



Dr. Cody pointed out that for two years now he had had to complete his budget recommendations before he had the results of the PTA budget surveys. Dr. Muir said this would be an important way to increase their attention to issues that citizens thought were important. In addition, they planned to work very closely with PTAs in terms of reviewing the new citizen budget. They expected to improve the document over a two- or three-year period so that it would be a good primer for the average citizen.

Mrs. Praisner assumed that the new books would still be updated each time there was action by the Board and Council. Dr. Muir replied that in terms of the Council's actions they probably would not change the management budget but would update the citizen budget to reflect Council and Board final actions. He explained that updating the management budget for staff was really not necessary because the Accounting Division incorporated those figures into accounting runs. Dr. Cody added that the management budget would have a limited distribution. Mrs. Praisner thought it would be very important that the budgets include an explanatory narrative to tell people what it was and what it was not. She remarked that they found themselves in trouble because they did not give the kind of explanatory information people needed. She would like to err on behalf of spoon-feeding people information they already knew. She agreed that the input from PTAs was important but suggested that they had to recognize that they had citizens without children in the public schools. She asked how they were going to deal with hearing from the general citizenry. In the past the county executive had held public hearings and developed a questionnaire. She wondered whether there was another way to solicit community comments on education. Dr. Muir replied that she was getting at budget issues. He said that the public hearing held by the Board and Council served that function. Mrs. Praisner pointed out that this was already too late as far as the superintendent's recommendations. She noted that they heard from very few citizens who did not have children in the public schools. She thought it would be useful if they were going to prepare a citizen budget to look at some ways of soliciting input. Dr. Cody suggested they consider regional meetings, and Mrs. Praisner suggested a press release or a form available in the libraries.

Dr. Shoenberg remarked that in the past they had handled facilities matters through the PTAs, and it was becoming more and more difficult to hold that kind of process in those channels of the PTAs. Civic associations, in particular, wanted to have some input.

Dr. Muir suggested that when the last citizen budget in the cycle was printed they might include a page as a questionnaire where people could comment both on the format of the budget as well as their views on spending. This copy could be circulated widely. He pointed out that if they did not know "what is", the input was not very helpful. If they did a good job with the citizen budget, they would get good comments. Mr. Ewing thought this was a good point. He was concerned about the issue of the extent to which they got reliable information. He noted that most people did not appear at public hearings and the

organizations they represented varied in size. He liked Dr. Muir's suggestion, but he suggested they needed something a bit more scientific in the form of survey research. He thought that a combination of these devices was probably what they needed. In regard to the two budgets, he said that as soon as they began to print fewer copies of the management budget the suspicion would be that they were hiding something. He said they ought to make sure that people understood that the full budget was available to them for inspection. This should also be made clear in the citizen budget. Dr. Muir pointed out that they had done a community survey every second year which would be the most scientific way to get to the broader community. The survey could include some budget related questions. The number of budgets printed would be dictated by demand rather than a predetermined number.

Mrs. DiFonzo inquired about the size of the citizen budget. Dr. Muir replied that it would be 36 to 48 pages; however, it might be smaller to begin with and grow as they incorporated data. Mr. Ewing asked if staff had looked at the budget-in-brief developed by OMB for the federal government. Dr. Muir indicated that he had not seen it but would.

Dr. Shoenberg remarked that if they updated at each stage of the budget process there would be several different versions in the community at the same time. Mrs. Praisner pointed out that there were now. Dr. Shoenberg noted that people with the current budgets were more likely to be fully aware of the process. Dr. Muir thought that this could be accommodated by using different colored covers or by a description in the document.

In regard to the management budget, Dr. Muir explained there were really no substantive changes except for two. They hoped to be able to project revenues and costs one year beyond the year on which the Board would be acting. Secondly, many people found the "current services" page to be useless or confusing. It was their feeling if they had a more comprehensive "program mission" page they could provide essential information which was better related to Board goals and priorities.

Mr. Ewing thought that the entire set of recommendations were really excellent. Dr. Muir commented that they were finally working on getting the operating budget process computerized. They hoped to have this in time for the 1988 budget. They had had a person working during the summer to develop the process. This would put more workload on the Budget Office because they would be generating these forms as opposed to each unit in MCPS. On the other hand, it would save a tremendous amount of clerical time in the different units, and all of the pages would be able to be summarized by the computer. Dr. Cody added that this would also assist them in analyzing the budget. Mrs. Praisner shared Mr. Ewing's view that this was a useful process and useful document. However, she had certain cautions and concerns. Because the documents were evolutionary and they might not see the same information from document to document, people would think that because material was not presented from year to year in the same

format that MCPS was trying to hide something. She said it was important to make the comment that they were modifying and working through the appropriate kind of budget process. She said that some of the material represented Board priorities, but it might not be important for future Boards and might change as they moved through their priorities.

Mrs. Praisner had some specific concerns about the material. She assumed that enrollment data would be for the school system or by kinds of schools. Dr. Muir replied that it would be countywide and by levels of school. Mrs. Praisner thought they should modify the bullet which stated "the kinds of things citizens consider when they select schools." She pointed out that school attendance was determined by residence. She did not know how they would talk about discipline or quality of teachers in a budget document. She assumed that the section on parent priorities would state that over the past few years they had had an increase in parent desires for "X, Y, and Z." In talking about the allocation process and how resources got to the school, she felt it was important to incorporate the time when certain things were done. For example, they should tell people that staff were allocated at a certain point and that an adjustment was made at a certain point. Dr. Cody commented that they were also considering a stand-alone document which talked about resource allocations in much more detail.

Mrs. Praisner said that it was important when they were talking about class size by grade to say as of when and what kind of data they were talking about in what time period. She had a real question about why students in an honors program were included in a statistical profile and how it would be used as opposed to including students in special education or students in vocational education. She also had a question about including students moving to and from private schools. She wondered what image they were conveying about that school which was not necessarily appropriate. She said they could talk about the mobility rate which did have an impact on the school.

Mrs. Slye shared many of Mrs. Praisner's concerns. She noted that the old statistical profile contains special education information but the new form did not have this information in the same section. She thought this might be an attempt to represent the variety of programs offered in the school insofar as that information had a bearing on budgetary issues. She agreed with Mrs. Praisner about private school attendance and agreed that mobility rate had an impact on the school situation. She thought that the statistical profiles were useful because they provided the type of information that people wanted to have in the budget.

Dr. Shoenberg hoped that when they talked about test scores they were very careful to explain what the factors were affecting those standardized tests. One of the things they got in community discussions had to do with an average test score as an effector of parent choice versus what was likely to be the experience of any individual student. He said the assumption that because the average test scores at School A were lower than those at School B that the

experience of all children at School A would be less satisfactory was just not the case. If they were trying to perform an educating function, this was just one more place where they could perform that educating function. Dr. Cody stated that they had to deal with the issue of space limitations and think about the purpose and function of what they were trying to impart.

Mrs. DiFonzo commented that she agreed with many of the statements already made. She had a problem with showing "professional" staff versus "supporting services" staff. She knew they were talking about the academic staff and the pink- and blue-collar workers. For example, she suggested taking a school bus driver transporting 40 or fifty children down narrow streets and try to convince the driver he or she was not a professional. She asked whether there was another phrase that they could use just as "teaching" staff versus supporting services staff. Dr. Floyd suggested using "certificated" and "classified" because people wanted to know how many people in that facility had a professional license to practice.

Mr. Ewing said that if they were concerned about obtaining information about not only parents' priorities but also other citizen views, they should say something about how those priorities were dealt with by the budget document. Almost everything people wanted them to do was related to the budget because they had to pay someone to do these things or buy a service. He thought it would not be difficult to speak to those issues briefly by talking about what the budget did. The first question people asked was "how much does this provide for what," and the next question was "what does it provide in terms of quality." He also thought they should explain the differences between operating and capital budgets. He said they did need some kind of section on issues.

Dr. Floyd agreed that they should not focus on movement in and out of private schools, but he pointed out that this did have budgetary implications for the system as a whole. He would opt for them to try to find a way to do this for the entire school system to get some trends.

Dr. Shoenberg thought that the plan was heading in the right direction, and he was mindful that to do something like this would not be without costs. He was concerned that they not try and include things that were time-consuming and might not have that much impact.

Dr. Muir pointed out that getting the operating budget on the computer would be an important time-saver. It would also enable them to regenerate facts. However, the biggest development task would be to design the system in the first place. He hoped that the format once people were pleased with it would stay the same. Dr. Frankel added that school profiles would be on a management information system. The entire document would be produced on a p.c. including the graphics, and while the first year cost would be high, after that they would see advantages in being able to provide different combinations of data.

Re: BOARD OF EDUCATION LONG-RANGE BUDGET

## INITIATIVES

Dr. Cody stated that this was an important item for them to discuss in order to lay the groundwork for their fall budget review. There were a number of issues on which they had made previous commitments and others where no clear direction had been given. In regard to all-day kindergarten, he personally believed that they should get to a point in time when all-day kindergarten was available to every family wanting it for their child. They had goals for reducing class size and for elementary school guidance counselors. For kindergarten last year they made decisions to add teachers in the budget but never really put that on a particular track or time frame. It was extremely important to discuss this outside of the budget because it had a major impact on capital facilities. In addition, there were a number of items identified by Board members in memos.

Dr. Shoenberg noted that this topic had been brought to the Board on the motion of two Board members. Dr. Cody explained that they had tried to provide some financial information on the various items. Mrs. Slye thanked the superintendent for all the work that had been done. She wanted to respond to some issues Dr. Cronin had raised in a memo. She explained that she was not seeking a full and complete review of each item but rather a way in which they could begin to look at long-range implications. She hoped that when they made long-range commitments they would keep an eye on cost and facilities implications. She hoped that they might begin to develop a standardized way to present this kind of information. In addition to descriptive information, they might have information relating to positions, costs, and facilities issues if these were germane. This would give Board members an idea what it might take in actual resources to reach that goal. She felt that the paper was an excellent beginning, and she hoped that developing that kind of information would be an ongoing process.

Mr. Ewing thought the memorandum was helpful and responsive. He hoped that as they gave some thought to these items they also think about how the items related to Board priorities. Some of the items had intrinsic justifications of their own but, on the other hand, they might contribute to that purpose or exist as strategies for that purpose. For example, Head Start and Chapter 1 programs had a fairly direct connection to Priority 2 as well as Priority 1. He suggested that staff develop a matrix which showed these direct relationships. It was also useful for him to see the whole thing laid out in terms of impact not only on budget but also on facilities. He would have some additional suggestions on the facilities impact as they discussed these one by one. Dr. Cody explained that they could calculate facilities impact in terms of gross impact, but in some instances the only way to do this would be school by school.

Mrs. Praisner thought it was appropriate to look at long-range fiscal and educational directions. She was pleased that they were talking about the issue of having to look at time frames and pleased that they did not see this as an all inclusive list. She agreed that out

of the budget process there was a time for them to take a step back and look at all the issues they wanted to do and get some consensus about the direction they were taking and the implications of some of these commitments. She pointed out that they had some other commitments above and beyond what was on this list. She highlighted the computer literacy program because they had asked about a sequencing of this program over a period of years. She recalled that Mrs. Shannon had requested a grid on special programs. She thought they needed some sort of status report on issues they had started and information on new issues. She said they had the special education initiatives which would have impact from the standpoint of staff time. They had Title IX initiatives. They also had the whole issue of counseling, and they had talked about the area office and studying it from the standpoint of delivery of services. They had a Commission on Teacher Excellence which would have initiatives, priorities, and goals. She interpreted this as a "wish list" but there were other things that did need to be added to it if they were going to look at the full range of issues in a long-range planning process. She thought the Board had to keep in mind fiscal responsibility, facility responsibility, and how much staff could handle over what period of time. Some of these were continuations and did not include work from the standpoint of creative thinking, but they did have funding implications. Here they saw the funding implications if they continued to do things the way they did now, but she wondered if they could talk about other alternatives or options for doing some of these things.

Dr. Muir hoped that by next summer they would have brief descriptions of various programs, their goals and objectives, and what the costs were. The Board would then be able to aggregate that for any year and make some early decisions on what was reasonable to do. Part of the problem was that they had not been able to aggregate those kinds of things.

Dr. Shoenberg suggested that at the end of the discussion they talk about where they wanted to go. For example, they should discuss if they wanted to establish certain goals, in what form, and what they wanted to do with those goals as far as sharing them with the public and funding agencies. He said that what they agreed to was important, but even more important was what they decided to do with what they agreed to. He hoped that they would be able to come to an understanding of what their priorities were among these items, and he would add gifted and talented education to the list.

Dr. Shoenberg suggested they turn to elementary class size. Mrs. Slye asked whether the number of schools with no space had changed over the summer. Mr. Larry Bowers replied that it had not changed that much, but he noted that this assumed that principals did not make any accommodations for additional classrooms. They assumed that spaces for art and music would be used for those purposes and had not gone back to the schools to see whether other uses were being made of that space. Principals did make these accommodations, and he thought that the number 35 would be lower. In addition, the reopening of Cloverly might impact some of these numbers. Mrs. Slye asked if they

did track this information on a regular basis, and Mr. Bowers replied that this information was kept at the area level. Mrs. Praisner asked if these uses would change the capacity of the school, and Dr. Cody explained that the capacity did not change based on the principal's decision for classroom use.

Dr. Shoenberg noted that this discussion pointed out the number of interrelated issues they had to deal with at this meeting such as the APFO question and the way they determined capacity. He said the Board was going to have to make some compromises between its desire to make some better sense of the relationship between the determination of capacity and program with their ability to expand program and make adjustments. He suggested that whatever action they took should reflect the fact that they were working with a moving target.

Dr. Shoenberg said the second item was the reduction of oversized classes and asked whether there was any change from the budget. Mr. Bowers replied that this took into consideration three additional teachers. Mrs. Slye noted that Dr. Cody had tracked the class sizes over the past 20 years, and they had had the least success in reducing senior high class sizes. She asked whether this was related to space constraints. Mrs. Praisner pointed out that in a couple of years they had gone from the seven period day to the six period and back to the seven period. They had some schools with ninth grades moving in as well as the infusion of the honors program. Dr. Muir said there were two other factors. One was choice by students which made the whole thing less controllable, and the second was the Board's emphasis on elementary class size. Dr. Shoenberg said he would relate this to a pet theme of his which was the program formatting in the high school and the mode of instruction. Mrs. DiFonzo said they had to keep in mind the reality that even if they had a teacher to put in, in many schools they might not have the classroom. She thought they should keep in mind that in some areas of the county this might involve purchasing, renting, or leasing additional portable classrooms.

Dr. Shoenberg commented that the notion of oversize was very strange. They treated maximum class sizes as though they had some reality. These were figures they chose because they thought it was a goal that they could achieve. He pointed out that oversize classes were frequently over by one or two students. Dr. Cody added that academic classes were supposed to be at a maximum of 32, and there were very few with 33 or 34. He pointed out that in the next five or six years the overall county enrollment in the high schools would go down. In regard to all-day kindergarten, Dr. Shoenberg said he would like to have an expression of opinion by Board members as to the dilemma posed by all-day kindergarten. The paper showed the real facilities crunch they would have if they were going to implement a program that seemed to be extremely popular with parents. It seemed to him the best argument for all-day kindergarten had much more to do with Mr. Ewing's and Mrs. Slye's concern about the education of children from less rich situations as it did about responding to the needs of children who were academically more advanced. For a whole variety of

reasons it became a very important program. He asked how this importance stood in terms of the considerable capital expenditure that would have to be added.

Mr. Ewing thought that the arguments for Head Start were different from those for all-day kindergarten. He believed the argument for all-day kindergarten was one that went to the need for the school system to recognize that with relatively small numbers of exceptions most children arrived at kindergarten ready for a good deal more than the present half-day program could give them. Beyond that the school system had the opportunity to do some things in all-day kindergarten that they had difficulty in fitting into the half-day which had to do with diagnostic testing. He said the real argument for all-day kindergarten was that it enabled the school system to pick up on where students were when they arrived in school. The worst argument for it was that it was babysitting. He believed that the argument for all-day kindergarten was so strong that they should move ahead with it to make it available to parents who wanted it, but in a way that had the least impact on facilities. They could introduce it in places where they could afford to introduce it without expanding the facilities. As they built facilities, renovated, and expanded, they could make the program available. However, this did introduce the inequity of denying the advantages of all-day kindergarten to areas where the most rapid growth was occurring.

Dr. Shoenberg thought it had been their experience where they had introduced it that they ended up with all the students in all-day kindergarten. To talk about the program for those children whose parents wanted it would mean virtually all. He said that having made a commitment to move in this direction in one place, it became the expectation of everyone else. Some schools might not be in a position to have it for a very long time.

Mrs. Praisner was afraid that the option of doing other than what Mr. Ewing had suggested was not to do it at all. She said the long period of time was unfortunately the reasonable strategy. To say they were going full-blown into a capital construction program would not generate the support or the funding that they needed. She thought that Board members needed to be realists when it came to capital budget funding situations. She thought they had to talk about the strategy and clearly articulate the strategy when all-day kindergarten was introduced into a school or a cluster. Parents had the perception that if a school had all-day kindergarten and two students beyond the limit wanted all-day kindergarten that they were going to have to accommodate them. Parents in other schools were upset because they could not transfer into the school or have access to the program. To the community, the placement of the program was arbitrary. She thought they had to talk about this. She said that the educational rationale was there and the commitment was there for the long term. They did have to develop strategies for dealing with the long-term goal and the short-term implementation and delivery to address some of the community concerns.

Dr. Cody commented that in some situations where there was no choice,

their strategy might have to include a lottery. He said that if they had something like this as a goal, he wondered whether they should not go ahead and develop at least some version of a facility plan to help them know what it was they needed. They could then acknowledge how fast this could be provided. Dr. Shoenberg stated that again this issue highlighted another factor inherent in this discussion. Any decision they made on any of these made a kind of commitment on behalf of a school board whose membership was going to change and a staff whose membership was going to change. It would mean that a lot of the room for improvements which was always a minimal percentage of the budget would be almost used up in advance. There would be certain expectations created by setting these goals. Mr. Ewing commented that this was true, but the alternative was simply to try to make up their minds every year.

Dr. Shoenberg said it was obvious that the Board would not finish its discussion and asked that this item be rescheduled for further discussion. Dr. Cody advocated scheduling one or two more discussions between now and the time they went to work on the superintendent's budget. Mrs. Praisner cautioned that they might have a Board action that seemed to drive the budget, and they might be accused of making determinations on the budget before citizens had had an opportunity to comment. She said that the community needed to know these were things they were working on, but she was not clear that they even wanted a formal process. Mr. Ewing agreed that these were correct cautions. It was his view that they would continue to talk about these to see the areas for some degree of consensus and to convey those to the superintendent. The superintendent was advised but not commanded by the Board to include these in his recommendations. This would separate out for him those things on which the Board seemed to have strong consensus and reduce the likelihood of surprise. Dr. Shoenberg thought there should be some way to solicit public opinion in a structured way. Mrs. Praisner disagreed because it would formalize the process. She asked what would be the end result of this process, and Mr. Ewing replied that the end result would be the superintendent's proposed budget. Dr. Cody said that the budget would reflect the discussions of the Board, staff, and PTA. Mrs. Praisner said that this exercise would be useful in pulling together all of the things they had been discussing, but she again cautioned about formalizing the process. Dr. Floyd commented that this was a function of leadership, and people were elected or appointed to lead. He thought they had to be out front so that people would understand where it was that they were trying to go. He said that it was their responsibility to look five or ten years down the road.

Re: EXECUTIVE SESSION

The Board met in executive session from noon to 1:45 p.m. to discuss personnel and legal matters. Mrs. DiFonzo left the meeting because of illness.

Re: BOARD/PRESS/VISITOR CONFERENCE

The following individuals appeared before the Board:

1. Carole Gelfeld, Luxmanor PTA
2. Jim Moore, Montgomery JOURNAL
3. Carol Fanconi, Gaithersburg High School PTSA

RESOLUTION NO. 369-85 Re: SHERWOOD HIGH SCHOOL AIR CONDITIONING

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

WHEREAS, Sealed bids were received on August 6, 1985, for air conditioning Sherwood High School as follows:

BIDDER	LUMP SUM
1. Harry E. Densel, Inc.	\$254,760
2. C. W. Mechanical Contractors, Inc.	261,000
3. Charles W. Lonas, Inc.	262,500
4. Tyler Mechanical, Inc.	264,737
5. Darwin Construction, Inc.	295,000
6. American Combustion, Inc.	334,489

and

WHEREAS, The low bidder, Harry E. Densel, Inc., has performed satisfactorily on other MCPS projects; and

WHEREAS, Low bid is within staff estimate and sufficient funds are available in Account 999-63 to effect award; and

WHEREAS, G. W. Mechanical Contractors, Inc., protests award to Densel as Densel clarified its bid by stating that PEPCO fees were not included in the bid price; and

WHEREAS, Staff has determined that none of the four lowest bidders, including G. W. Mechanical Contractors, Inc., incorporated PEPCO fees in their proposals as PEPCO was unable to provide their fee costs; now therefore be it

Resolved, That a contract for \$254,760 be awarded to Harry E. Densel, Inc., to accomplish air conditioning at Sherwood High School, in accordance with plans and specifications covering this work dated July 19, 1985, as prepared by J. B. Wyble & Associates.

RESOLUTION NO. 370-85 Re: CARDEROCK SPRINGS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL  
ROOF REPAIRS

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

WHEREAS, Sealed bids were received on August 7, 1985, for roof repairs at Carderock Springs Elementary School as follows:

BIDDER	LUMP SUM
--------	----------

- |                            |          |
|----------------------------|----------|
| 1. J. E. Wood & Sons Co.   | \$45,291 |
| 2. Darwin Construction Co. | 59,959   |
| 3. Orndorff & Spaid        | 71,726   |

and

WHEREAS, The low bidder, J. E. Wood & Sons Co., has performed satisfactorily on other MCPS projects; and

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

Resolved, That a contract for \$45,291 be awarded to J. E. Wood & Sons Co., to accomplish a reroofing project at Carderock Springs Elementary School, in accordance with plans and specifications covering this work dated July 24, 1985, as prepared by the Division of Construction and Capital Projects.

RESOLUTION NO. 371-85 Re: AWARD OF CONTRACT - FURNISH AND INSTALL INDUSTRIAL ARTS MODIFICATIONS - VARIOUS SCHOOLS

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

WHEREAS, Funds were approved in the FY 1986 Capital Budget for industrial arts ventilation at various schools; and

WHEREAS, Sealed bids were received on August 7 to furnish and install industrial arts modifications at Kennedy and Springbrook High Schools, Parkland and White Oak Junior High Schools, and Mark Twain School as indicated below:

1. W. B. Maske Sheet Metal Works - Proposal A (Kennedy) \$6,329; Proposal B (Mark Twain) \$9,063; Proposal C (Parkland) \$9,478; Proposal D (Springbrook) \$10,505; Proposal E (White Oak) \$11,836; Total \$47,211
2. Darwin Construction - Proposal A (Kennedy) \$25,000; Proposal B (Mark Twain) \$20,000; Proposal C (Parkland) \$20,000; Proposal D (Springbrook) \$25,000; Proposal E (White Oak) \$20,000; Total \$110,000

and

WHEREAS, The low bidder, W. B. Maske Sheet Metal Works, has performed satisfactorily similar projects for MCPS; and

WHEREAS, The bid results are within staff estimate and sufficient funds exist for contract award; now therefore be it

Resolved, That a contract be awarded to W. B. Maske Sheet Metal Works in the amount of \$47,211 to furnish and install industrial arts modifications at Kennedy and Springbrook High Schools; Parkland and White Oak Junior High Schools, and Mark Twain School in accordance

with plans and specifications dated July 24, 1985, prepared by the Division of Construction and Capital Projects and Morton Wood, Jr., Engineer.

RESOLUTION NO. 373-85 Re: TWINBROOK ELEMENTARY SCHOOL,  
RENOVATION AND ADDITIONS (Area 2)

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

WHEREAS, Sealed bids were received on July 30 for the Twinbrook Elementary School Renovation and Additions as indicated below:

BIDDER	BASE BID	DEDUCT ALT. 1	DEDUCT ALT. 2	TOTAL*
1. Hess Construction Company, Inc. and Hess Mechanical Corp., A Joint Venture	\$2,737,000	\$ 80,855	\$36,000	\$2,701,000
2. N. S. Stavrou Construction, Inc.	2,830,000	84,000	37,500	2,792,500
3. Henley Construction Co., Inc.	2,827,995	112,000	30,000	2,797,995
4. The McAlister-Schwartz Co.	2,889,610	95,000	22,000	2,867,619
5. Kimmel & Kimmel, Inc.	2,984,000	110,000	22,000	2,962,000
6. Merando. Inc.	3,171,500	82,000	20,000	3,151,500

\*Indicates acceptance of base bid and Deduct Alternate 2

Description of alternatives:

Deduct Alternate 1: Air-conditioning

Deduct Alternate 2: Kitchen Equipment

and

WHEREAS, The low bidder, Hess Construction Co., Inc., and Hess Mechanical Corporation, A Joint Venture, has successfully performed similar projects; and

WHEREAS, Sufficient funds are available to effect award; now therefore be it

Resolved, That a contract for \$2,701,000 be awarded to Hess Construction Co., Inc. and Hess Mechanical Corporation, A Joint Venture, which includes acceptance of the base bid and Alternate 2, to accomplish the requirements of the plans and specifications entitled, Twinbrook Elementary School, Renovations and Additions, dated May 1, 1985, prepared by Arley J. Koran, Inc., architect.

RESOLUTION NO. 373-85 Re: REDUCTION OF RETAINAGE - MONTGOMERY  
BLAIR HIGH SCHOOL ADDITION AND  
MODERNIZATION (Area 1)

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

WHEREAS, Kimmel & Kimmel, Inc., general contractor for Montgomery Blair High School Addition and Modernization, has completed 96 percent of the specified requirements and 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, Aetna Casualty & Surety Company, by letter dated July 24, 1985, consented to this reduction; and

WHEREAS, The project architect, Eugene Delmar & Associates, has recommended that this request for reduction in retainage be approved by letter dated July 25, 1985; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the contract's specified 10 percent retainage withheld from periodic construction payments to Kimmel & Kimmel, Inc., general contractor for the Montgomery Blair High School Addition and Modernization, currently amounting to 10 percent of the contractor's request for payment to date, now be reduced to 5 percent with 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. 373-85    Re:    ARCHITECTURAL APPOINTMENT - ROSEMARY HILLS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL - ADDITION AND ALTERATIONS (Area 2)

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

WHEREAS, It is necessary to appoint an architect to provide required design services and administration of the construction contract for the Rosemary Hills Elementary School addition and alterations project; and

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education enter into a contractual agreement with the firm of Garrison-Babarsky Associates to provide required design services and administration of the construction contract for the lump sum of \$128,710 for the Rosemary Hills Elementary School project; and be it further

Resolved, That the State Interagency Committee for Public School Construction be informed of this appointment.

RESOLUTION NO. 375-85    Re:    ARCHITECTURAL APPOINTMENT - CEDAR GROVE

ELEMENTARY SCHOOL - ADDITION AND  
ALTERATIONS (Area 3)

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

WHEREAS, It is necessary to appoint an architect to provide required design services and administration of the construction contract for the Cedar Grove Elementary School addition and alterations project; and

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education enter into a contractual agreement with the firm of Victor Smolen and Associates to provide required design services and administration of the construction contract for the lump sum of \$133,000 for the Cedar Grove Elementary School project; and be it further

Resolved, That the State Interagency Committee for Public School Construction be informed of this appointment.

RESOLUTION NO. 376-85 Re: ARCHITECTURAL APPOINTMENT - EAST  
GERMANTOWN ELEMENTARY SCHOOL (Area 3)

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

WHEREAS, It is necessary to appoint an architect to provide required design services and administration of the construction contract for the East Germantown Elementary School project; and

WHEREAS, Staff has employed the Architect/Engineer Selection Procedures as modified to include a design competition; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Board of Education enter into a contractual agreement with the firm of Thomas Clark Associates to provide required design services and administration of the construction contract for the lump sum total of \$249,500 for the East Germantown Elementary School project.

RESOLUTION NO. 377-85 Re: WORKS OF ART FOR OAK VIEW ELEMENTARY  
SCHOOL

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

WHEREAS, Authorization for the selection of artists to receive

commissions to produce works of art is delineated in Article V, Section 1, Chapter 8, "Buildings," of the Montgomery County Code; and

WHEREAS, Staff has employed selection procedures submitted by the superintendent to the Board of Education on February 10, 1984; and

WHEREAS, The Montgomery County Arts Council has participated in the selection process as required by law; and

WHEREAS, Funds have been appropriated for this purpose in the FY 1985 Capital Improvements Program; and

WHEREAS, The law also requires County Council approval before the Board of Education can enter into contracts with said artists; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Board of Education enter into contractual agreements, as indicated, subject to County Council approval:

ARTIST	WORK	COMMISSION
Robert Sanabria	Relief	\$5,000
Frank Smith	Mural	7,000
Steven Weitzman	Bas Relief	7,000

and be it further

Resolved, That the County Council be requested to expeditiously approve the above commissions to the indicated artists.

RESOLUTION NO. 378-85 Re: BETHESDA-CHEVY CHASE HIGH SCHOOL  
CONSTRUCTION PROJECT SETTLEMENT

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

WHEREAS, On September 14, 1976, the Board of Education awarded a contract to Stauffer Construction Company, Inc., to accomplish a modernization project at Bethesda-Chevy Chase High School; and

WHEREAS, On November 13, 1979, the Board of Education terminated the contract, and requested the project bonding company, Fidelity and Deposit Company of Maryland, to complete the work; and

WHEREAS, Fidelity and Deposit Company of Maryland completed the project; and

WHEREAS, The conduct and activities of the contract parties and the termination have been the subject of arbitration and litigation; and

WHEREAS, The involved parties have now reached settlement; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Board of Education approves the proposed settlement with Stauffer Construction Co., Inc. and Fidelity and

Deposit Company of Maryland concerning the Bethesda-Chevy Chase High School project, which shall include the payment of \$100,000 by the Board to Fidelity and Deposit Company of Maryland, the furnishing of appropriate releases to Stauffer and Fidelity, and the receipt by the Board of appropriate releases from Stauffer and Fidelity; provided, however, that this approval is conditioned upon appropriation of funds by the County Council and county executive; and be it further

Resolved, That as the project account balance is \$68,893.79, a transfer of \$31,106.21 is required from the local unliquidated surplus account (balance before transfer \$47,428.42); and be it further

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

RESOLUTION NO. 379-85 Re: FY 1986 SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION FOR THE MOBILE EDUCATION TEAMS (METs)

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

Resolved, That the superintendent of schools be authorized to establish the following ten-month positions: 1.0 teacher specialist (A-D), .5 counselor (A-D), .5 parent liaison specialist (A-D), and 2.0 instructional assistants (Grade 10); and be it further

Resolved, That the superintendent of schools be authorized, subject to County Council approval, to receive and expend from the U. S. Department of Education under ESEA Title VII to provide an FY 1986 Mobile Education Teams (METs) project: An Intensive Catch-up Program for LEP Students, Grades 6-9 in the following categories:

CATEGORIES	SUPPLEMENTAL
02 Instructional Salaries	\$120,600
03 Instructional Other	17,280
07 Student Transportation	1,000
10 Fixed Charges	32,566
	-----
TOTAL	\$171,446

and be it further

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

RESOLUTION NO. 380-85 Re: PROCUREMENT CONTRACTS OVER \$25,000

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Mr. Foubert 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, All bids received in response to Bid 74-85, Refuse Collection, should be rejected due to feasibility problems at this time with using trash dumpsters at schools, and staff has decided not to use vendors for trash removal at six pilot-test locations; and

WHEREAS, The bid received in response to Bid 194-85, Donuts, should be rejected and the items rebid since the only bid received did not meet specifications regarding delivery to each school by 7:30 a.m.; now therefore be it

Resolved, That Bids 74-85 and 194-85 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:

5-0780-21-00	COG IFB, Heating Oil	
	NAME OF VENDOR	
	Steuart Petroleum Co.	\$3,236,608
130-85	Copiers (Group II Maintenance of Currently Owned Machines)	
	NAME OF VENDOR	
	Hi-Tech Industries, Inc. (10 months)	\$ 281,250
152-85	Building Materials	
	NAME OF VENDOR(S)	
	Allied Plywood	\$ 20,230
	Boyer and Cramer's, Inc.	4,170
	Leland L. Fisher, Inc.	2,562
	Hudson Supply & Equipment	10,395
	Thomas W. Perry, Inc.	21,936
		-----
	TOTAL	\$ 59,293
160-85	Frozen Juice Bars	
	NAME OF VENDOR	
	Smelkinson Bros. Corp.	\$ 36,038
166-85	Steel Lockers	
	NAME OF VENDOR(S)	
	Steel Products, Inc.	\$ 126,904
	Wholesale Replacement Hardware Co.	9,500
		-----
	TOTAL	\$ 136,404
183-85	Diplomas	
	NAME OF VENDOR	
	Josten's, Inc.	\$ 73,051
196-85	Supplemental Music Instruments	
	NAME OF VENDOR(S)	
	Drums Unlimited, Inc.	\$ 3,662
	Ideal Music Co.	1,648
	Music and Arts Center, Inc.	310

	Washington Music Center, Inc.	43,787
	Zavarella's Music	5,260
		-----
	TOTAL	\$ 54,667
200-85	Driver Education Behind-the-Wheel Training	
	NAME OF VENDOR(S)	
	Easy Method, Inc.	\$ 117,162
	Poly Method Driving School	6,120
	Potomac Driving School	6,120
		-----
	TOTAL	\$ 129,402
201-85	Optical Mark Reader Equipment	
	NAME OF VENDOR	
	National Computer Systems	\$ 81,040
202-85	Optical Scanners	
	NAME OF VENDOR	
	Chatsworth Data Corporation	\$ 47,800
	GRAND TOTAL	\$4,135,553

RESOLUTION NO. 381-85 Re: MONTHLY PERSONNEL REPORT

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

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

RESOLUTION NO. 382-85 Re: EXTENSION OF SICK LEAVE

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Mrs. Praisner seconded by Mr. Ewing, 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
Barnes, Elizabeth	Career Information Asst.	30
	Computer Related Instruction	

RESOLUTION NO. 383-85 Re: PERSONNEL REASSIGNMENTS

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

Resolved, That the following personnel reassignments be approved:

NAME	FROM	TO
Max Goff	Classroom Teacher	Assignment to be determined Effective August 29, 1985 Will maintain salary status and retire July 1, 1987
Verna Oberbroeckling	Classroom Teacher	Instructional Assistant Bells Mill Elementary Effective August 29, 1985 Will maintain salary status and retire September 1, 1987

RESOLUTION NO. 384-85    Re:    DEATH OF MRS. SARA A. ELLER, CLASSROOM  
TEACHER AT ROCK VIEW ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

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

WHEREAS, The death on July 29, 1985, of Mrs. Sara A. Eller, a classroom teacher at Rock View Elementary School, has deeply saddened the staff and members of the Board of Education; and

WHEREAS, Mrs. Eller had been employed with Montgomery County Public Schools for one year; and

WHEREAS, Mrs. Eller was an outstanding teacher and an asset to the Rock View staff, and her level of professionalism benefited not only her class but the entire school program; now therefore be it

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

RESOLUTION NO. 385-85    Re:    DEATH OF MR. JAY U. LEE, BUILDING SER-  
VICES WORKER LEADER I AT DUFIEF  
ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

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

WHEREAS, The death on July 16, 1985, of Mr. Jay U. Lee, a Building Services Work Leader at DuFief Elementary School, has deeply saddened the staff and members of the Board of Education; and

WHEREAS, Mr. Lee was a conscientious employee of Montgomery County Public Schools for over seven years; and

WHEREAS, Mr. Lee demonstrated competency in his role as building

services work leader, and he also participated in the Outdoor Education program and was highly effective in working with staff and students; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the members of the Board of Education express their sorrow at the death of Mr. Jay U. Lee 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. Lee's family.

RESOLUTION NO. 386-85 Re: DEATH OF MRS. ARLENE F. MOWEN, OFFICE ASSISTANT IN THE DIVISION OF ACCOUNTING

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

WHEREAS, The death on July 30, 1985, of Mrs. Arlene F. Mowen, an Office Assistant in the Division of Accounting, has deeply saddened the staff and members of the Board of Education; and

WHEREAS, Mrs. Mowen had been a dedicated employee of Montgomery County Public Schools for over sixteen years; and

WHEREAS, Mrs. Mowen performed her duties with the utmost accuracy and always strived for perfection; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the members of the Board of Education express their sorrow at the death of Mrs. Arlene F. Mowen 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. Mowen's family.

RESOLUTION NO. 387-85 Re: DEATH OF MR. RICHARD LLOYD ROBERTS, PLANT EQUIPMENT OPERATOR II AT TILDEN INTERMEDIATE SCHOOL

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

WHEREAS, The death on July 20, 1985, of Mr. Richard Lloyd Roberts, a Plant Equipment Operator at Tilden Intermediate School, has deeply saddened the staff and members of the Board of Education; and

WHEREAS, Mr. Roberts was a loyal employee of Montgomery County Public Schools for over twenty-seven years; and

WHEREAS, Mr. Roberts was a cooperative staff member giving of himself in time, energy, and services to students and staff; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the members of the Board of Education express their sorrow at the death of Mr. Richard Lloyd Roberts 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. Roberts' family.

RESOLUTION NO. 388-85 Re: PERSONNEL APPOINTMENTS AND TRANSFERS

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

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

APPOINTMENT	PRESENT POSITION	AS
Jerome E. Lynch	Assistant Principal Walt Whitman H.S.	Supervisor of Secondary Instruc. Area Admin. Office Grade O Effective 8-14-85
Marilyn E. Nelson	Legal Services Planner Office of the Supt.	Supervisor of Secondary Instruc. Area Admin. Office Grade O Effective 8-14-85
TRANSFER	FROM	TO
John DiTomasso	Principal Pine Crest ES	Principal Galway ES Effective 8-14-85
Jack Ramsey	Principal Assigned to Area Off.	Principal Robert Frost IS Effective 8-14-85
James Heins	A&S Counselor Springbrook HS	Assistant Principal Thomas Pyle IS Effective 8-14-85
APPOINTMENT	PRESENT POSITION	AS
Sandra L. Killen	Teacher Spec., Math Dept. of Acad. Skills	Principal Pine Crest ES Effective 8-14-85
Ann R. Mathias	Assistant Principal Assigned to Dept. School Facilities, Planning & Development	Principal Montgomery Knolls ES Effective 8-14-85
Kennon Evans	Elementary Principal Trainee Cresthaven ES	Principal Cresthaven ES Effective 8-14-85
Darlene Simmons	Teacher Specialist Dept. of Special Ed. & Related Services	Director, Bridge S Grade N Effective 8-14-85
TRANSFER	FROM	TO
Joseph Reiff	Assistant Principal Einstein HS	Assistant Principal Sherwood HS

George Cokinos	Assistant Principal John F. Kennedy HS	Effective 8-14-85 Assistant Principal Einstein HS
Felecia White	Assistant Principal John F. Kennedy HS	Effective 8-14-85 Assistant Principal Einstein HS
Amanda Winters	Asst. Supervisor for Special Services Area Admin. Office	Effective 8-14-85 Acting Asst. Princ. John F. Kennedy HS
Jack Schoendorfer	Human Relations Specialist	Effective 8-14-85 Acting Asst. Princ. John F. Kennedy HS
APPOINTMENT	PRESENT POSITION	AS
Carlos R. Hamlin	Assistant Principal Potomac Senior HS Dumfries, Virginia	Assistant Principal Woodward HS Effective 8-14-85
Nick M. Urick	Assistant Principal W. Winchester ES Carroll Co. BOE Westminster, MD	Assistant Principal Redland MS Effective 8-14-85
Lois H. Loew	Per Diem Psychologist MCPS & Concurrent Psychotherapist Child Center Rockville, MD	Psychologist (.time) Area Admin. Office Grade G Effective 8-14-85
Paula Rehr	Teacher Specialist Dept. of Acad. Skills	TV Instruc. Spec. Dept. of Instruct. Resources Grade F Effective 8-14-85
Roberta Haines	Teacher Specialist Dept. of Inst. Res.	TV Instruc. Spec. Dept. of Inst. Res. Grade F Effective 8-14-85

Re: FACILITIES PLANNING/CAPITAL BUDGET  
CALENDAR PROPOSALS

Dr. Cody stated that as long as their capital requests were minor and went to the state, no attention was paid to time schedules. Now they were not minor, and the state no longer had capital funds. They realized they had to come up with new time schedules regarding county government. This led to a lot of proposals and meetings with PTA, staff, and county government staff. In addition, legal requirements had to be taken into account to come up with a time schedule for facilities planning and the capital budget. The Board had been provided with a summary of that process, the identification of a series of issues, a document with some different calendars, and a recommendation for discussion.

Dr. Muir thought they had come up with a proposal within which everyone could work. He said they had a requirement in the

Montgomery County Charter for a consolidated CIP to be presented to the County Council by January 1. They needed the September 30 enrollment data in order to make good decisions and prepare the capital budget; however, there was not much time before the receipt of that data and the January 1 date. They had come up with two alternatives. They were suggesting that the capital budget be published in the first week in November and that there be joint hearings with the Council and executive. There would be Board of Education action the last week in November to get the state-eligible projects to the state by December 7. The county government could consolidate the MCPS capital budget into the county executive's budget and make the January 1 deadline. He explained that the alternatives came in terms of the facility plan. They were trying to get action on the facilities plan in "synch" with action on the capital budget. The two proposals were similar, but the difference came in how much time citizens needed to react to the superintendent's preliminary recommendations. Plan 1 would propose the superintendent's preliminary recommendations the first week in June similar to the timing for the Area 2 options. Those preliminary recommendations would have to be based on the prior year's enrollment updated in May. Citizen comments would be due toward the end of July, and the superintendent's final recommendations would be out the third week in October in order for the superintendent to have the latest projections. Both of the plans did not wait for the thirtieth day enrollment. They were trying to experiment with making projections from the tenth day enrollment because the difference between the tenth day and the thirtieth day was slight. They hoped to be able to computerize this projection process. He explained that the difference in the second plan was that the superintendent's preliminary recommendations would be out at the end of August which cut down on the time for citizen comment. They would have only four weeks after the superintendent's preliminary recommendations were published. However, they were trying to come up with recommendations for the plan as well as some considerations for the following year which would minimize surprises. This would get communities working with the area offices and the facilities planning staff to work through concerns about projected actions.

Dr. Shoenberg noted that on page 3 some assumptions were listed and facilities and the capital budget were supposed to be congruent; however, both calendars had facilities decisions after the capital budget. Dr. Muir replied that while these were in following weeks they did not necessarily have to be in following weeks. They were trying to give as much time to the Board as possible. He said that the Board needed to make capital budget decisions by the last week in November so that the county executive's staff could incorporate these actions into the county budget and meet the January 1 Council deadline. He thought that by that time the Board would be familiar with the facility plan final recommendations and know the capital budget implications. They assumed that the Board would be able to deal with the necessary capital budget actions before confirming those actions in the facilities plan. If not, they could back up the decision point by a week, but this would put the Board in a time bind.

Dr. Shoenberg cited the Northwood closure which had considerable capital budget implications for the following year. For the Board to have taken a capital budget action before taking action on a school closure would have raised havoc with the community. He pointed out that they had a proposal from the PTA and asked about problems with this proposal. Dr. Muir replied that the PTA proposal called for the superintendent's final recommendations to be published on September 15 which would not give the superintendent knowledge of the current year enrollment. Dr. Shoenberg asked about a plan which would split the difference and perhaps schedule all the facilities and capital budget action in one week. Dr. Cody replied that he and the staff would work on this. He said that the facility update contained multiyear capital budget needs. As the Board made capital budget decisions each year they were really making capital decisions for the following years. It would cover boundary changes, new schools, additions, and portables. The facility update process did not cover renovations; however, that could be included in a separate document. They really went through a facilities update which had a three-, five- or six-year capital plan in it with dollars and cents on it. Dr. Shoenberg pointed out that there was another item in there that needed some kind of reconciliation. They had capital budget hearings in conjunction with the County Council and county executive, and they ran the risk of those hearings becoming facilities hearings.

Mrs. Praisner commented that as she looked at all these charts, she did not believe that every county in the state had these kinds of problems. She thought there must be some way of getting a handle on this even if it meant changing the documents used to drive this process. For example, they might have started from the other end by saying they had to build schools and what was the best way of planning a process to do that. Dr. Muir did not think anyone else had a facilities planning process like Montgomery County and many jurisdictions did not have to submit capital budgets to their Councils on January 1. Mrs. Praisner pointed out that all of them had to submit capital budget requests to the state in December. It seemed to her that most counties had decided in December what their capital budgets were going to be. She would like them to look at the facility plan process as they had created it with preliminary recommendations, final recommendations, Board alternatives and the time table. She felt that this was the problem, and this may have been generated for a time period they did not have anymore.

Mr. Ewing thought that Mrs. Praisner's point was a good one. The facilities planning process was a process aimed primarily at school closings. The idea was to make sure they did that in a way that granted due process to affected communities. It might well be in an era when they were closing few schools that they did not need to hold to such long time frames. They might have a single process for both capital budget and facilities plan building in the due process only when they were proposing to close schools. This might make it possible for them to handle this in a less extended time frame. It did not mean they should not adopt some of the recommendations the PTA made for early June preliminary recommendations, but it should

make it possible for them to put those two processes together, certainly in September after the tenth day enrollment was available. Dr. Cody remarked that the principle interest of the citizens was when they were going to build a school and whether it was going to be big enough. He wished they could do five-year facility plans with budgets and update everyone of them every year. Dr. Muir commented that this was what the facilities planning policy called for, but the trouble was there were always reasons to change the decisions. Dr. Cody agreed but pointed out that they were in a period of reversal of trends. Dr. Shoenberg said that the growth problem was not going to involve closing facilities but would involve a lot of tinkering with boundaries. Mr. Ewing added that boundary decisions did not necessarily have to be made in the context of capital budget decisions.

Dr. Muir noted that they had tried to be sensitive to Board and staff workload. This process ended the first week in December, and in the years when the Board was engaged in collective bargaining with employee organizations usually in December they spent a lot of time on this issue. It was the time when the superintendent had to spend some time on making operating budget decisions, and in January and early February the Board was involved with the operating budget. One of the advantages of the fall was that it was a period of time not already committed to some other things. They did not see this as two separate processes. He envisioned a facilities plan as being a series of data and decisions out of which came some logical decisions for the capital budget.

Mrs. Vicki Rafel commented that the problem for everyone involved with this, not just staff and Board but community, was the one of workload. December was a terrible time for PTA presidents to have to deal with this, and June was not wonderful to deal with preliminary plans. She thought the most important objective was to try to even that load out. Mrs. Slye preferred the MCCPTA time line because it got around the known scheduling difficulties. Mrs. Rafel pointed out that their plan did put a tremendous burden on staff in May. Mrs. Slye inquired about the difference automation of the process made. Dr. Muir replied that the raw data from which to make the projections for the facilities plan and capital budget were not available until mid-September at the earliest if they took the tenth day enrollment or September 30. He would envision a ten-day time frame as opposed to a thirty-day time frame. With a September 15 publication date for the superintendent's final facilities recommendations, he would never see the September enrollment of any kind.

Dr. Fisher reported that now this was done in about a three-week period of time. They usually received the September 30 enrollment on October 4 or 5 and met with the superintendent in late October. They projected the enrollments for every school and assessed those against capacity and looked at alternate solutions. As long as they were projecting 150 schools per grade for six years, they were not going to do this quickly.

Mrs. Praisner said that the concern she had with facility plan

recommendation one was with the superintendent's preliminary recommendations due out the first week in June. If they did not meet the deadline, they might as well wait until September. At the end of the school year people would be anxious about what was going to come out, whether it was a closure or a boundary change. She agreed that the superintendent's final recommendations had to come out later than September 15 or even late September which might cause some condensing of time between the Board's work session and the Board's action and alternatives. She had a concern with Board action based on MCCPTA's calendar at a time period in November when in some years they were talking about elections. It seemed to her they should have Board action prior to the elections or a week or two after the election. Her preference would be prior to the election. Her other questions dealt with following year considerations they alluded to. If they were talking about a general sentence that if enrollment projections increased they would anticipate additions or boundary changes, she thought that was reasonable. If they were talking about moving X-development out of this school into Y-school in two years, she thought they would cause themselves grief. She said that when MCCPTA came forward as a committee they talked about not only the Board and the calendar and the process. She thought MCCPTA did a great service in its discussion with members of the County Council and representatives from Park and Planning about their involvement and place in the process. She noted that some of the recommendations of MCCPTA related to other government agencies, and she wondered about the response received from those agencies. Mrs. Cordie Goldstein thought that sending the preliminary recommendations to Park and Planning in plenty of time for them to respond was something she believed Park and Planning would agree to. Their committee thought that communities might automatically send their views to the Board, superintendent, and Park and Planning.

Mrs. Praisner recalled that MCCPTA was concerned about the confusion as far as the role and responsibility of the Planning Board and how they solicited community input. Mrs. Rafel said the question was whether the communities discussed the same thing with the Planning Board and whether communities were adequately informed on how the process was working. Mrs. Mary Ann Bowen said their initiative would be that the time line would have enough flexibility to allow for input to Park and Planning and measure out some of the need for the public forum that they seemed to require.

Dr. Shoenberg stated that one aspect of the proposal they had not commented on was the time of the superintendent's preliminary recommendations in relation to opportunity for input from the affected communities. He asked if Board members had preference for the earlier preliminary recommendations vis-a-vis the later ones. Mr. Ewing replied that he preferred the earlier. It seemed to Dr. Shoenberg that the general feeling was June or earlier. He asked if staff had enough sense of things to go on with this. Dr. Cody thought the discussion had been helpful including weighing the timing of some of these things. The preliminary recommendations would come out in late spring and sit over the summer for comment. The suggestion was also made that staff break out the pieces of this and

rate all of the steps and raise the question of why they were there. He wanted to pursue a clearer picture of how they were linking facility update and the capital budget.

Mr. Ewing suggested that before they came to a final resolution they check with other county agencies so that they would have an opportunity to comment. Dr. Muir replied that in the process of developing the paper they did talk with Council and OMB staff; however, they had not consulted with Park and Planning but had heard Park and Planning wanted six weeks between the superintendent's preliminary and final recommendations. Mrs. Praisner saw a valid reason for Park and Planning to make comments on the preliminary recommendations. In the final recommendations the Board and superintendent would be making modifications, but the reality was that they were still dealing with the same schools and the same general concerns. Park and Planning recommendations should be general and not school specific comments when it got to the final recommendations.

Dr. Muir called attention to an item on a three-year cycle for facility plan revisions. Dr. Shoenberg said that he had a real question about that. While in theory it was a good idea, in practice the decisions involving one school cluster frequently involved adjacent ones. It seemed to him that if it were set up this way, they would be promising the public that they were solve the cluster problems within the high school cluster. He pointed out that they were running a countywide school system, and the area divisions were entirely arbitrary. Dr. Muir said that part of the concern was that they seemed to be falling into some sort of an area examination. Dr. Shoenberg stated that he was uncomfortable with that part. Mr. Ewing thought there might be something of an alternative which might be to think about the way they scheduled without saying they were going to do a certain number of clusters a year. Dr. Cody commented that consideration was given to doing elementary one year and secondary the next. He noted that it was the solution-generating that took the time because the enrollment forecast had to be done every year anyway. Dr. Muir agreed that he would go back to the drawing boards and return with another paper for Board consideration.

Re: TIMELINE FOR CAPITAL PROJECTS DECISIONS FOR  
THE BLAIR CLUSTER ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS

Dr. Shoenberg explained that the Board had before it a timetable for Blair area decisions. Dr. Cody said that on August 16 they would distribute information to the community which would consist of the superintendent's final recommendations including the two alternatives. He would supply the Board with the cost implications of the proposals. The community would be asked to supply written comments to the superintendent by September 13. Board members asked that a public hearing be scheduled, and it was agreed that this would be held on Tuesday, September 17.

Re: NEW FORMULA FOR SCHOOL CAPACITY -  
SECONDARY

Dr. Shoenberg said that the superintendent was recommending no change in this capacity formula. Dr. Cody explained the background of the concern about the elementary school capacity formula and the problems that were created when the average class size was reduced. He said that the guidelines from the state for secondary schools were different. They were not 30 to 1; they were 25 to 1. This meant that in the 70 to 90 percent range it would be about 22.5 which was about the average class size in secondary schools. They concluded that the state formula for secondary schools as applied to Montgomery County, which meant factoring out the special education classes, worked pretty well.

Dr. Fisher explained that at secondary schools where they had a large special needs program such as a large ESOL center or a large vocational wing, these posed special programs. They had to make some adjustment in the formula or make some kind of facility modifications. Mrs. Slye asked how the special educational initiatives plan worked into this. She asked if they were moving more in the direction of more special programs in the schools rather than fewer and, if so, would they make a formula adjustment. Dr. Cody replied that in the special education initiatives they expected some shifting of programs, but they did not anticipate much growth. However, this would not change the formula. It seemed to Mrs. Slye they would have an annual update based on programmatic use. She asked what they did at the secondary level with the special use rooms such as a shop room. Dr. Fisher replied that this was a teaching station. The formula was based on a 25 to 1 average, but an electronics shop might be used by 15 or 20 students, but offsetting that would be a music room with space for 60 students.

Mrs. Slye stated that numerically she understood it, but programmatically she had problems with the fact that the spaces were not interchangeable. Dr. Fisher said that Paint Branch had a wing which provided for more space for that part of the program than the enrollment of the school called for. Therefore, the school was not in balance programmatically, but in the specifications they had written for Paint Branch they had brought the other classrooms into balance. He said that when they put the whole program together it would average out.

It seemed to Mr. Ewing that unless they built in some kind of mechanism into the formula for special needs programs, they would end up with a result like that they faced at Einstein when the special program was pushed aside when enrollment in the regular program rose. He thought they should try to avoid that and pointed out that when they had large masses of spaces assigned to something like vocational education they would be less likely to convert these spaces. If they knew they had a continuing proportion of their student body in special education, he wondered why they couldn't build facilities at the secondary level to arrange for special spaces as they did for art and music at the elementary level. Dr. Cody did not know whether this was part of the plans for the two new high schools. One way would be to handle it with some kind of program-related formula for

each high school, and the other way was to come up with guidelines for the programs they were going to put in each high school. If the school became overcrowded, they should not move special needs students out. He agreed that staff would look at that part of the formula again.

Mrs. Praisner said it almost seemed they were asking how much of the capacity of a building should be set aside for special programs at the secondary level. She had asked about their goal for clustering special education programs and what was the balance of regular and special enrollment. It seemed to her that if they had a goal or an objective they could build it into the planning for the buildings. She appreciated the information staff had obtained from other counties which indicated Montgomery County was not unique in looking for a formula. Other counties had identified that 30 to 1 was not an appropriate kind of planning process. One paper indicated that Anne Arundel and Howard were trying to get the state to change its formula, and she asked if staff would check into this.

Dr. Shoenberg thought that the decision on the high school was right and that special education programs could be done outside the formula. For that reason, he liked the new suggestions for the elementary formula because it did not involve them in two separate ways of setting capacity. He was still concerned about the timing of the phase in of a different facilities calculation. There was a question of whether to use the new calculation in considering the Area 2 situation.

Dr. Cody drew attention to the proposed use of the same numbers for elementary as for the high schools which was intended to get to deal with reduced class size that they were aiming for four and five years from now. Use of a new formula did not mean that schools were going to be overcrowded next fall. The formula itself really did not address kindergarten and that would have some impact. He hoped that later they would have a more precise notion of the impact of going to all-day kindergarten.

Mrs. Praisner assumed the chair.

Re: A MOTION BY DR. SHOENBERG TO TABLE THE  
PROPOSED RESOLUTION ON SUBDIVISION  
REVIEW METHODOLOGY (APFO REVIEW)  
(FAILED)

A motion by Dr. Shoenberg to table the proposed resolution on subdivision review methodology failed with Mrs. Praisner, Dr. Shoenberg, Mrs. Slye, and (Mr. Foubert) voting in the affirmative; Mr. Ewing and Dr. Floyd voting in the negative.

Dr. Shoenberg assumed the chair.

Re: SUBDIVISION REVIEW METHODOLOGY

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



students were key to problems in society. They believed students should be enrolled in certain math and science courses and vocational courses. The perception of career roles could also be attended to by the employment of certain people in the school system.

Dr. Cody that the school system had been attending to many concerns and recognized that a lot of progress had been made. He called attention to the appointment of women to key positions in administration and as supervisors in transportation. In terms of enrollment of girls in certain math and science courses, the enrollment was the same but there was some inequity in the very advanced courses. It was their belief that these areas needed to be targeted on and elevated to the level of specific objectives. He hoped that the Board would adopt these as their objectives at a future meeting.

Dr. Shoenberg suggested that they begin with science/math/computer first and then turn to vocational education and employment. Mrs. Slye noted that the discrepancy in the SAT score differential remained great. She inquired about national trends about the differential, and Dr. Muir replied that the pattern nationally was the same as it was here. Mrs. Slye said a relatively high number of female students tended to take SATs and combined with the low enrollment in higher level math courses this might produce this result artificially. She again requested information on the national trend. She noted that on attachment 1 the remark was made that females whether enrolled in lower or higher percentages than males in advanced courses received proportionally more A's in all courses but one. Yet female students had the differentiated test scores. She asked about testing anxiety. She said they did not do a very good job for providing an environment that encouraged female students to take risks in the same proportion that male students did. Male students were willing to take a "C", but female students entered the course only when they could come out with a high mark. She knew that these were attitudinal issues and difficult to solve. She appreciated the effort that had gone into this because it pointed up areas where they had room for improvements. She thought the two targeted areas were good places to begin. She recalled that when they discussed the honors program she had requested that those statistics be broken out by male and female participation.

Mr. Ewing thought that the two objectives were well stated and well defined. Carrying through on these as planned should give them good indicators as to how well they were doing. He said they had some outcome measures which were quantitative, and he would hope that when they had gone far enough into this process to have some data that they also begin to inquire as to why if there still remained some discrepancies. They also needed to know why they were making progress so that they could build on any successes. Dr. Muir explained that it was their intention to get at that concern. They needed to get into the data and find out a lot of specifics. Mr. Ewing commented that they could be doing all those activities and not be fully aware of why they were succeeding or why they were failing. Dr. Cody stated that they had set as one of their objectives the

female scores on the math portion of the SAT rising to the point where there were no statistical differences between the sexes. Mr. William Clark said that about 54 percent of girls took the SAT and 46 percent of the boys. Dr. Cody said they did not know the answer as to how much of that accounted for the difference in the mean score.

Dr. Shoenberg remarked that the understanding of these differences was at such a primitive state that one hesitated to ask for answers. One article might suggest that there were biological differences between men and women that accounted for some of these differences in performance, and there were articles refuting that. He said that ever since the SAT had been given, women had scored on the average 50 points below men on the math portion. Over the years attitudes about what was appropriate for males and what was appropriate for females had changed, but the 50 percent difference was still there. He commented that that was no reason to back off the effort.

Mrs. Praisner said she had highlighted many of the items raised by Mrs. Slye. She granted that there was limited knowledge of the factors at play here. She thought it would be useful to know what had been written and what other school systems had determined were successful factors or not successful factors. She was struck by all of the activities dealing with staff members, but little discussion with the students themselves as to why they chose not to enroll or why they chose not to take the SAT or math courses. It seemed to her that students were a resource that they had not used, and they might be able to get at some understanding of the dynamics involved when a student decided not to go to Edison. She noted that most of this was directed at the high school level, and she thought some of these activities had to be focused at the sixth, seventh, and eighth graders. For example, she did not know how many JIM schools had career days, and there might be activities at the levels where they could build the strategy to address the kind of successes that they wanted. If students did not have an opportunity to go to the Edison Center and see the programs or to take the preliminary courses, they would not be able to enroll when the time came, let alone be interested in and willing to enroll. She thought they were on target in identifying these few goals and working on them, but she was concerned about more student involvement in the whole process.

Mrs. Slye recalled that Dr. Carricato had given them the results of a very interesting study done with eighth and tenth graders. There was a wide range of student preferences expressed by both boys and girls, and she wondered what they could do to help a few more of those students exercise those choices. The interest was there, but somewhere they had a chink in the process between what the students saw themselves as wishing to do and what either they had time for or what the school system could facilitate effectively. This was something she would like to know more about. She said they had to deal with the reality that they might be talking about SAT scores, but two-thirds of the women would have to support themselves and a family at some point in their lives. The SAT scores were a woman's ticket into a self-sustaining life. If a woman had inadequate preparation for the marketplace, her children would be at risk.

Dr. Shoenberg said he would like to talk about attitudinal problems

on the part of staff that students encountered. There were problems of patronization and suggestions that women were not clearly up to the men. He thought that this consciousness-raising was in the TESA problem. While they had thought of TESA as addressing minority concerns, it just as forcefully addressed concerns of women about teacher responses to them.

Dr. Floyd said that part of the information in the paper showed that they had been tracking this over a six or seven year period of time and that they were still experiencing some differences in SAT and other test data. He hoped that they would not go off on some tangents of some presumed causal relationships to explain this difference. He thought they had to use some common sense approaches to a lot of this. Men had been taking the SATs for 75 years and there was an institutional memory. He thought they really needed to take a look at what they needed to be doing in order to set the priority and make sure they had the emphasis on encouraging people to get involved and look at what had happened in the last ten or fifteen years where that had occurred. He was not talking about SAT scores per se but the greater society. He said they could not wait until they had confirmed statistical evidence that told them they were absolutely certain that certain things caused certain things.

Dr. Shoenberg suggested they move to the role model. He noted that this was a discussion item, but they expected to take some formal action in September to endorse these initiatives. He said they would be happy to hear from members of the community in the interim. He suggested that the Title IX committee be asked to comment before the Board took action.

Dr. Cody said that this section had several parts to it including appointment of women in administration and in maintenance. They had procedural requirements for appointments which was really a seniority system, but in addition they recognized the guidelines of their agreement with MCCSSE allowed them to take training as well as experience into account. They wanted to plug in training roles. One of their attorneys had advised them they would be guilty of reverse discrimination if they went ahead with their original plan of reserving positions for women only. Now these training positions would be open to all employees, but through a recruiting effort they would expect a number of the training positions would be occupied by women who would then go into permanent positions in these areas. In subsequent years they hoped to have more such positions. In addition, they would have increasingly aggressive recruiting techniques for all positions.

Dr. Shoenberg understood MCCSSE's expressed concerns about certain principles that were established in the Agreement. On the other hand, they needed MCCSSE's cooperation in order to attack this whole problem. Where there were ways of dealing with this problem that were not in violation of the agreement, MCCSSE needed to be creative in helping MCPS to deal with those problems. Mr. Ewing recalled that in the past MCCSSE had given strong support to Title IX initiatives. As he understood it, the concern was with the training program and the permanent status granted after the program. He suggested they

might want to modify the language to state the trainees would be eligible for permanent status. He realized this weakened the commitment, but it might encourage MCCSSE to understand MCPS was not taking an action to undermine the contract. He thought the notion of setting aside some training positions into which they would make efforts to recruit females was a very good idea.

Dr. Shoenberg thanked staff and indicated that the Board would take formal action in September. Mr. Ewing asked that the paper be sent to the Title IX committee for their comment and reaction.

Re: BOARD POLICY ON PUBLIC HEARINGS

Mr. Ewing pointed out that the Board had a different process for the facilities plan; however, this was not referenced in this document. Concern was raised over many people signing up and stating the same thing. Mr. Fess suggested that the purpose of the hearings be reinforced and the public be encouraged to consolidate testimony.

Re: BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS

1. Mr. Ewing noted that the July 30 report on progress being made by minority students showed that, while progress was not uniform, on the objectives set for Priority 2 a substantial amount of progress had occurred. He thought that staff and students should be commended for that progress.
2. Mr. Ewing called attention to the report on suspension data, and noted there had been a number of stories in the media about that data. For several years running they had had newspaper comment that said school officials were unable to explain why the high rate of suspension of black students continued. This made it appear they were totally baffled by the whole affair which was not true. He was concerned that they had not attempted to begin any fundamental inquiry into why it was they continued to get this disproportionate rate of suspension. He hoped that they would start some kind of inquiry into "why" which meant the examination of cases in a systematic way. He urged the superintendent to start a research inquiry. Dr. Cody agreed and indicated that they had done some examination last year. Four or five years ago there was an examination, case by case. This showed the the suspensions were justified under policy, but it did not ask why the incident happened in the first place. He intended to ask DEA to analyze the literature in this whole area which would probably lead to basic research in this area. Mrs. Praisner thought that the research should include questions about the climate of the school. She appreciated receiving progress reports on the priorities as well as the TESA information. They had received some material on student participation in non-athletic extracurricular activities. She inquired about the extent to which students who were suspended were also the students who were not participating in activities afterschool.
3. Mr. Ewing recalled that some years ago he had introduced a resolution on a policy regarding purchasing from minority vendors, and he was requesting a copy of that resolution. The Board had

committed itself to progress in that area. He inquired about progress in implementing the policy and information about where they were now and any need to revise the policy. Mr. Richard Fazakerley gave a brief overview of the status of the policy and indicated that he would supply this information to the Board in writing.

RESOLUTION NO. 390-85 Re: EXECUTIVE SESSION - AUGUST 26, 1985

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Mrs. Praisner seconded by Mrs. Slye, 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 August 26, 1985, at 7:30 p.m. to discuss, consider, deliberate, and/or otherwise decide the employment, assignment, appointment, promotion, demotion, compensation, discipline, removal, or resignation of employees, appointees, or officials over whom it has jurisdiction, or any other personnel matter affecting one or more particular individuals and to comply with a specific constitutional, statutory or judicially imposed requirement protecting particular 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.

RESOLUTION NO. 391-85 Re: RESOLUTION OF COMMENDATION FOR SCHOOLS HONORED BY U. S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION IN THE SECONDARY SCHOOL RECOGNITION PROGRAM - REDLAND MIDDLE, PARKLAND JUNIOR AND WOOTTON HIGH SCHOOL

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

WHEREAS, The United States Department of Education recognizes outstanding secondary schools throughout the nation; and

WHEREAS, This year for the first time the State of Maryland participated in the program; and

WHEREAS, Six Maryland schools were recognized for their "steadfast dedication to achieving excellence and surmounting obstacles"; and

WHEREAS, Three Montgomery County secondary schools were so honored; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the members of the Board of Education extend

congratulations to the staff and students of Redland Middle School, Parkland Junior High School, and Thomas S. Wootton High School for their recognition by the United States Department of Education as outstanding secondary schools; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the principals of Redland Middle, Parkland Junior, and Wootton High Schools.

RESOLUTION NO. 392-85 Re: ETHICS PANEL MEMBERSHIP

On motion of Mrs. Praisner seconded by Mrs. Slye, 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, Mrs. Elizabeth Spencer has resigned from the Ethics Panel; now therefore be it

Resolved, That Dr. Adele H. Liskov be appointed to complete the remaining one year term from August 13, 1985, to September 1, 1986.

RESOLUTION NO. 393-85 Re: MINUTES OF MAY 23 and MAY 28, 1985

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

Resolved, That the minutes of May 23 and May 28, 1985, be approved.

RESOLUTION NO. 394-85 Re: BOE APPEAL NO. 85-9 (STUDENT TRANSFER)

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education dismiss BOE Appeal No. 85-9.

RESOLUTION NO. 395-85 RE: BOE APPEAL NO. 85-12 (STUDENT TRANSFER)

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education affirm the decision of the superintendent in BOE Appeal No. 85-12.

RESOLUTION NO. 396-85 RE: BOE APPEAL NO. 85-13 (STUDENT TRANSFER)

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education dismiss BOE Appeal No. 85-13.

RESOLUTION NO. 397-85 Re: BOE APPEAL NO. 85-14 (STUDENT TRANSFER)

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education dismiss BOE Appeal No. 85-14.

RESOLUTION NO. 398-85 Re: BOE APPEAL NO. 85-15 (STUDENT TRANSFER)

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education remand BOE Appeal No. 85-15 to the superintendent.

RESOLUTION NO. 399-85 Re: BOE APPEAL NO. 85-18 (PROFESSIONAL)

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

Resolved, That BOE Appeal No. 85-18 be referred to a hearing examiner.

RESOLUTION NO. 400-85 Re: SEH 1-85

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

Resolved, That the Board affirm the decision of the superintendent in SEH 1-85.

RESOLUTION NO. 401-85 Re: SEH 2-85

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

Resolved, That the Board affirm the decision of the superintendent in SEH 2-85.

Re: NEW BUSINESS

Mrs. Praisner moved and Mr. Ewing seconded a motion that the Board of Education consider requesting of the County Council and county executive, given their interest in increased access to day care, that they provide funding for day care space in school construction projects.

Re: ITEMS OF INFORMATION

Board members received the following items of information:

1. Items in Process
2. Construction Progress Report
3. Volunteer Services for the Elderly: A Project of the Department of Career and Vocational Education in Cooperation with the Housing Opportunities Commission

4. Educational Specifications for the New East Germantown Elementary School
5. Educational Specifications for the New Darnestown/Travilah Elementary School
6. Report on the Management and Control of the Furniture and Equipment Inventory System
7. Suspension Data for 1984-85

Re: RECESS

The Board adjourned for dinner from 5:40 to 8 p.m.

Re: REPORT OF THE AREA 2 TASK FORCE

Dr. Shoenberg thanked the members of the task force for their effort in preparing their report. The Board would give the report serious consideration, and he thanked Ginny Miller for chairing the committee.

Mrs. Miller thanked the Area 2 staff and, in particular, cited Pat Dowling who had typed the report. She said that the task force saw Area 2 problems as long standing and compounded by school closures five or six years ago. They felt that there were sometimes known as the "easy" area because they had a majority of academic students, but they did not think this was true. She thanked Dr. Shekletski for better communication and for providing some stability in the past couple of years. She said that they were asking for resources, and they were looking forward to the Area 2 facility review. There were many wonderful opportunities in Area 2 schools, and they appreciated all the teachers, all the administrators, and all the support staff. They offered the task force report along with praise for the good things that were happening in Area 2 schools. However, they would like to improve on the good system they thought they already had. Dr. Shoenberg stated that there were a number of recommendations which might have emerged from a task force in the other administrative areas. He asked if they might begin the discussion by pointing out those recommendations that intuitively seemed to them to be problems special to Area 2. Mrs. Miller felt that the average student in Area 2 schools needed a more comprehensive program. They thought they had many average students who needed to be more stimulated and needed to have a stronger program. There were some very bright students who were lumped into a curriculum that did not always meet their needs. They had honors courses, programs for the gifted and talented, and special education, but they did have a very large group in the middle that seemed to be sitting there and not getting as much stimulation as they could.

Mrs. Vicki Bowers stated that Area 2 was a pilot area for the learning disabilities project, and in that effort a lot of children who used to be coded "learning disabled" were not now coded although they did have bonafide educational needs. That meant that the resources from special education for these students dropped off, but these children still had needs. They were concerned that in the effort to more closely identify learning disabled students, which

they applauded, that all students with extraordinary educational needs received the help and resources they needed whether they had a label or not.

Mr. Armand Checker remarked that there was a pervasive fear that schools were going to close once again as well as a fear of overcrowded schools. Both of these got in the way of parents' views that this was a good educational system. Parents felt there was going to be change and upheaval in the educational process. In regard to the average student, Dr. Shoenberg said they had heard the same issue raised in other areas. He asked about the evidence on which they had based their conclusion: parent opinion, objective indicators, or student opinion. Mrs. Miller replied that it was parent and student opinion. She asked about choices for a student when that student was not selected for the honors courses. There was nothing in the middle which was as stimulating as it could be. They had a system where the tail wagged the dog because they had so many needs and so many special programs they had to have. Mrs. Bowers stated that the program committee had looked at the report of the reading study. The K to 8 population gave them cause for concern for the students in the low reading groups who were not getting the MCPS-Board approved curriculum. These students were receiving the old basal approach and were not receiving the enriched instruction in the instructional programs in reading and language arts. The children knew that they were not expected to do as much, and it was a self-perpetuating cycle. Teachers did not expect the students to comprehend; therefore, the students were not taught comprehension. A lot of parents were concerned about this. Dr. Shoenberg asked if this seemed to be across the board or in some schools and not in others. Mrs. Bowers replied that they did not make an effort to separate schools and evaluate program in an individual school. Therefore, they kept a lot of their sources confidential.

In regard to the honors program, Mrs. Praisner asked to go back to the perception that if one were not in the honors courses you were in a lesser level class. There was the suggestion that one could beef up that program if the program needed beefing up. Where there was self-selection or a narrowing because of course requirements, they would not have the whole pool of students available in this class. The assumption was that the way to resolve this was to beef up the average program, and she wondered if they had explored any other alternatives. She asked if they had some recommendations as far as the honors program. Mrs. Miller replied that they had addressed the honors program in their report. Some schools felt that students should be dropped from an honors course if they got a C. Mrs. Praisner explained that she was talking about the content. Mrs. Marian Long stated that one of the major concerns about the average classes seemed to be the size of the classes. This contributed to the perception that there were too many students with too many varying abilities to be served adequately in the middle classes. Most of the criticism centered on English and social studies which were areas that were not necessarily self-selected. One of the teachers mentioned that one school had different levels in the middle grouping which other schools did not have. Dr. Shoenberg asked

whether they had a sense of how many schools had additional levels of groups. Dr. Shekletski replied that basically they had the honors section, the average section, and the section for students with special needs. On the problem of the 6-7-8 stanine students, the perception he got from parents was that the honors program dictated what happened to the rest of the students. Parents felt that the above-average student was capable of doing many of the program activities which were earmarked for the honors students, but their children did not receive this because they were not in the honors courses.

Mrs. Bowers said that a lot of concern about honors did not necessarily relate to the curriculum. It related to strategies for teaching. For instance, students in honors courses did seminar work which was much more interesting than doing a book report. She said that there were a lot of good teachers in Area 2, but a lot of this was parent perception. She felt there was a need to get good information about schools out to the parents.

Mrs. Praisner asked if any attempt was made to verify the validity of the comments. Mrs. Miller replied that this was about as hard to pinpoint as the old discussion about class size. They were asking the teacher with the middle level group to teach many levels, and the honors teacher had a homogeneous class. They were saying they had this average class with students at different levels which was a much more challenging class to the teacher. It was their perception that the teacher taught to the middle level in this average class. Mrs. Praisner agreed that this was hard to verify. In regard to Dr. Shekletski's comment on 6-8 stanine grouping, she said that this was not a wide range and seemed to be a reasonable kind of grouping to talk about. There might be a perception that the range was wider than that, and they needed to address the accuracy of this. Dr. Shekletski commented that in many schools in Area 2 the average classes consisted of 6-7-8 stanine students. A student with special needs would be a stanine 5 student, and schools used alternative staffing to provide special support for those kinds of students. Mrs. Pam Roddy remarked that if they looked at class sizes, the honors classes were often the largest classes which was a Catch 22 because many students wanted to be in honors, and they had the debate about limiting those classes. Mrs. Praisner noted that this was true countywide.

In regard to class size, Mrs. Slye asked whether class size itself was a problem or was it class size surrounded by the activity of trying to get into the upper level classes, or both. Mrs. Long replied that it was probably both. Dr. Shekletski remarked that when they talked about class sizes and students in need, Area 2 probably got fewer teachers for the disadvantaged because of the criteria by which they were allocated. Yet in many schools, they tended to keep those class sizes smaller which created larger classes for the higher ability student.

Mrs. Bowers had problems in dealing with students in terms of stanines because students tested differently in different areas.

They were talking labels, and these were not numbers that fit into a box. They were talking about children with a wide variety of needs and abilities.

Mrs. Slye asked whether it was their implication that there was no compensatory help for students because of the state learning disabilities project. Mrs. Bowers replied that it was. She said that from the beginning of this project that had been a concern among schools. While it was good to have a feel for the needs of the child, it did not do any good to know that the child needed X-number of hours of service and that the service was not provided. This meant that the principals had to do some juggling to provide resources to meet the needs of those students. Mrs. Miller added that labels were put on by the school system. They were addressing a group of students with high ability who had not made the honors program but were still very capable. Mrs. Bowers commented that the danger of labels was that expectations went with them.

Mrs. Slye asked if they had found schools that did deal effectively with those students. Mrs. Miller replied that Churchill did have a program where the school worked with students of high ability who were not performing to the level of that ability.

Mrs. Praisner recalled that in talking about the special education initiatives she had asked some questions about the LD program and the Board had raised that concern about implications of the program that had not really been identified.

Mr. Ewing thought the report was excellent and very helpful. He remarked that it was overwhelming in terms of the numbers of recommendations and asked that the committee help the Board sort out the critical first steps the Board should focus on. It occurred to him that there were two kinds of issues at least in terms of instruction. One of those was to provide the resources to reduce both average class size and oversized classes. The second was to deal with the issue of differentiated instruction/resources for all students. Those seemed to him to be critical steps in the instructional area for the Board to address. He noted that one of the items on the Board's earlier agenda focused on what the Board and school system might be doing as a long-term strategy for reducing class size.

Mrs. Miller remarked that class size was an issue. They had used a maximum class size of 28; however, by the end of the school year that figure was usually larger. Then they had an honors class of 35 or a combination third-fourth grade with 30 students. She said that averaging the classes was crucial to every level, but they had large classes in some grades and small classes in others. They should look not at the average but at the individual class size.

Mrs. Bowers stated that there were other priorities. These were staff training, students leaving ESOL before they were ready to function in the regular classroom, and the use of criterion referenced tests. These tests were designed to be used as an

instrument for planning instruction and were now given at the end of the year for accountability. They felt very strongly that these tests should be returned to their original purpose and not used for accountability. In addition, a lot of people thought that too much time was spent on testing and that the results from tests were not always useful in planning instruction. Dr. Shoenberg remarked that one of the things that was demanded of them were the average test scores for the school, and those people comparing schools seemed to put a lot of faith in those scores. The Board did not put much faith in them at all as a determinant of school quality. If people were saying what Mrs. Bowers had suggested, it might enable them to stop doing some things with these test scores. Mrs. Bowers explained that she was not talking about the nationally normed tests because these were mandated by the state. However, she felt that the misuse of those far outweighed the usefulness of them. Mrs. Miller explained that Area 2 parents did want to see results and were concerned about having some guidelines.

Mrs. Slye said it was her interpretation that they tested to evaluate the child's needs and should not test in a vacuum at the end of the year. Mrs. Bowers commented that this was especially true with the CRTs which had been developed within Montgomery County for the Montgomery County curriculum. The national tests measured things that might or might not be highlighted in the MCPS curriculum. She said they had to give careful consideration to the use of the CRTs, and teachers needed to know how to read these results and how to use them. Dr. Cody asked if they would consider some variation in which the CRT items were used during the year for diagnostic and instructional purposes and then some version used at the end of the year for a system-wide or schoolwide assessment. He pointed out that what they had was the California Achievement Test which did not necessarily address the curriculum. He felt that they needed a combination of both. Mrs. Bowers reported that some years ago there was some talk that the State of Maryland would look at the Montgomery County CRTs and use them as a measure; however, this never materialized. She said that the public at large had a lot of numbers as far as tests were concerned, but they did not have a lot of sophistication about what the numbers meant. Mrs. Praisner did not think that anyone at the table would disagree with Mrs. Bowers. Mr. Stephen Loeb stated that what they were saying about testing varied from school to school. Some principals handled it very well, but some did encourage their folks to teach to the test as a way of showing how well the school was doing. It all tied back to a key feature of the program committee report which was the area of variability. Mrs. Bowers said that the variation from school to school in all areas was remarkable, and there were striking differences between neighboring schools. They were concerned about this although they did not want carbon copies in every school. They thought there should be some recognizable pieces and that they should be able to walk into any Montgomery County school and know that students in that classroom were getting the curriculum, that the teacher had been trained, and that the necessary resources were there. They thought there should be some things recognizable from school to school such as the information provided parents.

Mr. Ewing felt that this concern did come across very clearly in the report, and it was something they had heard about other schools. He asked what the task force suggested as a remedy for that. Mr. Loeb replied that they were struck by the span of control with the associate superintendent as a general manager being responsible for 46 principals. Any major corporation doing that would go bankrupt. He suggested that they did have to reduce the span of control, and one way might be to consider having five assistant superintendents who would report to the associate and have a more direct control over the principals. It was the feeling of the task force that a lot of the variability was due to the individuality of the principals. Dr. Shoenberg reported that this fall they would be discussing the role of the area office. He pointed out that in recent years they had gone from six areas, to five, and to three, which was partially in response to the concerns of the public and the County Council about "too much administration." It had proven very hard for the public to understand the relationship between having appropriate supervision and the quality of instruction.

Mr. Ewing asked if the task force discussed the delicacy of the balance between assuring that there was a common core on the one hand and on the other hand assuring that principals had enough flexibility both in staffing and in decision-making authority to deal with the real variations in student ability. He felt that this balance had to be achieved. If they placed on the principal such tight restraints, the result might be that the kind of people they all wanted to see as principals -- creative, decision-making people -- would be hobbled. Mrs. Long replied that none of them wanted a cookie cutter school system. However, they did feel a better span of control would help, not in forcing a principal to do something, but to provide more guidance. For example, they found gross inequities in the implementation of gifted and talented programs. In some schools there was not a fully implemented program although parents had been trying to have the school address this for years. She said that just having more people to provide guidance and having someone with more authority might encourage the weaker principals to get their act together.

Mrs. Bowers commented that one of the things that fed into this was staff training. If teachers got their training at 3 p.m. after a long day, it was not the same as having the teachers receive training in a well-thought-out day-long program. She said that teachers should have the opportunity to be observed in their own classrooms as well as observe other teachers in their classrooms. She commented that there was another element to the whole equation which was the parents. Each community needed to include in its equation of what happened at the school not only the students, teachers, and administrative staff but also the parents who had, for instance, a lot to say as to whether their children were college bound. The Head Start study said that children lost the advantages of Head Start as they progressed through school. That said to her the school system needed to work with parents and there needed to be that partnership with the school.

Dr. Floyd commented that he was very interested in the discussion about management variations and wanted to reread the report. He said that when they consider the span of control that they ought not to jump to conclusions too quickly that the way in which they fixed this was to have more assistant superintendents reporting to the associate. They had one set of policies which the Board had adopted and one set of administrative guidelines which everyone was supposed to follow. It might be that they needed to take a comprehensive look at what all these people were doing and find out how the policies were being carried out and how the regulations were being monitored. Mrs. Miller explained that they thought the other two areas should have the same structure. They also realized there were area office personnel who could be given new titles and new qualifications, and they were not suggesting hiring 20 more people and putting them in area offices.

Dr. Cody was glad that they brought the span of control issue forward because there were alternate ways of dealing with this. Several weeks ago they had issued a request for proposals to go into this in a little more depth, not only about the issue of span of control but also about the relationship between the central and area offices. They had not issued a contract but hoped to have a report in time to consider for next year's budget. The recommendations might not have budget implications, but they often used the budget to make organizational changes.

Dr. Floyd noted that this was the second of two significant reports that had come out about Area 2 in the past several weeks. He asked whether they saw any common points between the task force report and the staff report. Dr. Shoenberg said he was going to raise a similar question. In the task force report they saw a paradox of people seeing too many students in some schools and too few in others. People saw a need for change as long as they themselves did not experience the change. He wondered if they had general guidance to give to the Board without reference to specific schools. Mrs. Miller said the task force wanted long-range planning, and they wanted to be kept informed. The task force was not quite sure they could say anything more than that. The underenrolled schools wanted boundary changes to get more students, and the overenrolled schools wanted the status quo because they might need those students in five years. It was a parochial view. They did not say anything as a task force because they were trying to be careful with each other. Dr. Cody explained that the document that went out early in the summer was a product of discussions in the clusters in which a lot of ideas were raised. It was not a series of recommendations. In a couple of weeks he would be distributing his preliminary recommendations. Mrs. Miller said they had read about thousands of transfers under the transfer policy. She was curious as to whether Areas 1 and 3 had the same amount of transfers. They had some difficulty with the number of transfers, but not those for legitimate educational reasons and in the best interest of the student. They were talking about a transfer request when a parent wanted to push a child into a school no matter what. It seemed to them there were hours and hours of wasted time

for the area staff in reviewing these transfers.

Mrs. Praisner was not clear about the recommendations. The task force seemed to be saying that the area office was spending all this time only to have the higher authority reverse it. She was not sure about the statistics regarding reversals at the higher level and thought the Board should see these figures. She did know about the numbers getting to the Board. The Board had discussed the transfer policy, and one bone of contention was the lack of information for parents going into the process. They were finally developing information sheets to go along with the transfer request so that parents would understand the process. She requested staff to supply information about decisions being overturned. Dr. Cody replied that last year it was about half. Mrs. Miller explained that they were talking about the hard core people who knew how to get around the school system. The task force had been told these requests were always approved because staff did not want them to get to the Board. Mrs. Praisner explained that the Board had tightened up on the transfer process, and the policy now clearly stated that at each level there would have to be an additional request for transfer. In addition over the years they had more and more schools closed to transfer, and an appeal went into effect when a school was closed to transfer. Dr. Cody said that an alternative was to let the appeal stop at the area office, but Mrs. Praisner pointed out that there had to be an appeal to the Board. Mrs. Miller said that often the area office did not receive information when an appeal was granted, and the rules changed. Dr. Cody agreed that there were some real and perceived problems. They now had one person handling the appeals at the central office, and all the decisions were communicated to the area office.

Mrs. Bowers stated that one of the frustrations with the transfer policy was the perception that there were Cadillac high schools and Chevy high schools, and no one wanted their child to go to a mediocre school. This was a problem that had to do with educating the public.

Mr. Ewing recalled that one of the things that the Board considered was a proposal to change the transfer policy in terms of its basic presumption. At present the presumption was that everyone may transfer unless, and the unless categories were several in number. Another way to deal with the transfer policy was to state a different presumption. That presumption would be that everyone goes to his or her home school and there must be a finding of a legitimate reason to transfer. This would create a very different set of expectations, but the Board had not done anything with that yet. He thought it would need to be accompanied by efforts to deal with the perceptions that there were widely varying levels or qualities of schools and variations in program. The variation in program was real. For example, for eleven years one high school principal firmly and successfully resisted the implementation of a program mandated by the state Board of Education and by this school board. He thought the variability issue did contribute to the perceptions on the part of the public as to differing quality.

Dr. Shoenberg stated that one of the advantages of having a multi-school system was to have some variability among schools so that people had some choice. He said they ought to begin with the presumption that people could, within reasonable limits, make a choice within those different styles of school. The degree to which that was true was another question. What they had been discussing was a question of considerable debate about centralized control and local autonomy and why they had a county school system at all. Mrs. Bowers noted that all people did not have access to transfers because there were schools that were closed. She suggested that perhaps the policy itself needed to be examined. People without lawyers and without expertise about the school system did not have the same access to the transfer mechanism as everyone else. Mr. Checker said that he wanted to get back to the question of what was unique about Area 2. He knew that the majority of the PTAs did not represent all the people, but people kept saying that if it took more money to fix it they were willing to spend more money to bring the schools up to the standards they wanted. Dr. Shoenberg said that within reasonable limits they had had good cooperation from the county executive and the County Council. They had had about a 10 percent increase in the budget last year, but a lot of that had to do with increases in size and increases in salaries. He thought there were limits beyond which those providing the funding were not willing to go without an awful lot of encouragement and support. For example, if the Board proposed an increase in the budget of \$60 million which would fix some of the things they were concerned about, that figure itself would have a psychological effect. For himself, he said there were certain kinds of intuitive limits on budget increases. This morning they had talked about some of the things they would like to do programmatically. There were some things that the space in the physical plant would not allow them to do except over a very long period of time because the resources of the county for funding capital improvements were really pushed very hard. For example, they did not have space in which to put extra teachers for such things as all-day kindergarten. He reminded them that only about 30 percent of the families in the county had children in the public schools.

Mr. Ewing did not disagree with that, but he thought that while they did well with the county executive and the County Council they also were required to go through a certain kind of misery in order to arrive at that good result. The Council did hear from a lot a people the Board of Education did not hear as much from such as the Taxpayers League and people on fixed incomes. He thought the Board did hear from people all over the county who wanted to improve the quality of the public schools, and the Board had been able to push pretty hard. He recalled that they had gone through a period during which the Board was faced with declining enrollment and with pressures from the Council and the executive to close schools and reduce other expenditures. The Board at that juncture over a good many objections, including his, made a lot of cuts including the cutback on the area offices. He said that they were just now beginning to recover from some of those reductions. They had not built enough upcounty and had closed too many schools which meant

they had a lot of catch-up to do on capital projects. They were trying to do that and were bumping up against the ceiling on bonding capacity. Last year's 10 percent increase in the budget was double the rate of inflation and the biggest percent increase of any unit of the county government. This was true for the capital budget as well while the county cut back on a lot of other capital improvements. Mrs. Miller said that they had tried to address capital issues but could not because the last update of the ratings of buildings was 1979. There was a great concern in the Area 2 schools about the condition and upkeep of schools as well as equipment problems and delayed remodeling. She did not think that anyone was addressing the wear and tear on these buildings which were used by the community. Nothing was being put back into the buildings with heavy community use. Mrs. Praisner reported that through the ICB there were some funds coming back to specific schools, but there had been a continuing expression by Board members to Council members regarding community use of public buildings which had gone no further than community use of public schools. The Board raised the issue of budget and maintenance from the standpoint of the operating and capital budget when they had discussed renovation issues with the county executive and the Council. The problem was that the state, which had funding responsibilities, had not spent any money within the last five years except on new school construction and major renovations.

In response to a question about the academy, Dr. Shoenberg explained that this was not funded. He said the superintendent would be considering this and making recommendations to the Board.

Mrs. Lois Williams reported that the transportation subcommittee had surveyed parents and had heard almost exclusively from the parents of elementary school students. She said that the first five recommendations were an easy and inexpensive way of reducing a lot of the perceptions of Area 2 transportation problems.

Dr. Shoenberg thanked the task force for their efforts. He said that the Board would continue to review the recommendations and would communicate with the task force as they did so. Mrs. Bowers added that there was some dissatisfaction about access to vocational programs for Area 2 students and a lack of knowledge about what the programs were and how students could get into them. There was also a lot of concern about students in alternative programs and the fact that there were more students out there than there were problems. They had seen a survey report of the 1983 graduating seniors, and it occurred to them that no one had done a survey of the students who had dropped out.

Re: ADJOURNMENT

The president adjourned the meeting at 10 p.m.

-----  
President  
-----

Secretary

WSC:mlw