

January 24, 1994

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education oppose HJR 2 - First Aid Instruction in Secondary Schools.

RESOLUTION NO. 50-94 Re: HB 51 - PROCUREMENT LAW - REMOVAL OF SANCTIONS AGAINST REPUBLIC OF SOUTH AFRICA; HB 59 - STATE FINANCE AND PROCUREMENT - REMOVAL OF SANCTIONS AGAINST REPUBLIC OF SOUTH AFRICA; AND SB 199 - STATE FINANCE AND PROCUREMENT - REMOVAL OF SANCTIONS AGAINST REPUBLIC OF SOUTH AFRICA

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 support, if amended, the following legislation: HB 51 - Procurement Law - Removal of Sanctions against Republic of South Africa; HB 59 - State Finance and Procurement - Removal of Sanctions against Republic of South Africa; and SB 199 - State Finance and Procurement - Removal of Sanctions against Republic of South Africa.

Re: PUBLIC COMMENTS

The following individuals appeared before the Board:

1. Phyllis Parks Robinson, MCEA
2. Claren Holmes
3. Patricia McAdam
4. Jackie Craven
5. Henry Craven
6. Tom Royals
7. Cecilia Royals
8. Jim Deligianis
9. Joan Veon
10. Mrs. Earl Marshall
11. Barbara Torres
12. Dawn Ellis
13. Michael Calsetta
14. Julia Bromley
15. Peter Davio

Re: SNOW EMERGENCY

Dr. Vance stated that the last week was a unique experience. They had heard from the governor's office, the county executive,

Washington Gas, and PEPCO, and they had gotten to know their counterparts in contiguous counties. Staff from Maintenance, School Plant Operations, and Transportation worked continuously in response to the extreme weather conditions of snow, sleet, and freezing rain and the sub-freezing temperatures. The transportation inclement weather team was on duty day and night last week to provide him with information about changing weather conditions. The team went out at 3 a.m. to assess road conditions, and decisions on opening school were made at 5 a.m.

Dr. Vance reported that staff had put in 1900 regular work hours and 990 overtime hours to spread 1,360 tons of sand, cinders, and potassium on school system property. They had frozen and broken pipes in 89 buildings, and staff worked 1200 regular work hours and 900 overtime hours to repair the pipes. Staff responsible for heating worked 2,000 regular hours responding to 280 calls. He thanked staff in Transportation, Maintenance, and Building Services, and he extended a special thanks to the secretaries in all the offices who manned the phones starting at 5 a.m.

Dr. Vance indicated that schools had been closed a total of five days, and any subsequent closings would require them to make up any missed days. If this occurred, they might look to using President's Day, the spring break, or extending the school year. He had requested Dr. Grasmick to place this on the agenda for the next meeting of the state superintendents. He pointed out that on one of the days they had closed because of the state and local authorities, and he hoped they could get a waiver for this day.

As far as the professional day on January 26, Dr. Vance explained they considered disruptions to family schedules and day care if the schedule were changed. Staff had contacted Board leadership, MCCPTA, and principals to share their thinking about the professional day. The only group in favor of changing the date was MCEA. The issue of the exam schedule affected 21 senior high schools as contrasted to 121 elementary schools. The due dates for secondary teachers to turn in grades had been extended for one week in order to accommodate the time needed to grade the exams. Classes were not in session during exam periods, and teachers would have time during the day to work on examinations. He realized this posed a difficulty for some teachers, particularly those giving essay examinations. The start of the second semester would be moved to February 1 in order to ensure that all exams including make-ups could be given. All final grades would include exam results.

Ms. Gutierrez understood that the issues were complex, but she recommended they learn a lesson from this about the need to be flexible. They should have a clear understanding with the public and employee organizations regarding the criteria used when they made decisions, especially around January and February. The professional day was for grading of exams as well as planning for

the next semester; therefore, she would recommend that the professional day be linked to the last day of the semester knowing that it might be flexible. Mr. Ewing observed that had he been consulted prior to the decision, he would have recommended switching the day. He wanted to make clear that the Board of Education as a whole was not consulted.

Mrs. Gordon reported that she had been called on Friday afternoon not for her opinion but to discuss all the ramifications. She noted that the Board set the calendar, and in order to change the calendar, it would take Board action. The Board could do that this evening, but she did not know how this could have been done last week.

Mr. Abrams agreed with Ms. Gutierrez on lessons learned. He was hearing some rigidity in the range of options. Even if a decision were made to change the professional day, there would have been unhappiness because of its potential inappropriateness for elementary schools. Because of what he had been told, they probably needed some clarification of the affect of the professional day on middle schools. He thought they might institute a more formalized consultative process early on. He suggested they not rule out the possibility of treating the units differently. For example, the professional day could be held for the elementary schools and postponed for the secondary schools.

Dr. Vance remarked that the idea of lessons learned was a valid one. They would have to work with the constituent groups for the balance of the school year and find out the state superintendent's view on waivers. He pointed out that last year they had snow days in March, and he thought they should begin the dialogue and look at options.

Mrs. Fanconi commented that this was a very complicated decision. For example, the schools were not planning to serve lunch on Wednesday. The cafeteria workers and transportation staff were scheduled to be off. Therefore, it was not just a matter of calling the students back but all of the support services would have to be recalled. In addition, the Recreation Department had programs planned for January 26. She knew that it was a difficult decision to make. She appreciated all of the things that had to be considered by executive staff when they made that decision.

Mrs. Brenneman temporarily left the meeting at this point.

RESOLUTION NO. 51-93 Re: UTILIZATION OF FY 1994 FUTURE
SUPPORTED PROJECT FUNDS FOR AN
INTERGOVERNMENTAL PERSONNEL
ASSIGNMENT (IPA) FOR CLARE VON
SECKER

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

Resolved, That the superintendent of schools be authorized to receive and expend with the FY 1994 Provision for Future Supported Projects a grant award of \$92,596 from the National Institute for Mental Health (NIMH), for the second year of a two-year intergovernmental personnel assignment (IPA) for Clare Von Secker, in the following categories:

	<u>Category</u>	<u>Amount</u>
2	Instructional Salaries	\$66,737
10	Fixed Charges	<u>25,859</u>
	TOTAL	<u>\$92,596</u>

and be it further

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

RESOLUTION NO. 52-93 Re: UTILIZATION OF FY 1994 FUTURE
SUPPORTED PROJECT FUNDS FOR
BIOTECHNOLOGY PROGRAMS AT THE
EDISON CAREER 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:

Resolved, That the superintendent of schools be authorized to receive within the FY 1994 Provision for Future Supported Projects a grant award of \$34,000 from the Howard Hughes Medical Institute (HHMI), through the Montgomery County Public Schools Educational Foundation, Inc., for two biotechnology programs at the Edison Career Center; and be it further

Resolved, That the superintendent of schools be authorized to expend \$14,000 for one project to enhance the biotechnology laboratory program, in the following category:

	<u>Category</u>	<u>Amount</u>
2	Instructional Salaries	\$12,306
3	Other Instructional Costs	6,648
10	Fixed Charges	<u>1,046</u>
	TOTAL	<u>\$20,000</u>

and be it further

January 24, 1994

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

RESOLUTION NO. 53-93 Re: RESCISSION OF RESOLUTION NO. 811-93, REALIGNMENT OF FEDERAL AND LOCAL FUNDING, AND RECOMMENDED FY 1994 SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION FOR THE HEAD START PROGRAM

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

Resolved, That Resolution No. 811-93, dated November 22, 1993, be rescinded; and be it further

Resolved, That the superintendent of schools be authorized to receive a grant award of \$249,227 of federal Title IIA Economic Opportunity Act funds, through the Montgomery County Department of Family Resources, Community Action Agency, increasing federal funds by \$122,134 for services already budgeted with a corresponding decrease in local revenue; and be it further

Resolved, that the superintendent of schools be authorized, subject to County Council approval, to expend an FY 1994 supplemental appropriation of \$127,093 from the federal government through the Montgomery County Department of Family Resources, Community Action Agency, for the Head Start Program, in the following categories:

	<u>Category</u>	<u>Positions*</u>	<u>Amount</u>
2	Instructional Salaries	2.0	\$ 95,398
10	Fixed Charges	_____	<u>31,695</u>
	TOTAL	<u>2.0</u>	<u>\$127,093</u>

* .5 Fiscal specialist, Grade 24 (12 month)
 .5 Social services assistant, Grade 13 (10 month)
 1.0 Speech pathologist, C-D (10 month)

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. 54-93 Re: FY 1994 CATEGORICAL TRANSFER WITHIN THE PROVISION FOR FUTURE SUPPORTED PROJECTS

Resolved, That a contract for \$151,503 be awarded to Barber-Colman Pritchett, Inc., to install the energy management system at Julius West Middle School and that the project be assigned to the general contractor, Dustin Construction co., for implementation and supervision.

RESOLUTION NO. 58-93 Re: REJECTION OF BIDS - NORTH CHEVY
CHASE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

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

WHEREAS, Construction bids received on December 14, 1993, for the North Chevy Chase Elementary School modernization project exceeded the budget by approximately 350,000; and

WHEREAS, Staff believes that measures can be implemented in conjunction with rebidding at a later date to reduce the overage; and

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

Resolved, That the bids received for the North Chevy Chase Elementary School modernization be rejected and the project be rebid.

RESOLUTION NO. 59-93 Re: REJECTION OF BIDS - BROOKHAVEN
ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

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

WHEREAS, Construction bids received on December 9, 1993, for the Brookhaven Elementary School modernization project exceeded the budget by approximately \$480,000; and

WHEREAS, Staff believes that measures can be implemented in conjunction with rebidding at a later date to reduce the overage; and

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

Resolved, That the bids received for the Brookhaven Elementary School modernization be rejected and the project be rebid.

WHEREAS, The City of Gaithersburg is exploring ways to fund a gymnasium as part of the Rosemont Elementary School modernization project; and

WHEREAS, Staff has negotiated a fee with the Rosemont Elementary School modernization project architect to prepare construction plans for the gymnasium addition; and

WHEREAS, The city's staff concurs with the amount of the design fee and is in the process of identifying a source of funds to permit planning to being; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Montgomery County Board of Education approve an increase of \$29,100 to the contract of Garrison-Schurter Architects to provide professional architectural services for the gymnasium addition to Rosemont Elementary School contingent upon the receipt of funds from non-county sources.

Re: UPDATE ON PLANS FOR EARLY CHILDHOOD
EDUCATION

Dr. Vance stated that since 1989 they had provided annual updates on early childhood education to the Board of Education. Tonight's presentation would focus on the progress they were making in implementing the early childhood education policy adopted by the Board on July 22, 1991. There were 12 issues that prompted four planned actions. One of these would establish a more coordinated early childhood management model including Chapter 1, Head Start, and the early childhood unit under one director. The plan was shared with a group of principals, several committees, and early childhood educators to solicit their ideas and recommendations. He thought that the plan strongly supported the early childhood education policy and provided an organizational structure that would make MCPS even more effective in its delivery of early childhood services. Dr. Joseph Villani, associate superintendent, would lead the presentation. Dr. Vance thanked the Board for their notes and comments, and he was delighted to see the materials that Mr. Ewing had provided on three-year olds and Head Start.

Dr. Villani reported that they were going to discuss progress on the policy as well as the Board's Action Area for 1993-94. They had representatives from central office, elementary principals, elementary teachers, parents, and community agencies with whom they formed partnerships to speak about specific activities carried out in implementing the policy. They wanted to discuss what they had been doing to promote developmentally appropriate practices for young children, to provide models for early childhood education, and to coordinate all early childhood education efforts to maximize program effectiveness.

Dr. Villani introduced the following: Dr. Lucinda Sullivan, director of the Department of Academic Programs; Dr. Mary Helen Smith, director of the Department of Student, Community, and Staff Support; Dr. Naomi Plumer; Mrs. Lois Bell, principal of Summit Hall ES; Mr. John Burley, principal of Daly ES; Ms. Betty Collins, principal of South Lake ES; Ms. Laura Silkwood, principal of Carson ES; Ms. Margaret Yates, principal of Bel Pre ES; Mr. Ken Evans, principal of Ride ES; Dawn Ellis, principal of Burtonsville ES; Ms. Patricia Blum and Ms. Renate Brenneke, preschool education program (PEP); Mr. Vince Fazzalare, Ms. Janet Wells, and Ms. Deborah Leibowitz, early childhood; Ms. Nancy Goldsmith, Head Start Transition Project; Ms. Georgia Lewis, Adult Education; Ms. Myra Neviasher, Chapter I; Dr. Neil Shipman; Dr. Wave Starnes, Enriched and Innovative Instruction; and Mrs. Betty Baldwin, Head Start.

Dr. Plumer reported that the Board had a summary of the major goals contained in the early childhood policy. The early childhood staff reviewed the goals constantly because these were the mandates under which the unit operated. The Board also had a brief description of 12 current issues affecting early childhood education and a status report on each issue. The first seven issues were under the category of instruction and were (1) establishing developmentally appropriate practice, (2) integrating the curriculum, (3) authentic assessments, (4) grading and reporting, placement, promotion, acceleration, and retention, (5) language and thinking experiences, (6) readiness for school, and (7) Success for Every Student with an emphasis on mathematics for the young learner.

Dr. Plumer indicated that these issues had been addressed through training which began in the fall of 1991. By the end of this current year, 2,500 staff members would have participated in one or more training sessions related to the implementation of the early childhood education policy. Training opportunities had been offered to elementary school administrators and trainees, classroom teachers pre-kindergarten to Grades 3 (regular and special education), special subject teachers such as art, music, and physical education, reading and resource teachers, counselors, curriculum specialists, high school child development teachers, pupil personnel workers, psychologists, special education supervisors, OIPD staff, and child care providers. The training had been well received, and the demand far exceeded the supply, resulting in long waiting lists. They had used their own exemplary teachers for most of the training, and the evaluations were excellent. In some cases, they had brought in nationally recognized presenters. More than 20 topics had been offered, all leading to a better understanding of the early childhood policy.

Dr. Plumer explained that future training needed to build on this foundation as well as two new areas. One was the need to understand and apply the process of authentic assessment in the

early childhood classroom. The other was to provide model demonstration centers for the many teachers who had expressed a desire to see how developmentally appropriate instruction could begin and how it looked in various stages of implementation.

Issues eight and nine addressed the importance of successful collaboration, both within MCPS early childhood groups and between MCPS and outside agencies providing services to young children and their families. A realignment of early childhood services was essential to establish a more effective management model that ensured high levels of communication, collaboration, cooperation, and coordination. The tenth and eleventh issues reiterated the importance of pre-kindergarten and all-day kindergarten programs and the Board's long-standing commitment to the expansion of these programs. The last issue referred to an initiative which placed instructional assistants in first and second grade classrooms to better individualize instruction and meet the needs of their diverse student population. The paper before the Board also included an updated list of planned actions including the realignment of early childhood programs, the establishment of model demonstration sites, the beginning of the training for appropriate early childhood assessment, and the revision of early childhood report cards to be consistent with the policy.

Dr. Villani explained that in the paper on realignment of services they proposed a model which put Head Start and Chapter 1 within a Division of Early Childhood Education. This was not to change the way they delivered services or the direction of the program. They were attempting to coordinate the efforts better and to make sure they were getting maximum efficiency out of available staff and resources.

Mr. Joseph Yuhas, acting director of the Division of Chapter I, stated that Chapter I had been established in 1965 as part of the War on Poverty Program, and MCPS was one of the first school systems to apply for and receive these funds. By 1983, they were serving a little over 3,000 youngsters and had programs in 23 public schools and three non-public schools. In 1983, the Board started providing local support to the Chapter I program. In 1993 they were serving close to 8,000 students in 47 public schools and four non-public schools. They were serving almost every school eligible by federal guidelines, and there were only four schools not being served. In the FY 1995 budget they proposed to pick up two of these schools.

Mr. Yuhas reported that the Chapter I law was scheduled to be reauthorized by Congress next summer, and these decisions would affect almost every LEA in the nation because 93 percent of the school systems received some level of Chapter I support. Congress was looking at the reauthorization very closely and had appointed four independent commissions to make recommendations.

One of these commissions was chaired by Dr. David Hornbeck, former state superintendent of schools. The recommendations of the commissions were in a report entitled, "Improving America's School Act." The first recommendation was that states must establish high standards for all students and could no longer have different expectations for Chapter I students. Chapter I was going back to its original name of Title I. Remedial drill and repetition programs would no longer be approved. They would be moving away from norm-referenced testing and moving to performance-based assessment.

The second recommendation was a renewed focus on teaching and learning. They were proposing a school-wide program approach for any school with 75 percent free and reduced lunch participants. In Montgomery County Broad Acres and Oak View met the criteria. They recommended forming targeted assisted schools which would have FARMS at the 50 percentile and would receive greater Chapter I funding. MCPS had eight schools meeting that criteria. There was a greater emphasis on sustained professional development. Secondary schools above the 75 percent poverty range would have to be served first before serving additional elementary schools. MCPS did not have any secondary schools meeting that criteria. They were looking at the selection procedures for limited English proficient students and mildly learning disabled to make it easier for them to receive services.

The third recommendation was that schools needed to be provided more flexibility in terms of how they used their Chapter I resources. Principals and school leadership teams were best equipped to determine what their needs were and how best to utilize the available resources. States were to develop an accountability system to make sure things were moving and resources were being used effectively. The fourth recommendation stressed parent involvement and developing links among parents, schools, and community. They were recommending that parents be included on school leadership teams. They would be moving into more of a Head Start model where they would look at social, emotional, and nutritional needs of youngsters.

The final recommendation was that Chapter I resources be targeted to schools where the needs were the greatest. Currently 10 percent of Chapter I funding was used for concentration grants, and now up to 50 percent would be used for this purpose. Only seven LEAs in Maryland now received these grants, and Montgomery County was not one of those.

Mrs. Lavolia Mack-Miller, acting director of the Division of Head Start, reported that on January 12, 1994, the administration released a report of the advisory committee on Head Start policy which stated that the world of Head Start was dramatically different than in 1965. Today the needs of families and children who live in poverty are more complicated and urgent than ever

before from children who lived with violence and substance abuse to families with interrelated problems of homelessness, lack of education, and unemployment.

Mrs. Mack-Miller said that in MCPS Head Start used the federal performance standards, the early childhood policy, and Success for Every Student for the program. They worked to assure that every Head Start class was developmentally appropriate, involving parents in all aspects of the children's education, providing an integrated curriculum that was multicultural, and working to ensure a smooth transition from Head Start. They provided training to staff and parents to implement these goals. They coordinated with other MCPS administrative and curriculum offices and collaborated with other early childhood programs, the Private Industry Council, and the Housing Opportunities Commission. The Head Start mission extended beyond the early childhood policy to include provisions for social services and health care. The number of social services assistants had not kept pace with the increasing number of children and families served. As funding for classroom was made available, corresponding funding for support staff needed to be included.

Mrs. Mack-Miller commented that the face of poverty had changed. Family needs were more complicated than ever before. Head Start had to focus on the needs of children in the context of their families and community by enhancing family services and increasing parent involvement. Children were coming into the Head Start classrooms with significant needs that impaired their ability to learn. Referrals from teachers had doubled in the past few years, and they were requesting help with children who were angry, out of control, fearful, depressed, impulsive, and inattentive. Children did not leave their experiences, fear, and anger at the doorway. These were carried into the school. This gave the word, "readiness," a new dimension -- ready to sit, ready to listen, ready to comply, ready to trust, and ready to feel safe. She believed that the comprehensive nature of Head Start was more important now than ever.

Mrs. Aileen Craig, principal of Highland ES, recalled that in 1980 she was a member of a group assigned the responsibility to review and revise the early childhood portion of the K-8 policy. They put a lot of effort into the revision, but nothing much happened because there was no commitment. Now they had a separate policy which represented a major commitment to early childhood education. It has increased principals' awareness of early childhood education and involved them more in the implementation of the policy.

Highland was a K-5 school, with two sections of EEEP, two sections of Head Start, four kindergarten classes, two early childhood education special education classes, four first grades, four second grades, and four third grades for a total of 22

classes of early childhood students. In her fourth and fifth grade she had seven classes, which meant that 22 sections out of 29 were early childhood. Implementation of the policy had to be a major effort in her school, and the policy needed regular review by school staffs to understand what needed to be done and where they were in the implementation process. The early childhood unit helped the schools with the implementation.

Mrs. Craig stated that the developmentally appropriate program was age appropriate and reflected what they knew about how children learned. It addressed the individual students, their development, their interests, and their cultural background. However, sometimes there was a problem with developmentally appropriate practices, and staffs did not know what was expected of them. Staff Development had been key in helping schools with these issues. Staff Development could validate that many of the practices in use in the classroom were, indeed, developmentally appropriate. At the local school they saw teachers participating in staff development and returning to school to implement these practices in the classroom including different ways to approach math, problem solving, and integrating the curriculum. Principals were optimistic that developmentally appropriate practices would become more widespread.

Another issue was performance-based assessment, which was a major MCPS effort. Mrs. Craig reported that every school had a school assessment leadership team (SALT). Principals and reading teachers had an opportunity to hear a speaker on performance-based assessment and came back to their schools with information about portfolios. In regard to the organizational realignment, Mrs. Craig said that principals thought this was overdue. Principals felt the realignment would coordinate student services and efforts and maximize communication. She was delighted to see the demonstration classes surface again because they were a highly effective tool to help teachers with the implementation of program. She also supported the review of the report cards for early childhood education. Mrs. Craig emphasized that principals needed to be involved in training, curricula, developmentally appropriate practices, multiculturalism, and legislation. There was also a need for parent education and involving parents more by getting them into the classrooms.

Ms. Vivian Gee, kindergarten teacher at Carderock Springs ES, commented that she had been in early childhood education for more than 15 years. Although she had been satisfied with her own performance as a teacher, she felt there were many new things to learn and new strategies to use. Therefore, she was excited about the early childhood education training opportunities, and she attended workshops on social settings to provide lifelike experiences for children, extending music into the regular classroom, mathematics for kindergarten students, and the concept of multiple intelligences. These sessions opened her eyes and

her mind to new ways to empower children to take more responsibility for their learning. This year she had become a trainer in social settings, and she had shared her experiences with other teachers in her school.

Ms. Gee said that upon reflection she had been in control of all learning, but the early childhood training enabled her to become the facilitator in her classroom. She became the facilitator rather than the "sage on the stage." She had rearranged her classroom to have the children make real choices about how they learned. They chose from a variety of hands-on active projects and quiet reading experiences. She would like the opportunity to observe teachers implementing developmentally appropriate practices in the classrooms and looked forward to the demonstration classrooms. As a result of her participation in the early childhood training, she now looked at the whole child, provided integrated experiences, created a language-rich environment, and provided choices for children according to their best intelligences. She guided children to reflect and think about their experiences and solutions to problems. She had always welcomed all children to her classroom. It was her responsibility to take children where she found them and to challenge each child to move forward toward success. The training validated as well as redirected her beliefs about children. She said the important concepts of how children learned were now her focus, and the different ways each child learned had become her planning keys as she implemented the objectives in the content areas.

Mr. Jeffrey Allen, third grade teacher at Harmony Hills ES, explained that as a recently tenured teacher he came to the system feeling that he had been adequately prepared at the college level to be a good teacher. However, he also came with some preconceived notions and some expectations about where he thought his third grade students should be academically. It did not take very long to find out that quite a few of them were not meeting up to his expectations. He found himself looking at the glass as being half empty. He asked himself what was wrong with his students; however, after reevaluating his role as an educator, he now asked what he could do to support his students.

Mr. Allen believed all students could learn and be successful. He found himself challenged to get his students to do that learning and to meet the high expectations that were being placed upon them as mandated by Success for Every Student. He had brought his concern to his colleagues and his principal, and they steered him in the direction of additional training. The opportunities provided by the early childhood unit brought about change in his professional growth and in his ability to now see the glass as being half full.

Mr. Allen had attended workshops on developmentally appropriate practices, an in-depth study of the early childhood education policy, the use of social settings within the classroom to integrate the curriculum, recognizing the multiple intelligences of children, and effective classroom management skills. As a result of these training opportunities, he had readjusted his teaching style and his teaching strategies. He understood that developmentally appropriate practice addressed the difference between age appropriateness and individual appropriateness. He was using thematic-based instruction, a whole language approach, differentiated instruction, and multi-sensory approach to classroom instruction. He had become a teacher who was more aware of his students abilities and their needs, and he felt that he now had some of the teaching tools necessary to implement the early childhood education policy into his classroom. Yet he also recognized the need for further growth on his part, and because of this he was looking forward to future training opportunities with the early childhood unit including opportunity to visit model classrooms where he could observe teachers.

Mr. Fredis Garcias, president of the Head Start Transition Governing Board, explained that the program had given confidence and to use strategies in his home with his family. He knew that it was easy to be a parent, but it took a lot of effort to be a good parent. Now his child had developed confidence, and when his child came home, he came home to a parent who would listen to him and learn about school activities.

Mr. Garcias stated that the progress he had made in Head Start was important to him. He wished that more parents could have these experiences and learn how to be happy at home and to understand that developing that child/parent relationship was the most important thing in the family. Head Start taught him to work with his child at home to get that child ready for kindergarten. He was now learning about computers from his son, and he encouraged other parents to come forward to gain the experiences he had through the Head Start program.

Ms. Mary Ellen Savorese, Division of Children, Family, and Youth, stated that she was a child care resource specialist. She wanted to highlight the collaborative efforts of MCPS with the county government and other public and private agencies. The Department of Family Resources shared a leadership role with MCPS in the formation, development, and expansion of the early childhood advisory council. This council had expanded to include representatives of many county programs which touched the lives of young children and contributed to their success. The council met regularly to share information and ideas and to avoid duplication of programs. They also collaborated by sharing early childhood training opportunities with child care providers on an "as available" basis. This sharing had become very visible and meaningful since the establishment of the early childhood unit

and the Board's policy, and this encouraged her department to apply for a dependent care grant last year with the Maryland State Department of Education. They created a 26-minute video on the topic of quality before- and after-school care, and this video was currently being advertised in national publications. They produced the video because they heard from principals and parents regarding quality care for young and school-age children.

Ms. Savorese reported that MCPS had a long history of supporting child care. At present the school system had before-, after-, and pre-school child care at 100 school sites. Several Board members had recently attended a dedication ceremony at Thurgood Marshall ES where the county government built a child care center in cooperation with MCPS. This was the first in the nation and should serve as a model. The county worked with Dr. Rohr to make sure child care facilities in schools met standards that were important to principals and parents. With facilities management and the ICB they had developed selection criteria and evaluations that principals and community groups could use when they were selecting a child care provider for their school.

Because of the large numbers of centers and the growing concerns people had about quality, her department was working with the early childhood unit on the matter of five-year olds. With the loss of all-day kindergarten, many five-year old children were enrolled in complement programs. Many parents were looking for programs that extended the educational day of the child and provided developmentally appropriate opportunities after kindergarten. Ms. Savorese announced that they had plans to develop a curriculum model based on MCPS early childhood policy and curriculum. This would be given to providers who wished to provide a full-day program for these children. This curriculum could support and enrich curriculum and instructional practices specified in the early childhood policy. If this were successful, this curriculum could be expanded for other programs serving young children at school sites. She believed that the policies adopted by the Board and the materials developed by staff were too good to end when the child walked out of the school doors.

Ms. Savorese stated that she had been involved in child care and early childhood programs for over 20 years, and in the past several years she had felt a very strong new wind blowing. She was pleased to be asked to speak this evening. MCPS staff was encouraging providers to have the level of professionalism that MCPS was known for.

Mrs. Fanconi thanked the presenters and suggested that the discussion be extended to allow for Board comments. Ms. Gutierrez commented that there were some issues as to whether the program would be fully funded. She asked staff to get back to the Board when they had more information about federal funding.

Dr. Cheung commented that funding for Chapter 1 had not increased but the distribution method would change. More funds would go to LEAs with high poverty rates, and most likely MCPS would not be competitive in getting these funds. He reported that the Goal 2000 was to try to prepare children to go to school, and he thought that MCPS could serve as a model for the U.S. Department of Education in terms of implementing their strategies. Unfortunately there would not be additional funds available for education. He said that they needed to lobby their senators and representatives for federal funds.

Ms. Gutierrez asked about barriers for disabled and ESOL students to receive Chapter 1 funds. Mr. Yuhas replied that Chapter 1 youngsters needed to be identified at the end of first grade on the basis of a norm-referenced standardized test. Many LEP youngsters were not capable of taking these tests; however, MCPS had developed a referral process to get students into Chapter 1 without having to take the test. The federal government was moving toward eliminating some of these barriers.

Ms. Gutierrez asked whether the staff was keeping data on children to show that all of these programs were of academic benefit to the children. She asked whether they had the numbers to show the Board. Dr. Villani replied that they were putting into place an accountability process which would give them a measure of student achievement on a yearly basis for Grades 3 through 8. They were looking at a process to assess student achievement before Grade 3. The only numbers they had now were the numbers in the Success for Every Student plan. From this year on, they would be able to collect data in math and reading/language arts on an individual student basis and on a grade by grade basis.

Ms. Gutierrez asked if they were doing the SIMS approach for pre-kindergarten and the early grades. For example, could they track a student and be able to say that this fourth grade student had the benefit of early childhood programs. Dr. Sullivan replied that it might not be the same test from one grade to another, but they would have portfolio information and individual assessments. They would be able to look at growth, and they would have indicators to show whether the child was able to handle more complicated material. After the third grade, they would have linear data with the same test from one grade to another. All the literature showed they should not use standardized tests before Grade 3. Ms. Gutierrez asked whether they could capture information on children who had been in the Head Start program. Dr. Sullivan replied that they could.

Mrs. Brenneman commented that it was more than giving data to the Council. She wanted to discuss how they communicated to parents about the progress of children in kindergarten through third grade. Many parents wanted more than just a portfolio. She

asked how they were training teachers to communicate with parents so that parents knew whether or not the child was working up to his or her capabilities. Dr. Plumer replied that this was a complex question. The field of authentic assessment was new and emerging. Teachers needed to have training before they could implement this. They needed to be trained in what to observe, when to observe it, how to record it, what to collect, how to organize and analyze it, how to use it in program planning, and how to translate it into a report to be shared with parents. Some schools were at the beginning stages of a portfolio project, and some material was on the market to guide teachers and educators in this process. Dr. Plumer commented that this was going to be different and would be much softer than a score.

Mrs. Brenneman asked about what the teachers who had not been trained were telling parents. Mrs. Craig replied that they had had a staff meeting today, and this was the subject of the meeting. They talked about all the different ways they could communicate with parents. They talked about photocopying samples of text the youngsters had successfully read and understood. They talked about making tapes where students demonstrated their comprehension of reading. She agreed that they had to help parents understand what was going to be a better form of reporting to them. They would be doing some sort of individual testing of youngsters in terms of word recognition and understanding. Teachers were excited about this, and while her school was not a pilot school, they had already ordered their portfolios from the warehouse. She agreed that they had to educate parents in this process while they were also educating teachers.

Mrs. Bell reported that her teachers were using photography. Every exhibit of children's work included a picture of the child in the process. They would revisit this "interest" at a higher level, and they would be able to see the vocabulary grow. Teachers were taking anecdotal data and putting it into the portfolios. Parents could come in and look at where the child was in September and then in January see where the child was. To her this type of assessment had much more meaning than a percentage. She added that the literature on Head Start indicated that the initial gains were superb; however, the gains faded without the support needed to carry it through. She would put a plug in for the transition project. Ms. Goldsmith commented that the transition project was in its second year of operation. Their first year data were not as impressive as they had hoped, but they hoped the data would change after the second year. She reported that this was a three-year study, and there was money for the fourth year and MCPS would be in competition for these funds. MCPS had to show the federal government that it was making progress.

Mrs. Gordon stated that she had had the opportunity earlier this year to attend a conference in St. Charles Parish, and one of the schools she visited was a primary school using a portfolio method of assessment. The staff talked about the time and effort it took to prepare themselves and parents. There was some resistance on the part of parents who were used to seeing a letter grade. However, in the second year, parents did not want to go back to a grade because the portfolio gave them a much better picture of what their children were really learning. She was sure that this school would be willing to share their experiences with MCPS staff.

Dr. Cheung complimented staff on their outstanding presentation. He had been asking staff for an automated individual student profile for many months; however, the staff was presenting a better model of what he had envisioned. They would present a total picture of the children and be able to show the growth from year to year. Now they had gone multimedia in their presentations to parents. He also complimented staff on interagency collaboration. He had been concerned about after-school enrichment and was pleased to see the programs available. He would suggest they look to intergenerational programs as well as having young adults mentor young children.

Mr. Ewing commented that some people in the county including some Council members were reluctant to believe facts in relation to early childhood education. He suspected that if they were able to provide the most perfectly clear and clean data on the performance of students who had had the benefit of Head Start compared with students who did not, this would not change the views of most of those people one wit. This did not mean that the Board should not continue to support efforts to improve on their ability to assess the effectiveness of early childhood education. For this reason, the Head Start transition program was very important as well as the continuous effort to collect and organize data with respect to the experiences of MCPS and other LEAs. This had been a focus of the research and evaluation committee of the Board, and the committee was pressing for better data and more complete data. It seemed to him that the body of evidence on the effectiveness of early childhood education continued to grow.

Mr. Ewing regretted that the superintendent's budget proposal had so little in the way of expansion in early childhood education. While they did a lot with Chapter 1 in terms of local funding, they were not funding all eligible children. They did come close to funding all eligible children in Head Start. Furthermore, in both Chapter 1 and Head Start they had some limits they imposed on themselves. In the case of Head Start their program was for four-year olds, and there was a national report which suggested that children should have the benefits of early childhood education before their fourth birthday. He believed they should

begin to press for the funding of Head Start for all eligible three-year olds. It seemed to him that Chapter 1 needed to be expanded as well, and the Head Start program needed to be extended into the early grades on more than a pilot basis.

Mr. Ewing believed that the staff was doing a remarkably fine job both in central office and in the schools in implementing the policy. However, they were still not meeting all the needs and they were still not meeting all teacher needs for staff development and training. He thought that they were going to have to do something to move faster to meet these needs.

Mr. Abrams and Ms. Baker left the meeting at this point.

Mrs. Fanconi said that she would like to have some information for the budget discussion. She asked for indicators over the last five years on the number of Head Start students and the percentage of free and reduced lunch students because she did not think they were meeting the needs of that early childhood population. She would like some discussion of how they identified the children and the number on the waiting list as well as how many of those they actually did serve during the year.

It seemed to Mrs. Fanconi that the concentration grants on Chapter 1 had some relationship with educational load. It concerned her that the government was looking at giving incentives for districts to put all the poor children in one school so that they could get these funds. She would bring up these issues when the Board talked about facilities and how they reported poverty. She said that it was critical for them to be able to track this population.

Ms. Gutierrez said she was delighted to hear that portfolios were being used. She suggested that at some point the Board officially endorse this in order to make a stronger statement in favor of moving towards portfolio-based assessments. She thought this would have some kind of budgetary impact for the staff training and materials. She asked staff for any budgetary information they could provide.

Mrs. Fanconi thanked the presenters and guests in the audience.

Re: BOARD/SUPERINTENDENT COMMENTS

1. Mrs. Brenneman reported that last week she had been able to visit the Ellington School for the Performing Arts in Washington, D.C. She had provided the superintendent with the materials she received. She hoped that other Board members would be able to visit the school. Their program ran from 8 to 5 every day, with the intensive arts program running from 2 to 5 p.m.

Resolved, That the Board of Education of Montgomery County hereby conduct a portion of its meeting on January 29, 1994 at 9 a.m. to discuss personnel matters; and be it further

Resolved, That the Board of Education of Montgomery County hereby conduct a portion of its meeting on February 8, 1994, at 9 a.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 continue at noon; 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 these meetings shall continue in closed session until the completion of business.

Re: REPORT OF CLOSED SESSIONS - JANUARY
11 AND 13, 1994

On December 14, 1993, by the unanimous vote of members present, the Board of Education voted to conduct a closed session on January 11, 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, January 11, 1994, from 9 a.m. to 10:15 a.m. and from 12:45 p.m. to 2:10 p.m. The meeting took place in room 120 of the Carver Educational Services Center, Rockville, Maryland.

The Board met to discuss a citizen complaint regarding Seneca Valley High School and to consult with its attorney regarding next steps on the complaint. At noon the Board consulted with its attorney regarding a response to another attorney. The Board reviewed and voted unanimously to accept the personnel monthly report. The Board voted unanimously to accept the superintendent's recommendation for the principalship of Wheaton Woods ES and Beverly Farms ES and for a personnel specialist nominee. Board members also adjudicated appeals.

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

The Montgomery County Board of Education met in closed session on Thursday, January 13, 1994, from 8:40 p.m. to 11:50 p.m. The meeting took place in room 120 of the Carver Educational Services Center, Rockville, Maryland.

The Board met to adjudicate an appeal. The Board next met with counsel to determine next steps in the citizen complaint regarding Seneca Valley HS.

In attendance at the closed session were Stephen Abrams, Carrie Baker, Fran Brenneman, Judy Bresler, Alan Cheung, Blair Ewing, Carol Fanconi, Thomas S. Fess, Bea Gordon, Ana Sol Gutierrez, Roger Titus, and Mary Lou Wood.

Mrs. Gordon assumed the chair.

RESOLUTION NO. 63-94 Re: MFD CONTRACTING

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

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.

RESOLUTION NO. 64-94 Re: ALTERNATIVE TEACHER CERTIFICATION

On motion of Mr. Ewing seconded by Mr. Abrams (on January 11, 1994), the following resolution was adopted unanimously by members present:

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

RESOLUTION NO. 65-94 Re: ORGANIZATION OF THE HIGH SCHOOL

On motion of Mr. Ewing seconded by Mr. Abrams (on January 11, 1994), the following resolution was adopted unanimously by members present:

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.

Re: A MOTION BY MS. GUTIERREZ ON WOMEN
IN NON-TRADITIONAL POSITIONS
(FAILED)

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

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.

RESOLUTION NO. 66-94 Re: BOE APPEAL NO. T-1993-30

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education adopt its Decision and Order in BOE Appeal No. T-1993-30, a transfer matter.

Mr. Fess announced that Mr. Abrams and Ms. Baker had signed the Decision and Order before they left the meeting.

RESOLUTION NO. 67-94 Re: BOE APPEAL NO. 1993-26

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. 1993-26, a student eligibility matter.

Mr. Fess announced that Mr. Abrams and Ms. Baker had signed the Decision and Order before they left the meeting.

RESOLUTION NO. 68-94 Re: BOE APPEAL NO. 1993-29

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education adopt its Decision and Order in BOE Appeal No. 1993-29, a student disciplinary matter.

Mr. Fess announced that Mr. Abrams and Ms. Baker had signed the Decision and Order before they left the meeting.

RESOLUTION NO. 69-94 Re: BOE APPEAL NO. 1993-36

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education adopt its Decision and Order in BOE Appeal No. 1993-36, a tuition matter.

Mr. Fess announced that Mr. Abrams and Ms. Baker had signed the Decision and Order before they left the meeting.

Re: NEW BUSINESS

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education ask officially for the views on the superintendent's advisory committee on special and alternative education on the proposal for the curriculum called SAFE to advise the Board of its views on that curriculum.

Re: ITEM OF INFORMATION

Board members received the Quarterly Change Order Report as an item of information.

RESOLUTION NO. 70-94 Re: ADJOURNMENT

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education adjourn its meeting at 11:45 p.m.

PRESIDENT

SECRETARY

PLV:mlw