



"Serving as president of the Montgomery County Board of Education has been an experience I will never forget. There was a surprise in learning from Mary Lou that my unanimous election as Board president was the first in her recollection, and it is a habit that I am glad we have repeated this year. There were so many hours in front of the County Council and state agencies, and most of them were highly successful. There was my national television debut on '20/20.' There was our retreat with key staff and principal leaders to reaffirm the commitment to our five priorities that I think are extremely important. There were the visits to the schools, too few visits for my liking. And finally there was the terrific support and assistance from all the Board members, those at this table and those who are no longer at this table and from staff, especially those in the Board Office, the superintendent's and the deputy superintendent's office. Mary Lou, Midge, Lillian, Ann, Tom and David, especially. I guess that I hope that my obsessive compulsiveness in dealing with things has not done them in.

"I have enjoyed myself, and I think I have learned a great deal. After two years on the Board, I will now begin my first year not as an officer of the Board, and without any officer responsibilities I am looking forward to focusing on specific issues of interest and to visiting schools. I have really missed that, but I did not want to miss this opportunity to thank everybody who has given me so much this year. Thank you so much. It has been fun and enjoyable."

Re: Statement by Dr. Shoenberg

Dr. Shoenberg read the following into the record:

"I certainly thank you, fellow Board members, for the honor of your confidence in me. I hope that I will be able to fulfill that in the course of the year. I have had the opportunity since I have been on the Board to watch two presidents function and to learn from them. I am pleased to say that, unlike some other positions in which I have been in training, these were positive lessons and not negative ones. From Blair I think I learned something about how to do business with some flair and the need to pay attention to the community and to show some real concerns and interest for them and to have patience in hearing everyone out. Marilyn's energy I cannot possibly equal though I may have learned from it and admired it. I don't know that it is given to me to have that kind of energy. I know that it is not given to me to pay the remarkable attention to detail that she has in the course of the year. She calls it 'obsessive compulsiveness.' I call it attention to detail.

"I am warning the Board staff that it is likely that they will have to do an abrupt about-face from somebody who thinks of all the details to somebody who thinks of none of them. They are going to have to be in the reminding business. I hope I can begin to equal Marilyn's ability to find the right words at the right time. Time and again when the situation has been difficult and when there has been someone before the Board who has us grinding our teeth or

conversely when there are people to whom the right thing has to be said, she has found the right words. She has also, gavel or no gavel, kept the Board business moving along. My problem will be remembering that I am in charge of the meeting. On a couple of occasions when I have had the gavel, I have forgotten that. I will try to remember. I think I will get used to that in time.

"I hope that in my own way and in my own style, I will be able to do the kind of job that my predecessors within my memory have been able to do. When people are elected, they often say what they expect to do during their time in office, but I don't think that is the case with the Board president. Whoever is the presiding officer is simply that, the presiding officer and also the representative of the Board to the public, and in that respect the person represents the whole Board, not him or herself. As a member of the Board clearly the president does not give up his or her right to voice an opinion and the ability to voice those strongly, but that is simply as one more member of the Board. When the Board has decided, the president deals with those decisions in a way that reflects what the Board as a whole has decided. So I am not going to talk about what I expect to do in office. It is not for Board presidents to do that.

"No Board year is not a busy year. They are all busy. Every issue that comes up is major. In the year ahead there are many things that we can foresee, and I am sure some things will happen that we don't now foresee. They always do. At this time of year we are all concerned about budget and facilities matters. It appears that we are going to revisit Northwood High School again. Whatever the decision is, I hope it is the last time we are going to do that and we are going to have a decision that is going to happen and is going to stay in place. We are also going to have to deal in some way with the enormous capital needs of the school system, and I am pleased to say despite some minor differences as to what goes on what list, that there is clear recognition and considerable support of the school system's capital needs from the executive and from the County Council. I look to our working together in harmony on those matters, and to have the disagreements remain comparatively minor ones.

"The budget is going to be a serious problem for us. As we are able to do more and more, expectations continue to increase. We have the reputation which is almost literally true of being the wealthiest county in the United States and people expect much from that fact. This leads to many conclusions from people, but even the wealthiest county can't do everything. And as we do more, people will expect more. We are going to have to deal with that. We are going to have to try to meet those expectations as best we can and to convince the people who need to be convinced of what the school system's needs are.

"Those are the two big items on the agenda now. The third one, an ongoing one and one that I hope we are not going to neglect and are going to keep before us, is our five priorities. We have begun to

move on those. Our two first agenda items this morning are a status report on Priorities 1 and 2 and a presentation of a kind of master chart on curriculum implementation which shows where we are in the planning of some of the things that support those priorities and Priority 4 as well. The Board has moved resolutely and appropriately on those priorities. The system has recognized them. The superintendent, I know, is building them into his budget and keeping those clearly before us. I know that as long as we keep focused on those that the public and the funding agencies who are responsible for this are going to know where we are and why we are doing what we are doing. I think it is very important that both of those things be clear, that we remember what our plan is and that we make sure that our public knows the ways in which our actions relate to those plans.

"I look forward to working with the Board in a new capacity for me and to working with staff. The superintendent now sits to my left, and Dr. Cronin to my right. I look to support from both of them. I know that I will have it, and I hope that I in turn will be able to give them the kind of support that they need. I promise not to make snide remarks to them behind my hand anymore often than is necessary and the mood strikes me and to maintain the decorum of the meeting despite the fact that I know I have a sympathetic audience. I promise to pay attention to what is going on and not let my mind drift and to remember that I am in charge of the meeting and that I do have to call on the next person who has his or her hand raised. To Marilyn, again, thanks for a very good year. I look forward to a good year. To staff whom I have enjoyed working with so much, I expect to enjoy that relationship and a closer relationship even more. This is a marvelous group of people and a wonderful school system to work with and to be associated with. It is really a first-class operation. I feel good about it all the time, and I am looking forward to the next year."

Re: A Statement by Dr. Cronin

Dr. Cronin read the following into the record:

"The vice president gets to speak, but briefly. That is the function of being vice president. I want to thank Marilyn for the last year. The train left the station last December, and it was either get on board or get off the track. It was a pleasure being on board, and I know the communication Marilyn and I had was excellent this past year. I made her a promise which I also make to Bob that where she went and where she needed the support, I would be there. It was fun working with the County Council, knowing that I could back up Marilyn and that we had first-class leadership at that point. I know this year we also have first-class leadership and there will be the same back-up. So that as Bob looks to his right, I will be there, and it will be my function also I hope with my colleagues to serve you too, sharpen our communication, to be sure our priorities are on line, that we are still on the train, and that at the end of this year we will be further along to our goal which is excellent education in this county. You have my promise, Bob."

Resolution No. 638-84

Re: Board Agenda - December 11, 1984

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education approve its agenda for December 11, 1984, with the change of the item on the Student Board Member Election from "discussion" to "discussion/action."

Re: Status Report on Board/Staff  
Priorities

Dr. Cody reported that the Board had two status reports, one led by Dr. Lois Martin and the other by Mrs. Helen Holston. He said they were all familiar with the sequence of activities they had engaged in as a school system and as a community last year concerning Priority 2. The written report on Priority 2 chronicled those major activities, identified specific objectives as measures to determine progress, and spoke to plans developed by the schools.

Dr. Cody explained that last spring they began to move on Priority 1 by asking themselves what they should do as a school system to respond to that. They had purposely taken Priority 2 as the first order of business last year. He said that only when they felt good about the progress and process had they turned to Priority 1. They had had a retreat earlier in the school year and the principal question was what they needed to do as next steps on the various priorities. After the retreat, they enlarged the circle of consultation in the school system. This fall they had a series of reiterations asking the principals and supervisory staff how they thought the school system should further attend to Priority 1.

Dr. Cody said that a steering committee was appointed representing teachers, principals, and area and central offices. This was done to recognize skill and talent and ability in MCPS was all over the place. He thought the extent to which they sought the advice and counsel of staff across the school system was the extent to which they would be successful. They had had an extensive and large-scale involvement process to come up with a plan. Out of that process, Dr. Martin and her steering committee had prepared a report which identified the nature of the problem, ideas, and proposals for expenditures. He recalled that as Priority 2 evolved last year conclusions were reached that they needed to use the talent in schools at the local level. They had tried to do the same thing with Priority 1.

Dr. Lois Martin, associate superintendent, explained that they had tried a new process of getting timely input from a large group of people in the school system. They decided to use the monthly A&S meetings because the participation was around 250 people. Their September meeting was on the report of the Task Force on Higher Order Intellectual Skills, and at that meeting they broke into about

20 small discussion groups with trained leaders. Each participant rated the task force recommendations from strongly agree to strongly disagree. There was almost unanimous agreement on implementing higher order intellectual skills through the existing curriculum. There was strong agreement on a well-planned implementation, including all students, having continuous training, and reviewing and evaluating instructional materials. There was strong disagreement with hiring a person to be a coordinator and having area teacher specialists for higher order intellectual skills. She said they were surprised about how the different job classifications agreed on the recommendations.

Dr. Martin stated that in the next month they divided the staff into small discussion groups to talk about implementation of Priority 1A to increase student achievement. People were asked to rank items indicating "strong support" to "no support." Nothing received "no support." Implementing the K-8 reading, writing, math and science curricula and the 9-12 English curriculum received strong support. They also asked people to pick two items they felt were the most important to focus on. These were computer literacy and the use of educational technology. They asked staff for measures, and high support was received for criterion-referenced tests. Dr. Martin reported that there was a strong thread on not forgetting the affective area and how students felt about their accomplishments.

Dr. Martin said they asked what needed to be done to implement Priority 1. There was strong support for emphasizing the priority through increased budget and increasing teacher training. Next was administrator training and then resource teacher assistance. One item that was not a choice was staffing, but this came through clearly and they ended up dealing with this.

Dr. Floyd inquired about increases in secondary enrollment and how it fit into Priority 1. Dr. Martin replied that this was increased enrollment in the subjects listed in Priority 1 in order to encourage better achievement. Dr. Floyd felt that the report itself was informative and easy to follow. He said that it gave them cost figures and some milestones.

Mr. Ewing requested that Board members receive hard copies of the transparencies used by Dr. Martin in her presentation. He commented that there was more there about how they answered the questions about how well all of this was working than in the written document. He said there was a role for the area office in assisting with assessment of needs and a role for the Department of Educational Accountability. Staff members felt there were assessment measures that would give them some information. He thought that tests by themselves would not tell them everything. There will have to be ways for the Board and staff to be able to say what all this meant and whether they were really succeeding. For example, there was a strong emphasis on implementing the K-8 curriculum, and there might be some things in the curriculum that staff found were not working. This type of feedback was not spoken to explicitly, and he thought this had to be part of the process so

that they could make corrections as they went along. Dr. Martin explained that the next step was to follow up on the details, and the Board would be receiving reports. She agreed that the adjustment of the curriculum was important. As a county they had relatively little mandated from the standpoint of the curriculum, and she said they might have to make changes in the Program of Studies itself.

Mr. Ewing hoped that as they looked at what they were doing they would not be guided exclusively by the raw test scores. He was looking for some regular effort to interpret, understand, and pull together a wide variety of information which included student and staff reaction as well as objective data. Dr. Martin explained that they were going to continue as a steering committee. She agreed that they did need to talk about this issue because it was important that they not focus entirely on test scores. She believed that students themselves were very good reporters of how successful they were as learners.

Miss Duby reported that she was in the first run-through of the new 9-12 English curriculum. Although she had learned a lot from it, she had had teachers who were not thoroughly trained in what they were teaching. She said the report talked about staff training and an academy for curriculum implementation. The Board also received a paper about staff training courses which were cancelled for lack of enrollment. Two courses were teaching and evaluating writing in secondary schools and teaching interrelated arts in the classroom. She would assume that the academy because of a different organization would make sure that they got these courses to teachers. For that reason she would be very supportive of the academy. She suggested that teachers needed on-going training and support.

Ms. Ann Meyer, principal of B-CC High School, remarked they were excited about the idea of the academy and discussed the need to have a training program that would give teachers the opportunity to come together to be coached, to review concepts and skills, and to do this in a setting other than their own school. She thought the opportunity for training should be during the day when teachers were fresh and not after school hours. It was their intention to offer on-going training. The academy would give principals the opportunity to reward teachers and to direct teachers who needed special training. This could focus the school on a particular aspect of instruction.

Dr. Cronin commented that he was looking for this kind of report. He did not think much would happen to the Board priorities as the Board changed because these were the bill of rights for students. It had to be implemented so that teachers had a bill of rights to have the resources that they need to teach. They had heard often that the Board needed to know what it was committing by budget, and the paper did have a fiscal note which did say that this was a costly enterprise. However, this would be a benefit to students. He indicated that he would listen to new Board members because they

were asking that the new Board members also own those priorities. He inquired about autonomy for local schools because it would appear they often gave autonomy to plan and little autonomy to provide the resources. Dr. Michael Bonner, principal of Glenallan Elementary School, replied that they did have autonomy through the minigrant process established for Priority 2. He would like to see a little more autonomy on how to use those funds at the local level, given that someone would audit how these funds were used.

Dr. Cody said he had been giving some preliminary thought to the committee proposals for staff training. He thought the academy was a very good idea. On the basis of information he had been getting, the faculty of every school was at a different stage in this process. The decision as to what was needed at that school ought to be made at the local level. The academy would be a service operation responding to what the principals and teachers at each school said they needed. Dr. Cronin asked whether they were planning to bring classroom teachers to the academy to teach or to use central staff. Dr. Martin replied that they planned to do both. Dr. Patricia Sweeney, area director of educational services, said that at present many subject specialists in the area offices were spending a major portion of their time training new teachers. They felt this was a rather inefficient way, and the academy would be a way in which they could reassign some of the subject specialists along with some central office staff to do training. They felt very strongly that classroom teachers who had been trained and were doing a good job in implementation should also be involved in planning and teaching. Dr. Cody said they were considering how much it would cost to have regular teachers expert in curriculum to provide leadership in workshops for other teachers. Dr. Martin added that another aspect of this was demonstration classrooms and placing the academy in a location where it would be easy for teachers to visit classes.

Dr. Cronin called attention to a statement that training was not considered an optional activity or a fringe benefit. He would change one word in terms of "required activity" to a "right" or a "benefit." He also noted the report listed methods of teaching early adolescents, and he hoped that in the future they could talk about this because this was critical.

Mrs. Praisner thought the document was useful for Board and staff and also for the community to understand where they were and the timetable. It would be useful to modify this as they went along and see whether they had met the timetables. She had a question about cable television because she had heard at the County Council that the cable company might not be incorporating wiring for schools as part of their obligation. She asked that the status of this be clarified with the county government. Dr. Cody replied that the obligation of the cable company was to run the cable to the closest corner of the school building. They had learned recently that the cable was stopping at the street; however, they would follow up on this.

Mrs. Praisner was not sure how the academy would interact with existing staff development. She asked whether staff development would operate the academy and what component would assure that not only were the courses offered but that people were taking advantage of them. Dr. Martin replied that the steering committee decided it was not their role to discuss how the school system was organized. She had discussed with staff development a variety of ways to approach planning, and they had taken on the planning for a comprehensive staff development plan and the academy. In regard to courses, the problem was the courses were after school and for credit. People did not need credit or 45 hours of afterschool activity. They saw the academy as approaching this very differently and providing either summer workshops or primarily school-day workshops in which the teachers would have a substitute. They saw the whole delivery method and the incentive as being different. Dr. Bonner added that each school would be required to come up with a long-range training plan.

Mrs. Praisner said that in regard to Dr. Cronin's remarks she would call this a "required component." She said they had talked about 15 curriculum coordinators and asked whether they were planning to start with the .5 position in 30 schools and then to evaluate the impact of that position. There would be no commitment to that process until after the evaluation was completed. Dr. Martin replied that they had talked about trying different models of staffing at every level. Mrs. Marie Anderson, principal of Stedwick Elementary School, added that this was an area where they talked about what happened back at the school. They wanted to look at how these people were working and what use could be made of their training. Mrs. Praisner asked whether they were looking toward having one of these positions in every school, and Mrs. Anderson replied that they were but they were willing to start on a small scale. Mrs. Praisner said there was talk about allocating by need and not by numbers. She asked whether they were talking about extra positions. Dr. Bonner replied that numbers had to be one of the first criteria. He thought that the area office did a good job of assigning teaching staff, and he did not see this as a change in the process. Mrs. Praisner asked whether they were referring to other kinds of staff positions, and Dr. Sweeney replied that they were thinking about the subject specialist time allocations by school.

Mr. Ewing was concerned about the issue of balancing the need to assure that schools had flexibility in meeting needs with the need to assure that there is an objective which is common for all schools at all levels. He remarked that parents were worried about schools being uneven, being staffed differently and doing things differently. Whether this was true or not, it was a firm belief among large numbers of parents. He said the Board felt Priority 1 was important because it was reacting to that concern in part. The purpose would not be flexibility or variability but the achievement of that kind of objective. He felt that this was extremely important to communicate this to parents and the community. He had heard people worry about the minigrants on that score. A lot of people did not understand there was a larger and overarching purpose

for these grants. Dr. Peg Egan, principal of Eastern, replied that schools did have different populations and different expertise among staff. However, the point of the local school planning was to get people up to a standard. This year she had 15 teachers who were either first or second year teachers in Montgomery County. All of these teachers needed more training. She thought it needed to be said that the point of flexibility was to reduce variability in terms of a child's education, not to increase it.

Ms. Meyer explained that they required every school to plan and pay close attention to content areas. Those plans would be reviewed and considered by the area office. There would be a dialogue between the area and school regarding adjustments to the plans. Dr. Shoenberg stated that this was an important point because part of the reason this issue came forth was a lack of clarity on the part of the school community as to where the school was headed. He thought there should be a game plan so that everybody was headed for the same goal, and he asked whether schools went beyond one year in terms of goals and objectives. Mr. Joseph Villani, area director for instructional services, commented that Priority 2 called for a five-year plan and goals. They were calling for a parallel process in Priority 1. Dr. Shoenberg hoped that this could be shared with the school community.

Mrs. Slye thanked the committee for their thoroughness in both a proposed implementation process and a budget process. She said many good ideas were lost in the school system because they were not thorough in the way they were implemented. Dr. Cronin asked if the ideal plan began with a dialogue between the teachers, principals, and parents, went to the area office for discussion, and returned for refinement with teachers, parents, and principals. Dr. Egan replied that they had in mind a process similar to the one used in Priority 2. They did try to get community input, review, and dialogue.

Dr. Shoenberg thought they were headed in the right direction, and the timing was right. He said that it was clear that staff development was central. The longer these discussions went on, the more obvious it was that if they were going to change they had to focus on instruction. The whole report and the academy addressed the instruction issue head on, and for that reason he found this very helpful. They did need to be clear on the status of the training as a requirement versus something people could take advantage of if they wanted to. It seemed to him that the option came at the school level, and it was an option not whether something was going to take place but what was going to take place. He thanked staff for the report and remarked that he had seldom seen something that Board members had embraced so wholeheartedly. In regard to Priority 2, Dr. Cody explained that schools had plans, these plans were being carried out, and the area offices were monitoring whether schools were carrying out the plans. He said that decisions had been made last year about specific targets, and they had set in motion the collection of information. Reports would be provided to the Board and the public.

Mrs. Helen Holston, supervisor of elementary instruction, said that staff working on Priority 2 had given the Board reports on several occasions. The report before the Board highlighted steps that had already been taken. This year they would continue to expand their clearing house function. Last year they had tried to develop something that would provide resources to schools to help support the plans that schools had adopted. This was in the form of a resource manual developed by Mrs. Helen Chaset, educational diagnostician. Mrs. Chaset explained that the manual was not the result of her own work but rather a result of everyone in the school system recognizing that Priority 2 was their top priority last year.

Mrs. Holston reported that they were sharing information about successful programs so that the school system would not be in the position of recreating the wheel. She said that one of their charges was to involve more parents and community members in the project. The steering committee would be coming up with some specific plans in terms of how this could be addressed. This year they wanted to work through central office's responsibilities and would be working with Priority 1 in terms of the roles and responsibilities of central office. They also had another task force working on this and hoped to have a report very soon. The last one was to initiate monitoring of what was going on in the schools. The Department of Educational Accountability was working a system where they could get information from schools and determine whether schools were meeting the targets at least for the first year. The addendum to the report identified the targets set system-wide. Each local school developed its own plan and would be looking at the targets set for the first year. Mrs. Holston explained that the implementation process was in the area office now, and the associate superintendents were present to answer those questions. Mrs. Praisner asked that the Board Office be provided with a copy of the resource book so that Board members could examine the book in detail.

Dr. Cody remarked that they had taken the school system staff with community support through a process which had made them knowledgeable about the problem. In every school in the county they had an understanding of the disparity in achievement and participation, individual targets, and a specific plan of how the school last year proposed to accomplish those targets. They had the monitoring of those plans by the area office to help schools carry out the plans to the extent the individual schools needed help. The key results would be contained in the information gathered to see the extent to which the discrepancies were reduced. If they gathered information and were not satisfied, they would go back and look at other ways.

Mr. Ewing thought this was a good report and a helpful one. He reported that he had borrowed and read about a dozen of the individual school plans from last year, and it was obvious that they were just starting this process of looking at this issue. There

were a lot of people involved in learning what they needed to do. However, he thought there was still a lot missing from those plans. Sometimes he had the flavor that the school had done its plan and so much for planning. He hoped that the effort to think through the problem was something that did not stop there but went on, was refined, and enriched by the experiences that others were having in successful programs. He hoped that they were continuing to have intensive school-based involvement in thinking through the problem and refining the plans. Mr. Ewing said the progress report spoke to gains in achievement and participation of black and Hispanic students. He agreed that this was the major concern that the Board had, but the progress report did not speak to Asian students at all. Many Asian parents had pointed out that not every Asian student was average, and there were some having great difficulty academically and a great many having difficulty in terms of participation in school activities. He asked what they were doing in that arena.

Dr. Paul Vance, area associate superintendent, thought his first concern was a very legitimate one and an overarching concern of the area offices. He agreed that it was difficult to maintain the concentrated focus for an extended period of time, and while they intended to keep the focus on Priority 2 it would be a difficult task. On Mr. Ewing's second concern, Dr. Vance reported that two schools in Area 1 had reviewed their targets and resource needs because of an unexpected influx of Asian students.

Dr. Cody agreed with Dr. Vance's first comment, but he had faith that the belief was strong in the school system to keep attending to Priority 2. He believed that when the various measures were taken in the spring, this would further draw their attention to success and the need for course corrections.

Dr. Lee Etta Powell, area associate superintendent, commented that in regard to the plans Mr. Ewing read he may have seen missing the implementation strategies to achieve the goals that were identified in the plans. The schools had to work out a process to achieve the goals, and then when the teams visited the focus of the teams would be on a dialogue in the schools to determine what the implementation strategies were and how successful the schools were in the attainment of their goals.

Dr. Floyd asked whether the team could tell some people that the plans were not suitable. Mrs. Holston was sure that some teams did. The purpose of the teams was to hear the data and to hear the plans that the schools had developed as a result of the data. They had the opportunity to discuss with the schools whether they felt there were some shortcomings, and schools incorporated a lot of the ideas from the teams in their own plans. The teams would be revisiting the schools in the spring. Dr. Vance added that in many instances visiting teams did make recommendations and were not satisfied with the original effort of the school. In some instances the team visited two or three times until they came to agreement on a plan and its content.

Dr. Floyd assumed the Board had received in prior reports the information on Priority 2 that was contained in the new Priority 1 report. Dr. Shoenberg responded that the report on Priority 2 was a summary of last year's activities and the preliminary plans were not in the same form as those in Priority 1. Dr. Floyd appreciated Dr. Vance's observation. He hoped that they would define "help" broadly and define it to mean that they expected the schools to get positive results. The priority was not an option to engage in if one was so inclined.

Mr. Ewing remarked that the public was bothered by this priority because they saw it as something the school system did at the cost of other students. The school system had to make the public understand that they were doing this, not at the cost of other students, but if they were successful all students would benefit. They also had an obligation to do what they must to help those students who were having difficulties, whether academic or participatory. He mentioned that the Board had received the report of its committee on minority student achievement. He thought it was helpful and that it would be useful for the steering committee to receive copies of the report and to respond to it in some fashion because it did relate to Priority 2 concerns.

Dr. Shoenberg thanked the committee for the useful discussion. He said the Board felt they were heading in the right direction.

Re: Long-range Plan for Curricula

Dr. Shoenberg recalled that the document before the Board had been done at the request of a former Board member. It seemed to him that her request was well founded because he found the document extremely useful.

Dr. Cody reported that the motion adopted by the Board dealt with a master plan. After discussing this with Mrs. Shannon, he determined that she had in mind a chart that showed the status of the various curriculum initiatives that the school system had taken or not taken. This would allow them to see the diversity or the missing links of what they were doing or not doing in the school system in terms of curriculum areas. As they pulled the information together, staff had concluded that they were not ready for a chart yet. They wanted a discussion with the Board to further clarify what they wanted to know about all of these things.

Dr. Martin remarked that this exercise turned out to be unbelievably difficult because they did not speak the same language. This project was a big education for staff, and they had decided to maintain something like this. She pointed out why elementary schools had felt overloaded and called attention to Board policies on grading and organizing the curriculum by objectives that could be measured. While the only new direction was the reading/language arts curriculum K-8, the rest of curriculum was organized by grade level objectives. All of that caused big changes in elementary

schools. There were content changes in the seventh and eighth grades. She said that while they kept up to date in course materials, there had been little changes in curriculum at the senior high school level. The change here was the English program.

Dr. Shoenberg requested questions from Board members and topics for further discussion. Miss Duby recalled reading about a study group in math and science; however, the only reference was to a study group in foreign languages. She said that every time they discussed foreign languages they discussed the course sequence in seventh and eighth grade. Dr. Martin said they did plan to address these issues but at the moment they had a vacancy in the coordinator position. There was a 1979 report of an ad hoc committee appointed by the deputy superintendent, and staff had followed up on some of these recommendations. She thought that the whole intermediate level curriculum needed a look because their current Program of Studies could not be taught because there was too much of it. They also had the junior high and middle school policies which did create options for schools. Miss Duby indicated that she would be interested in discussing this topic at another time.

In regard to graduation requirements, Miss Duby asked if the needs assessment would be done in two or three years. Mr. Richard Pioli, director of the Division of Aesthetic Education, replied that they would see something unofficial before next September because the requirement took effect for the incoming ninth grade. It would take longer to figure out the sequence of what was going to happen in four years.

Dr. Cronin had thought they needed a time frame with costs for each level of the time frame. He said that where it said "current status development" he would ask about the completion date and at what cost. He would like to know the staging of curriculum, the time frame, and the resources needed. Dr. Cody replied that this would be the information in the long-range plan. The Priority 1 steering committee would be developing a plan along the model he had described at the Board/staff retreat. Dr. Fountain and his staff were developing a plan for school-to-work transition for handicapped students. The first stage was a conceptual stage of identifying objectives, outcome measures, and a strategy. The second stage would contain how long, who would do it, and at what cost. The question would be whether they would follow through on everything they did. They agreed it should be done for the priorities and other programs such as computer education and gifted and talented education. To answer all of these things on curriculum would be a series of separate documents.

Dr. Martin indicated that they had to select the items they did in detail because it required a great deal of compromise among 30 different programs. She would argue strongly that they select a few that they were going to do at that level of detail. Mr. Ewing expressed his agreement. Part of the problem they faced was figuring out what they had in front of them in terms of where they

were going and what process they were going to follow to get there. He took this as neither a master chart nor a long-range plan. This was a snap shot of where they were with some observations here and there of where they ought to go. He thought it would be helpful to the Board if there could be some further discipline applied to this in the sense of saying had they included only that which had already been approved. Dr. Martin noted that the "needs" in the paper had not been approved. Mr. Ewing noted that in some cases those needs had been incorporated in plans. If they would distinguish between those, they would have nothing but a snapshot. Then they could begin to fill in those areas where they thought they should move.

It seemed to Dr. Shoenberg that it would be helpful if they had some idea of where the principal cruxes were for the staff. Mrs. Praisner agreed with Mr. Ewing's remarks. She said they needed to differentiate between what was in place and where they were going. She would like to see a cost figure about things they had decided to implement but as yet had not implemented. The Board would know how long it would take and how much it would cost to have all schools implement curricula that had been adopted. She would like to see a list of the kinds of things staff had identified as areas where there would have to be changes. They should identify the decisions the Board had to make. She agreed that they had to look at the foreign language area. They had to look at arts and science. She thought they had to discuss career education and career programs which might be incorporated in the discussion they were going to have about vocational programs up-county. They might want to talk about internships and the community service question. She had a question about an honors course in chamber music. She had a concern about "honors" being listed until they had evaluated the honors program that they had.

Mrs. DiFonzo commented that there was a considerable body of concern in the community among parents of learning disabled children in regard to the fine arts requirement. These children are mainstreamed for subjects such as art, and while the children were doing well in academic subjects, they seemed to be doing poorly in arts courses. Parents think their children will not be able to graduate because they would not be able to pass the fine arts requirement. Parents talked about eye/hand coordination problems, gross motor skill problems, and reading problems. Mr. Pioli replied that this was one of their concerns with the advent of the required credit. However, they would not be able to figure this out between now and September. The requirement was for all students, and they were taking this concern very seriously because parents and students had a tremendous concern about this. He did believe that there were going to be some special courses developed because he did not think those kinds of children could be successful in the courses that they already had in existence. He commented that the fine arts credit was a challenge that they had to meet not only in making sure that courses were there but that students felt good about taking these courses.

Dr. Shoenberg agreed that there was a need to have Board discussion

on the whole matter of foreign languages. It was his feeling that if they were serious about foreign languages they should be teaching them in the elementary schools which was an enormous undertaking.

Mr. Ewing remarked that what they had here was a first paper in a process. He asked whether they needed a response from staff and a proposed process for achieving the results of this effort. Dr. Cody agreed that this was a first step. They wanted to hear from the Board and would go back and have a further discussion with staff. They would further define the paper and decide where they wanted to go with this effort.

Re: Executive Session

The Board met in executive session from 12:20 to 2:05 p.m. on legal and personnel matters.

Re: Board/Press/Visitor Conference

Mrs. Karen McClelland, Kensington-Parkwood PTA, appeared before the Board.

Resolution No. 639-84                      Re: Award of Procurement Contracts  
Over \$25,000 and Rejection of a  
Bid

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

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

WHEREAS, Sufficient funds will be budgeted for replacement of school buses in FY 86 operating budget; and

WHEREAS, All bids received in response to Bid 7-85, Portable Telescoping Scaffold, should be rejected and rebid with revised specifications that include additional designs that may be economically advantageous and to encourage additional competition; now therefore be it

Resolved, That Bid 7-85 be rejected; and be it further

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

	Name of Vendor(s)	Dollar Value of Contract
13-85	Trucks	
	Chevy Chase Chevrolet	\$ 84,129
	less trade-ins	-4,150

	Sport Chevrolet Co., Inc.	61,626
	less trade-ins	-2,500
	Steuart Motor Co.	46,050
	less trade-ins	-1,150
	Wantz Chevrolet, Inc.	11,026
	less trade-ins	-650
	Total	\$ 194,381
29-85	Industrial Arts Finishing Materials	
	Brodhead-Garrett Company	\$ 11,680
	Graves Humphreys Company	2,741
	McKilligan Supply Corporation	8,706
	Roberts Company of D.C., Inc.	724
	Thompson & Cooke, Inc.	1,815
	Total	\$ 25,666
35-85	Library Media Center Supplies	
	Brodart Co.	\$ 5,545
	Chaselle, Inc.	8,911
	Demco, Inc.	2,688
	Gaylord Brothers, Inc.	3,096
	Kunz, Inc.	788
	Nicholas Pipino Associates	6,983
	University Products	1,032
	Nelson C. White Co.	1,400
	Total	\$ 30,443
42-85	Magazine Subscriptions	
	Popular Subscription	\$ 163,046
44-85	School Buses	
	International Harvester Co.	\$ 280,432
	Sonny Merryman less trade-ins	-78,900
	Wantz Chevrolet, Inc.	1,590,938
	Total	\$1,792,470
53-85	Processed Meats	
	Concept Marketing	\$ 2,700
	Manassas Frozen Foods	3,150
	Mazo Lerch Co., Inc.	19,382
	A. W. Schmidt & Son, Inc.	12,948
	Smelkinson Brothers Corporation	1,740
	Stanley Foods and Equipment Co., Inc.	7,020
	Total	\$ 46,940
	GRAND TOTAL	\$2,252,946

Resolution No. 640-84

Re: Boiler and Heating System  
Replacement at Fairland Elementary  
School and Boiler and Piping  
Replacement at Georgian Forest  
Elementary School - Rejection of  
Bids

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

WHEREAS, Sealed bids were received on December 6, 1984, for boiler and heating system replacement at Fairland Elementary School (Proposal A) and boiler and piping replacement at Georgian Forest Elementary School (Proposal B) as follows:

Bidders	Proposal A	Proposal B
Combined A&B		
1. Charles W. Lonas and Sons	\$208,800	\$103,100
\$311,900		
2. E.J. Whelan & Company	256,203	128,860
385,063		
3. Tyler Mech. Contracting, Inc.	264,000	135,000
399,000		
4. Arey, Inc.	285,582	146,100
431,682		
5. American Combustion, Inc.	295,470	146,444
438,414		

and

WHEREAS, Bidders were not responsive in their bid documents in providing references statements of compliance with asbestos removal and disposal and/or letters from surety reference bonding which are material and significant; and

WHEREAS, The projects will be rebid in January with particular attention being focused on the deficiencies of the support documentation accompanying the bid proposals; now therefore be it

Resolved, That all bids received on December 6 be rejected and that the boiler and heating system at Fairland Elementary School and the boiler and piping replacement at Georgian Forest Elementary School be readvertised at the earliest possible convenience.

Resolution No. 641-84                      Re: Accessibility Modifications for  
the Handicapped - Various Schools

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

WHEREAS, Sealed bids were received on November 27, 1984, for accessibility modifications for the handicapped at various schools, as indicated below:

Bidder	Base Bid
1. Ernest R. Sines, Inc.	\$158,900
2. Jesse Dustin & Son, Inc.	195,000

and

WHEREAS, The low bidder, Ernest R. Sines, Inc., has performed similar projects satisfactorily; and

WHEREAS, Recommended bid is within staff estimate and sufficient funds are available to effect award; now therefore be it

Resolved, That a contract for \$158,900 be awarded to Ernest R. Sines, Inc., to accomplish accessibility modifications for the handicapped at various schools (listed below) in accordance with plans and specifications covering this work dated November 5, 1984, prepared by Arley J. Koran, Inc., architect:

- |                                      |                                     |
|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 1. John T. Baker Intermediate School | 6. Redland Middle School            |
| 2. Albert Einstein High School       | 7. Rock View Elementary School      |
| 3. Glen Haven Elementary School      | 8. Westover Elementary School       |
| 4. Glenallan Elementary School       | 9. White Oak Junior High School     |
| 5. Jackson Road Elementary School    | 10. Charles W. Woodward High School |

Resolution No. 642-84                      Re: Negotiated Settlement - Roof Failure Col. Zadok Magruder High School

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

WHEREAS, Legal counsel and staff have negotiated a \$40,000 value settlement for the premature roof failure at Col. Zadok Magruder High School from the following parties:

Bird, Inc. (Material Supplier)	
1,000 roofing squares of roofing shingles	\$30,000 value
Orndorff & Spaid, Inc. (Roofing Contractor)	
Roofing services to Board of Education	8,000
Glen Construction Co. (General Contractor)	
Cash payment	2,000

and

WHEREAS, Legal counsel and staff recommend that a \$40,000 value settlement is an equitable share of the \$200,000 cost to replace the roof since the original roof was used approximately 13 years and the reroofing specification requirements were increased; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the superintendent be authorized to accept the



Resolution No. 645-84

Re: Extension of Sick Leave

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

WHEREAS, The employee listed below has suffered serious illness; and  
WHEREAS, Due to the prolonged illness, the employee's accumulated sick leave has expired; now therefore be it

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

Name	Position and Location	No. of Days
Doris T. Webster	Building Service Worker Magruder High School	30

Resolution No. 646-84

Re: Death of Miss Catherine Ashley,  
Auditory Teacher at Bradley Hills  
Elementary School

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

WHEREAS, The death on November 25, 1984, of Miss Catherine Ashley, auditory teacher at Bradley Hills Elementary School, has deeply saddened the staff and members of the Board of Education; and

WHEREAS, For the eighteen years that Miss Ashley had been a member of the staff of Montgomery County Public Schools, she displayed that rare ability to provide maximally stimulating learning experiences through a happy, relaxed classroom environment; and

WHEREAS, Miss Ashley had earned the respect of her colleagues, pupils and parents; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the members of the Board of Education express their sorrow at the death of Miss Catherine Ashley 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 Miss Ashley's family.

Resolution No. 647-84

Re: Death of Mr. Robert E. Dorsey,  
Bus Attendant, Special Education,  
Division of Transportation

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

WHEREAS, The death on November 20, 1984, of Mr. Robert E. Dorsey, bus attendant, special education, in the Division of Transportation, has deeply saddened the staff and members of the Board of Education; and

WHEREAS, Mr. Dorsey had been a loyal employee of Montgomery County Public Schools for over twenty-one years; and

WHEREAS, Mr. Dorsey's dedication to his 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 Mr. Robert E. Dorsey 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. Dorsey's family.

Resolution No. 648-84                      Re: Death of Mrs. Kathryn A. Mullinix,  
   Cafeteria Worker II at Baker  
   Intermediate School

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

WHEREAS, The death on November 21, 1984, of Mrs. Kathryn A. Mullinix, cafeteria worker II at J. T. Baker Intermediate School, has deeply saddened the staff and members of the Board of Education; and

WHEREAS, Mrs. Mullinix had been a loyal employee of Montgomery County Public Schools and a member of the cafeteria staff for more than 24 years; and

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

Resolved, That the members of the Board of Education express their sorrow at the death of Mrs. Kathryn A. Mullinix 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. Mullinix's family.

Resolution No. 649-84                      Re: Personnel Appointment

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

Resolved, That the following personnel appointment be approved:

Appointment	Present Position	As
Edward W. Shirley	Administrative Asst. to the Deputy Supt. of Schools-Gen. Adminis.	Principal Designate Sligo Middle School Effective as of March 1, 1985
	Office of the Deputy Superintendent	

Re: Focus of a Proposed Policy on  
Special Programs

Dr. Cody reported that they were in an early stage on this project and needed Board help to think through issues and questions. This might lead to a policy, process, or perhaps a set of criteria. He had asked Dr. Kenneth K. Muir, director of the Department of Information, to gather information about special programs they now had, the population they were serving, what their purposes were, and what criteria had been used to determine the location of the programs. He asked the Board to identify the variables they thought it was important to consider. At a minimum they needed to think about items to consider when decisions were made about special programs.

Dr. Muir explained that in the past a lot of these programs had been implemented through budget deliberations. They hoped in the next several years to have a long-range plan that would stand by itself as opposed to the budget being a planning process.

Dr. Shoenberg asked that the Board see whether they agreed on the assumptions, A through E, and then proceed through the questions one by one. Mr. Ewing was concerned about the second assumption and the definition of equity. Equity was posed in terms of opposites. He did not think equity meant making every program available to every student, and he did not think it was a matter of equal dollars spent. He thought that equity had to do with access and availability of certain things they believed either so good that they ought not be denied to anyone or fundamental elements of everyone's education. He cited the seven-period day as an example of the latter; however, he did not feel there was as much agreement about all-day kindergarten and the up-county magnets. There they had to ask the extent to which those fit the criteria and when they wanted to go beyond the criteria to undertake something that might be experimental and desirable. With respect to the last of the five, he agreed that special programs should be evaluated regularly and thought everything else should be as well.

Mrs. Praisner recalled that when she first raised the subject she hoped they would not get into a policy because she saw this more as a process. She would agree that the items listed were the kinds of things they needed to examine. As a result of this discussion, she hoped it would force the system, the Board, and the community to

define a special program and why something was being initiated. Everyone affected by the program would understand clearly what was going on when something was done. They would make some determinations as to the impact of the decision and some information as to the commitment they were making for funding, accessibility, and evaluation. She thought that some of the questions presented were valid for them to address although she was not sure of some of the wording. She thought it was necessary for the Board and the system to have some clear focus as to what they were doing and why they were doing it. She would define equity as equal access to programs if one has determined already that is a program one is qualified to have access for. Equal access to every program would not be for every person. If they have a program for a special population, they were talking about equal access within that special population. She stressed that they had to be clear to the community that "equity" did not mean "equal."

Dr. Cody stated that as a minimum they were talking about an outline of those ideas that ought to be developed so that the proposal answered the questions. He had come across topnotch ideas in which the full implications of whether or not this was for everyone or for certain students had not been thought through. Another dimension was the role of special programs that were locally developed that might differ. For example, in the areas they had alternative programs for high school students which were not the same in each area.

Dr. Cronin recalled that when this came before the Board they had specific issues. He did not think they should lose track of that particular idea. He said there would be a need to have equal education comprehensively K-12 as Mrs. Praisner had said. If that was not there, the special programs were not meant to compensate for the lack of equal education in those schools. If there was a special program designed for a special need, were that need to shift, the program would also shift. This would meet a need they had over and above the need of fundamental education. Therefore, there might be a need for up-county vocational education area as opposed to the Wheaton/Edison Center type of education. It might be a different type and quality of program. The programs might end up being completely different. If they had magnet programs in one school to attract students to that school, they had to ask whether the next closest school needed the same program. If that next closest school needed resources to provide adequate education, it needed that education no matter what was in the next closest school. He asked whether they were developing competing schools within the same cluster for the same kinds of services. He asked whether the creation of a special program led to that program becoming the ordinary program.

Mrs. Slye thought that one of their problems might be that the Board had never defined the term "magnet" or "special" program. She noted that they also spoke to the concept of a two-tier process based on cost, and she wondered whether many of the issues raised in items 1 through 6 did not also lend themselves to two-tier consideration

based on definition of the terms "magnet" vs. "special." In other words, it had been the Board's pattern to deal differently with a situation calling for a magnet program than simply a special program situation. She suggested they clarify their terms and look to a two-tier process based not only on funding but also on terminology. She shared concerns about equity, particularly as it related to accessibility rather than to identical programs. She was concerned in No. 6 that in expanding the minigrant process they might tend to favor those schools most creative in their approaches to their own problems. Mr. Ewing thought this was a very important point because sometimes when they asked people to go through a process it stifled their ability to come up with anything. Similarly with regard to the Board, he said they were not going to write a policy or procedure that prohibited Board members from introducing new concepts or proposals. At the same time if they ended up with a policy or process saying that a Board member was responsible for writing up a full proposal and costing it out, they would not get that either. He suggested there had to be some provision for concepts and ideas to come forward and go through a process of getting developed.

Mr. Ewing said there could be a checklist for major proposals that included objectives, needs to be met, who was to be served, what was the access or availability of the program, what grade and school level was to be served, when should it go into effect, where, at what cost, and what the timing would be. He thought this was important and worth doing. He said there were three different kinds of programs, vocational programs, gifted and talented programs, and magnet programs for the purposes of integration. He remarked that all of these had given them problems in answering the kinds of questions that were on the checklist he had listed.

Mrs. Praisner liked the idea of a checklist and explained that they had problems with these programs because other groups wanted the programs without the Board's being clearly able to define whether the program met their needs. In one case they had instituted a program without understanding the financial implications. They had also changed delivery of the program by adding bus transportation without understanding what the impact of that would be. They had developed all-day kindergartens as magnets for integration and then had moved them elsewhere. She would add to the checklist, questions of long-term, definition of the population, impact on existing programs and existing schools, and long-term implications of the program regarding expansion. Dr. Cody would add another category on analyzing the impact on other programs. For example, as they expanded computer education programs in the high schools, there was a drop in industrial arts. He pointed out that they had added high school graduation requirements and did not know the consequences.

Dr. Muir added that one question was raised in connection with an art center. The question was the impact of a central art center on resident programs in other schools.

Dr. Shoenberg commented that they were in this problem because two

situations existed. One was that it was a long way from one end of the county to the other, and the second one was that they did not have unlimited funds. If things were closer together and they had unlimited funds, they would not be looking at a policy. Another problem was that someone came along with a suggestion of something neat to do, and everyone else could think of three other things that would be neat to do. The question was which were they to do. Those things rising to the attention of the Board come before the Board for a variety of reasons and represented only a portion of the ideas considered. He stated that to try and adopt a program that dotted the "i's" and crossed the "t's" on all questions would probably tie them up in knots. He thought that a checklist was the right direction in which to go. However, they should not have an elaborate set of procedures which precluded them for exercising their judgment.

Dr. Cronin felt that one important element was in section four because too often the Board did an end-run around staff. The proposals came from above rather than working their way up through staff. He would like to see a process where the Board received information rather than creating. Mr. Ewing differed with that view. He said that he was not elected solely to be the recipient of staff ideas. Board members were also elected to implement ideas that were of interest and importance to the community. He thought the Board's job was to test those ideas against the realities of what staff thought was feasible and affordable by going through a checklist.

Dr. Cronin thought that if the only way a needed program could become reality was by a Board member raising it, there was something wrong with the system. Mr. Ewing did not agree because ideas came to them from a whole range of reasons and they always would. Miss Duby noted that the comment had been made that the Board waited for budget to make changes; however, this was the only time they looked at everything in one block. She suggested that they needed better communication to the community on items that were on the top of the Board's list. She thought they needed to do things a little less piecemeal, and she said that if they communicated better they would avoid the charges that the Board was not being equitable.

It seemed to Dr. Floyd that they were dealing with initiatives on the one hand and developmental approaches on the other. He thought that these were tied together, and he hoped they would never get to the day when they had only one route to an idea arriving at the Board table. He would welcome ideas flowing to the Board from every direction. However, when they were trying to deal with an idea or a program, there were some things they had to know. They had to know what the fiscal impact would be, and they needed to know the possible impact on other programs. It seemed to him that a checklist was a good idea.

Dr. Shoenberg commented that they were using a little different procedure with the budget this time which would give them the opportunity to know at what points in the budget people would want

to raise issues. They might have a list of items that people wanted to augment or reduce. He thought these ideas should come together at budget time, but they should not come seriatim. Before they made decisions, he thought they should have before them a list of the things that were of the same magnitude, scope, and type that they had also talked about doing. He remarked that there was something to be said for certain things rising to the surface, but there were some ideas that never really came to the Board's attention. Sometimes items got the Board's attention for the wrong reasons. He recalled that the issue precipitating this discussion was the math/science/computer program for the northern part of the county. This had been insisted upon by a fairly broad range of people and came to the Board's attention in legitimate ways. There were other things they might do with the same amount of money that they should consider in tandem. As part of the process, he would like to see some kind of listing of what were the other things that needed to be considered at the same time as an alternative to the proposal they were dealing with.

Mrs. Praisner stated that she was not clear about Dr. Shoenberg's suggestion. She worried about having four or five proposals and communities competing for them. She did not like the word "competition" because it implied that one was going to choose other things. She said that it was not always a choice of "X" or "Y" and might be a choice of none of the above. She thought that tying this to budget was part of the problem. She did not see the actions coming at the same time as the budget because there were a lot of compromises in the budget. She suggested that they needed self-discipline when it came to the budget based on what they had already committed to. She thought they needed a list of prior commitments such as the seven-period day.

Dr. Cronin said that as they talked about items the community acted on these items before a staff response came back to the Board. For example, as they discussed the Watkins Mill school they heard about the effect it could have on Gaithersburg. In terms of the Area 2 task force, there was almost a group formed before it was brought up as a Board issue.

It seemed to Mr. Ewing that they were never going to escape competition and the question of who got what, when, and how. He said that what Dr. Shoenberg was talking about was being clear in advance of the adoption of the budget about when things might be scheduled for implementation and what they would cost on a yearly basis. He thought that the superintendent and his staff did a fair amount of this already. He recalled that several years ago the Board had a planning process which required them to meet a number of times, well in advance of the budget, to review major program areas for the purpose of deciding whether those were areas they wanted to pursue, expand, or contract. In 1979 the Board abolished this procedure, and he thought they had to overcome the legacy from that Board. He thought they were starting on a planning and development process.

Mrs. DiFonzo commented that they had gotten into problems in the budget process because of commitments they had made to programs put in place over the years. In addition, they had been known to make personnel decisions in the process of the budget and close schools in the budget process. To her way of thinking, none of those items belonged in the budget process. She thought they did need to establish a process for this, whether it was a checklist or some other format. However, she would not like to see a policy because they might paint themselves into a corner.

Dr. Cody said he had a clear notion about what the next step would be. He would identify steps to consider for a checklist or a guide, and he would bring this back to the Board.

Re: Community Arts Concept Paper

Dr. Cody reported that the Board had had money placed in its budget, and the Board had asked for ideas on how to respond. Several months ago the Board received a paper identifying several alternatives including a proposal for a community arts center. He had asked Dr. Martin and staff to look at the community arts alternative because this seemed to be what the Council was thinking about. The paper before the Board suggested a governance structure set up by the Council with the cooperation of the school system; however, the paper did not identify a specific site.

Mr. Richard Pioli, director of aesthetic education, explained that the paper was an attempt to give life to the idea of a community arts center serving all age levels and all groups. It could possibly be located in a closed school but the paper did not limit the center to a closed school. One part would be a program for children and youth in which they would present to preschoolers as well as school-aged children arts instruction that would not take the place of school art instruction. The second component had to do with programs for adults and families. The third component had to do with the artists-in-residence program which would allow artists to rent space at reduced costs. The fourth component had to do with the auxiliary programs which would supplement regular programs. They would hope there would be community theatre space, gallery space, and an opportunity for the artists to sell their products. They were suggesting a board of directors be put together from the business community as well as some representatives from the county government and the schools. This would give them a structure that would be able to govern and to raise funds. They had included a budget based on Montgomery County government salaries.

Dr. Cronin liked the proposal because it was in a closed school, foundation funded, and a Montgomery County operation rather than a school system operation. He thought the paper put the arts center back where it did belong and did support the arts community. He saw the MCPS involvement as being an active encouragement of the program rather than planning.

Mrs. Evelyn Ordman, president of the Montgomery County Arts Council,

stated that a great deal of thought had gone into this proposal. Speaking for her executive committee, she said they had a list of 75 visual and performing artists who had requested studio space at a reasonable price. Dr. Posilkin had been working with the Council to rent empty classrooms. However, the proposal before the Board might not be attainable because of financing. She thought it would conflict with other fund raising efforts in the arts. Secondly, the arts center would duplicate many programs offered by the Strathmore Hall Arts Center, Montgomery College, and the Department of Recreation. She asked that the Board take no final action on the proposal until her board members had had an opportunity to study it. Dr. Shoenberg explained that this was a discussion item; however, they probably would not need to take action on the proposal because there was no financial involvement of the public schools.

Mr. Eliot Pfanstiehl, director of the Strathmore Art Center, recalled that 25 years ago his father had tried to get an arts center established in Montgomery County. Park and Planning had a similar proposal, and in 1976 a performing arts feasibility study was done which resulted in Strathmore. He cited the acute need for rental studio space for artists. If they were talking about a nongovernment sponsored art center, they had to look at the private sector and see where the dollars could come from in Montgomery County. However, they did not have the head offices of many corporations. He thought that Montgomery County was a very difficult place in which to raise money. He suggested they could contract a lot of services out to existing groups in the county; however, these groups were not well funded. In addition, the Maryland Arts Council was not well funded. Most of the foundations were downtown and did not support Montgomery County activities in any significant amount. He thought that the proposal before the Board was terrific and said that if it happened it would happen because someone pulled together the existing resources. He also urged them to call this the Montgomery County Arts Education Center because the focus should be education.

Mrs. DiFonzo said she understood the proposal to involve no MCPS teachers, no supervisory personnel, and no maintenance people. She said nothing would be taken out of the MCPS school day for participation and no MCPS money would be involved. She did not see how this could require Board of Education action. She thought that the proposal was a great one and thanked staff for developing a non-MCPS proposal. Mrs. Praisner thought that it was an excellent proposal. She agreed no formal Board action was necessary, but it also seemed to her they needed to communicate with the Council if not by Board action perhaps by consensus.

Dr. Cody thought that the proposal before the Board was in line with ideas expressed by Mr. Hanna and others. However, the funds had been placed in the MCPS budget. He agreed that the plan was not for Board implementation, but the Board might wish to convey the plan to the County Council as an idea they might want to consider.

Mr. Ewing thought it was an excellent idea to get the things

together, and he said the proposal was very well developed. It seemed to him there were people in the arts who would want to get involved, and the Board should consider passing along some suggestions to these groups. He suggested that the Board might want to consider endorsing the concept in a formal action without endorsing the method by which it was achieved. They also had to deal with the fact that the money was still in the Board's budget.

Dr. Cronin noted that they had had some discussion with day-care providers. He thought that another way this could become an education program in the arts would be grafting that onto the programs of private day-care providers. Mr. Pfanstiehl suggested they recommend the creation of an arts round table for Montgomery County. Mrs. Ordman added that they could also involve the day-care providers.

Dr. Shoenberg suggested that the superintendent and Board officers get together and decide on an appropriate resolution for Board adoption to deal with the concept paper and the rather complicated funding relationship for the \$1 million. It was his sense that the Board was enthusiastic about the general concept. Mrs. Praisner recalled that as president she had signed a memorandum requiring communication with the Council before the Board expended these funds. Dr. Shoenberg thanked staff for their hard work and the imaginative proposal they had prepared.

Re: Discussion with MCR on Student  
Board Member Election

Miss Ann Sissala, president of MCR, presented the Board with a revised copy of the proposed grievance procedure. Mrs. Praisner said she had spoken to MCR about the need for Board action; however, she was concerned about moving on the grievance procedure without allowing for staff comment.

Resolution No. 650-84                      Re: MCR Student Board Member Election  
Procedure

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

Resolved, That the Board approve the calendar for the major dates for the election of the student member of the Board of Education for 1985; and be it further

Resolved, That the proposal of rules for governing and the grievance procedure be acted upon at a subsequent meeting.

Mrs. Praisner noted that the rules were no different than the ones in place last year. They had some concerns about the rigidity of requiring that the video tape be shown during social studies classes

and that students be given the time to vote during their English classes. Mr. Mike Michaelson explained that the Board would be receiving an assessment report in the very near future. Mrs. Praisner asked whether a principal could have some latitude for scheduling, and Dr. Pitt replied that the regulations could be established to permit this. Miss Jenny Leete felt that this was okay as long as the basic intent of the rules was followed.

Miss Duby stated that a lot of people had strong objections to giving class time to vote. She did not know that increasing voter turnout was the reason for giving class time to vote; however, they were trying to insure that every student who wanted to vote had the time to vote. This was not possible unless class time was given. They were also trying to insure equity between and among schools so that all students had the same opportunity to get to the polls. She said that she had worked with elections procedures for a long time and had had problems with giving principals leeway. She suggested that principals could obtain a waiver from the elections administrator. In this way they would have control and accountability. Dr. Pitt had a problem with that suggestion because it put the elections administrator in a difficult situation.

Dr. Shoenberg said the problem was the enormous variation in voting from one school to another. In a number of cases this was traceable to administrators not keeping up their end of the bargain. They had provided the opportunity for principal input and had received very little; therefore, they assumed the procedure they established was satisfactory. He thought that the students and the Board felt somewhat let down by that behavior. While he felt that some flexibility was appropriate, it had to be in keeping with the intent of whatever it was they came up with.

Dr. Floyd felt that they should do everything necessary to insure that students had an opportunity to vote. On the other hand, he thought the lesson should be real. In the real world the polls were open for a certain time. Dr. Cronin pointed out that adults could make their own decisions on when to vote; however, students might have only three minutes to catch a school bus. He asked whether it would be possible for the special elections committee to be requested by a principal for a change in voting time and grant approval. Miss Tracy Kuka, election administrator, thought it would be difficult for one person to have this responsibility without some backup. Dr. Pitt suggested that perhaps someone in administration could grant this appeal.

Dr. Shoenberg suggested that Mr. Michaelson and Miss Sissala come back to the Board with a proposal to modify the elections procedure to allow some flexibility but maintain the assumption that time would be provided for students to vote.

Mr. Ewing thought that the proposal before the Board was reasonable and that the Board should vote on it. Dr. Shoenberg asked that they next look at the grievance procedure. Miss Leete explained that the procedure was the same as last year's except for section 11 which

allowed for a candidate's filing a grievance against the special elections committee. Mr. Michaelson added that this process had been in effect for seven years, and during that period six grievances had been filed.

Mrs. Praisner asked whether they had to approve the elections procedure annually. She asked that someone check into whether or not they had to have an annual vote. If they could do this, they would only have to vote on any changes in the procedure. They could have a resolution stating that the process would be in place unless altered. Mr. Ewing suggested that the special election committee could establish an annual calendar and let the Board know about it. He said that while he had no objection to Item 11, he wished they could avoid sending everything to hearing examiners. Dr. Shoenberg and Mrs. Praisner also thought they should avoid using a hearing examiner when possible. Mrs. Praisner asked for a staff response to the proposal. Dr. Shoenberg asked that this item be rescheduled as soon as possible in January.

Re: Board Member Comments

1. Mr. Ewing reported that on Saturday he had attended the graduation ceremony for Second Genesis for which the school system provided the educational component. He said it was a good thing the school system continued to support that effort.
2. Mr. Ewing assumed that the Board would be coming back to the issue of legal fees. He noted in the financial report that legal fees were higher than budgeted which was true of past years. Dr. Shaffner replied that they would have a report for the Board in February.
3. In regard to the financial report, Mr. Ewing pointed out an area of difficulty regarding employee benefits. He said that the Board needed some information on why that was occurring and the reason for it. Dr. Pitt replied that they were doing an in-depth analysis, and Dr. Shoenberg asked that this be done in the context of the budget. Mr. Ewing also called attention to an outside consultant's report and suggested the Board and the audit committee look at that report.
4. Mr. Ewing reported that the Board had received a budget format that the county executive's staff developed. He hoped that after the current budget season the Board would address itself to the issue of budget format. Dr. Cody explained that they did have a task force on this subject which would be reporting after the budget.
5. Mr. Ewing said that MCCPTA had sent the Board its comments on the facilities planning activities. He thought it would be important for the Board to address the assumptions used in planning. For example, one assumption that had been used was to put as many students as possible in as few schools as possible which left them with little margin for error.

6. Mr. Ewing indicated that he had been contacted by parents in the Eastern Junior High School area who had concerns about the program being planned for an arts and communications magnet. The parents felt left out as one of two junior highs feeding Blair High School. He said that the Board had talked about this but had not reached resolution. He hoped that the Board could have a report from Dr. Cody, and Dr. Cody indicated that he would provide such a report in the next few weeks.

7. Dr. Cronin stated that yesterday he had the privilege of participating in SAS Day. He had visited a number of sites, and he had heard at these sites that children would be coming home from school excited about what they had learned in the classroom. He expressed his appreciation to the members of staff who prepared the SAS training programs for the teachers and to the Human Relations Department which had done an excellent job as usual.

8. Mrs. Praisner commented that she had reviewed the superintendent's response to the MCCPTA document on facilities planning. She pointed out that many of the MCCPTA recommendations did not relate to the school system. She asked whether Dr. Cody's reaction had been shared with MCCPTA, and Dr. Cody explained that he had sent it to the Board for comment. Mrs. Praisner said that she would like to see the response shared. She asked whether they could have the opportunity to see responses and reactions from other agencies involved. She also suggested that they find out next steps from MCCPTA.

9. Mrs. Praisner assumed that the committee on minority student education would be scheduled for a future meeting. At the same time, the committee had raised a question on the terms of their members. She wondered whether the committee was aware that the terms of some members had been staggered. She pointed out that since the creation of the committee, the Board had made some modifications to the charge of that committee. She hoped they could clarify the membership, the terms of membership, and the charge to the committee.

Resolution No. 651-84

Re: Executive Session - January 8,  
1985

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

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 January 8, 1985, at 9 a.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 proceedings or matters from public disclosure as permitted under Article 76A, Section 11(a) and that such meeting shall continue in executive closed session until the completion of business; and be it further

Resolved, That such meeting continue in executive closed session at noon to discuss the matters listed above as permitted under Article 76A, Section 11(a) and that such meeting shall continue in executive closed session until the completion of business.

Resolution No. 652-84                      Re: Minutes of October 9, 1984

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

Resolved, That the minutes of October 9, 1984, be approved.

Resolution No. 653-84                      Re: Minutes of October 31, 1984

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

Resolved, That the minutes of October 31, 1984, be approved.

Resolution No. 654-84                      Re: Minutes of November 15, 1984

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

Resolved, That the minutes of November 15, 1984, be approved.

Resolution No. 655-84                      Re: Citizens Advisory Committee on  
Family Life and Human Development

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Dr. Cronin seconded by Mrs. Praisner, 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; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the following individual be appointed for a two-year term to serve as community member-at-large for Area 1:

Mr. Peter Benjamin

Resolution No. 656-84                      Re: BOE Appeal No. 84-33

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

Resolved, That BOE Appeal No. 84-33 be withdrawn.

Resolution No. 657-84                      Re: BOE Appeal No. 84-38

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

Resolved, That BOE Appeal No. 84-38 be granted a 30-day extension.

Re: New Business

1. Mrs. Praisner moved and Mr. Ewing seconded the following resolution:

WHEREAS, The issue of child care has become one of increasing importance in Montgomery County; and

WHEREAS, Several task forces and committees have made recommendations for action in this area; and

WHEREAS, The county government has proposed that it assume the leadership role in establishing a county policy; and

WHEREAS, The Montgomery County Public Schools has been asked to assist in this endeavor; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Montgomery County Public Schools offers its services as a partner in this endeavor; and be it further

Resolved, That Montgomery County Public Schools will offer its support to the county government in the following areas:

1. the use of surplus space in operating schools by child care programs under the auspices of the Board of Education's joint occupancy policy
2. the use of transportation services as identified in administrative procedures
3. the availability of the school system's expertise to promote child care by:
  - . identifying needs through the use of MCPS student population projections
  - . sharing expertise with child care providers
4. the assessment of MCPS curriculum needs related to child care and the latch key child
5. the encouragement of principals and PTA members to explore child care issues
6. the identification of potential sites--both at operating

and future school sites--for use for child care programs

2. Mr. Ewing assumed that prior to January 5, the Board would have a major news release on the dedication of the Educational Services Center as the Carver Educational Services Center. Mr. Fess explained that the news release was in preparation and invitations were being sent.

Resolution No. 658-84                      Re: Scheduling Discussion of Item on  
Career Education Program

On motion of Dr. Cronin seconded by Mr. Ewing, the following resolution was adopted with Dr. Cronin, Mrs. DiFonzo, Mr. Ewing, Dr. Floyd, and Mrs. Slye voting in the affirmative; Mrs. Praisner and Dr. Shoenberg abstaining (Miss Duby voting in the affirmative):

Resolved, That the item of information on the career education program be scheduled for Board discussion.

Re: Executive Session

At 4:45 p.m. the Board adjourned to executive session. Miss Duby left the meeting at this point. The Board reconvened in public session at 5 p.m.

Resolution No. 659-84                      Re: Amendment to the Agenda for  
December 11, 1984

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education amend its agenda for December 11, 1984, to add an action item on collective bargaining.

Resolution No. 660-84                      Re: Memorandum of Understanding  
Regarding Implementation of  
Article 28(F) of Collective  
Bargaining Agreement between  
Montgomery County Education  
Association and Montgomery County  
Public Schools

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education approve the following memorandum of understanding and authorize Mr. Robert G. Cooney to sign the memo:

The Montgomery County Education Association ("MCEA") and the Montgomery County Public Schools ("MCPS") are parties to a collective bargaining agreement, effective August 31, 1984

("Agreement"). Set forth below is the understanding of the parties with regard to the implementation of Article 28(F) (i.e., the representation fee provision) of the Agreement:

1. (a) Within ten (10) days after execution of this Memorandum of Understanding, MCEA will notify MCPS in writing of the amount of the representation fee to be charged to unit members for the 1984-85 contract year under Article 28(F) of the Agreement. For each subsequent year, MCEA will provide such notification prior to October 1.

(b) Pursuant to . 6-407 (c) (2) of the Maryland Education Code, the representation fee "may not exceed the annual dues of the members of the organization." Such members' annual dues include payments earmarked for MCEA and its state and national parent organizations, the Maryland State Teachers Association ("MSTA") and the National Education Association ("NEA"), respectively and the representation fee will be determined with respect to this three-tiered structure.

2. Prior to December 1, 1984, of the 1984-85 contract year, and prior to October 1 of each subsequent contract year, MCEA will determine the percentage of its members' dues, as defined in Paragraph 1 above, that represents the cost of "negotiations, contract administration, including grievances, and other activities as are required under . 6-407(b) of the Act. (. 6-407(c)(1)). MCEA will base this determination on a review of financial records and other documents describing MCEA's activities, and will be guided by the language of the Act, the United States Supreme Court decisions in *Ellis v. BRAC* and *Abood v. Detroit Board of Education*, and other relevant federal and state court decisions. The representation fee will not include the cost of political or ideological activities unrelated to collective bargaining, other activities not germane to collective bargaining, or benefits or activities available to or benefitting only MCEA members (e.g., member-only insurance programs).

3. Promptly after notifying MCPS of the amount of the representation fee pursuant to Paragraph 1 above, MCEA will send a written communication to each employee in the unit who is required to pay such a fee under Article 28(F) of the Agreement. This communication will inform the employee, inter alia:

- (a) of his or her obligation under Article 28(F) and this Memorandum of Understanding to pay a representation fee to MCEA;
- (b) of the amount of the representation fee and the manner in which it was determined;
- (c) of his or her option to pay the representation fee directly to MCEA or to execute a payroll deduction form authorizing MCPS to deduct the fee from his or her salary. The mechanics for the deduction of representation fees and the transmission of such fees to MCEA will, as nearly as possible, be the same as those used for the deduction and transmission of membership dues to MCEA; and
- (d) that his or her failure to pay or authorize payment of a

representation fee will not affect his or her rights, benefits or status as an employee of MCPS.

4. (a) If an employee who is required to pay a representation fee under Article 28(F) of the Agreement is employed in a unit position on a part-time basis or for less than a full contract year, the representation fee for that employee for said contract year will be a pro rata portion of the annual fee, based on the number of days actually worked during said year, rounded to the nearest month.

(b) If the employment of an employee who is required to pay a representation fee under 28(F) of the Agreement is terminated (voluntarily or otherwise) before MCEA has received the full amount of the representation fee to which it is entitled, said employee will be liable to MCEA for the unpaid portion of the fee.

5. If an employee who is required to pay a representation fee under Article 28(F) of the Agreement fails to do so, MCEA may take appropriate steps -- including the commencement of legal action against the employee -- to collect the amount in question. MCPS will not be required to terminate a unit member's employment or take disciplinary action against a unit member for failing to pay or authorize payment of a representation fee.

6. Consistent with . 60407(c)(4) of the Maryland Education Code, which is incorporated herein, the obligation to pay a representation fee will not apply to an employee whose religious beliefs are opposed to joining or financially supporting any collective bargaining organization. In order to be eligible under this paragraph for an exemption from the obligation to pay a representation fee for any contract year, an employee must:

- (a) submit to MCEA and MCPS prior to January 1 of the 1984-85 contract year, and prior to October 1 of each subsequent contract year, or within thirty (30) days after being hired into a unit position, whichever is later, a written statement setting forth the basis of his or her religious belief;
- (b) during said contract year pay an amount equal to the representation fee to a nonreligious, nonunion charity or to such other charitable organization as may be agreed upon by said employee and MCEA; and
- (c) prior to the end of said contract year furnish to MCEA and MCPS written proof of such payment.

7. Article 28(F) of the Agreement will not apply to short-term substitutes, as defined in Paragraph 3 of the Definitions Section of the Substitute Teacher Addendum, but will apply to long-term substitutes, as defined in said Addendum, who are hired after August 31, 1984. Promptly after receiving the quarterly list referred to in Paragraph 8 below, MCEA will bill long-term substitutes who are required to pay a representation fee under Article 28(F) for a pro-rata portion of the annual fee based on the number of days actually worked during the quarter in question. MCEA will send a written communication to each long-term substitute who is required to pay a representation fee informing the employee of his or her

obligation under Article 28(F) of the Agreement.

8. Within ten (10) days after the end of the month, beginning with the month during which this Memorandum of Understanding is executed, MCPS will submit to MCEA a list of all employees who were hired into unit positions during said month. Within ten (10) days after the end of each quarter, beginning with the September through November 1984 quarter, MCPS will submit to MCEA a list of all employees who were employed as long-term substitutes during said quarter. These lists will include the names, job titles and dates of employment for all such employees.

9. MCEA has agreed to indemnify and save MCPS harmless against, inter alia, any claim arising out of actions taken or not taken by it in regard to the implementation of Article 28(F) of the Agreement and this Memorandum of Understanding. MCEA will assume primary Responsibility for the defense of any such claim. Counsel for MCPS will be permitted to enter an appearance and will be kept fully apprised of litigation developments by counsel for MCEA, but MCEA will not be responsible for any legal fees MCPS may incur in this regard.

Any dispute between the parties as to the meaning or application of this Memorandum of Understanding will constitute a grievance within the meaning of the grievance procedure in the Agreement.

MONTGOMERY COUNTY  
PUBLIC SCHOOLS

MONTGOMERY COUNTY  
EDUCATION ASSOCIATION

Re: Items of Information

Board members received the following items of information:

1. Items in Process
2. Construction Progress Report
3. Annual Report - Committee for Minority Student Education (for future consideration)
4. Monthly Financial Report
5. An Evaluation of Three Components of the Career Education Program in Montgomery County Public Schools

Re: Adjournment

The president adjourned the meeting at 5:10 p.m. to an executive session on negotiations.

President

Secretary

WSC:mlw