



consideration approximately one month prior to the date on which approval will be sought and the superintendent of schools may extend this period to allow further time for citizen reaction to curriculum documents dealing with sensitive topics..." (From Board Resolution No. 400-73, June 18, 1973); and

WHEREAS, The Program of Studies is the document which contains the prescribed curriculum elements, including instructional objectives, of all MCPS curriculum programs and courses (MCPS Regulation 345-1 Development and Approval of Curriculum and Supporting Materials); and

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

WHEREAS, The Council on Instruction, charged by the superintendent with considering recommendations for curriculum change, has expressed approval of one new course; and

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education approve Word Processing for publication in the MCPS Program of Studies as part of the curriculum for Edison Career Center.

Resolution No. 124-85                      Re: Approval of New Curriculum - Human Services: Child Care/Care of the Aging Program

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

WHEREAS, The school laws of Maryland specify that the county superintendent shall prepare courses of study and recommend them for adoption by the county Board (The Public School Laws of Maryland, Article 77, Section 4-205); and

WHEREAS, The school laws of Maryland also state that the county Board, on the written recommendation of the county superintendent, shall establish courses of study for the schools under its jurisdiction (The Public School Laws of Maryland, Article 77, Section 4-110); and

WHEREAS, Board of Education policy has resolved "that newly developed curriculum documents will be presented to the Board of Education for consideration approximately one month prior to the date on which approval will be sought and the superintendent of schools may extend this period to allow further time for citizen reaction to curriculum documents dealing with sensitive topics..." (From Board Resolution No. 400-73, June 18, 1973); and

WHEREAS, The Program of Studies is the document which contains the prescribed curriculum elements, including instructional objectives,



has requested that the 10 percent retainage amount, which is based on the completed work to date, be reduced to 5 percent retainage; and

WHEREAS, The project bonding company, Fidelity and Deposit Company of Maryland, by letter dated February 7, 1985, consented to this reduction; and

WHEREAS, The project architect, Grimm & Parker Architects, by letter dated February 6, 1985, recommended that this request for reduction in retainage be approved; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the contract's specified 10 percent retainage withheld from periodic construction contract payments to J. Roland Dashiell & Sons, Inc., general contractor for the modernization at Bradley Hills Elementary School, currently amounting to 10 percent of the contractor's request for payment to date, now be reduced to 5 percent with the remaining 5 percent to become due and payable after formal acceptance of the completed project and total completion of all remaining contract requirements.

Resolution No. 127-85                      Re: Dedication of Land for Public  
Street Olney Elementary School  
(Area 1)

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

WHEREAS, The Montgomery County Government is planning to realign and widen Georgia Avenue and will require a public dedication of land from the Board of Education where the proposed realignment abuts our Olney Elementary School, its endorsement to cover the dedication of additional land and slope grading; and

WHEREAS, Final approval and realignment of the new roadway includes temporary access for the grading of slopes adjacent to the school property; and

WHEREAS, All construction, restoration, and future maintenance activities will be performed at no cost to the Board of Education with the Montgomery County Government and contractors to assume liability for all damages or injury; and

WHEREAS, This easement and the land dedication for an improved roadway will benefit the surrounding community and subject school site; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the president and secretary be authorized to execute a final deed for the realignment and widening of Georgia Avenue where it abuts the Olney Elementary School, their endorsement to cover the dedication of additional land and slop grading which are shown on the plan.

\*Mrs. DiFonzo joined the meeting at this point.

Re: Board/Press/Visitor Conference

The following individuals appeared before the Board of Education:

1. Kathy Petitt, Bradley Hills Elementary School PTA
2. Carole Huberman, MCCPTA

Resolution No. 128-85                      Re: Personnel Appointment and  
Reassignment

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

Resolved, That the following personnel appointment and reassignment be approved:

Appointment	Present Position	As
Phyllis B. Smolkin	Home Instruction Program MCPS	Social Worker Mark Twain School Grade G Effective March 8, 1985

Temporary Reassignment for the 1985-1986 School Year

Name and Present Position	Position Effective July 1, 1985	Position Effective December 1, 1987
Mary E. Boehm A&S Teacher	Teacher Placement Asst. Division of Staffing Department of Personnel Services	Retirement

Resolution No. 129-85                      Re: HB 1098 - Asbestos Removal  
Fund

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 support HB 1098 - Asbestos Removal Fund.

Resolution No. 130-85                      Re: HB 1342/SB 547 - Prekindergarten  
Education

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education support legislative study of





associate superintendent for the receiving school. When accord cannot be reached at the area level, an appeal may be submitted to the superintendent (designee). The decision of the superintendent may be appealed to the Board of Education in accordance with the process delineated in Student Transfer (JEE) policy regulation (JEE-RA).

### 3. Feedback Indicators

The annual report on Quality Integrated Education includes a report of transfer activity in designated schools and will reflect dates of transfer approval and the impact of policy implementation.

and be it further

Resolved, That staff be instructed to return to the Board of Education as soon as possible with a restatement of 1. Purpose.

Re: Proposed Process for Establishing  
and Evaluating Special Programs

Dr. Cody said they tried to consider what information needed to be before the Board when a program was proposed. Mr. Ewing said he had a couple of questions related to the general issue of how a member of the Board got a program before the Board for action if the superintendent did not recommend it. He also asked how this process distinguished between those things which were expansions of existing programs such as the expansion of all-day kindergarten and the second vocational center versus the establishment of the first career center. It seemed to him that if they were going to go to this amount of trouble to describe what it was they were planning to do, they ought to be clear that whoever proposed this ought to have looked at available research and made this research available to the Board. He wondered what would happen if the superintendent reviewed something and concluded the program was not worthy of funding or consideration by the Board. He asked how the Board could get a proposal before the Board in this format. He assumed they could do that by drawing up the proposal themselves. He was afraid they were limiting the Board's ability to take initiatives.

Dr. Cody explained that the superintendent could have a proposal developed or the majority of the Board could say they would like such a proposal developed by the staff for Board consideration. He asked whether the Board wished to have some number less than the majority of the Board to have a plan developed. Mr. Ewing asked what would happen if a Board member developed a proposal under the proposed format. Dr. Cody did not see a problem although this was not clearly articulated in the process before the Board.

Dr. Floyd asked about the difference between this and the present procedure of introducing something under New Business. Mr. Ewing explained that if the item fell under the special programs procedures, it would be different.

Mrs. Praisner said that Mr. Ewing had raised a major concern about how to get the process stated and to know at what point it required more than one Board member to do something. It seemed to her the problem was in the sentence stating that "if the superintendent and

majority of the Board proposed a program...." She said that once it was proposed if the majority of the Board wanted more than just the preliminary information it would be another step in the process. She said they would not want to require a majority of the Board in order to get something on the table.

Dr. Shoenberg said it seemed to him that even with a fully developed proposal brought in by a Board member, the Board would want the superintendent's reaction. He thought the point was the Board needed to make up its mind that it wanted to examine a program in more depth.

Dr. Kenneth Muir explained he had envisioned that if a Board member wanted to make a proposal and wanted to get it fleshed out, he would bring it up as a matter of new business, discuss it around the table, and if three other members of the Board wanted more information it would be turned over to staff. Mr. Ewing said it seemed important to recognize that sometimes there were Board members in the minority who were persistent about pursuing certain objectives and, while they shouldn't take up a lot of staff time, they should not be precluded from continuing to try to persuade other Board members. Dr. Cody agreed that the paper did need to be restated.

Mr. Ewing indicated that he had not received a response to his question about expanding existing programs under this process. Dr. Muir replied that if they were expanding something like all-day kindergarten, it would not be under this process. On the other hand if they were talking about moving a racial balance program from Silver Spring, and moving it to Gaithersburg for a different purpose, and it affected students currently attending more than one school and required more than \$10,000, it would be under this process. Dr. Cody added that a career center with different programs would also be under this process.

Mr. Ewing thought they should be doing things that had two objectives. They should be facilitating new ideas and making sure these came to the Board with full documentation. He did not want them to get so tied up in getting documentation that it would prevent new ideas from surfacing. Dr. Shoenberg understood the purpose of this as getting the Board to be clear about what it was it wanted. This could take the form of consensus on a general idea or it could take the form of consensus around a rather well developed document. He thought that Dr. Muir's definition needed to be more clearly reflected in the document.

It seemed to Mr. Ewing that the normal process was that Board members would do some development work on their own to make as good an argument as possible, but in all those cases Board members tended to rely heavily on information received from staff. He hoped this would not turn into an excuse for staff being reluctant to provide information.

Mrs. Praisner said it was important when staff worked on proposals

and when the Board acted on proposals that they have before them the answers to the questions defined in the process paper. In this way, staff, the Board, and the community would be clear about the purpose of the program, the population served, cost implications, and what the impact might be on other schools and existing programs. She thought that these questions were useful, and if these questions had been asked in the past it might have saved Board, community, and staff some headaches. She did, however, wonder about the use of a three-year evaluation process. Dr. Muir replied that this was a reasonable planning period, and in the past they had not looked a year or two beyond the first year of program implementation. This meant that the Board would be receiving a special report for the first three years.

Dr. Shoenberg asked that this item be scheduled for Board adoption as soon as possible.

Re: Recommended Amendment to the FY  
1986 Operating Budget

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

WHEREAS, The Board of Education FY 1986 Operating Budget was adopted on February 12, 1985, in the amount of \$438,953,893 with the understanding that amendments might be required as a result of program modifications; and

WHEREAS, A review of pupil transportation requirements by appropriate staff indicates that a reduction of sixteen (16) replacement buses can be made in the pupil transportation category in the amount of \$432,516; and

WHEREAS, The adoption of this amendment will change state categories as indicated below:

State Category	BOE Approved Budget	Board Amendment	Board Amended Feb. 25, 1985
01 Administration	\$ 26,763,671	\$ -	\$ 26,763,671
02 Instructional Salaries	224,670,020	-	224,670,020
03 Instructional Other	12,254,352	-	12,254,352
04 Special Education	44,794,512	-	44,794,512
05 Student Personnel Svcs	1,331,653	-	1,331,653
06 Health Service	34,173	-	34,173
07 Student Transportation	21,784,531	(432,516)	21,352,015
08 Plant and Equipment	34,321,721	-	34,321,721
09 Maintenance of Plant	12,437,029	-	12,437,029
10 Fixed Charges	46,093,367	-	46,093,367
11 Food Services	600,268	-	600,268
14 Community Services	233,404	-	233,404
61 Food Service Fund	13,635,192		13,635,192
TOTAL	\$438,953,893	\$(432,516)	\$438,521,377



further

Resolved, That the purchase and installation of these belts will not proceed until the superintendent has provided the Board of Education with assurances of the positive effects of using seat belts and a plan for further implementation and control of their use.

Re: A Motion by Mr. Ewing to Amend the  
FY 1986 Operating Budget (FAILED)

A motion by Mr. Ewing to amend the FY 1986 Operating Budget to establish a reserve fund of \$291,768 for 12 teaching positions failed with Mr. Ewing, Mrs. DiFonzo, and Dr. Shoenberg voting in the affirmative; Dr. Floyd voting in the negative; Dr. Cronin, Mrs. Praisner, and Mrs. Slye abstaining (Miss Duby voting in the affirmative).

Re: Amendments to the FY 1986  
Operating Budget

WHEREAS, The Board of Education FY 1986 Operating Budget was adopted on February 12, 1985, in the amount of \$438,953,893 with the understanding that amendments might be required as a result of program modifications; and

WHEREAS, A review of pupil transportation requirements by appropriate staff indicates that a reduction of sixteen (16) replacement buses can be made in the pupil transportation category in the amount of \$432,516; and

WHEREAS, The Board of Education (amending this resolution) desires to pursue the use of seat belts in school buses and has added \$75,000 for this purpose contingent upon further information from the superintendent of schools; and

WHEREAS, The adoption of this amendment will change state categories as indicated below:

State Category	BOE Approved Budget	Board Amendment	Board Amended Feb. 25, 1985
01 Administration	\$ 26,763,671	\$ -	\$ 26,763,671
02 Instructional Salaries	224,670,020	-	224,670,020
03 Instructional Other	12,254,352	-	12,254,352
04 Special Education	44,794,512	-	44,794,512
05 Student Personnel Svcs	1,331,653	-	1,331,653
06 Health Service	34,173	-	34,173
07 Student Transportation	21,784,531	(357,516)	21,427,015
08 Plant and Equipment	34,321,721	-	34,321,721
09 Maintenance of Plant	12,437,029	-	12,437,029
10 Fixed Charges	46,093,367	-	46,093,367
11 Food Services	600,268	-	600,268
14 Community Services	233,404	-	233,404
61 Food Service Fund	13,635,192		13,635,192
TOTAL	\$438,953,893	\$(357,516)	\$438,596,377

now therefore be it

Resolved, That the request in Category 7, Student Transportation, for replacement school buses be reduced by sixteen (16) in the amount of \$432,516; and be it further

Resolved, That \$75,000 be added to Category 7, Student Transportation, for the purchase and installation of seat belts in all new school buses purchased for September, 1985; and be it further

Resolved, That the purchase and installation of these belts will not proceed until the superintendent has provided the Board of Education with assurances of the positive effects of using seat belts and a plan for further implementation and control of their use; and be it further

Resolved, That the Board-adopted FY 1986 Operating Budget be amended to reduce Category 7, Student Transportation, by \$357,516 for an amended total of \$438,596,377; and be it further

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

Re: Board Member Comments

1. Miss Duby introduced Mr. John Foubert of Blair High School, who is a candidate for the student Board member position. She also announced that the first town meeting would be held on March 11.
2. Mrs. Praisner stated that on Friday she had represented the Board of Education at the opening of the Education Fair at Wheaton Plaza. She said that the displays were excellent and community members were positive and enthusiastic about the program. She commended the members of the Planning Committee as follows: Jack Schoendorfer and Sally Keeler, co-coordinators; Doris Bindell; Mary Ann Britton, Frank Chisley; Ed Clements; Karen Craney; Pearl Drain; Geraldine Fowlkes; Jan Geletka; Bev Goodsell; Thornton Lauriat; Frank Masci; Jane McAuliffe; Barbara Mendenhall; Ruby Porter; Paula Rehr; Leslie Roche; Stanley Sirotkin; Marie Smith; Paulette Smith; Robert Walter; and Donald Weinberger.
3. Mrs. Praisner noted that the memo on the study of the use of Ride-on Buses included a letter from Price Waterhouse. She asked staff for information on the statement on page 2 of that letter that certain cost measures such as cost per student and cost per mile were inappropriate and the statement on page 4 that made it appear that Price Waterhouse had already reached a conclusion. She thought that the study was to determine whether there would be cost savings or not; therefore, she had a concern about the entire process.
4. In regard to the First Boston report, Mr. Ewing said that aside from the fact there was a mistake as the county finance director had pointed out, there were a number of other issues related to it. He was aware that Art Spengler was working on this issue, and he hoped that the superintendent would let the Board know as soon as possible any additional issues with respect to this. Mr. Ewing indicated

that the county executive had indicated in his letter that he had heard from no one. He said that he had also asked the county executive eight questions about the whole process, and the executive had asked Dr. Rogers to respond. He had received a response from Dr. Rogers which had responded without answering. He would share the response with the Board.

5. Mr. Ewing said that the February 22 Sentinel had contained an article that stated the county government was looking into movable classrooms. The county executive had ordered a search for school systems with experience with transportable classrooms. He said they needed to know what it was the county executive had ordered and suggest to him that the superintendent was also looking into this same issue and it would be wasteful to have two separate inquiries.

Resolution No. 141-85                      Re: Executive Session - March 12,  
1985

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Dr. Cronin seconded by Mrs. Praisner, 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 March 12, 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. 142-85                      Re: Minutes of December 11, 1984

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

Resolved, That the minutes of December 11, 1984, be approved.

Resolution No. 143-85                      Re: Minutes of February 4, 1985

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Mrs. Slye seconded by Dr. Floyd, the following resolution was adopted unanimously (Miss Duby abstaining):

Resolved, That the minutes of February 4, 1985, be approved.

Resolution No. 144-85                      Re: Minutes of February 6, 1985

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Dr. Shoenberg seconded by Mrs. Praisner, the following resolution was adopted unanimously (Miss Duby abstaining):

Resolved, That the minutes of February 6, 1985, be approved.

Resolution No. 145-85                      Re: BOE Appeal No. 1984-38

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education dismiss BOE Appeal No. 1984-38, at the request of the appellants.

Resolution No. 146-85                      Re: Ethics Panel Membership

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

WHEREAS, The Board of Education adopted Resolution No. 162-84 which appointed three members to the Ethics Panel; and

WHEREAS, Mr. John Wassell was appointed for a one-year term which will expire on February 28, 1985; and

WHEREAS, Mr. Wassell has indicated that he wishes to continue to serve on the Ethics Panel; now therefore be it

Resolved, That Mr. John Wassell be reappointed to the Ethics Panel for a three year term from 3/1/85 to 2/29/88.

Re: New Business

1. Mr. Fess reminded Board members that financial disclosure forms were due on April 30.
2. Mrs. Praisner asked if the information items on child care issues and the budget alternatives task force would be scheduled for Board discussion. Dr. Shoenberg replied that they had been scheduled.
3. Mr. Ewing asked if the issue of transfer in clusters and impacted schools would be scheduled for Board discussion and action, and Dr. Shoenberg assured him that it would.
4. Mr. Ewing moved and Dr. Cronin seconded a motion that the Board schedule a time to review the policy on the return of tests and the impact of the policy.

Re: Items of Information

Board members received the following items of information:

1. Staff Response to Child Care Issues (for future consideration)
2. Monthly Financial Report
3. Staff Response to Citizens Advisory Committee for Career and Vocational Education
4. Budget Alternatives Task Force Report (for future consideration)

Re: Adjournment

The president adjourned the meeting at 11:05 p.m.

President

Secretary

WSC:mlw