

the middle on the preferred model for Montgomery County. The task force had made an effort to combine the two; however, they were unable to do this.

Mr. Baranick stated they saw the internal diagnostic model as a method by which schools could do a self-diagnosis, but they thought the information gained should be confidential between the school and the area office. The major factors for motivation would come through the areas of professional recognition and involvement with peers. On the external assessment model the committee members felt that financial rewards and public recognition were crucial. Public knowledge was essential to motivation, and rewards might include released time and professional leave.

Dr. Rosenberg reported that he had served as the chair of a group who had chosen the internal model and continued with that as a preference. They had looked at the Fairfax and Santa Clara. Both of these systems had focused on an internal diagnostic model. He explained that they saw it was possible to incorporate the Board's priorities in the internal model. The model had several characteristics. It relied on staff/system commitment in an internal process. It recognized that there were differences among schools, and the model used in-service training. It was an ongoing process and diagnosis was for program improvement. The model used existing tests already mandated by the Board of Education. It would also avoid school by school comparisons. The rewards were professional recognition within the school system. For example, teachers in those schools recognized would serve on teams going to other schools. Dr. Rosenberg called attention to the criteria and explained that each of them would have indicators and assessment measures to be used. Schools would have to receive "satisfactory" on all seven. Exemplary schools would receive "exemplary" on four out of the seven criteria, including the sections on reading/language arts and mathematics achievement.

Ms. Contrera reported that she had visited South Carolina where the external assessment model had been in effect for three years. The model had been put into effect as an integration device, and they used the state minimum competency exams as a criteria. They looked at reading/language arts test scores, math test scores, parent satisfaction, student satisfaction, teacher attendance, and student attendance. Her group had looked at the need in Montgomery County and thought there should be some payback to the students and teachers as well as public recognition of the schools doing a good job. In the MCPS model they were looking at reading/language arts and math achievement using criterion-referenced tests which could yield national norm data. There would be a sample survey of parents and students. They had added staff satisfaction to their model and would look at attendance for students and teachers. The rewards would be professional conferences and substitute days. In addition, there would be financial rewards which could amount to \$14 per student and which could be used for a variety of things. The allocation of professional leave would be based on a teacher attendance formula. They had also looked at the flags they were

flying in South Carolina for the outstanding school, and they were also suggesting a letter of commendation from the superintendent. Their plan recommended piloting and phasing in of the external model.

Mrs. Praisner inquired about sharing of the two models, and Dr. Rosenberg replied that there was quite of bit of sharing which led to the split on the committee.

Dr. Cody felt that the report was an extremely valuable document because one the Board's priorities was to develop an instrument to measure for school effectiveness. He said that the models represented a philosophical difference in how to determine whether a school was effective. However, the criteria used, although stated slightly differently, were similar. In regard to the Board's priorities, they were well on their way regarding minority achievement and were working on the first priority. This month a task force would be appointed to work on defining higher order intellectual skills, and another task force would be working on the fourth priority. He said that in the coming months they needed to examine more intensively priorities having to do with student outcomes. He thought that both models could be used at different times for different purposes. It seemed to him they would be well served to focus on what the measures were.

Mr. Ewing commented that it was a question of whether they had addressed accountability to the public in both models. It was clear in one of the models. The literature stated that motivation was recognition; however, this did not answer what kind, how much, by whom, and for what. One form was recognition of outstanding performance in a public document. The question was if they did not recognize accomplishment through some public mechanism, how did they achieve accountability and reporting to the public. Mrs. Praisner asked about Fairfax's efforts in this area, and Dr. Rosenberg replied that they relied on an internal process other than in measurable skills. Mr. Baranick added that in Santa Clara they were low-key about sharing information, although it was available on public inquiry.

Dr. Greenblatt stated that she was excited about the report which was a superb job and would move them forward. She did not see why the two models could not be meshed together because a good operating school would do its own evaluation. She thought it was very important to have a visible award system noting the schools that were truly outstanding and effective. She commented that the report seemed to be heavily oriented to elementary schools, and she was thinking about the secondary schools. She pointed out that parents looked at SAT scores and Merit Scholarships, yet this was not incorporated in the plan. The other area was parent satisfaction, which she felt was nebulous. She wondered whether that question was meaningful. What was critical was parental involvement in the education of their children, but she did not know how this could be measured. She thought that they should not consider this in financial terms, but they should look at this as a way of

motivating.

Ms. Contrera replied that the secondary model was not as fully developed, and consideration had been given to adding the PSAT. This could be given across the board to secondary students to make them eligible for scholarships and awards, and the test was relatively inexpensive.

Dr. Steve Frankel, director of the Department of Educational Accountability, suggested that the external model could be used for all schools, and the internal model could be used where there was a special need. Dr. Cody stated that they had to move in the direction of defining measures in a way to not only be responsive to accountability but also to cover the progress of all kinds of students in a school.

Dr. Cronin reported that he had had the privilege of meeting with the committee and of receiving all of the literature. He had never seen a more complicated set of literature which presented no one conclusion. He agreed they had to compensate staff fairly and educate all the children. In regard to the internal model, he was concerned about the lack of publicity, information, and the closing of the process. He remarked that people needed to have a total commitment to their schools, and they had to trust the community and the press. Part of the information flow was through the press, and if they operated out of fear of knowledge they closed the process down. He suggested the more information they had out to the public on where they wanted to go and where parents could assist them, the better off they were. He liked the openness of the external model and the characteristics of the internal model.

Mrs. Peyser commented that she was very excited about the report. She had several suggestions of additional indicators. In regard to student performance, she said a great deal of research had established that the single most reliable predictor was homework. She would like to see some indication of evidence that students were doing homework daily. In regard to the high school she would add evidence of increased enrollment in honors and advanced placement courses. In reference to climate she would add if students were demonstrating self and mental discipline in all their classes. She would ask if there was evidence that learning was the top priority in the school. One of the best indicators would be few interruptions to classes. She thought it would be helpful if they looked at the products of the schools and go to graduates who were in the world of work and in college.

Dr. Greenblatt remarked that they could get confused about their purpose. They had to look at progress and improvement, and they should be looking at the products and outcomes of what the school was achieving. She wanted to know what were the best performing schools, the ones with the highest level SATs. She said that rather than focusing on minimal standards, they should be focusing on outcome.

Dr. Shoenberg commented that the difference between the two plans was the difference between intrinsic and extrinsic rewards. He noted that most of the criterion measures related to outcomes used standardized norm-referenced tests, and those tests were related to socioeconomic status. He thought that to look at just outcomes would run counter to the end they were trying to achieve. They should look at improvement as well as actual scores. He remarked that schools were about more than just the 3 R's. He agreed that the model seemed to apply far better to elementary schools than to high schools. He pointed out that tests measured a minimum set of skills that MCPS went far beyond, and he had some uncertainty as to whether the tests got at everything. As far as parental views, he noted that they could have a school people felt good about but where the scores were not good. In the high schools they had to go beyond the 3 R's and look at whether they had a substantial academic activity in the school, whether there was challenge provided in the classroom, and whether teachers employed instructional methods to challenge all students and to address the learning styles of a full range of students. He was concerned that the criteria did not look at instruction except for the 3 R's, and he didn't see them getting inside classrooms in either of the plans. Dr. Cody replied that one of the plans would get into the classroom in the process of school. He felt there was no way to keep private some of the measures they would use. The other model could be used on a periodic basis if there were a problem. Dr. Shoenberg thought that the indicators did not get at the instructional relationship.

Mrs. Shannon thought that the two plans could be merged in some way. For example, the internal model could be given to schools to prepare for the external evaluation. She also thought they should publicize the outcomes and pointed out that if they did not have publicity they could not give accolades to the recent accomplishments of Takoma Park Junior High School. As to what was an effective school, she could not agree that it was only the best performing school. To her it was one that took what it had, worked with it, and maximized the outcome. She hoped that they did not exclude schools because of the socioeconomic factor. She asked about unresolved issues. She also said that no one should be excluded because she wanted to know how everyone was performing including special education and gifted and talented.

Mr. Robertson remarked that there was a lot of good work in the report and a lot that would continue to happen. He had a basic concern about meshing with existing evaluation and assessment programs. He thought the assessment should not detract from education in the schools and not take time and energy away from the actual education. He requested feedback on what could be amended or removed when the assessment program was in place.

Mrs. Praisner felt there was a lot of useful information in the report, and she hoped they would focus on what Montgomery County thought should be the criteria for determining what was an effective school. She said there were some elements to this best left in the school, and she hoped they could mesh the two plans and find

something for Montgomery County. She hoped this would include meeting the needs of students and not just test scores. She asked that PTAs and the community be given an opportunity to comment on the report and requested that their responses be included in the next report to the Board. Dr. Shoenberg suggested that the Board schedule a work session on this topic.

Re: Executive Session

The Board of Education met in executive session at lunchtime on personnel issues, negotiations, and appeals.

Re: Board/Press/Visitor Conference

The following individuals appeared before the Board.

1. Jane Stern, Montgomery County Education Association
2. Nancy Dacek, MCCPTA

Resolution No. 2-84

Re: Connecticut Park Center Partial Reroof (Area 1)

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

WHEREAS, Sealed bids were received on January 5, 1984, for reroofing portions of the Connecticut Park Center, as indicated below:

Bidder	Lump Sum
1. Orndorff & Spaid, Inc.	\$66,269
2. J. E. Wood & Sons Co., Inc.	72,220
3. R. D. Bean, Inc.	76,150
4. Colbert Roofing Corporation	78,818
5. Mueller Roofing Service, Inc.	97,790

and,

WHEREAS, The low bidder, Orndorff & Spaid, Inc., has performed similar projects satisfactorily; and

WHEREAS, Low bid is within staff estimate and sufficient funds are available in Account #999-42 to effect award; now therefore be it

Resolved, That a contract for \$66,269 be awarded to Orndorff & Spaid, Inc., to accomplish a reroofing project at Connecticut Park Center in accordance with plans and specifications covering this work dated December 14, 1983, prepared by the Department of School Facilities.

Resolution No. 3-84

Re: South Lake Elementary School - Property Easement (Area 3)

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Mr. Ewing

fact, result in a negotiated fee to be paid to the school system in return for the subject property access; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the president and secretary be authorized to execute a permanent easement between the Board of Education and the Washington Gas Light Company and Frederick Gas Light, Inc., consisting of a twenty-foot wide area containing 14,982 square feet (.3439 acre) across the Magruder High School for the purpose of installing an additional 6" pipeline to serve the area gas customers; and be it further

Resolved, That a negotiated fee be paid to the Board of Education for the permanent easement, said funds to be credited to the Rental of Property Account 32-108-1-13.

Resolution No. 5-84 Re: Glenallan Elementary School -
Storm Drainage Easement (Area 2)

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

WHEREAS, Montgomery County Department of Transportation has requested a right-of-way and storm water drainage easement across the Glenallan Elementary School site for the purpose of installing storm drainage; and

WHEREAS, The proposed storm drainage improvements will benefit both the school community and will not affect any land now utilized for school programming and recreational activities; and

WHEREAS, Montgomery County will assume all liability for damages or injury resulting from the installation and future maintenance of the subject improvement; and

WHEREAS, All construction, full restoration and any future repair activities will be performed at no cost to the Board of Education; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the president and secretary be authorized to execute a permanent right-of-way and temporary access easement for Montgomery County Department of Transportation at the Glenallan Elementary School site for the purpose of installing storm drainage.

Resolution No. 6-84 Re: Amendment to the FY 1984 Capital
Improvements Program

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

WHEREAS, On December 13, 1983, the Board of Education authorized the appointment of an architect to design the new Gaithersburg Area Elementary School utilizing existing local planning funds

appropriated in FY 1975 for the East Gaithersburg Area Elementary School project; and

WHEREAS, On January 9, 1984, the Education Committee of the County Council suggested that the utilization of this prior appropriation should be authorized through an amendment to the FY 1984 Capital Improvements Program; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Board of Education approves an amendment to the FY 1984 Capital Improvements Program for a project entitled, "Gaithersburg Area Elementary School," Project No. 746017, indicating the use of the existing appropriation in this project for planning in FY 1984; and be it further

Resolved, That the county executive be requested to recommend approval of this amendment to the County Council.

Re: Inspection Date for
Wheaton/Edison

The inspection date for Wheaton High School/Edison Career Center was set for Tuesday, January 17. Dr. Greenblatt will attend.

Resolution No. 7-84 Re: Award of Procurement Contracts
Over \$25,000 and Rejection of Bids
and RFP's

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

WHEREAS, Funds have been budgeted for the purchases of equipment, supplies, and contractual services; and

WHEREAS, All proposals received in response to RFP 84-03 should be rejected because the job will be completed by MCPS employees on a "part-time/extra job basis"; and

WHEREAS, The sole bid received from Barwood Cab, Inc., in response to RFP 84-12, should be rejected due to adverse emotional impact on handicapped students who are now comfortable with regular drivers that have been assigned; now therefore be it

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

43-84 Electrical Supplies and Equipment	
Name of Vendor(s)	Dollar Value of Contracts
Empire Electronic Supply Co.	\$ 5,401
General Electric Supply Co.	9,825
Maurice Electrical Supply Co., Inc.	30,519

Rockville Electric Supply, Inc.	4,579
Tricounty Electrical Supply Co.	24,179
TOTAL	\$74,503
51-84 Office Papers	
Antietam Paper Co., Inc.	\$ 5,867
Barton, Duer and Koch Paper Co.	61,215
Nationwide Paper, Inc.	1,913
Frank Parson's Paper Co.	1,675
RIS Paper Co.	91,250
Stanford Paper Co.	558,252
Virginia Paper	47,812
TOTAL	\$767,984
56-84 Graphic Arts Equipment	
A. B. Dick	\$13,565
NPG, Inc.	1,350
L. S. Patton Supplies, Inc.	11,624
TOTAL	\$26,539
59-84 Carpeting	
American Excelsior Co.	\$29,400
84-15 Two-Bucket, Used Aerial Device	
Pitman Mfg. Co., Inc.	\$65,220
GRAND TOTAL	\$963,646

and be it further

Resolved, That RFP 84-03 and RFP 84-12 be rejected.

Re: School Calendar for 1984-85

Dr. Greenblatt moved and Dr. Shoenberg seconded the following:

WHEREAS, The number of duty days for employees is negotiable; and

WHEREAS, For the purposes of planning, budget development, and providing tentative information to parents and staff members, a calendar is needed; and

WHEREAS, If the need arises from negotiations, this calendar can be revised; and

WHEREAS, The establishment of school terms of the County Board of Education is required by state law; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the proposed school calendar for 1984-85 be adopted, subject to negotiation of the number of duty days.

Re: A Motion by Mrs. Peyser to Amend
the School Calendar for 1984-85
(FAILED)

A motion by Mrs. Peyser to amend the school calendar for 1984-85 by adding a non-school day for Inauguration Day and extending the school year by one day failed with Dr. Greenblatt and Mrs. Peyser voting in the affirmative; Dr. Cronin, Mr. Ewing, Mrs. Praisner, Mrs. Shannon, and Dr. Shoenberg voting in the negative (Mr. Robertson voting in the negative).

Re: A Motion by Mr. Ewing to Amend the
School Calendar for 1984-85
(FAILED)

A motion by Mr. Ewing to amend the school calendar for 1984-85 by scheduling a non-school day on Friday, October 19, to permit staff members to attend the MSTA Convention failed for lack of a second.

Re: A Motion by Dr. Cronin to Amend
the School Calendar for 1984-85
(FAILED)

A motion by Dr. Cronin to amend the school calendar for 1984-85 by making October 19 a non-school day failed with Dr. Cronin and Mr. Ewing voting in the affirmative; Dr. Greenblatt, Mrs. Peyser, Mrs. Praisner, Mrs. Shannon, and Dr. Shoenberg voting in the negative (Mr. Robertson voting in the negative).

Board members requested additional information on the calendar and proceeded to the next item on the agenda while the information was being prepared.

Re: Monthly Financial Report

Dr. Cody indicated that they were doing a debt analysis of the budget and, if there were steps to be taken, they would be reported to the Board at the next meeting. Mr. Ewing said that as he read the report the Council had set aside \$1 million while the projected deficit was \$1.5 million. Dr. Pitt explained that these were the predictions of the primary account managers and was their best judgment right now. Dr. Shoenberg noted that the set-asides could be applied only in certain categories so the deficit was more than \$.5 million.

Resolution No. 8-84

Re: An Amendment to the School
Calendar for 1984-85

On motion of Dr. Greenblatt seconded by Mrs. Peyser, the following resolution was adopted with Mr. Ewing, Dr. Greenblatt, Mrs. Peyser, Mrs. Shannon, and Dr. Shoenberg voting in the affirmative; Dr. Cronin and Mrs. Praisner voting in the negative (Mr. Robertson voting in the negative):

Resolved, That the school calendar for 1984-85 be amended to make the first day of summer school for students July 6 and the in-service day July 5.

Resolution No. 9-84

Re: School Calendar for 1984-85

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Dr. Greenblatt seconded by Dr. Shoenberg, the following resolution was adopted with Mr. Ewing, Dr. Greenblatt, Mrs. Peyser, Mrs. Shannon, and Dr. Shoenberg voting in the affirmative; Dr. Cronin and Mrs. Praisner voting in the negative (Mr. Robertson voting in the negative):

WHEREAS, The number of duty days for employees is negotiable; and

WHEREAS, For the purposes of planning, budget development, and providing tentative information to parents and staff members, a calendar is needed; and

WHEREAS, If the need arises from negotiations, this calendar can be revised; and

WHEREAS, The establishment of school terms of the County Board of Education is required by state law; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the proposed school calendar for 1984-85 be adopted (as amended), subject to negotiation of the number of duty days.

Resolution No. 10-84

Re: Monthly Personnel Report

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Dr. Shoenberg seconded by Dr. Cronin, the following resolution was adopted unanimously:

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

Resolution No. 11-84

Re: Personnel Reassignment

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Dr. Shoenberg seconded by Dr. Cronin, the following resolution was adopted unanimously:

Resolved, That the following personnel reassignment be approved:

Name	From	To
Leverenz, Carl H.	A & S Teacher On Leave M-10	Special Education Instruc- tional Assistant Westland Intermediate Will maintain present salary level January 3, 1984

Resolution No. 12-84

Re: Extension of Sick Leave

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Dr. Shoenberg seconded by Dr. Cronin, the following resolution was adopted unanimously:

WHEREAS, The employees listed below have suffered serious illness; and

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

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

Name	Position and Location	No. of Days
Bradbury, Violet L.	Bus Operator Area III	30
Riggs, James E.	Building Service Worker Wootton High School	30

Resolution No. 13-84

Re: Death of Mrs. Edith C. Blackman,
Counselor at Tilden Intermediate
School

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Dr. Shoenberg seconded by Dr. Cronin, the following resolution was adopted unanimously:

WHEREAS, The death on January 1, 1984, of Mrs. Edith C. Blackman, counselor at Tilden Intermediate School, has deeply saddened the staff and members of the Board of Education; and

WHEREAS, In the more than twenty-one years that Mrs. Blackman had been a member of the staff of the Montgomery County Public Schools, she had become the consummate professional; and

WHEREAS, Mrs. Blackman's experience and competency added a special dimension to the total guidance and school program; now therefore be it

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

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

Resolution No. 14-84

Re: Death of Mrs. Eleanor P. Clements,
Bus Attendant, Special Education,

Division of Transportation

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Dr. Shoenberg seconded by Dr. Cronin, the following resolution was adopted unanimously:

WHEREAS, The death on December 30, 1983, of Mrs. Eleanor P. Clements, bus attendant, special education, in the Division of Transportation, has deeply saddened the staff and members of the Board of Education; and

WHEREAS, Mrs. Clements had been a loyal employee of Montgomery County Public Schools for over fifteen years; and

WHEREAS, Mrs. Clements' dedication to her job was recognized by students, staff, and the community; now therefore be it

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

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

Resolution No. 15-84 Re: Death of Ms. Pat C. Frankel,
Classroom Teacher on Leave,
Monocacy Elementary School

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Dr. Shoenberg seconded by Dr. Cronin, the following resolution was adopted unanimously:

WHEREAS, The death on December 18, 1983, of Ms. Pat C. Frankel, a classroom teacher on leave from Monocacy Elementary School, has deeply saddened the staff and members of the Board of Education; and

WHEREAS, In the short time Ms. Frankel had been a member of the staff of Montgomery County Public Schools, she had developed good communication and rapport with students, parents, and staff; and

WHEREAS, Ms. Frankel had established high standards and earned the respect of her colleagues; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the members of the Board of Education express their sorrow at the death of Ms. Pat C. Frankel and extend deepest sympathy to her family; and be it further

Resolved, That this resolution be made part of the minutes of this meeting and a copy be forwarded to her family.

Resolution No. 16-84 Re: Death of Mrs. Kitty K. Turner,
Classroom Teacher on Leave from
Tilden Intermediate

adopted unanimously:

Resolved, That the following personnel transfer and appointments be approved:

Transfer	From	To
Ann Meyer	Principal Gaithersburg High	Principal Bethesda-Chevy Chase High Effective March 1, 1984
Appointment	Present Position	As
John M. Burley	Teacher, Grade 4 Twinbrook Elementary School	Administrative Assistant to Associate Superintendent Office of Instruction and Program Development Grade M Effective January 17, 1984
Rosemary Peterson	Financial Planning Law and Associates Bethesda, Maryland	School Psychologist Related Services Team Base: Stephen Knolls School Grade G Effective January 23, 1984

Re: Staff Response to the Report of
Superintendent's Advisory
Committee on the Education of the
Gifted and Talented

Dr. Waveline Starnes, educational planner for gifted and talented, stated that the response was the staff's attempt to respond to the recommendations of the committee.

Mrs. Shannon noted that there were five or six recommendations which indicated a need for funds which amounted to close to \$2 million. She asked whether recommendations dealing with cost had been addressed. Mrs. Starnes replied that they had submitted several of these as "wish" items to Dr. Cody, and she thought that her largest "wish" item had been granted this year. She did wish that they could increase the TAPESTRY program to the 22 schools.

Mrs. Peyser inquired about the hours of training needed to implement

the honors program. Dr. Starnes replied that they had included 12 hours in the budget with a half-day of follow-up for teachers. For administrative training, they were running different types of courses. Mrs. Peyser asked for a paper explaining the basis on which they arrived at the number of days and the reasons for such training. In regard to transportation to magnets in Areas 1 and 3, she reported that she planned to introduce a resolution in the budget for Lakewood and Cannon Road. She was concerned about gifted students having to change schools so many times.

Mr. Ewing inquired about the initial results of the assessment of the TAPESTRY program. Dr. Starnes replied that they did not have the results but would be looking at them this year. She explained that one of her priorities was to look at gifted and talented students in the performing arts as well as academic subjects. Mrs. Praisner commented that if they could not expand the TAPESTRY program there were ways of expanding knowledge of the program. Dr. Starnes explained that part of the program design included in-service training which would be offered this spring. Mr. Ewing reported that he had received a call from the former president of the Taxpayers League who supported giving students opportunities to participate in the arts.

Dr. Shoenberg recalled that several weeks ago Mr. Ewing had raised the question of whether they ought to provide activities for anyone if they could only provide certain activities for some students. In the area of programs for the gifted and talented, they had gone through a process of doing a little bit here and there. They had all felt they did not have a program that was coordinated, and he wondered whether they wanted to continue this process. Dr. Starnes replied that most of the programs implemented did not start with every school. She, too, was concerned about the issue of equity because there was no way to have a program like TAPESTRY in every school. Dr. Shoenberg commented that they started a pilot, went a step beyond, and were cut off in mid-course. For this reason, it was difficult to have good articulation from level to level. He wished there were some way all of this could be pulled together.

Dr. Cronin remarked that in the area of computers they could see a five-year plan, the steps to implement, and the cost of that implementation. Dr. Starnes indicated that they did have a plan which was submitted in 1980; however, they were not always on schedule with that plan.

Mrs. Shannon recalled that sometime ago she had requested a comparison performance on standardized tests between students in gifted and talented programs and those who were not. Dr. Kathleen Hebbeler, coordinator of research/ statistics, replied that there were 12 schools in this study, and the results would be available next year. Dr. Cody asked whether they would be able to get a matched set of students to compare, and Dr. Frankel replied that there were too many students who turned down the program. Therefore, they were now doing a lot of observations in the program to find out what exactly was going on. Dr. Greenblatt had heard

that a lot of individualized testing was going on in the Burning Tree program. Dr. Starnes replied that this year they would spend in excess of \$6,000 for testing for the three gifted programs. Dr. Greenblatt requested a specific dollar figure on this testing. Dr. Starnes explained that now that they had an extensive testing program there were fewer placement appeals.

Mrs. Praisner suggested that as the Board went through the budget process it would be useful for the committee to provide items and recommendations to the Board.

Re: Annual Report of the Counseling
and Guidance Committee

Mrs. Susan Goldstein stated that the committee was grateful that the Board had authorized a study of guidance services. She said that the committee would like to reemphasize its recommendations listed at the end of its report. Dr. Cronin noted that the committee was calling for the reorganization of central office guidance support services and establishment of a Department of Pupil Services. He asked whether this would be expanded to serve students with special needs. Mrs. Elizabeth Arnold replied that it would. Dr. Darryl Laramore, supervisor of guidance, explained that Montgomery County was the only district in Maryland without a division of pupil service. Dr. Cronin inquired about the recommendations and next year's budget. Dr. Pitt replied that the questions raised in this report were raised last year, which was one of the reasons why a study was recommended. He agreed there needed to be a different organization; however, the problem was they were not going to have the answers in time for next year's budget.

Mrs. Praisner asked whether they had done an assessment of the impact of the loss of the guidance specialist. Dr. Laramore replied that there was a concern regarding the eight new elementary school counselors. The peer counseling project had deteriorated because there was no one to train the counselors. Ms. Kathy McGuire, counselor, added that she had felt the loss of the specialist because she did not have a resource she could call upon. In response to Dr. Cronin's question as to why elementary school counselors were needed, Ms. McGuire replied that in schools with over 500 children, they couldn't see all the children recommended by teachers or parents or by children themselves. She added that they saw the counseling role at the elementary level as different from secondary schools dealing with direct services to children.

Mr. Ewing thought the objective of providing at least one counselor in each elementary school was one the Board ought to pursue. He asked, if the Board continued to piecemeal it, did they have the right number of pieces for next year and were they satisfied with the criteria being used to assign those additional increments to schools. Mrs. Goldstein said they were satisfied with the pieces as opposed to none at all and they realized the budgetary process. They were pleased that ten new elementary counselors were being suggested for next year but had some concern with 300 being the

number for each counselor because it was overwhelming in terms of seeing children on a regular basis. Dr. Laramore stated they were still satisfied with the criteria for assignment of additional counselors, and Mrs. Arnold added that they were actually gratified with the number of counselors assigned.

Mrs. Shannon noted that the report gave all of what the counselors do and she asked for an evaluation of the effectiveness of the four-year education plan. Dr. Laramore responded that assessments were that in the junior high schools it was "hit and run" and that it fell apart primarily at the junior high level. He added that the handbook was prepared by junior/middle school counselors so that eighth graders and their parents would have an outline of the steps necessary in the four-year plan.

Mrs. Praisner asked if there was a way they could summarize more than by topic, or what areas were more of a priority or issue. Dr. Laramore replied that it was based on end-of-year reports for the guidance committee and they were only given topics, but by contacting the school and asking what happened they could flush these out. Mrs. Praisner noted she always found the local school guidance minutes very interesting and very useful and asked what the advisory committee was doing with that information. Dr. Laramore said there were two guidance advisory committee workshops to which all members of the local GACs were invited, and the agenda was a result of concerns or things that came out of GAC reports.

Mr. Robertson questioned what "outside referrals" meant in the second recommendation which asked for a revision of the MCPS mental health policy. Dr. Laramore explained that if a student or parent asked a counselor who to go to for family counseling, at the present time the counselor was not supposed to say anything but only give the parents a listing of community mental health referral services.

Mrs. Praisner asked how that had been arrived at, and Dr. Pitt responded that there had been many meetings with the Mental Health Advisory Committee about the issue of whether counselors ought to be mental health professionals or ought to be limited more. Finally there was agreement by the Board and staff and they came up with a policy that does limit the definition.

Dr. Greenblatt raised the issue of the college admissions seminar. Her feeling was that it is the weakest area of the school system, that it is left up to parents and that to parents recommendations for college are the most critical aspect of guidance. Mrs. Goldstein noted they were asking for more support for counselors at all levels in the areas of administration and support. There was no time to develop other areas because there was so much paper work to be done.

Dr. Greenblatt noted that not many people were involved in GAC meetings and that a vast amount of students and parents had no contact with the advisory committee. She asked what the school system was doing to contact parents, to see that proper information

was given to them, and that better efforts were made at the secondary level for college counseling. Dr. Laramore agreed that they were not doing enough. He noted that counselors had been denied professional leave when they were willing to pay their own expenses to visit colleges. Dr. Greenblatt asked whether there wasn't a way to have informal contact with colleges at the College Fair. Mrs. Arnold explained that they wanted to support the idea of getting more counselors in attendance.

Dr. Greenblatt asked if each school had someone who was a specialist in college counseling. Dr. Laramore replied that each school had someone coordinating this activity and this position might rotate. He thought that all counselors should have rapport with college admissions personnel. There was a possibility of contact at the College Fair, but he felt counselors needed more than that.

Mrs. Peyser remarked that the handbook was an improvement. One part of the handbook compared transcripts of two youngsters and one was illegible. She thought the handbook information was critical for eight graders and should not wait until the eleventh grade. She said that the college application process was not discussed in great detail and suggested that college admissions counselors could write out a page of suggestions. She hoped that the next booklet would be written by the college admissions counselors, and Dr. Laramore explained that the current one had been. He added that the eighth grade booklet did include some of the same information.

Dr. Cronin asked for specifics on leave denials for counselors. He inquired about the final recommendation on the development of a program. Mrs. Goldstein replied that the Board had expressed concern about the lack of consistency regarding guidance services. Dr. Laramore reported that when the state had conducted on-site reviews it was agreed that MCPS would have a specific handbook at each level for the guidance program. These handbooks would be done during the summer, he explained that it did have budget implications and agreed to provide a paper.

In regard to professional level, Dr. Pitt explained that there was a problem with people having classroom responsibilities and those like media specialists and counselors who did not. He said that they would have to look into the situation.

Dr. Shoenberg remarked that he was concerned about everyone having a clear understanding of the role of the guidance counselor from the counselor's point of view. The recommendations had to do with professional and organizational concerns, and he thought it was important to make the distinction between counseling and information-giving duties. Counselors too often got bogged down in information giving which aides might do just as well. They should think about using counselors in ways for which they were trained. Dr. Laramore added that the career information technician was an attempt to provide information-giving services. Dr. Shoenberg thought there were other routine duties that could be handed in this way as well. He hoped that some of this would come out in the

Resolved, That the Board of Education urges the Montgomery County Delegation to return to the original wording of MC 421.

Re: A Motion by Mr. Ewing Regarding
the Proposed Ordinance on Reuse of
Public Schools

Mr. Ewing moved and Dr. Cronin seconded that the Board take a position in support of Mr. Scull's proposed ordinance on reuse of public schools.

Resolution No. 22-84 Re: Substitute Motion by Dr. Cronin
Regarding the Scull Proposal

On motion of Dr. Cronin seconded by Mrs. Shannon, the following resolution was adopted with Dr. Cronin, Mr. Ewing, Dr. Greenblatt, Mrs. Praisner, Mrs. Shannon, and Dr. Shoenberg voting in the affirmative; Mrs. Peyser abstaining (Mr. Robertson voting in the affirmative):

Resolved, That Mr. Ewing's proposed motion on the Scull proposed ordinance on the reuse of closed public schools be deferred until January 18.

Resolution No. 23-84 Re: Policy BLB - Rules of Procedure in
Contested Matters

On motion of Mr. Ewing seconded by Dr. Cronin, the following resolution was adopted with Dr. Cronin, Mr. Ewing, Dr. Greenblatt, Mrs. Praisner, Mrs. Shannon, and Dr. Shoenberg voting in the affirmative; Mrs. Peyser being temporarily absent (Mr. Robertson voting in the affirmative):

Resolved, That BLB - Rules of Procedure in Contest Matters be corrected as follows:

- Page 1: 2nd Resolved - "563-745" should read "563-74"
2.a) "proceed" should read "proceedings"
2.c)(3) add a comma after "Complaints" and a semicolon
after Nonresident Students" so that it reads:
"Transfer of Students,
Community Involvement-Inquiries and Complaints, Tuition for
Resident and Nonresident Students; and appeals heard within
the sole discretion of the Board, ..."
- Page 2: 4.a) "act upon appeal" should read "act upon an appeal"
4.d) "with 10 days" should read "within 10 days"
- Page 4: 5.a)(3) "such importance of" should read "such importance
to"
5.c) (A) and (B) should read (a) and (b)
- Page 5: 6.i)(1) "He shall" should read "The Presiding Officer

shall"

Page 6: 6.i)(4) "He may" should read "The Presiding Officer may"
6.1) "hearings" should be singular "hearing"
6.m)(3) "as he considers" should read "as the Presiding
Officer considers"

Resolution No. 24-84 Re: Policy BLB - Rules of Procedure in
Contested Matters

On motion of Mr. Ewing seconded by Dr. Cronin, the following resolution was adopted with Dr. Cronin, Mr. Ewing, Dr. Greenblatt, Mrs. Praisner, Mrs. Shannon, and Dr. Shoenberg voting in the affirmative; Mrs. Peyser being temporarily absent (Mr. Robertson voting in the affirmative):

Resolved, That the following changes be made in BLB - Rules of Procedure in Contested Matters:

Page 5: 6.e)(2) Delete subparagraph (2) and insert:
"(2) An accurate record of all hearings, disputes, or controversies shall be kept by the county superintendent in order that, if an appeal is taken, the record shall be submitted.
"(3) Unless waived by all the parties, a stenographic record of that part of the proceedings which involves the presentation of evidence shall be made at the expense of the county board of education. The record need not be transcribed, however, unless requested by a party to the controversy, by the local superintendent, by the local board, by the State Superintendent, or by the State Board, as the case may be. The cost of any typewritten transcript of any proceedings, or part of proceedings, shall be paid by the party of entity requesting it."

Resolution No. 25-84 Re: Policy BLB - Rules of Procedure in
Contested Matters

On motion of Mr. Ewing seconded by Dr. Cronin, the following resolution was adopted with Dr. Cronin, Mr. Ewing, Mrs. Praisner, Mrs. Shannon, and Dr. Shoenberg voting in the affirmative; Dr. Greenblatt and Mrs. Peyser abstaining (Mr. Robertson voting in the affirmative):

Resolved, That Policy BLB - Rules of Procedure in Contested Matters be amended by the following:

Page 6: Insert a new subparagraph p) as follows:
p) Rehearings.
(1) A party aggrieved by the decision and order rendered in the particular case may apply for rehearing within 30 days after service on him of the decision and order. Action on the application shall lie in the discretion of

the Board.

(2) Unless otherwise ordered, neither the hearing nor the application for a rehearing shall stay the enforcement of the order, or excuse the persons affected by it for failure to comply with its terms.

(3) The Board, on rehearing, may consider facts not presented in the original hearing, including facts arising after the date of the original hearing, and may by new order abrogate, change, or modify its original order. Change the old subparagraph p) to subparagraph q).

Re: Appeals and Contested Matters

Mr. Thomas Fess, ombudsman/staff assistant, called attention to the letter from the Board's attorney suggesting possible amendments to increase the flexibility of the Board with regard to hearing procedures. Dr. Greenblatt asked whether they were referring to the fact that the Board said they wanted a different procedure to approve an appeal without going through the hearing process. Mr. Charles Reese, Board attorney, said that section 2(c)(3) intended to permit the Board to do that. Mr. Ewing suggested that Mr. Reese draw up a specific proposal for Board consideration, and Mr. Reese agreed to draft procedures. Mr. Ewing asked that the procedures permit the Board to make a decision on the written record. Dr. Shoenberg pointed out that the problem came in regarding material submitted at the lower levels of the appeal. Mrs. Praisner asked that any procedures prepared also change the policy in other sections as needed.

Re: Board Member Comments

1. Mr. Ewing reported that he had attending two meetings on Child Care on January 5 and 7. He would provide the Board with copies of his notes and materials distributed at the meetings. He said there were a number of recommendations for policies and budget issues, and he would urge the Board to look at the materials.

2. Mrs. Peyser stated that the Board had received the class size report, and there were about 100 classes over the maximum at the senior high school level. However, there were a number of very small nonacademic classes. She asked what was going to be done about this. Dr. Pitt replied that it had compared the report with last year's, and there were a number of reasons for the class sizes. There were more students than projected, and Area 1 had less than anticipated. He agreed to send Board members an analysis of the situation, and he thought they could improve on class size. Mrs. Peyser asked that he encourage principals to offer courses every other year.

3. Mrs. Praisner stated that the facilities policy called for alternatives submitted by the community to be given to the superintendent. Board members would receive all alternatives in one packet at the end of the process. However, an issue had developed because one of the alternatives submitted requested a response from

the Board on other matters. In the future, staff would copy the alternatives and submit them to the president for review.

4. Mrs. Praisner had received a number of requests from the community to meet with them regarding their alternatives. She was not planning to meet with the community because the Board did have an established hearing process.

5. Mrs. Praisner announced that she would have office hours in the Board Office on Friday mornings from 9 to 11:30 except when the ICB was meeting.

Resolution No. 26-84

Re: Appointments to the Audit
Committee

On motion of Dr. Shoenberg seconded by Mrs. Peyser, the following resolution was adopted with Dr. Cronin, Mr. Ewing, Mrs. Peyser, Mrs. Praisner, Mrs. Shannon, and Dr. Shoenberg voting in the affirmative; Dr. Greenblatt being temporarily absent (Mr. Robertson voting in the affirmative):

WHEREAS, On September 13, 1978, the Board of Education passed a resolution creating an Audit Committee, which was given responsibilities for reviewing internal audit reports, meeting with the external auditors to discuss the scope of their work and their audit findings, and reviewing reports generated by the Department of Financial Services; and

WHEREAS, Regular meetings of the Audit Committee are held quarterly, and special meetings may be called by the chairperson or at the request of either of the other members to the chairperson; and

WHEREAS, The Audit Committee, appointed by the president of the Board of Education, consists of three members serving staggered terms of three years each, and the term of office begins on the date of the first all-day Board meeting in December of the year of appointment and ends three years later on November 30; and

WHEREAS, Mr. Blair Ewing has served for three years, Mrs. Suzanne Peyser for two years and Mrs. Odessa Shannon for one year on the committee; and

WHEREAS, Eligibility for appointment to the Audit Committee is limited to members of the Board of Education whose remaining terms of office with the Board are equal to or greater than the terms for which they are appointed on the Audit Committee; now therefore be it Resolved, That Mrs. Shannon be reappointed to the Audit Committee to serve her second year; and be it further

Resolved, That Dr. James Cronin be appointed to the Audit Committee to serve until November 30, 1986; and be it further

Resolved, That Mrs. Marilyn Praisner be appointed to serve the remaining term of Mrs. Peyser until November 30, 1984; and be it

further

Resolved, That Mrs. Shannon serve as the chairperson of the committee until November 30, 1984.

Resolution No. 27-84 Re: Minutes of October 11 and 24,
November 8, 21, 22, and 28, 1983

On motion of Dr. Shoenberg seconded by Mrs. Peyser, the following resolution was adopted with Dr. Cronin, Mr. Ewing, Mrs. Peyser, Mrs. Praisner, Mrs. Shannon, and Dr. Shoenberg voting in the affirmative; Dr. Greenblatt being temporarily absent:

Resolved, That the minutes of the Board of Education be approved as follows:

October 11, 1983
October 24, 1983 (as corrected)
November 8, 1983 (as corrected)
November 21, 1983
November 22, 1983
November 28, 1983 (as corrected)

Resolution No. 28-84 Re: BOE CASE 1983-37

On motion of Dr. Shoenberg seconded by Mrs. Peyser, the following resolution was adopted with Dr. Cronin, Mrs. Peyser, Mrs. Praisner, Mrs. Shannon, and Dr. Shoenberg voting in the affirmative; Mr. Ewing voting in the negative; Dr. Greenblatt being temporarily absent (Mr. Robertson voting in the affirmative):

Resolved, That the Board of Education deny BOE Case 1983-37 (transportation) and sustain the recommendation of the superintendent.

Resolution No. 29-84 Re: BOE Case 1983-41

On motion of Dr. Shoenberg seconded by Dr. Cronin, the following resolution was adopted with Dr. Cronin, Mr. Ewing, Mrs. Praisner, Mrs. Shannon, and Dr. Shoenberg voting in the affirmative; Mrs. Peyser voting in the negative; Dr. Greenblatt being temporarily absent (Mr. Robertson voting in the affirmative):

Resolved, That the Board of Education deny BOE Case 1983-41 (student transfer) and sustain the recommendation of the superintendent.

For the record, Mrs. Peyser stated that she did not feel a child should be denied a transfer to another school based on his or her skin color.

Dr. Shoenberg assumed the chair.

Resolution No. 30-84 Re: Policy on Recognizing MCPS Staff
and Student Achievement

On motion of Mrs. Praisner seconded by Mrs. Shannon, the following resolution was adopted with Dr. Cronin, Mr. Ewing, Mrs. Praisner, Mrs. Shannon, and Dr. Shoenberg voting in the affirmative; Mrs. Peyser voting in the negative; Dr. Greenblatt being temporarily absent (Mr. Robertson voting in the affirmative):

WHEREAS, On February 8, 1983, the Board of Education adopted a policy on recognizing MCPS staff and student achievements; and

WHEREAS, This policy establishes the practice of recognizing students' and employees' outstanding achievements at "monthly evening business meetings"; and

WHEREAS, The Board of Education recently adopted a framework for Board business meetings with an emphasis on Board priorities, facilities, budget, and negotiations; and

WHEREAS, It would be desirable to have the latitude to schedule special meetings to recognize staff and students or, time permitting, to include this ceremony at a business meeting; now therefore be it

Resolved, That Resolution 103-83, dated February 8, 1983, on recognizing MCPS staff and student achievements be amended to delete "regular business" from the second WHEREAS clause and "monthly evening business" from the first Resolved clause.

Re: A Motion by Mrs. Praisner
Regarding Student Performing
Groups

Mrs. Praisner moved and Dr. Shoenberg seconded the following:
Resolved, That the Board remove from the all-day Board meeting the time set aside for student performances.

Re: A Substitute Motion by Mrs. Peyser
on Opening Exercises

Mrs. Peyser moved a substitute motion that the Board begin each business meeting with a prayer as did all other legislative bodies. Mr. Ewing seconded the motion.

Dr. Shoenberg moved the motion out of order. Mrs. Peyser appealed the ruling of the chair. Dr. Cronin, Mr. Ewing, Mrs. Praisner, Mrs. Shannon, and Dr. Shoenberg supported the ruling of the chair (Mr. Robertson supported the ruling of the chair).

Resolution No. 31-84 Re: Student Performing Groups

On motion of Mrs. Praisner seconded by Dr. Shoenberg, the following resolution was adopted with Dr. Cronin, Mr. Ewing, Mrs. Praisner, and Mrs. Shannon voting in the affirmative; Dr. Greenblatt, Mrs. Peyser, and Dr. Shoenberg voting in the negative (Mr. Robertson abstaining):

Resolved, That the Board remove from the all-day Board meeting the time set aside for student performances.

Re: New Business

1. Mrs. Peyser moved and Dr. Greenblatt seconded the following:

WHEREAS, Research has shown that the single most reliable indicator of student achievement is homework; and

WHEREAS, The current K-8 Policy includes the requirement that homework be assigned 3-5 times a week; and

WHEREAS, Practice, drill and review outside of class are necessary to reinforce what is taught in class; and

WHEREAS, Research has shown that the more time spent on learning, the more learning will take place, and daily homework can increase student time spent on learning by 10%, 20%, 50% or more; and

WHEREAS, There is not enough time in class for students to thoroughly master all the skills, concepts and knowledge of an academic subject; and

WHEREAS, Students learn to be more independent when they are given opportunities to follow directions and complete assignments outside of class; and

WHEREAS, Daily homework gives students the opportunity to develop self-discipline, which is necessary for success in jobs and college; and

WHEREAS, Regular homework provides more opportunities for creativity and enriches the learning that takes place during the school day; and

WHEREAS, Good study habits are developed when students read and research material, write essays, review lessons, and study for tests at home; and

WHEREAS, There is greater continuity of learning when homework serves as a carry-over from the lessons of one day to the lessons of the next day, and there is a day-to-day sense of purpose in that kind of learning; and

WHEREAS, Daily homework improves communication between the home and school, parents have an understanding of the work their children are doing, a check on their children's progress, and an opportunity to assist their children in their studies; now therefore be it

Resolved, That in the academic subjects, grades 9-12, homework (to be done outside of class) will be assigned 3-5 times a week, and the length and type of assignment will be determined by the individual

teacher and should include a variety of activities: reading, writing, review, drill, short-term and long-term projects, etc., depending on the subject; and be it further

Resolved, That the above resolution be included in the MCPS Homework Policy and the MCPS Senior High Policy.

2. Mr. Ewing moved and Mrs. Shannon seconded the following:

WHEREAS, The students at Takoma Park Junior High School achieved the highest passing rate on the Maryland Functional Math Test administered in the fall of 1983; and

WHEREAS, They also made the greatest gains of any school in the county; and

WHEREAS, The results are evidence of what extraordinary accomplishments are possible when the principal, staff, students and parents all join hands to achieve a good result; and

WHEREAS, This accomplishment demonstrates that major gains are possible in schools with high proportions of minority students; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Montgomery County Board of Education congratulates the students, parents, staff and principal of Takoma Park Junior High School and acknowledges their extraordinary accomplishment; and be it further

Resolved, That the lessons learned from the Takoma Park Junior High School achievement be distilled and made available so that other schools may benefit from what was done to make this accomplishment possible.

Re: An Amendment to the Motion on
Takoma Park Junior High School

Dr. Greenblatt moved and Mrs. Peyser seconded that the motion on Takoma Park be amended to award \$500 for educational purposes within the school to Takoma Park Junior in recognition of their accomplishments.

Resolution No. 32-84 Re: Postponing the Amendment to the
Motion on Takoma Park Junior High
School

On motion of Mr. Ewing seconded by Mrs. Shannon, the following resolution was adopted with Dr. Cronin, Mr. Ewing, Mrs. Praisner, Mrs. Shannon, and Dr. Shoenberg voting in the affirmative; Dr. Greenblatt and Mrs. Peyser voting in the negative (Mr. Robertson voting in the negative):

Resolved, That the proposed amendment to the motion of Takoma Park Junior High School be postponed until a policy is in place.

Resolution No. 33-84

Re: Takoma Park Junior High School

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

WHEREAS, The students at Takoma Park Junior High School achieved the highest passing rate on the Maryland Functional Math Test administered in the fall of 1983; and

WHEREAS, They also made the greatest gains of any school in the county; and

WHEREAS, The results are evidence of what extraordinary accomplishments are possible when the principal, staff, students and parents all join hands to achieve a good result; and

WHEREAS, This accomplishment demonstrates that major gains are possible in schools with high proportions of minority students; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Montgomery County Board of Education congratulates the students, parents, staff and principal of Takoma Park Junior High School and acknowledges their extraordinary accomplishment; and be it further

Resolved, That the lessons learned from the Takoma Park Junior High School achievement be distilled and made available so that other schools may benefit from what was done to make this accomplishment possible.

3. Dr. Greenblatt moved and Mrs. Peyser seconded the following:

WHEREAS, The United States Department of Education has rewarded excellent schools across this nation; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Board of Education of Montgomery County will establish an awards program for excellent schools within Montgomery County.

Re: Items of Information

Board members received the following items of information:

Items in Process
Construction Progress Report

Re: Adjournment

The president adjourned the meeting at 5:55 p.m.

President

Secretary

WSC:mlw