their work had been developing models particularly at the elementary school. They did preparation on teaching tolerance and getting staff prepared for teaching "A World of Difference." They did spend a lot of time responding to calls, but as a new staff, they had spent a great deal of time developing proactive models. They had sent people into schools to develop some models they could refine. A lot of this had been on sexual harassment particularly at the elementary school level because not much material was available for young children. They were working with the compliance officer, guidance, system-wide training, school improvement, and the Office of Administration to take a look at how Human Relations could be more proactive. They

had to touch base with the faith communities and other partnerships where the human relations element was not now in evidence. With more staff, they were increasing their outreach. They had hoped that during the summer they could do more of this. For example, one human relations staff member was attending OIPD worksessions on multicultural education. In addition, a lot of work had been spent on developing the ideal model for human relations which was being built from the MCCPTA. They were about ready to unveil it and provide it to schools and offices.

Mrs. Gordon said Dr. Lancaster had talked about the plan, and the recommendations spoke to develop a comprehensive system-wide human relations program. She asked whether this was what he was talking about. Dr. Lancaster replied that this was part of it because this recommendation spoke to the issue of accountability. They were working with the Department of Educational Accountability on that, and DEA had advertised to give Human Relations consulting services to provide technical support.

Dr. Cheung stated that he shared the observations expressed by Mrs. Gordon. He was impressed with their activities now they had additional staff. Human relations was a very important and very complicated issue because there were a lot of needs. As he read through the report, he wondered about the focus because the additional staff was not adequate to do all the jobs mentioned in the report. He asked what would be their focus in terms of what the Department could do best and what they could get other people to do. Dr. Cheung commented that students were really their focus, and he believed that life was about relationships which should be built into the curriculum. Their focus should maximize and optimize the use of staff and their expertise. Training about sexual harassment was very important, but there were other issues for training.

Dr. Cheung said he was intrigued by some things mentioned in the report such as better data and a satisfaction survey. Dr. Lancaster had mentioned their involvement in boundary determination committees in terms of what the Department could offer. They had also mentioned the multicultural curriculum, and Dr. Cheung inquired about their role in special education. All of this would help improve staff and relationship skills for the student aspect of this.

In regard to focus, Dr. Lancaster said they would get back to paying closer attention to what students were doing. They would place greater emphasis on training administrators. They would work on the human relations committee networks and hate/violence. As far as boundaries, this was the first time they were meeting staff dealing with boundaries and facilities and one staff member was actually attending the boundary sessions and talking with the staff and the community. They had a lot of concerns in relation to special education, and yesterday they had workshops with

resource teachers on 504 and 94-142. They were spending more and more time with special education staff to complement their work. Mrs. Brenneman commented that she was still not getting a sense that they were reaching out beyond schools. They had three community human relations advocates, and she wondered if they were reaching out to the community beyond the school system. Dr. Lancaster replied that there was more reaching out to make sure their limited staff was not a restriction. They were tying into programs and activities outside of MCPS. For example, they were working with the Human Relations Commission on hate/violence, and they were working toward a comprehensive effort to educate students on the issues of tolerance. They were working with the Commission, the Police Department, and the State's Attorney to use their resources. In addition, because of the diversity on the Human Relations staff they were able to tie into other kinds of communities.

Mrs. Brenneman noted that there was a PTA model on human relations, but MCPS did not have jurisdiction over the PTA. She asked what they were doing to reach out to the parent community. Dr. Lancaster replied that for next year they would have an emphasis on parent education. They intended to work with clusters and do workshops on Saturdays for parents.

Mrs. Brenneman observed that the report talked about a brochure. Every agency put out brochures, but she did not know how many people actually read them. She thought that MCPS did not necessarily communicate very well about what they did. People made comments about what the school system should be doing, but the system was already doing what they wanted. The last chapter of the Corporate Partnership report was on this issue, but the Board never focused on this. She asked whether anyone had ever evaluated how MCPS let people know what they were doing.

Dr. Lancaster replied that this had been one of the weaknesses of the Department. They had not shared with people the things that they did. They had not had a brochure, and even MCPS employees were not too sure of the role of Human Relations. A brochure was one of the ways to communicate; however, they had never made a public relations effort and it was time to do this. They had talked about bulletin boards and hotlines and upgrading computer services. A brochure would be a first step in telling people how to access the Human Relations Department.

Mrs. Brenneman thought that at some point they had to evaluate how effective their brochures were. Dr. Lancaster reported that on sexual harassment they noticed a significant difference after the brochures came out. They received a number of referrals because someone had seen that brochure. Mrs. Fanconi suggested that they refer to sexual harassment by the policy or as the prevention of sexual harassment.

Dr. Lancaster felt that the introduction of the sexual harassment policy had done more to alert them and make them aware of some of the things they needed to do not only in preventing sexual harassment but also in the areas of bias and disability. The models and guidelines they had used in this policy were now applicable in a number of other categories. The public relations effort on preventing sexual harassment had been extremely effective.

Dr. Vance stated that given the overall restructuring of the school system, he and the deputies had placed a great deal of authority in decision making in the hands of the associates and the directors. For example, they had moved away from the model where it would be the Office of Information's responsibility to inform the public. Dr. Lancaster and his staff had the latitude to explore public service slots, cable television, public forums, and flyers. This was a question of leadership and priority which the appropriate associate and/or director placed on it. It would be some time before they had a unit that would take on itself a slick public relations effort. He thought it belonged in the hands of the persons who had the responsibility for the various departments in MCPS.

Ms. Gutierrez said she would like to take a few minutes to talk about a more historical perspective on efforts in the Human Relations Department. In 1990 when she was elected to the Board, they began to look at how the department could be more effective and updated in terms of what the school system was needing and what changes they were seeing in the student population. She thought they had come a long way, and they had made some giant strides in defining the role of human relations in the school system. She thought that the task force had been very good in helping them with this. This was also a slow process. They had been at this for a long time, and she was frustrated because they were still planning to plan or beginning to pay. They should be able to point to two or three very visible actions that stated they had changed in their approach and overall effectiveness in human relations.

Ms. Gutierrez was not clear that what the new staff was doing was terribly much different from what the old human relations staff had been doing. The model had somewhat continued because of the caseloads, and they had yet to see the other side of the effort. Looking at what the Board had before it, she would like to suggest they needed greater clarity and focus and to prioritize what they planned to do in this area. She called attention to the paper listing the Department's three focus areas for 1994-95 and suggested calling them "action areas." The first one talked about developing an accountability plan, but the committee recommendations asked for a program plan to be implemented by May, 1994. It was July now, and she thought they needed to

develop this plan. In that program plan they should set the mission and the vision of what the Department needed to do. The mission was not clear to the Board, the system, and the general community. She would encourage the Department to reconsider and include an accountability plan within the larger program plan. Within that framework, they should also review their policies.

Their second step was to review the human relations committees, and Ms. Gutierrez noted that there were policy implications here, too, for the superintendent to develop a policy; however, this was not reflected in the policy analysis as a new policy. She felt that these activities needed to be linked and integrated in a more clearly planned approach. It was evident to her that there were too many things to do in this area. If they tried to do them all, they would be done in a very diluted fashion. They needed a clear understanding with priorities. This was something that the Board had to do. She thought the sexual harassment policy had been a good vehicle for lessons learned because it was a good policy and clear about what was required. It was clear about outcomes and looked at the issue as a comprehensive system. She was not so sure this could be said about the other human relations policies. They had to look at where they could be much more effective in their human relations mission and decide what vision they had for the school system. It seemed to her their highest priority was to move on with clear milestones for a scheduled plan, not an accountability plan, but a program plan which was absolutely essential before they did anything else in this area. She suggested that this program plan have a very short time for preparation and for action by the Board.

Mr. Ewing stated that they had a set of issues here that were important for the future course of the school system. The Human Relations Department was truly a roller coaster ride, if one looked back 25 years ago to the initiation of the Department. They began with a reasonably aggressive program that grew more aggressive in the 1970's and ended in the late 1970's with a determination that the program should be weakened. No one said this, but that was what they did. The historical account in the paper before the Board left out all the passion and pain that accompanied all of that. It was an extremely painful process with the dismissal by the Board of the Minority Relations Monitoring Committee in an atmosphere of enormous hostility and anger. This gave a clear indication that the minority community would no longer be served by an active and aggressive Human Relations Department. Several years after this, the Board attempted to restart the process and had been struggling since with the issue of "what is it, given the limited resources, that we want to do?" What was it they felt they could do, given what they thought they knew about community attitudes and what they thought they knew about what the school system needed to do?

Mr. Ewing thought they had found themselves in a situation where the school system was expected to respond to every case because of rising expectations in the community. These cases were more by themselves than the staff could reasonably expect to be able to handle given the size of the staff. Now they were being asked by the group speaking to long-range planning to develop a comprehensive systemwide human relations program with a detailed plan for implementation with outcomes. He sensed that this was ongoing, but given the workload and the flow of cases, this was hard to get to and hard to devote time to. It seemed to him it was important that they did this because they really had to consider what it was they wanted in the long run for this Department. He suspected they had different perceptions about what it was that was the most important. From his perspective, the most important thing was to deal with the issue that arose around discrimination, stereotyping, and expectations.

Mr. Ewing said a further definition would be discrimination by the school system with respect to staff and students, stereotyping of students and staff, and expectations of students and staff that were the consequences of stereotypes and discrimination. There was a necessity for aggressive responses. He was not saying they had no responses, they did. Over the years they had had responses of various kinds with varying degrees of effectiveness. Some of those were excellent, but the problem persisted. It might be that it was so deeply rooted in American society and culture as reflected in Montgomery County, that no matter what they did over the years it would be very difficult to make more than a modest change. However, he was hopeful that with an aggressive approach they could, in fact, be more effective in the future.

Mr. Ewing explained that discrimination and stereotyping came along racial and ethnic lines as well as social class or income lines. They had a lot of trouble with those issues, but the paper did not really speak about these. For him, those were the most critical issues. He did not deny that the issues of sexual harassment, disability, and gender equity were important, but the other issues were even more critical today as they attempted to cope with the sense on the part of some community members and some students that the school system was indifferent to what happened to students and to employees in these areas. He did not think this was true, but there was that perception.

The Gordon report spoke to this as a key issue and as one they had not been able to address despite all their efforts. Mr. Ewing was concerned because they needed to have a comprehensive system-wide human relations program which specified what their priorities were and did so initially in terms of what they thought needed to be done and then in terms of what available staff members could do. It was easy to say they wanted everything to happen all at once, but it was important to be

realistic. It might be that they felt strongly enough about this to suggest to the superintendent this was an area that required more resources. It was his view that this was the case.

Mr. Ewing said his next figure of speech was not a roller coaster ride but a stove. Dr. Lancaster had a stove with about 24 burners all going full blast, and that was more than anyone could tend to with his available staff. Therefore, it was important to set priorities. It was also important to recognize that they had these continuing problems of discrimination, stereotyping, and expectations. These were not very popular ideas with a large portion of the public. He recalled that when they required H.R. 18 of all employees he took the course which was a wonderful one, but a great many people took it and were outraged at being required to be in that course. They thought that since they had to take the course the school system was saying to them that they were a bunch of bigots. He did not think that was the intent. The more they talked about these issues, the more they disturbed those who would not like them to talk about this issues and did not perceive that these were really problems. National surveys showed that people thought this did not affect the way people worked, lived, and went to school. He thought they could not avoid addressing these questions, and he did not have an answer as to how they did that in such a way as to offend no one. He said they were kidding themselves and the community, if they did not think they still had a problem.

Mr. Ewing said he knew Dr. Lancaster and Dr. Vance believed they had a continuing problem. The problem was what did they say about it and what did they do about it. This was what needed to be contained in a comprehensive system-wide program. They needed to specify what they planned to do about it and what they expected to happen over what timeframe. He believed this was what the advisory group had in mind. He was somewhat disturbed that the Commission recommended a comprehensive systemwide human relations program, but the response to that was "develop an accountability plan." He hoped that was a shorthand response and did not reflect the sense that the comprehensive program was in fact an accountability program.

Mr. Ewing observed that in his years on the Board they had discussed human relations perhaps six or ten times when part of the discussion focused on the issue of "whose job is human relations." It was clearly not just Dr. Lancaster's job. If they were going to be effective, it had to be everyone's job in the sense of school system staff, parents, students, and community. One problem with a larger staff in Human Relations was that the larger it got, the more inclination there was on the part of the rest of the people involved was to think they did not have to work on this issue because the staff would do it. This was another reason for a system-wide human relations program that spoke to this as being everyone's responsibility. Then they had

to spell out what people would be asked to do. He was satisfied they had made a good beginning, but there was a great deal more that needed to be done. He would be interested in hearing a staff response regarding a system-wide program and how they were going to speak to the kinds of issues having to do with discrimination, stereotyping, and expectations.

Mr. Abrams explained that he came at it from a slightly different perspective in terms of the timing of the activity. He read that the human relations climate survey had not been conducted, and he wondered whether it made sense to develop a human relations baseline information survey for the purpose of developing priorities and for benchmarking on an accountability structure. Dr. Lancaster replied that this was a critical way of approaching it. Standards would be used as a checklist, and they would periodically check those to determine whether or not they were dealing with those specific indices. He liked the baseline approach, and he agreed with Mr. Ewing that the issues of stereotyping, expectations, and discrimination were not talked about very much and really ought to be. For example, he had not been in any session with community or school people when the issue of expectations had not been expressed as the number one matter people were concerned about. To him, expectations were almost more important than anything else because if they were positive and realistic, a lot of the other things seemed to melt away. In talking to DEA, it would be possible to develop a county-wide baseline because right now there was no standard. A climate survey was one way of saying it, but he liked the concept of baseline.

Mr. Abrams said in Dr. Lancaster's description of baseline he was hearing an expectation of baseline as opposed to an inventory of current status. It seemed to Mr. Abrams that at least as a beginning point they needed a more objective statement based on current conditions. This might bring a different dose of reality to the discussion and might temper what the expectations were.

Mrs. Fanconi aligned herself with comments made by Mr. Ewing, Ms. Gutierrez, and other Board members. She thought that Mr. Ewing stated it very well and very kindly. She noted that this Board had been talking about this since 1990, and she was disappointed in how slow this was. First they were told they had to have a task force. They had a task force, and the task force completed its work in 1993 for Board discussion on July 25, 1993. They had implementation plans in October of 1993, and here they were. They had had difficulty in implementing their timeline. The Board had not held up scheduling this item. They had also talked about the importance of this, and it was key and essential in Success for Every Student. This included the expectations, the change of attitude, the change in behavior, and the whole area of respect for individual differences which included race, ethnic, socioeconomic, handicapping conditions, and gender. They

had a number of different groups working on these issues including the over-representation of black males in special education. All of these were expectations, and there seemed to her to be a need to look at the efforts across the school system in OIPD, staff development, etc. She thought they needed to get moving, and she thought they should start with a comprehensive management plan which included not only a vision and goals but outcome measures and accountability.

Mrs. Fanconi stated that she wanted to express a state of emergency. While the Board wanted everything at once, it was the superintendent's responsibility to bring them some feedback of when that expectation was unrealistic. She suggested they turn to the policy analysis.

Ms. Gutierrez thought that coming up with a comprehensive program plan would help them establish the goals of the program, and doing a policy review outside of that was an exercise that would not get them where they needed to be. She recommended that they stop the policy recommendations and give emphasis to the development of a plan. Most of the recommendations were window dressing. In some areas she thought they should do a more comprehensive view of the current policies, and she pointed out that no new policies were being recommended. She felt there were several areas where policy should be recommended.

Ms. Gutierrez said she would recommend the Board not take action in the area of policies. They should allow the focus of the group to concentrate on developing a draft program plan as soon as possible within which there would be a policy review and an identification of critical areas in which there was no policy. She was amazed by the consensus on the Board regarding the importance of this program and the sense of urgency and a real need for action. Actions in this area were not necessarily popular, but they could not continue to dance around them. She believed this Board really wanted to make a mark and take some action here. That kind of support was very valuable for the superintendent to be able to come to the Board in a very short period of time with that comprehensive plan.

Mr. Abrams commented that if this were a motion he would second it for the purpose of discussion. He did agree with the thrust of the recommendation in terms of not proceeding forward now but rather taking the comments made today and focusing them on the baseline assessment to use that as a framework in which to measure both policy and an implementation plan. In terms of the sense of urgency, he said that senses of urgency usually translated themselves around election time. He would much prefer to see a dispassionate review. He was also concerned in part about the half full and half empty glass in the community because in order to make a program like this work it required a substantial buy-in not only by the school community but also the

parents and general community at large. He was not so sure jamming something down the community's throat was the quickest way to change attitudes, and that was the business they were in. To that extent, he would like to get a sense of where they were, what needed to be changed, and how aggressive did they want to be with it. This was what he saw lacking in this document. The quicker they did this, the better, but the quicker they did it right, the better.

Mrs. Fanconi asked Ms. Gutierrez if she agreed with Mr. Abrams' analysis of her motion. Ms. Gutierrez replied that this was not exactly what she meant. She did not know if they could make a motion because this was a discussion item. In general terms, she did not think they had to finish the survey and come up with their baseline before they could do anything else. Part of the comprehensive program plan was conducting those surveys. They needed that framework, and there were pieces of the program that were already there but others were missing. She also objective because she was not trying to ram anything down anyone's throat. The sense of urgency came as a response to the slowness in making any significant progress in this area. They needed to have some very clear evidence of gains, products, and steps they had achieved. She said that she would like to make a motion.

Mrs. Fanconi thought that a motion would be appropriate. The second part would be to give a consensus on the analysis of the policies. If the Board were to move postponement until they received a management plan, this might affect the policy review. When the item came to the Board, she had to see whether this was one of the items they would like to come to closure on prior to December. There would be time if they wanted to do this. Mr. Fess stated that the Board would need to move to amend the agenda because this was scheduled as a discussion item.

Dr. Vance stated that over the decades he had considered himself a student of social movements and retrogression in the United States. He did not think the situation confronting Montgomery County was any different than what was occurring in the rest of the country. The American dilemma as described by Myrdal was no longer black and white. It was black, white, yellow, and brown, and any shade they wanted to put in between. What he had brought to the Board was a reflection of the sum total of his experience in dealing with these issues. He could not agree with Ms. Gutierrez more. The Board had before it a superintendent willing to bring them as dramatic and drastic program as they were willing to defend. What he had brought them was where the county was right now. When he travelled around the county, he did not hear about the progress that blacks, Hispanics, and Asians were making. He heard that he was the superintendent who was saying, "white males do not apply." This sent a very telling message to him. What he had submitted to the Board were proposals and policies that he thought were appropriate for the times. Again,

he could not agree with Mr. Ewing more. He did not know any more if it was in the heart of America to make any further adjustments. What they had in front of them was the considered best judgment of the superintendent.

Mrs. Fanconi remarked that she found those very disturbing comments. She did not think from her point of view that what they were asking for was draconian. She thought what they were asking for was a consistent message that this Board had spoken to over the last four years starting with the Gordon report. She felt they might be seeing this from different perspectives.

Re: A MOTION BY MS. GUTIERREZ TO AMEND  
THE AGENDA (FAILED)

A motion by Ms. Gutierrez to amend the agenda by making the item a discussion/action item failed with Dr. Cheung, Mr. Ewing, Mrs. Fanconi, and Ms. Gutierrez voting in the affirmative; Mr. Abrams, Mrs. Brenneman, and Mrs. Gordon voting in the negative.

Ms. Gutierrez suggested that in view of the discussion the superintendent might be able to identify the sense of the Board and be able to take some appropriate actions without the Board's having to vote.

Mr. Ewing said they needed to remember what the outcome of the 1978 election was. The Board was proceeding with an aggressive and progressive set of policies to improve human relations. The election was fought on some of those issues, and the Board of Education changed its composition. Progress stopped, and they actually went backwards. The consequence of that was a deep division between the Board and the black community and between those who thought that the Board of Education ought to be taking a progressive stance and those who thought the Board of Education ought to be more careful and conservative in what it did. Among those who stood against in terms of this progressive stance were many teachers and staff. He said that because they had to be aware that the problems remained and that the community might not wish for an aggressive set of actions.

Mr. Ewing noted that they had a process that permitted them to gather in as objective a way as possible the community views from time to time and to influence these views. He was not sure these particular issues advanced the cause they wanted to advance. He was worried about the one and a half in-service day proposal because if present circumstance did not allow a full review of training activities, they would know even less if they allowed for more flexibility in scheduling. He had already heard that the human relations days were not always devoted to human relations training in some schools. He thought they would run the risk of making that situation worse. With respect to the other issue of accountability, it seemed to him it was a good

idea to emphasize the point of accountability system-wide. At the same time they needed to be able to say, "accountable for what and in what circumstances." This seemed to him to be part of the program plan.

Mr. Ewing said that Myrdal had written about the American dilemma, and they had a Montgomery County dilemma. The Board of Education wished to move vigorously in this area, but the community was not always willing to follow and neither was the school staff always willing to follow. He thought it was a good idea for them to focus on letting people know about what it was they did. He said they had done remarkably well over the years in pursuing human relations objectives in the county, but there were still a great many people who said to him that they were spending too much time and energy on "those" people. The thing that continued to surprise him was how little lack of comfort there was in saying that kind of thing. This was an issue they needed to spend more time on as a Board and as a staff. They did not know how to manage a program that was simultaneously effective and acceptable in the larger community. It was a dilemma and deserved both careful thought and continuing debate. He hoped that they could find time in the very near future to do that because staff would be the victims of this dilemma because they would not know what it was the Board wanted to do. The Board had not been forthcoming in letting staff know what approach they wanted, and in the absence of that the superintendent had given them some recommendations which were reasonable but not as much as many Board members wanted. He thought they had a much deeper and more thorough discussion ahead of them on the part of the Board in order to be able to give staff the guidance they needed. It might be that they were taking too long as a system to deal with this, but it was important for them to learn at least a few lessons from painful experiences in the past and not do things that were going to have backlash for the Board.

Mr. Abrams pointed out that the vote was to change the item to an action item, but the discussion was a question of deferral of that discussion which was not an action item. It was to give some direction in the course of that discussion, and part of that direction could be coming back to this item and not commenting on the superintendent's recommendation at this time. He shared some of the same concerns raised by Dr. Vance and Mr. Ewing. It seemed to him this issue was one that required pulling everyone together, and a much more comprehensive communication was necessary even in the context of the Board's discussion. The issue was rushing to get something in place versus the gradualism that it took to move a community along. For this reason, he had focused his comments on the baseline issues because the condition existing within the community needed to be communicated to provide a context of what they were discussing. He hoped this was one of the thoughts the superintendent would take back from

this discussion in terms of not only outcomes but how they arrived at those outcomes.

Mrs. Fanconi agreed with Mr. Abrams in terms of the procedure. She did not feel they needed to take an action to make it an action item because the action recommended by the Board member was to postpone the discussion until a management plan could come to the table; however, she had been overruled by the parliamentarian.

In regard to the recommendations for policy, Mrs. Gordon commented that how they looked at human relations was going to have an effect on how the greater community accepted what they were doing. If they regarded human relations as a problem, this was going to be the way the community looked at it. If they came in with a proactive stance that human relations was about people living together, working together, and getting along, there would be those in the community who would still point out they were spending a lot of time with "those" people, but it would be much more difficult because "those" people would be all of them. This was how she envisioned human relations. She did not think they needed a policy to mandate that. If they just did the ten recommendations that the Commission made, they would be doing what they needed to do. She did not think they needed to do a great deal more. She did not have a problem with the Board's making a statement about the kind of climate they wanted to establish in MCPS. On the specific policy recommendations, she knew there had been some concerns in the schools about the one and a half day training because there was very little time before school for teachers to get ready. She thought that perhaps they needed to look at more flexibility. She agreed with Mr. Ewing that they did not do a very good job right now of assessing how those days were used. She did not know if moving the day or giving more flexibility would make it worse. She noted that frequently the full day in-service was done on days before supporting services employees were in the building. If they were going to continue that way, they needed to look at having those employees available when the workshops took place. She would not have a problem with the recommendation of the superintendent on that, and she thought that the recommendations on each of the policy steps were fine with her.

Mrs. Fanconi suggested they give the superintendent a quick statement about whether they should move forward with the policy options.

Ms. Gutierrez reiterated that they should hold on to the policy review until a prior step was taken. It might be that the recommendations would be the same, but to do these now would take staff time. She was not certain that it was a comprehensive review they should undertake; therefore, she thought they should not waste staff time. She was hearing some mixed messages from

the Board. Some said go slow on this because of the current climate. She pointed out that this was not the first time they had had this discussion. They had been discussing this issue over three years. She had not received letters and calls saying don't do this. On the contrary, she felt they had had very strong support from the community that this was an area they needed to focus on. She did not agree they needed to start from scratch with a baseline. The Gordon report did that and came out with very clear recommendations. She believed the Board had exercised leadership up to now and should continue with that leadership no matter what the political climate was.

Mrs. Fanconi said she was hearing two different points of view. One was go forward with the superintendent's recommendations on changing the three issues, and another to hold until they had a comprehensive management plan.

Dr. Cheung saw human relations as more than just discrimination, stereotyping, and expectations. These were symptoms because they did not know how to relate to people. Changing attitudes was more difficult than changing behavior. He did not totally agree with Ms. Gutierrez that these were the areas they needed to emphasize. He thought this was a continuous effort by everyone and a part of growing up. When he looked at Dr. Vance's recommendations on the three issues, he did not see any extra staff efforts. He had no problem with the recommendations of the superintendent on the three issues.

Mr. Abrams said his was a hybrid of Mrs. Gordon's and Dr. Cheung's. He agreed that these were small steps. He did not have problems with it, but this did not go to addressing the issues they had been discussing which was part of his concern. He thought that within the context of accountability they had incorporated the baseline approach. He felt that this was very important because the baseline approach was very necessary to move in a proactive direction. He did not have a lot of problems with this, but he thought they were going to have to come back and revisit policy after they had some additional information and before they could start comprehensive planning. They needed to know the community climate which had to be reflected more.

Mr. Ewing stated that he agreed with Ms. Gutierrez. It seemed to him there was a real possibility that a change in the one and a half days could mean that they had even less idea about what was going on or whether it was having any effect unless they were able to monitor it. He was not sure they had the capability to monitor it with their current staff in the school system. The objective of flexibility was a good one, but the question was whether they would be able to figure out what was going on. It was worth figuring out because for those staff not covered by the H.R. 17 requirement it was the only time when staff formally came across this issue. In regard to accountability, he was in favor

of accountability but they needed to know what it was they were asking people to be accountable for. They did not have this in front of them, and he was reluctant to say this was a good idea or not a good idea. He would rather see this in the context of the program plan before agreeing to it. He thought that the Board was not yet clear about what it wanted here, and this argued for further discussion by the Board.

Mrs. Brenneman supported the superintendent's recommendations. She said this was not backlash politically, but it was backlash in the community and who they asked to implement this. The Board had good intentions, and the day and a half was an example. Teachers felt that they were very busy and needed the time to get ready for the opening of school. If they enforced this, teacher resentment would build. She asked whether this was the best way to start off the school year. It did not make sense to do this even though the Board's intentions were good. She thought the superintendent's recommendations were good ones. They needed to go forth, but they had to look at the policies they had right now. They had to let people know what they were doing and what they had on the books right now.

Mrs. Fanconi stated that they appeared to have general consensus around the superintendent's plan if they had some additional information about how they could assure the schools would adhere to the day and a half and would have really good programs. She agreed with Mrs. Brenneman on the resentment of teachers because so many things had to occur in the days before the opening of school. They wanted people to be receptive to the message they were sending. If the scheduling time was making people less receptive, they needed to look at a way to ask people when the best time was and how this could be done close to the beginning of the school year. They knew there would be no change in plans for the current year; therefore, they had enough time to do some planning. She thought she was hearing the Board say they would like to have this scheduled as soon as possible for some kind of a more comprehensive plan with goals and objectives, how this fit into the policy recommendations, and more fleshing out of the day and a half. It seemed to Mr. Abrams they were saying they wanted to move forward in those directions, make the changes the superintendent was recommending, and have the superintendent return with a product when he felt comfortable with it. Mrs. Fanconi said the discussion said it was an extremely important issue pervading their philosophy of Success for Every Student and that the Board was very serious about the importance of the task.

Mr. Ewing hoped that they did not limit too much in advance what it was the Board planned to discuss. It seemed to him they needed to be able to think through what it was they wanted the system as well as the Human Relations Department to do and what priorities they wanted to establish. They wanted to think about strategies that would be effective rather than strategies with a

high risk for failure. They should think about strategies that involved some leadership efforts to persuade people that things needed to be done. He thought there were a range of issues here he hoped could be included in their discussion.

Mrs. Fanconi thanked staff for their presentation.

Re: ANNOUNCEMENT

Mrs. Fanconi announced that the Board had been meeting in closed session on legal matters.

Re: PUBLIC COMMENTS

The following individuals appeared before the Board:

1. Diane Proia, Drew Gifted and Talented
2. Michael Calsetta
3. Alan Lovell, Centers for the Handicapped
4. Rand Gelber, Fields Road ES

RESOLUTION NO. 467-94      Re: PROCUREMENT CONTRACTS MORE THAN  
\$25,000

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

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

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

108-92	Wiping/Polishing Cloths - Extension	
	<u>Awardees</u>	
	A & B Textiles	\$ 4,800
	Cross Wiping Materials	15,520
	General Wiping Cloth Company, Inc.	<u>42,336</u>
	TOTAL	\$ 62,656
116-92	Polyliner Bags - Extension	
	<u>Awardees</u>	
	Calico Industries, Inc.	\$ 89,873
	Interboro Packaging Corporation	1,349
	Monumental Paper Company	<u>2,931</u>
	TOTAL	\$ 94,153

146-92	Air Conditioning and Temperature Control Service Contract - Extension <u>Awardees</u> Carrier Building Systems and Service Combustioneer - Div. of Kirlin Enterprises HPS Mechanical, Inc. Trane Co./Div. of American STD TOTAL	\$	10,500 19,120 13,623 <u>5,945</u> 49,188
116-93	HVAC/Refrigeration Parts & Equipment - Extension <u>Awardees</u> Aireco Supply, Inc. Boland Trane Parts Center Capital Compressor, Inc. Consolidated Air CAPP, Inc. Grainger Heritage Food Service Equipment Co., Inc. Industrial Controls Distributors, Inc. Johnson Controls, Inc. William E. Kingswell Company KLB Associates, Inc. Landon and Gyr Powers McQuay Service Melchoir/Armstrong/Dessau R. E. Michel Company, Inc. H. M. Sweeney Company United Refrigeration, Inc. TOTAL	\$	1,618 20,000 10,500 15,000 61,500 3,801 8,500 2,614 20,000 2,590 11,500 5,000 23,000 51,067 1,676 2,369 <u>75,164</u> 315,899
136-93	Folding Gates - Extension <u>Awardees</u> Miller Wire Works, Inc. Overhead Door Company of Wash., DC TOTAL	\$	17,500 <u>17,500</u> 35,000
140-93	Milk, Milk Shake Mixes, Cottage Cheese, Yogurt, and Fruit Juices <u>Awardee</u> Green Spring Dairy, Inc.	\$	122,504
79-94	Emergency Repairs and Service of School Buses and Fleet Vehicles <u>Awardees</u> Atlantic Transportation Equip., Ltd. Discount Alignment and Tire Center, Inc. District International Trucks, Inc. General Automotive Servicecenter Light Truck Service Company, Inc. TOTAL	\$	40,000 40,000 40,000 40,000 <u>40,000</u> 200,000

87-94	Lamps		
	<u>Awardees</u>		
	C.N. Robinson Lighting Supply Company	\$	197,528
	Washington Cable Supply, Inc.		<u>6,868</u> *
	TOTAL	\$	204,396
98-94	Plumbing Supplies		
	<u>Awardees</u>		
	Best Plumbing Specialties, Inc.	\$	1,500
	Crest/Good Manufacturing Co., Inc.		3,271
	DS Pipe & Supply Company, Inc.		27,167
	Eddco Supply Corporation		1,619 *
	The Electric Motor Repair Co, T/A EMR		9,000
	Frederick Trading Company		2,010 *
	Heritage Food Service Equipment, Inc.		7,250
	McArdle & Walsh, Inc.		612
	R. E. Michel Company		50,495
	MSF County Services Company		121
	Noland Company		13,018
	Pier-Angeli Company, Inc.		1,430
	J.A. Sexauer		2,006
	Thomas Somerville Company		17,300
	Spartan		3,000 *
	Superior Specialty Company		29,584
	Tate Instrumentation and Controls		1,224
	USCO, Inc.		27,233
	Wolverine Brass Works		<u>2,720</u> *
	TOTAL	\$	200,560
102-94	Shade and upholstery Material and Related Materials		
	<u>Awardees</u>		
	C. R. Daniels, Inc.	\$	6,872
	John Duer and Sons, Inc.		8,514
	Dymalon, Inc.		361 *
	Frankel Associates, Inc.		13,863
	Loktite, Inc.		1,544
	Mileham and King, Inc.		60,004
	Rocky Mount Cord Company, Inc.		2,310
	Stimpson Company, Inc.		853
	Tedco Industries, Inc.		15,135
	Window Moods, Inc.		<u>1,358</u> *
	TOTAL	\$	110,814
105-94	Custodial Equipment		
	<u>Awardees</u>		
	Baer, Division of Acme Paper	\$	2,390
	J.D. Brophy, Inc.		4,340 *
	Daycon Products Company, Inc.		1,450 *
	INDCO (Independence Chemical Company)		4,876
	Viking Chemical Company, Inc.		<u>31,451</u> *
	TOTAL	\$	44,507



RESOLUTION NO. 469-94      Re:    ACCESSIBILITY MODIFICATIONS AT  
STEPHEN KNOLLS SCHOOL

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

WHEREAS, The following sealed bids for various accessibility modification projects at Stephen Knolls School were received on June 27, 1994, with work to begin July 13, 1994, and completed by September 30, 1994:

<u>Bidder</u>	<u>Amount</u>
Golden Construction Inc.	\$54,644
Hanlon Construction Co., Inc.	78,305

and

WHEREAS, The low bid is within the budget estimate of \$60,000 and the low bidder has completed similar projects successfully for other school jurisdictions; now therefore be

Resolved, That a \$54,644 contract be awarded to Golden Construction, Inc., for the accessibility modifications at Stephen Knolls School, in accordance with plans and specifications prepared by Murray & Associates, Architects.

RESOLUTION NO. 470-94      Re:    AWARD OF CONTRACT - WATKINS MILL  
HIGH SCHOOL

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

WHEREAS, The following bids were received on June 21, 1994, for the addition to Watkins Mill High School, with work to begin immediately and be completed by August 1, 1995:

<u>Bidder</u>	<u>Amount</u>
1. William F. Klingensmith, Inc.	\$2,180,231
2. The Hickman Construction Co., Inc.	2,221,000
3. Henley Construction Co., Inc.	2,246,550
4. Metro Pace Construction, Inc.	2,251,000
5. Kimmel & Kimmel, Inc.	2,316,300
6. Northwood Contractors, Inc.	2,339,000
7. R. M. Johnson & Associates, Inc.	2,437,669

and



WHEREAS, The architectural fee for the Montgomery Blair High School project had to be renegotiated due to a change in the original scope of the project; and

WHEREAS, Staff has negotiated a fee for the design of a new Montgomery Blair High School on the Kay Tract that is consistent with average fees for projects of similar size; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the original architectural contract with SHW Group, Inc., Architects, for the Montgomery Blair High School modernization project be amended to increase the fee to \$1,755,000 for the new building, which is approximately 5.6 percent of the anticipated construction budget.

RESOLUTION NO. 473-94      Re:    FY 1995 SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION  
FOR THE PROVISION FOR FUTURE  
SUPPORTED PROJECTS

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

WHEREAS, The FY 1995 Operating Budget adopted by the Board of Education on June 14, 1994, included \$500,000 for the Provision for Future Supported Projects; and

WHEREAS, The Board of Education will receive a number of additional projects that are eligible for funding through the Provision for Future Supported Projects during FY 1995; and

WHEREAS, A supplemental appropriation to increase the Provision for Future Supported Projects will yield the most effective way to process additional eligible projects; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the superintendent of schools be authorized to receive an FY 1995 supplemental appropriation of \$5,000,000 from the County Council to increase the Provision for future Supported Projects, in the following categories:

	<u>Category</u>	<u>Amount</u>
1	Administration	\$ 250,000
2	Instructional Salaries	2,200,000
3	Other Instructional Costs	1,750,000
4	Special Education	345,000
7	Student Transportation	5,000
10	Fixed Charges	<u>450,000</u>
	TOTAL	\$5,000,000

and be it further

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

RESOLUTION NO. 474-94      Re:    UTILIZATION OF FY 1995 FUTURE  
SUPPORTED PROJECT FUNDS FOR THE  
MAYDALE NATURE CENTER PROGRAM

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

Resolved, That the superintendent of schools be authorized to receive and expend within the FY 1995 Provision for Future Supported Projects, a grant award of \$3,000 from the Maryland State Department of Education (MSDE), under the bylaw of the Annotated Code of Maryland concerning environmental education, for the Maydale Nature Center Program, in the following categories:

	<u>Category</u>	<u>Amount</u>
2	Instruction Salaries	\$2,700
3	Other Instructional Costs	100
10	Fixed Charges	<u>200</u>
	TOTAL	\$3,000

and be it further

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

RESOLUTION NO. 475-94      Re:    SUBMISSION OF AN FY 1995 GRANT  
PROPOSAL FOR AFTER-SCHOOL FOREIGN  
LANGUAGE PROGRAMS AT CANDLEWOOD AND  
CANNON ROAD ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS

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

Resolved, That the superintendent of schools be authorized to submit an FY 1995 foreign language assistance grant proposal for \$26,760 to the Maryland State Department of Education (MSDE), under the U.S. Office of Education Foreign Language Assistance Act of 1988, for after-school foreign language programs at Candlewood and Cannon Road elementary schools; and be it further

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



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

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

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

<u>Name</u>	<u>Position and Location</u>	<u>No. of Days</u>
McGinn, Mary R.	Classroom Teacher New Hampshire Estates ES	10

RESOLUTION NO. 480-94 Re: PERSONNEL APPOINTMENT

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

Resolved, That the following personnel appointment be approved:

<u>Appointment</u>	<u>Present Position</u>	<u>As</u>
Barbara A. Jasper	Principal Johnston ES Irving Independent School District Irving, TX	Principal Farmland ES Effective: 7-13-94

RESOLUTION NO. 481-94 Re: PERSONNEL APPOINTMENT

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

Resolved, That the following personnel appointment be approved:

<u>Appointment</u>	<u>Present Position</u>	<u>As</u>
Sharon J. Jones	Acting Asst. Principal Burtonsville ES	Principal Gaithersburg ES Effective: 7-13-94

RESOLUTION NO. 482-94 Re: PERSONNEL APPOINTMENT

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

Resolved, That the following personnel appointment be approved:

July 12, 1994

<u>Appointment</u>	<u>Present Position</u>	<u>As</u>
Walter L. Tozier	Asst. Principal Rachel Carson ES	Principal Stone Mill ES Effective: 7-13-94

RESOLUTION NO. 483-94 Re: PERSONNEL APPOINTMENT

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

Resolved, That the following personnel appointment be approved:

<u>Appointment</u>	<u>Present Position</u>	<u>As</u>
Diana L. Wollin	Acting Asst. Principal Maryvale ES	Principal Oakland Terrace ES Effective: 7-13-94

RESOLUTION NO. 484-94 Re: PERSONNEL APPOINTMENT

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

Resolved, That the following personnel appointment be approved:

<u>Appointment</u>	<u>Present Position</u>	<u>As</u>
Sarah Menke-Fish	Acting Coordinator Eastern Magnet Program	Coordinator, Eastern Magnet Program Grade N Effective: 7-13-94

RESOLUTION NO. 485-94 Re: PERSONNEL APPOINTMENT

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

Resolved, That the following personnel appointment be approved:

<u>Appointment</u>	<u>Present Position</u>	<u>As</u>
Vera D. Torrence	Principal Strathmore ES	Coordinator, Elem. Mathematics Div. of Curriculum Coord. & Implem. Grade N Effective: 7-13-94

## RESOLUTION NO. 486-94 Re: PERSONNEL TRANSFERS

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

Resolved, That the following personnel transfers be approved:

<u>Transfer</u>	<u>From</u>	<u>To</u>
Donald J. Barron	Asst. Principal Walt Whitman HS	Asst. Principal Montgomery Vill. MS Effective: 7-13-94
Daniel Contesti	Asst. Principal Magruder HS	Asst. Principal Tilden MS Effective: 7-13-94
Elsie R. Moten	Asst. Supervisor for Special Services Upcounty Gov. Center	Asst. Principal Pyle MS Effective: 7-13-94
Cyrus Washington	Asst. Principal Seneca Valley HS	Asst. Principal Tilden MS Effective: 7-13-94
Ann P. Hare	Asst. Principal Rockville HS	Asst. Principal Clemente MS Effective: 7-13-94
Jesse E. Beard	Asst. Principal Clopper Mill ES	Asst. Principal Galway ES Effective: 7-13-94

## RESOLUTION NO. 487-94 Re: PRESENTATION OF PRELIMINARY PLANS - FLOWER VALLEY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

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

WHEREAS, The architect for the modernization/addition of Flower Valley Elementary School has prepared a schematic design in accordance with the educational specifications; and

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education approve the preliminary plan report for the modernization/addition of Flower Valley Elementary School developed by Wiencek + Zavos, Architects.



Resolved, That the Board of Education of Montgomery County hereby conduct a portion of its meeting on July 25, 1994, at 7:30 p.m. in closed session 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 these meetings 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 meetings shall continue in closed session until the completion of business.

RESOLUTION NO. 489-94      Re:    MINUTES OF MAY 10, 1994

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

Resolved, That the minutes of May 10, 1994, be approved.

RESOLUTION NO. 490-94      Re:    MINUTES OF MAY 16, 1994

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

Resolved, That the minutes of May 16, 1994, be approved.

RESOLUTION NO. 491-94      Re:    MINUTES OF MAY 23, 1994

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

Resolved, That the minutes of May 23, 1994, be approved.

RESOLUTION NO. 492-94      Re:    MINUTES OF JUNE 21, 1994

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

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

Re: REPORT ON CLOSED SESSIONS - JUNE  
28, AND 29, 1994

On June 14, 1994, by the unanimous vote of members present, the Board of Education voted to conduct a closed session on Tuesday, June 28, 1994, as permitted under Section 4-106, Education Article of the Annotated Code of Maryland and State Government Article 10-501.

The Montgomery County Board of Education met in closed session on Tuesday, June 28, 1994, from 7:15 to 8:10 p.m. The meeting took place in room 120 of the Carver Educational Services Center, Rockville, Maryland.

Board members met to vote (confirmed in open session) on personnel appointments for the director of the Division of Curriculum Coordination and Implementation; the principalship of Tilden MS, Cold Spring ES, Burning Tree ES, Kensington Parkwood ES, Montgomery Knolls ES, and Highland ES; and the assistant principalship of Seneca Valley HS, Magruder HS, Walter Johnson HS, Westland MS, Hoover MS, Blair HS, Walt Whitman HS, Sligo MS, Quince Orchard HS, and Eastern MS. They also approved the transfers of individuals to the assistant principalship of Rachel Carson ES, Rosemary Hills ES, Stone Mill ES, and Whetstone ES as well as a transfer of a principal to Seneca Valley HS.

The Board discussed the site selection for the Northeast Area High School and authorized negotiations for the site (unanimously). Members voted to allow an extension of public comments to allow all speakers on the waiting list to testify.

Board members adjudicated BOE Appeal No. 1994-7 and authorized a time extension to the superintendent on BOE Appeal No. 1994-9.

In attendance at the closed session were Steve Abrams, Carrie Baker, Larry Bowers, Fran Brenneman, Ann Briggs, Alan Cheung, Blair Ewing, Carol Fanconi, Tom Fess, David Fischer, Phinnize Fisher, Kathy Gemberling, Bea Gordon, Elfreda Massie, Ana Sol Gutierrez, Brian Porter, Roger Titus, Janice Turpin, Paul Vance, Joe Villani, Bill Wilder, Mary Lou Wood, and Melissa Woods.

On June 28, 1994, by the unanimous vote of members present, the Board of Education voted to conduct a closed session on Tuesday, June 29, 1994, as permitted under Section 4-106, Education Article of the Annotated Code of Maryland and State Government Article 10-501.

The Montgomery County Board of Education met in closed session on Wednesday, June 29, 1994, from 7:30 to 10:25 p.m. The meeting took place in room 120 of the Carver Educational Services Center, Rockville, Maryland.

Board members met to receive a report from the superintendent on his 1993-94 evaluation. Board members commented on the superintendent's paper and discussed next steps in the evaluation process.

In attendance at the closed session were Carrie Baker, Fran Brenneman, Alan Cheung, Blair Ewing, Carol Fanconi, Tom Fess, Bea Gordon, Ana Sol Gutierrez, Paul Vance, and Mary Lou Wood.

Mrs. Gordon assumed the chair.

RESOLUTION NO. 493-94 Re: CONTRACTING OUT - PLANT OPERATIONS

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education schedule a discussion on contracting out to give the superintendent some direction before the RFP on plant operations went out.

Mrs. Fanconi assumed the chair.

RESOLUTION NO. 494-94 Re: VOTING RIGHTS FOR STUDENT BOARD MEMBER

On motion of Ms. Baker (June 28, 1994) seconded by Mr. Abrams, the following resolution was adopted with Mr. Abrams, Mrs. Brenneman, Dr. Cheung, Mr. Ewing, Mrs. Gordon, and Ms. Gutierrez voting in the affirmative; Mrs. Fanconi abstaining:

Resolved, That the proposed resolution on voting rights for the student Board member be scheduled for action on August 29, 1994.

RESOLUTION NO. 495-94 Re: RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE MEDICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education schedule time to discuss and act on the recommendations of the Medical Advisory Committee.

RESOLUTION NO. 496-94 Re: LEGISLATION ON BOARD MEMBER SALARIES

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education schedule time this summer to discuss and perhaps take action on legislation concerning Board of Education member salaries.

RESOLUTION NO. 497-94 Re: BOE APPEAL NO. 1994-7

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education adopt its Decision and Order in BOE Appeal No. 1994-7.

Re: NEW BUSINESS

Board members raised the following items of new business:

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

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

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

2. Mr. Ewing moved and Dr. Cheung seconded the following:

Resolved, That the Board of Education schedule time before the opening of school this fall to review the CHI Centers request for a transportation contract.

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education schedule time to discuss the information item on Reporting Students Mathematical Progress to Parents.

RESOLUTION NO. 498-94 Re: PRESENTATION OF PRELIMINARY PLANS - SENECA VALLEY MIDDLE SCHOOL #2

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

WHEREAS, The architect for the new Seneca Valley Middle School #2 has prepared a schematic design in accordance with the educational specifications; and

WHEREAS, The Seneca Valley Middle School #2 Facilities Advisory Committee has approved the proposed schematic design; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Board of Education approve the preliminary plan report for the new Seneca Valley Middle School #2 developed by The Lukmire Partnership, Inc.

Re: RESOLUTION FOR APPROVAL OF  
OBJECTIVES FOR NEW HIGH SCHOOL  
SEMESTER COURSE COMPREHENSIVE  
HEALTH EDUCATION

Mrs. Gordon moved and Dr. Cheung seconded the following:

WHEREAS, The public school laws of Maryland specify that the county superintendent shall prepare courses of study and recommend them for adoption by the county Board (Annotated Code of the Public General Laws of Maryland, Education [Volume], Sec. 4-205); and

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

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

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

WHEREAS, The Council on Instruction, charged by the superintendent of schools with considering recommendations for curriculum, has recommended approval of the new high school semester course required for graduation: Comprehensive Health Education; and

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education approve the course, comprehensive Health Education, for publication in the Program of Studies as part of the MCPS curriculum to become effective in the 1994-1995 school year.

RESOLUTION NO. 499-94      Re:    AN AMENDMENT TO THE PROPOSED  
RESOLUTION ON THE OBJECTIVES FOR  
THE COMPREHENSIVE HEALTH EDUCATION  
COURSE

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

Resolved, That the proposed resolution on the objectives for the comprehensive health education course be amended to add the following Resolved clause:

Resolved, That the Health Education course will include alternative units for Focus Areas Two (physical maturation, emotional maturation, human reproduction, the birth process, infant care, early childhood, and aging) and Three (maturation, the reproductive process, sexual variations, contraception, premarital intercourse, marriage and family responsibilities, family planning, and sexually transmitted diseases) that are available to students whose parents desire these alternatives.

RESOLUTION NO. 500-94      Re:    RESOLUTION FOR APPROVAL OF  
OBJECTIVES FOR NEW HIGH SCHOOL  
SEMESTER COURSE COMPREHENSIVE  
HEALTH EDUCATION

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

WHEREAS, The public school laws of Maryland specify that the county superintendent shall prepare courses of study and recommend them for adoption by the county Board (Annotated Code of the Public General Laws of Maryland, Education [Volume], Sec. 4-205); and

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

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

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

July 12, 1994

WHEREAS, The Council on Instruction, charged by the superintendent of schools with considering recommendations for curriculum, has recommended approval of the new high school semester course required for graduation: Comprehensive Health Education; and

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education approve the course, comprehensive Health Education, for publication in the Program of Studies as part of the MCPS curriculum to become effective in the 1994-1995 school year; and be it further

Resolved, That the Health Education course will include alternative units for Focus Areas Two (physical maturation, emotional maturation, human reproduction, the birth process, infant care, early childhood, and aging) and Three (maturation, the reproductive process, sexual variations, contraception, premarital intercourse, marriage and family responsibilities, family planning, and sexually transmitted diseases) that are available to students whose parents desire these alternatives.

RESOLUTION NO. 501-94      Re:    PLANS FOR THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE  
ALTERNATIVE PROPOSAL ON GRADE SIX  
PROGRAMS FOR MIDDLE SCHOOL MAGNETS

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education approve the following proposal for students in centers for the highly gifted:

1. All current fifth graders at the Drew Center would be permitted to attend Col. E. Brooke Lee Middle School and would be assigned to a single sixth grade team. Students from the Barnsley Center could request a transfer to Lee MS to be included in the program as space permits, but no special transportation would be provided.
2. The development of a sixth grade program (1995-96 school) would be accelerated for the Eastern MS and Takoma Park MS magnets.

RESOLUTION NO. 502-94      Re:    TAKOMA PARK CULTURAL CENTER

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

July 12, 1994

WHEREAS, The state of Maryland has provided \$670,000 for a cultural center to be located in Takoma Park, Maryland; and

WHEREAS, The grant requires the county to provide a matching amount of funds; and

WHEREAS, It has been requested that the facility be placed on the Takoma Park Middle School site; and

WHEREAS, The center will provide cultural and programmatic advantages to the school and community, and its placement on the site will be compatible with the school programs; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Board of Education support the placement of the proposed regional cultural center on the Takoma Park Middle School site subject to resolution of the budget and timing issues, the superintendent of schools' concurrence of the specific plans and location, and approval by the County Council, county executive, and State Interagency Committee for Public School Construction; and be it further

Resolved, That, if appropriate, the superintendent of schools enter into a memorandum of agreement between Montgomery County Public Schools, the county government, and the city of Takoma Park to place the cultural center on the Takoma Park Middle School site.

Re: ITEMS OF INFORMATION

Board members received the following items of information:

1. Items in Process
2. Construction Progress Report
3. Reporting Students' Mathematics Progress to Parents

RESOLUTION NO. 503-94 Re: ADJOURNMENT

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education adjourn its meeting at 4:45 p.m.

---

PRESIDENT

---

SECRETARY