

they had employed 272. He said that 369 people had been reassigned, and about one third of those were people returning from leave. The others were teachers from Peary and from other schools with shifting enrollments. They had provided about 40 portable classrooms this year which was up considerably from previous years and was a reflection of the movement of student population.

In regard to the magnet schools, Dr. Cody indicated that at Takoma Park Junior High School 110 students had transferred in, and 70 plus were from outside of the cluster. Chevy Chase Elementary was holding its own, and North Chevy Chase was about 15 students over projection. They had forecast 283 at Rosemary Hills and had 338 students already. He reported that there were not many transportation problems. They got youngsters to school, fed them, and taught them, and he thought the Board should be pleased with the beginning of school because education in Montgomery County got off to a good start.

Dr. Pitt commented that at Rosemary Hills it was 50 percent minority and 50 percent majority. They would have more information when they had the tenth day enrollment, but right now kindergarten was over projections and at the secondary level they had 600 more students than projected. He had placed additional staff in the critical situations. They expected to make the class size report available after September 20.

Dr. Shoenberg asked whether the increase in enrollment might create a situation where they would have to request additional funds, and Dr. Pitt replied that this might be a possibility. Dr. Shoenberg asked if there were particular areas of the curriculum where there were teacher shortages. Dr. Pitt replied that at the moment they did not have any shortages but were having difficulty in obtaining part-time math and science teachers. However, in a year or two math and science would be difficult areas.

Dr. Cronin asked whether some areas were impacted more than others, and Dr. Pitt replied that upcounty was more crowded but the overages were countywide. Mrs. Praisner requested information on the situations at Springbrook and Kennedy. She recalled that the portables were placed at those schools by the request of the community. Dr. Pitt replied that at Springbrook the community had asked for a ninth grade in the high school, and they knew it was going to be crowded. For example, last year on the first day they had 2878 students in the junior and senior high schools, and this year it was 2870 in the two schools.

* Mrs. Peyser joined the meeting at this point.

Miss Duby asked whether there was a trend in underpredicting elementary school students. Dr. Cody explained that there was a turnaround in population which made predicting very difficult. Dr. Pitt reported that in January they had asked the planners to take a second look, and they had added 500 students to the projections, but they had missed the kindergarten situation. Dr. Shoenberg asked

whether they could get some idea as to whether or not these kindergarten students were coming out of private schools. Dr. George Fisher, director of planning, indicated that he could try to get some data from a state report on enrollment.

Re: Suspension Data for 1983-84 and
Staff Response to Task Force on
Discipline

Dr. Cody stated that in one sense discipline would always be a concern, but it was not the problem in Montgomery County as compared with other school systems. He agreed that they did have students misbehaving and problems did occur from time to time; however, they were concerned about another problem. It was not the frequency of the incidents, but the penalties they were meting out and the discrepancies between percentages of minority and majority students being suspended. He reported that Dr. Pitt and principals had discussed the problem and looked at ways of addressing this. Where suspensions had been high or discrepancies existed, there had been directives to principals to discuss this with their staffs and come up with their own ideas to solve the problem. He explained that in almost every case when a student was suspended, he or she did something. He said that this was a fundamental question of what caused young people to react in certain ways, and that was much more complicated for them to deal with. He suggested that as a school system they had to look beyond the act of suspending a student and look into the environment in which they were educating young people to see whether there were preventive measures. It needed to be dealt with on two levels, and they were proceeding to do so. Dr. Pitt was convinced that area superintendents working with principals recognized the problem. The situation had been discussed in depth with specific schools, and he felt that the response from principals was good. Mrs. Praisner remarked that they were talking about two things, dealing with what caused a student to act in a certain way and the differences as far as percentages. They were talking about assurances that behavior was treated the same way in different schools, and they should discuss ways staff and communities could work together so that there would be some understanding that equity was involved as well.

Dr. Cody agreed that they had to look at the questions of equity and cause and effect. He said there were certain conditions and ways of acting toward students of different races that exacerbated the situation. They had to look at equity and whether or not the same offense received the same treatment.

Mrs. Shannon remarked that she was glad to hear two words, "equity" and "prevention." She made the following statement for the record:

"If discipline is a problem it should be addressed. No one is saying that teachers should have to have disruptive students in the class, but the statistics speak for themselves and appear to suggest that some students are being subjected to disciplinary actions on the basis of other than their actions. When you look

at the summary sheet alone, where not only are the suspensions of the minority students across the board double that of the white students, but it is going up. It is increasing. So we are not addressing the situation at all. Whereas, the number of white suspensions is pretty steady.

"So we are talking about an issue of equity. Are white students doing exactly the same things as black students but not being disciplined for it, and that's where we don't have a handle on what is going on at the local school. We can very well evaluate those actions which are brought to the attention of the superintendent or the Board, and in many instances the actions are merited, but equity goes not to the merit of the situation but is everyone treated exactly the same for the same offense. In some way we have to get a handle on that which is at the local school level.

"A second comment which goes to prevention. As I read the staff report on student behavior and discipline, there is a recommendation for alternative programs and an A-team of some sort. I think with these recommendations we will still end up with the same problem. Because where you have alternative programs, students will still be referred to those alternative programs, and there is a potential for abuse based on the same criteria. Are referrals based on strictly behavior, or does race also enter into it? As far as the A-team, it is a plan for action when a problem has been identified. It is not a plan for prevention, and somehow I need to see the school system address the point of why these suspensions are taking place.

"The third thing that I need to say is I have a feeling, I don't have the data here, that we are primarily talking about black male students. The suspensions are by race, and then they are by sex. I need to know what is happening to the black male students in our school system, and if the black male student does represent the larger proportion of this then we need to find out why. What is it about a black male that is causing this kind of suspension data? Is it reaction to the black male? Is there a strange behavior that the black male exhibits that the white male does not? I don't have those figures here."

Dr. Pitt believed that the great majority of the minority suspensions were male suspensions. He would guess that the great majority of suspensions were male students, both black and white. Mrs. Shannon recalled that in a study she had done some time ago for some reason at about the fourth grade they started having problems with suspension of black male students. She asked that Dr. Frankel look at that and noted that this had been upheld in several other studies. She suggested that if they could catch it at that point they would not have it as a continuous problem.

Dr. Cronin expressed his agreement with remarks that had been made. He requested information on suspensions that were automatic and on those that were discretionary. He asked to see which suspensions

were automatic and which were the discretionaries. Dr. Pitt said that the discipline policy went from minimum to maximum, and there was a county policy on when students had to be suspended. In addition, the local school was to develop its own discipline policy. In some schools, fighting was an automatic suspension. The school discipline committee had discretion in developing that kind of policy. He thought there were other ways of dealing with young people in that situation other than removing them from school. In regard to the staff response to behavior and discipline, Dr. Cronin said that a statement was made that the area associate superintendents will request that all schools provide the time to review discipline concerns. He did not understand why an area superintendent had to "request" and suggested that the word be changed to "direct." In the second recommendation there was mention of alternative programs being a significant budget item. Dr. Cronin asked what was a "significant" budget item and whether they will be seeing this in the next budget. Dr. Pitt thought that these programs needed to be looked at very carefully, and he agreed there did need to be more alternative programs that were not special education. He felt that the area superintendent would be bringing in some recommendations for alternative programs; however, these programs were expensive. He thought that it was very important that the Board have a discussion of alternative programs. Dr. Cronin said he would like to add in-school suspension programs to that discussion.

Dr. Cody noted that the data provided the Board did combine the in-school and out-of-school suspensions. He said that in some schools the data represented both types of disciplinary action, and in some schools there was no in-school suspension because in some schools there was no space and/or staff. He hoped that in the future the information provided the Board would make the distinction between in-school and out-of-school suspensions.

Dr. Cronin thought they did not need a team of professionals going into a school because they did not have that kind of a massive problem. However, the report noted that resources were already available, and he asked whether these resources were significant to do the job. Dr. Pitt explained that where a school might have major problems they believed they had the ability to take a good, hard look at that school. He did not think they needed an A-team. If he was asking whether they had enough support personnel, he indicated that principals and teachers would say they needed more support. Dr. Cody added that the school system had the resources and had in the past pulled together a team of specialists to go into a school with special circumstances. Dr. Pitt commented that when they talked about people to work with youngsters having problems and their parents, they never had enough of those people.

In regard to alternative centers, Miss Duby had heard that adding more centers would open them up to more equity problems. She thought the problem could be addressed by quick identification of these students, but she did not know whether they could do this. She pointed out that they were sending these students to the

administration repeatedly and not using the pupil personnel workers that they were talking about when they had a large school problem. Dr. Pitt replied that there was a big difference between a youngster having some discipline problems and a youngster with very severe problems. He felt that the answer wasn't always taking the youngster and removing him from class. The answer was doing some other things. On the other hand, a small number of youngsters could not operate in a regular school, and this was where alternative programs came in. Miss Duby asked for information on specific offenses for which minority students would be more likely to be suspended. She was curious about whether they were still suspending students for cutting class.

Mrs. Shannon pointed out in all of the discussion they had placed the blame on the student. She said that somewhere along the line they needed to try to find out why students were misbehaving. She reported that she had gone to classes where students had raised their hands and were ignored. She had gone to classes where it appeared that these students were not recognized or encouraged. She thought there was a reaction to that, and in many instances that reaction was a disciplinary problem. She suggested they needed a discussion or to get into the schools to find out the situations that were giving rise to that kind of behavior. Dr. Cody noted that a student with problems didn't necessarily have those problems in every classroom. He also reported that half or more of the incidents leading to suspensions occurred in the hallways and not the classrooms.

Mrs. Peyser recalled that about a year or two ago a survey was taken, and 70 percent of the teachers and administrators responded. One response revealed that over 80 percent of the teachers said that disruptive students were a problem in the classroom. She did not believe that the major problem was in the halls. She believed there were students in many classrooms who were causing the teachers to have to take time away from teaching and taking students' time away from learning. If the teacher sent the student to the administration, the students were returned to the classroom with no improvement in their behavior. She asked whether they were rewarding these youngsters by letting them leave class. She felt that they continued to reward them by sending them to alternative schools where they were in very small classes. They spent twice as much money on educating these students who had no handicap simply because they chose to misbehave. She suggested that the 90 percent of the regular students should be getting the attention these students were receiving. The numerous adults in the schools and in the area office should be able to give their attention to the students mentioned by Mrs. Shannon, but instead they were giving their attention to the students who were misbehaving. She hoped that this year's budget would contain more in-school suspension programs and smaller class sizes where all the students could get the attention they deserved.

Mrs. Praisner suggested that this subject be discussed with the community and staff. She was encouraged by the fact that they were

discussing this issue and not ignoring it. She assumed that they would continue to discuss this and would see some information from the superintendent on the results of discussions with principals. She also anticipated that they would return to the issue of alternative programs as they got closer to the budget. She hoped that they would see information on numbers of schools with in-school suspension programs and on numbers that could have it if budget allocations were there. She asked that Board members put any other questions in writing.

Re: Honors Program Study

Mrs. Praisner noted that she and Miss Duby had provided memos on this topic. She asked about whether students receiving C's were being counseled out of honors classes. Dr. Lois Martin, associate superintendent, explained that they were still in pilot implementation. The original guidelines did state this, and almost immediately they realized they had a problem because they had advanced level courses which were one of a kind and there was no place for the student to go. On the other hand, in some courses they had honors-level work, and the student could transfer to the regular course. Therefore, they recommended counseling and reassignment for students in honors-level work courses but not for the student in the advanced level, French V or Calculus.

Dr. Waveline Starnes, educational planner for the gifted and talented, stated that in general they felt that honors work should result in A's and B's. For any student getting a C, they would want to look at whether there were ways to improve to get an A or B. Mrs. Shannon asked what would be the equivalent grade in a regular course to a C in honors. Dr. Martin replied that now a C would be equivalent in grade/point averages and class rank. Mrs. Shannon explained that she was not going to the issue of whether the grade was weighted or not. She was going to the issue of a student with a C being asked to leave an honors program. She asked whether a C in honors was the same as a B regular and, if so, why were they telling the student to get out of honors. She thought that being in an honors program allowed students to do better on the SATs which compensated for the class rank.

Mrs. Praisner did not see anything wrong with getting a C in an honors course because that meant average work. Dr. Shoenberg said he would draw an analogy to graduate courses, where if a student got anything less than a B that was tantamount to failing the course. It was his understanding that they were trying to give the grades in honors courses that equated to grades in other courses so that the great majority of students would get A's and B's. Getting a grade below a B in an honors course would be equivalent to getting less than a B in a graduate course.

Miss Duby had a problem with the way they were explaining this issue to students. It was her understanding that the policy was to benefit those students who were not doing well and who should be told that they have an option. But while they were trying to

provide this option to provide a course that students could perform better in, they were really threatening them and reinforcing fears about taking honors courses. She thought that keeping the policy in a restated way was important because students did need to have the option to get out. Other students think that once they are in, they will not be able to get out because of scheduling.

Dr. Shoenberg commented that unless his understanding of the way in which grades were being given was true then they did need to think about weighted grades. It was his understanding the teacher was asking what grade would the student get if the student were in the regular course and adjusting the grading system accordingly. Another concern about the honors courses was that not only was there a difference in the degree of difficulty, there was a whole difference in style. He indicated that the Board would be receiving a copy of the report of the Task Force on Higher Order Thinking Skills. He would like to know that one of the things differentiating honors courses from other courses was not the degree of their focus on higher order thinking skills. It may be more difficult problems, but they were trying to deal with the same set of problems.

Dr. Shoenberg thought it was to the credit of the Department of Educational Accountability and the school system that they had a study such as the one on honors so that they had some baseline data. However, he would caution them not to overreact to this report and try to do something about it. He thought that the problems the report turned up were predictable, especially since the program was implemented in some haste. The Board should discuss these problems, but probably the superintendent and staff would deal with these problems. In regard to the discipline study, it was a more public kind of problem. It was a problem that had seemed difficult to deal with. Because it involved trying to convey to a very large system a general set of understandings about what was appropriate behavior, they were faced with the problem of asking for the leadership of principals. They were concerned about individual teachers in the classroom and their autonomy, and at the same time they were trying across a very large system to convey a set of general understandings about standards of behavior and appropriate modes of response in which they were trying to create equity. Dr. Shoenberg thought that equity was the key idea in both of these situations. In both cases the superintendent and staff were aware of the problems and were making an effort to address those problems. He hoped that the Board would address the honors issue in the same way it approached the discipline issue. He believed that the Board having expressed its views, the system to the best of its ability would create a viable and reasonable situation.

Dr. Cronin agreed and hoped they could get away from how students were graded. As a teacher in honors courses, he had used A, B, and fail. He commented that they had skimmed the cream and they should stay at that level. He said that leadership and autonomy went hand in hand as long as principals understood what was expected from the

program. The Board's responsibility was to see that the program was funded. Dr. Cronin called attention to the statement that the .2 teacher coordinators are a resource to staff. He thought this was a totally gross understatement. He thought that the \$23,000 for stipends and substitute time to support the honors program was also a gross understatement. He hoped that the budget would reflect the actual needs and that the Board could then argue with the Council that they needed the funds to educate these children. He pointed out that DEA had told them that in a number of programs they did not have the staff training they needed.

Mrs. Peyser was pleased to see the expansion of honors classes and particularly the statement from the students that they were learning more and better. She felt that most students had the ability in some one area to enroll in an honors course. She thought that youngsters should be encouraged if they had a special interest in an area or special ability in one area. It was her feeling that any student interested should be given a chance. She was concerned about problems in clustering of classes. This should be avoided even if it meant eliminating guitar classes of one and two students. She said that teachers reported that developing two preparations for one class was time consuming. She noted that students in the class were getting half of the teacher's time at best. She said that many students had raised the need for weighted grades and the problem about enrolling in classes because they were labelled honors. She thought the answer was very simple and that was to weight the grade.

Mrs. Shannon stated that over the past several years they had been encouraging and improving the process of identifying black and Hispanic youngsters into gifted and talented programs. She felt they if they did not get into the gifted and talented courses they would not be in the honors program particularly if they talked about "skimming the cream." She suggested that in the next budget or if they got a grant they consider providing stipends for mentors in the same way they had stipends for coaches.

Miss Duby noted that they talked about honors as a program, and the philosophy and principles they applied to other classes should apply to honors. They expected in other classes that students would be challenged and strive for the A, and they needed to do the same in honors classes. They needed to make sure they talked about the honors program as an integral part of the whole program. They were providing special training to get excellent teaching techniques out of teachers for honors programs, and she wondered whether they were trying to carry those techniques into classes for average students. She was concerned that they were separating the honors program in their discussion and that they were not using what they learned in that in the other classrooms and that they were setting special standards or making exceptions for the students who were more capable.

Dr. Shoenberg pointed out that they designated certain advanced language courses as honors courses, but they had no separate honors

courses at lower levels of the language where there were differences in student ability. For example, they had no Spanish I honors or French II honors. He thought that some students might be bored in the introductory language courses. Dr. Starnes replied that most foreign language teachers did not want that kind of grouping in levels 1 and 2. They would prefer to have some students who were quite able and some who are less able. In addition, in a small school they could not group, for example, all Level 3 and Level 4 honors. Some students taking Level 3 and 4 would benefit from interaction with students who were more able in a language. They would like to talk with teachers and provide some extra support for grouping out of the \$23,000.

Dr. Shoenberg wondered whether they should begin to think about one or two programs around the county for students who were particularly able in foreign language. Dr. Martin thought this should be discussed with principals along with the idea of an accelerated program for intermediate schools.

Mrs. Praisner urged Board members to put any other questions in memo form. She agreed that the Board should not be making decisions as to grades, but she also thought that in creating the honors programs they had to know the implications of what they had created. They had to know the long-term educational implications and the long-term financial implications. They had to know whether this was really what they wanted. She thought they should encourage students to excel when they had the interest and ability to do so. She was concerned that all schools send the same message and did the same things. She pointed out that this was the first step, and DEA was planning another year of program evaluation. Dr. Steve Frankel, director of the Department of Educational Accountability, explained that the report was a preliminary survey. They wanted to look at difference in content and in methodology. They wanted to see whether any improvement could be made with the cluster. Mrs. Praisner said that in her memo she had some suggestions that maybe they would drop some honors courses. Dr. Frankel thought for a first evaluation this was positive. He thought they had to look at a way to handle students who had to drop the course and the degree to which high school teachers were willing and able to differentiate the way elementary school teachers did.

Mrs. Praisner assumed that they would be getting some comments from the appropriate employee associations. Dr. Martin replied that they anticipated involving the Council on Instruction which had representatives from those groups.

Re: Executive Session

The Board met in executive session on appeals and personnel matters. During this session, Mr. Ewing and Dr. Greenblatt joined the Board.

Re: Board/Press/Visitor Conference

The following individuals appeared before the Board of Education:

1. Wendy Cimmet, Walt Whitman High School PTSA
2. Connie Hill, QUEST parents
3. Roscoe Nix, Montgomery County Chapter, NAACP

Resolution No. 461-84 Re: Procurement Contract over \$25,000

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

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

Resolved, That having been duly advertised, the contract be awarded to the low bidder meeting specifications as shown for the bid as follows:

2-85	Lithographic Press Name of Vendor(s)	Dollar Value of Contract
	Interstate Printing Equipment Corp.	\$39,465

Resolution No. 462-84 Re: Lease for Part of Greencastle
Future School Site (Area 1)

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

WHEREAS, It has long been the policy of the Board of Education to actively pursue land lease agreements for interim use of future school sites to reduce maintenance costs and increase revenues; and

WHEREAS, Only those sites which readily adapt to interim uses without affecting their future development potential as school facilities are proposed; and

WHEREAS, Further restrictions upon land use proposals call for permitted uses which best serve the interests of the general public, with specific reference to the health, safety, and welfare of the immediate community; and

WHEREAS, The approved land users assume all liability for damages, injury, or death resulting from the use of our property during their tenancy; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the president and secretary be authorized to execute a lease with the Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission for a part of the Greencastle Future School site for

Resolved, That a contract for \$27,000 be awarded to Tyler Mechanical Contracting, Inc., to accomplish storm sewer relocation at Highland View Elementary School in accordance with plans and specifications dated August 2, 1984, prepared by the Division of Construction and Capital Projects.

Resolution No. 465-84 Re: Proposed South Germantown
Elementary School Site (Area 3)

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

WHEREAS, Several future school sites were considered for the proposed new South Germantown Elementary School; and

WHEREAS, Staff, with assistance from the county executive, Park and Planning, and community representatives, recommends the Germantown Park Future Elementary School site located along Cinnamon Drive as the best choice for the new school; and

WHEREAS, On November 5, 1981, the Board of Education, as part of its Long-range Educational Facilities Planning Policy, surplusd several future school sites including Germantown Park Future Elementary School site; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Board of Education rescinds a portion of its November 5, 1981, resolution #881-81 deleting the Germantown Park Future Elementary School site; and be it further

Resolved, That the County Council, county executive, Montgomery County Planing Board, and the State Interagency Committee be requested to take appropriate action to permit use of the Germantown Park site for the proposed South Germantown Elementary School.

Resolution No. 466-84 Re: Architectural Appointment -
Watkins Mill High School (Area
3)

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

WHEREAS, It is necessary to appoint an architect to provide required design services and administration of the construction contract for the Watkins Mill High School project; and

WHEREAS, Staff has employed the Architect/Engineer Selection Procedures approved by the Board of Education in November, 1975; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Board of Education enter into a contractual agreement with the firm of Duane, Elliott & Associates to provide

Program:

Category	Amount
02 Instructional Salaries	\$3,111
03 Instructional Other	600
10 Fixed Charges	289
Total	\$4,000

and be it further

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

Resolution No. 469-84 Re: Utilization of a Portion of the FY
1985 Appropriation for Projected
Supported Projects
for the Career Awareness
Community-Based, Mentor Program for
Economically Disadvantaged Youth

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

Resolved, That the superintendent of schools be authorized to receive and expend, within the FY 1985 Appropriation for Projected Supported Projects, a \$28,353 grant award from the Maryland State Department of Education under the Job Training Partnership Act for the career awareness community-based mentor program for economically disadvantaged youth, in the following categories:

Category	Positions	Amount
01 Administration		\$ 3,752
02 Instructional Salaries	.5*	19,127
03 Instructional Other		2,959
07 Transportation		1,880
10 Fixed Charges		635
Total	.5	\$28,353

*Teacher (A-D) 10-month

and be it further

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

Resolution No. 470-84 Re: Utilization of a Portion of the FY
1985 Appropriation for Projected
Supported Projects for the Head
Start Child Development Program

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

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. 473-84 Re: Death of Mr. Leroy Peoples,
Building Service Worker on Leave
from Westland Intermediate

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

WHEREAS, The death on August 5, 1984, of Mr. Leroy Peoples, a building service worker at Westland Intermediate, has deeply saddened the staff and members of the Board of Education; and

WHEREAS, Mr. Peoples had been a dedicated employee of Montgomery County Public Schools for over eleven years; and

WHEREAS, Mr. Peoples' reliability, cooperative attitude, and excellent human relations skills made him an asset to Montgomery County Public Schools; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the members of the Board of Education express their sorrow at the death of Mr. Leroy Peoples and extend deepest sympathy to his family; and be it further

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

Resolution No. 474-84 Re: Death of Mrs. Anita L. Phillips,
Cafeteria Manager at Highland
View Elementary

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

WHEREAS, The death on August 10, 1984, of Mrs. Anita L. Phillips, a Cafeteria Manager II at Highland View Elementary School, has deeply saddened the staff and members of the Board of Education; and

WHEREAS, In the more than eight years that Mrs. Phillips has been a member of the Montgomery County Public Schools staff, she was recognized for her superior performance and initiative; and

WHEREAS, Mrs. Phillips was a valued cafeteria manager, demonstrating her excellent organizational skills and sensitivity to the needs of the student body and community; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the members of the Board of Education express their sorrow at the death of Mrs. Anita L. Phillips 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. Phillips' family.

Resolution No. 475-84 Re: Personnel Appointment

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

Resolved, That the following personnel appointment be approved:

Appointment	Present Position	As
David B. Barr	Analyst/Programmer Division of Systems Development	Systems Analyst Division of Systems Development Dept. of Management Information and Computer Services Grade G Effective: 9/12/84

Resolution No. 476-84 Re: Utilization of Civiletti Funds -
FY 1985

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

WHEREAS, The Maryland General Assembly approved HB 669 (Civiletti) entitling Montgomery County Public Schools to additional basic state aid for FY 1985 amounting to \$1,304,722 and State Compensatory Education funds of \$394,243; and

WHEREAS, This legislation requires that the Board of Education describe the intended use of these funds to the State Accountability Task Force on October 1, 1984; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Board of Education approve the recommended use of these funds to be included in a report due to the State Accountability Task Force as required by HB 669.

Dr. Greenblatt temporarily left the meeting at this point.

Resolution No. 477-84 Re: Membership on Counseling and
Guidance Committee

Resolved, That the Board of Education appoint the following persons to a two-year term beginning immediately and terminating in June, 1986:

Ms. Thelma Bates	Ms. Vikki Gregory, Esq.
Mrs. Aleida Baum	Ms. LaVonne Hurd
Mr. Edward Bugash	Mr. Ronald Johnson
Mr. Jonathan Caruana	Mrs. Ruth Priest
Mr. Eddie L. Combs	Ms. Helen Youth
Mr. Osvaldo Diaz-Espada	Mr. Steve Ryan

and be it further

Resolved, That the following individual be reappointed for a two-year term terminating in June, 1986:

Mr. Gerald Malitz

Resolution No. 479-84 Re: Appointment of Members of Local
Advisory Council for
Vocational-Technical Education

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

WHEREAS, The Local Advisory Council for Vocational-Technical Education has been active since its establishment in 1977; and

WHEREAS, The subcommittee on membership is charged with maintaining the membership; and

WHEREAS, Vacancies now exist on the council due to resignations or the expiration of the terms of several members; and

WHEREAS, The vacancies for the council have been advertised as directed by the Board of Education; and

WHEREAS, In accordance with the Board-approved recruitment and selection procedures, the nominees listed below were recommended by the Local Advisory Council to the superintendent; and

WHEREAS, Members are appointed by the Board of Education through the superintendent; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Board of Education appoint the following persons to a three-year term beginning immediately and terminating in June, 1987:

Helen Weems Daley
Anne B. Menotti
Shirley J. Wilcher, Esq.

Resolution No. 480-84

Re: Appointments to the Citizens
Advisory Committee for Family
Life and Human Development

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

WHEREAS, COMAR 13A.04.01 requires that each local education agency have a Citizens Advisory Committee on Family Life and Human Development; and

WHEREAS, Montgomery County has had such a committee since 1970, consisting of representatives of various civic associations and religious groups, community members at large, and student representatives; and

WHEREAS, Membership on the committee is for a two-year term; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the following individuals be reappointed to represent their respective organizations for a two-year term:

Dr. Ronald E. Greger - Montgomery County Medical Society
Mrs. Susan McCarter - Planned Parenthood of Montgomery County

and be it further

Resolved, That the following individual be appointed to represent the respective organization for a two-year term:

Ms. Robin M. Fields - Jewish Community Council of Greater
Washington

and be it further

Resolved, That these individuals be notified of their appointments to the Citizens Advisory Committee on Family Life and Human Development.

Dr. Greenblatt and Mrs. Peyser joined the meeting at this point.

Resolution No. 481-84

Re: Presentation of Preliminary Plans
- Springbrook High School
Gymnasium

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

WHEREAS, The architect for the new Springbrook High School Gymnasium project, Victor Smolen & Associates, has prepared the schematic design in accordance with the educational specifications; and

WHEREAS, The Springbrook High School Gymnasium Planning Committee has approved the proposed schematic design; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Montgomery County Board of Education approves the schematic design report prepared by Victor Smolen & Associates.

Re: Policy on Naming Schools

Mrs. Praisner explained that this item would be on the Board's September 24 agenda for action. Board members discussed the policy, with the idea of making it more of a community decision rather than a Board decision. Dr. Cronin indicated that he would be introducing an amendment to the proposed policy on September 24.

Re: Name for Educational Services Center

On December 13, 1983, Mr. Ewing moved and Dr. Shoenberg seconded the following for action in the fall:

WHEREAS, The Educational Services Center was once the George Washington Carver High School, serving black students only prior to desegregation in 1954; and

WHEREAS, The Board of Education has committed itself to finding ways to assist black students and other minority students in improving their academic achievement; and

WHEREAS, George Washington Carver was himself a distinguished teacher, scientist, artist and musician, who believed in education and in the potential of black students to achieve great things in American life; and

WHEREAS, It is fitting and appropriate that the Montgomery County Public Schools should honor the memory and the accomplishments of George Washington Carver now and in the future; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Educational Services Center is renamed the George Washington Carver Educational Services Center, to be called the Carver Educational Services Center; and be it further

Resolved, That there be held an appropriate ceremony to which the public will be invited on the occasion of the dedication of the building to the memory of the values for which George Washington Carver stood.

Dr. Greenblatt suggested rewording the motion to state, "Resolved, That the original name of the Educational Services Center be restored to honor George Washington Carver; and be it further Resolved, That the Educational Services Center be called Carver Educational Services Center." The makers of the motion agreed to the change.

Resolution No. 482-84

Re: Name for Educational Services

Center

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

WHEREAS, The Educational Services Center was once the George Washington Carver High School, serving black students only prior to desegregation in 1954; and

WHEREAS, The Board of Education has committed itself to finding ways to assist black students and other minority students in improving their academic achievement; and

WHEREAS, George Washington Carver was himself a distinguished teacher, scientist, artist and musician, who believed in education and in the potential of black students to achieve great things in American life; and

WHEREAS, It is fitting and appropriate that the Montgomery County Public Schools should honor the memory and the accomplishments of George Washington Carver now and in the future; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the original name of the Educational Services Center be restored to honor George Washington Carver; and be it further

Resolved, That the Educational Services Center be called Carver Educational Services Center; and be it further

Resolved, That there be held an appropriate ceremony to which the public will be invited on the occasion of the dedication of the building to the memory of the values for which George Washington Carver stood.

Re: Board Member Comments

1. Mrs. Shannon recalled that the Board had received a letter about future school sites and implications for future use if the school had to be closed. The letter dealt with a buffer area between commercial and residential zones. Mrs. Praisner suggested that rather than scheduling this for discussion the Board wait and see what staff comments might be.

2. Mr. Ewing assumed all Board members had received a notice from the Washington Post about its grants for education and awards for outstanding teachers. He hoped that MCPS would participate in the program, and Dr. Pitt assured him that they would.

3. Mr. Ewing commented that when the data on local tests were published there were comments on what schools did well or did not do well. He was uncomfortable with some of those comparisons; however, he would agree that they needed improvement in some areas. He did not know why some schools did better than others, but he suspected it had to do with the extent to which the principal and faculty paid attention to the importance of the examinations. He hoped that as a

school system they would redouble their efforts to assure that students all over the county were encouraged and assisted to do as well as they could on these examinations. He remarked that the Takoma Park Junior High School case of last year showed what could happen when a community was behind an effort to do well on an examination.

4. Dr. Shoenberg noted that the new education act on math and science contained a large number of opportunities for MCPS to make application. He said that application in each case had to be made in conjunction with an institution of higher education or the Maryland State Department of Education. He hoped they would take advantage of this opportunity and apply for funds.

5. Dr. Cronin commented that the Board's gratitude ought to go to Mr. Villani at Blair High School for their most recent efforts on the state writing test.

6. Dr. Cronin reported that the Board had received a letter related to some Board members support for the western high school upcounty. He explained that the Board's original votes were predicated on a number of decisions which changed in the process of County Council decisions. He would hope that upcounty had no questions about the Board's support for that western high school. For the record, Mrs. Praisner stated Dr. Cronin was referring to a letter from a citizen who interpreted the fact that Board members reluctantly voted for the construction of the new school ahead of the addition to Seneca Valley as an indication of lack of Board support. The Board was reflecting a desire for both projects but for the Seneca Valley project to precede the construction of the new school.

7. Dr. Cronin noted that Channel 9 had had a special piece on the news calling for students to be involved in the schools. The news commentary called for two and a half hours of homework per night in the high school. As a single Board member, he would say "more power to any teacher who wanted to do that."

8. In regard to the selection of a new Board member, Dr. Cronin said that all communities should be clear that no single Board member acts alone. The pressure to be the single spokesman or spokeswoman for a group was an unfair pressure. That said to the other Board members to wait until they heard from that member before those concerns became voiced. He stated that he was a voting member, and he was available to talk with any member of the community and ought not to be hearing through a particular member the concerns of a particular community.

9. Mrs. Praisner acknowledged and congratulated everyone involved in the efforts to improve the safety record of bus drivers. She said that despite the 12 percent increase in the number of school buses and the 14 percent increase in the miles driven, there had been a 45 percent drop in the accident rate over the last five years. She congratulated Larry Skinner and all of the bus drivers and staff involved in that effort.

10. Mrs. Praisner recalled that the Board had asked for a plaque for the Board room which honored former Board members. She hoped that the plaque could be available before December.

Re: Proposed Resolution on Weighted Grades

On July 10, 1984, Mrs. Peyser moved and Dr. Greenblatt seconded the following:

WHEREAS, A goal of the Board of Education is to provide a positive and challenging curriculum for academically talented students; and

WHEREAS, Such a program should encourage (not penalize) those students willing to seek more challenging and more difficult courses; and

WHEREAS, It is equitable that courses which require greater effort, commitment and achievement have these factors reflected in the evaluation of student performance; and

WHEREAS, The present system rewards those students who select their courses not with the goal of learning as much as possible but of achieving the highest possible grade point average with the least amount of work; and

WHEREAS, Class ranking and grade point average are significant factors used by colleges and universities in selecting students for admission; and

WHEREAS, Many college admissions officers agree that "Montgomery County students are at a disadvantage because weighted grades are not used for honors/AP courses"; and

WHEREAS, "For the student competing for scholarship money, a class standing or GPA which does not reflect the higher level of scholastic endeavor may compromise a student's chances even if the courses are identified clearly as honors courses"; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the superintendent develop a plan for weighted grades in honors and advanced placement courses.

Resolution No. 483-84

Re: A Substitute Motion on Weighted Grades

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education ask the superintendent to

explore this issue further with a view toward making a determination as to benefits and disadvantages of MCPS students having weighted grades and to explore issues with colleges as to how they use grades and make his findings known to the Board.

Re: Proposed Resolution on Special
Programs for Upcounty

On August 7, 1984, Mr. Ewing moved and Dr. Cronin seconded the following:

Resolved, That the Board of Education place on its agenda early in the fall of 1984 a discussion of a proposal for special junior high and senior high programs which would serve the up-county area and would include a major focus on math, science, computers and high technology, to be instituted as soon as possible, perhaps beginning in the fall of 1985 in an up-county junior high school and in the fall of 1986 in an up-county high school.

Mr. Ewing agreed to amend his motion by deleting "early in the fall of 1984," putting a period after "technology" and deleting the rest of the sentence.

Resolution No. 484-84 Re: Special Program for Upcounty

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education place on its agenda a discussion of a proposal for special junior high and senior high programs which would serve the up-county area and would include a major focus on math, science, computers and high technology.

Resolution No. 485-84 Re: Policy for Special Programs

On motion of Mrs. Praisner seconded by Dr. Cronin, the following resolution was adopted unanimously:

WHEREAS, The Board of Education has never defined the term "magnet" but has in the past established and maintained magnet programs in grades K-12 including all-day kindergarten, foreign language immersion, and science and technology centers primarily to assist the school system's integration efforts; and

WHEREAS, The Board of Education has established "special" programs for the gifted and talented and high school vocational students; and

WHEREAS, The Board of Education is receiving more and more requests from individual communities to provide programs above and beyond the regular Program of Studies in individual school communities; and

WHEREAS, The Board of Education is interested in improving the education program and opportunities for students within MCPS; and

WHEREAS, The Board of Education also recognizes that the placement of these programs has budgetary implications; and

WHEREAS, These programs also have an impact on long-range planning, staff development and training, curriculum development and possibly the program at nearby schools; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Board of Education directs the superintendent to develop a policy and/or process for the development and establishment of special programs; and be it further

Resolved, That such policy and/or process shall address but not be limited to the issues raised above; and be it further

Resolved, That the Board of Education will discuss and adopt a policy and/or process prior to the further expansion of special programs; and be it further

Resolved, That the community will be given an opportunity to comment.

Re: Proposed Resolution on Master Plan
for Curriculum

On August 7, 1984, Mrs. Shannon moved and Dr. Cronin seconded the following:

WHEREAS, MCPS has long been recognized as innovators in both short-range and long-range planning; and

WHEREAS, MCPS has a long-range comprehensive master plan for educational facilities; and

WHEREAS, There exists a need for such a comprehensive master plan for curricula; and

WHEREAS, The purpose of such a plan would be that the system would be able to see the total picture and how revisions and add-ons would affect this total plan which would incorporate all curricula in all grade levels; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the superintendent be directed to establish such a long-range (5-year) comprehensive master plan for curricula and to report on this plan to the Board of Education for their action and approval.

Resolution No. 486-84

Re: Tabling of Proposed Resolution on
Master Plan for Curriculum

On motion of Mrs. Shannon 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 (Miss Duby voting in the affirmative):

Resolved, That Mrs. Shannon's proposed resolution on master plan for curriculum be tabled until after the Board/staff retreat.

Resolution No. 487-84 Re: Reading Study

On motion of Dr. Shoenberg 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 being temporarily absent (Miss Duby voting in the affirmative):

Resolved, That the item on "Reading Study: First Year Report" be scheduled at an appropriate time for Board discussion and in sufficient time that the report's implications for budget can be considered.

Resolution No. 488-84 Re: Blair/B-CC Clusters

On motion of Mr. Ewing 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 being temporarily absent (Miss Duby voting in the affirmative):

Resolved, That the item on "Report on Status of Blair/B-CC Clusters" be scheduled for Board discussion.

Resolution No. 489-84 Re: Executive Session - September 24,
1984

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Dr. Cronin seconded by Dr. Shoenberg, 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 (Miss Duby voting in the affirmative):

WHEREAS, The Board of Education of Montgomery County is authorized by Article 76A, Section 11(a) of the Annotated Code of Maryland to conduct certain of its meetings in executive closed session; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Board of Education of Montgomery County hereby conduct its meeting in executive closed session beginning on September 24, 1984, at 7:30 p.m. to discuss, consider, deliberate, and/or otherwise decide the employment, assignment, appointment, promotion, demotion, compensation, discipline, removal, or resignation of employees, appointees, or officials over whom it has jurisdiction, or any other personnel matter affecting one or more particular individuals and to comply with a specific constitutional, statutory or judicially imposed requirement protecting particular

Resolved, That the Board of Education supports parents in their efforts to limit the amount of TV their children are watching; and be it further

Resolved, That the Board of Education will work with the Montgomery County Council of Parent-Teacher Associations to encourage parents to use the evening hours to reinforce the schools by encouraging a "reading hour" and study time at home.

Re: New Business

Dr. Shoenberg assumed the chair.

Mrs. Praisner moved and Dr. Shoenberg seconded the following:

Resolved, That the Board of Education schedule a discussion on the school system's process for reviewing student transfer requests including consideration of changes in the administrative procedures for processing these requests and possible adoption by the Board of a separate appeals procedure to deal with student transfers.

Mrs. Praisner assumed the chair.

Re: Executive Session

The Board met in executive session on legal matters from 5 to 5:35 p.m. Mrs. Shannon left the meeting during executive session.

Re: Board Member Selection
Process

Mrs. Praisner noted that the applications of two candidates arrived after the the 5 p.m. deadline. Unless Board members objected, she would include those two individuals in the list of candidates for Board consideration. Therefore, there were the names of 40 individuals before the Board. Mrs. Praisner reported that the Board's attorney had advised that Mrs. Shannon was precluded from participating in the selection of her replacement. The actual filling of the vacancy should occur after the date when Mrs. Shannon's resignation was effective. Therefore, the final appointment would be made on October 1. The Board attorney also had no objections to the replacement procedure proposed by the Board.

Mrs. Praisner reported that on September 24, the Board would make a tentative selection. The individual would be appointed on October 1 and sworn in at that meeting. She said that Mr. Roger Titus had suggested that individuals who were candidates in the general election file a statement of intent to resign from the partial term if elected to a four-year term. The only individual who was a candidate had submitted such a letter of intent.

Resolution No. 493-84

Re: Acceptance of Mrs. Shannon's
Resignation

On motion of Dr. Cronin seconded by Mrs. Peyser, the following resolution was adopted unanimously:

Resolved, That the Board of Education accept, with regret, the resignation of Mrs. Odessa M. Shannon, effective September 30, 1984.

Re: Board Member Selection
Process

Dr. Shoenberg suggested that the Board nominate orally and proceed seriatim beginning with the people with the greatest seniority on the Board and alphabetically within that seniority for the first two nominations. To narrow the group, they would proceed in reverse order.

Mr. Ewing stated that he would have preferred to wait until after the general election and would have preferred to nominate three individuals, but the Board had decided both issues. He read the following into the record:

"The people I think are really extraordinarily talented and people I would like to support very much are Alan Cheung, Jerry Floyd, Jim Moone, Jack Nehemias, Janie Johnson, Martin Gerry, Carol Henry, Michael Subin, Verna Fletcher, and Sally Kaplan."

Mrs. Praisner asked that Mr. Fess certify that all of the names before the Board were eligible in that they were registered voters in the county. Mr. Fess reported that he had received from John Eisele, the elections administrator, certification that the 40 persons were registered voters in Montgomery County.

Dr. Greenblatt suggested that each Board member write down two names on a piece of paper. If they had fewer than 14 names, that would be it because their effort was to narrow down the list of interviewees.

Resolution No. 494-84 Re: Procedures for Selecting
Interviewees

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education have oral nominations of candidates to be interviewed.

Re: First Round Nominations to Select
Board Member to Fill Unexpired
Term

From the pool of 40 applicants for the Board member vacancy, the following were nominated:

Mr. Ewing: Jeremiah Floyd
Dr. Greenblatt: Nancy Dacek
Mrs. Peyser: Vincent Hollis
Dr. Cronin: Roberta D'Oyen
Mrs. Praisner: Janie Johnson
Dr. Shoenberg: Alan Cheung
Miss Duby: James Moone
Miss Duby: Timothy O'Shea
Dr. Shoenberg: Martin Gerry
Mrs. Praisner: Carol Henry
Dr. Cronin: Michael Subin
Mrs. Peyser: Marshall Lih
Dr. Greenblatt: Barry Klein
Mr. Ewing: Jack Nehemias

Re: Second Round Nominations to
Select Board Member to Fill
Unexpired Term

From the list of 14 names from the first round of nominations, the following were nominated:

Miss Duby: James Moone
Dr. Shoenberg: Alan Cheung
Mrs. Praisner: Janie Johnson
Dr. Cronin: Roberta D'Oyen
Mrs. Peyser: Vincent Hollis
Dr. Greenblatt: Nancy Dacek
Mr. Ewing: Jeremiah Floyd

Mrs. Praisner asked that Board members now submit names in writing. If there were four votes for additional names, these would be added to the list. She added the following names:

Timothy O'Shea
Martin Gerry
Michael Subin.

Mrs. Praisner read the following questions into the record and indicated candidates would be receiving copies as well as a time to be interviewed on September 17:

1. There is a general perception that we have both strong and weak administrators, principals and teachers. Do you believe the current evaluation systems adequately allow MCPS to find and assist people who need improvement in their jobs? If not, what adjustments would you propose for the system?
2. If you had to classify yourself as a single-issue candidate, which issue would you most strongly identify with your goals as a Board member if appointed? How would you approach the issue throughout your term?

3. What is your position on the level of financial support that should be provided by the Board of Education and County government for public education in the county, in general and in particular for staff salaries?
4. What do you feel you can contribute to the Board of Education and the children of Montgomery County?
5. What do you think are the three most serious problems in our schools today and what do you propose to do about them?
6. The Board of Education has adopted five priorities for the school system for the next several years. What is your understanding of and commitment to these priorities? What do you see as the next steps for the Board and the system?
7. What is your understanding of the appropriate role of a Board member in relation to the operation of the school system, i.e., where does the Board role end and the Superintendent's begin? For example, explain how you would proceed as a Board member if approached by an individual citizen with a complaint regarding a school staff member or school community with a request for additional services, staff or a new program.

Re: Items of Information

Board members received the following items of information:

1. Items in Process
2. Construction Progress Report
3. Report of 1983-84 Child Abuse/Neglect Referrals
4. Annual Report on Nonresident Tuition, 1983-84
5. Annual Report - Office of the Associate Superintendent for Instruction and Program Development
6. Follow-up Study of Special Education Graduates Class of 1983
7. Annual Report - Office of the Superintendent
8. Annual Report - Office of the Associate Superintendent for Supportive Services
9. Annual Report - Office of the Associate Superintendent for Special and Alternative Education
10. 1984 Maryland Functional Writing Test Results

Resolution No. 495-84

Re: Adjournment

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education adjourn its meeting at 6:10 p.m.

President

Secretary

WSC:mlw