



Dr. Pitt said they would be looking at class size and would be working on reducing =class size where they needed to. He though that senior high class size would be under last year's due to population projections. He reported that the biggest problem was at Lake Seneca Elementary where they were 200 youngsters over projections; however, the staff had done a fine job in handling the additional students.

Dr. Cody said he had just received the fifth day report, and there were 92,714 students which was about 1,000 more than actual enrollment last year. He estimated they would pick up about 100 to 200 students by the end of the month. He said he had visited Lake Seneca and Flower Hill, and while the contractors were putting the finishing touches on the buildings the teachers had prepared the classrooms for students and were meeting in planning groups. Because of the situation at Lake Seneca, they were securing four portable classrooms. Mr. Ewing asked when they could expect to have these portables in place, and Dr. Pitt replied that the arrival date was September 23.

Mr. Ewing asked about the status of the other portables. Mr. William Wilder, director of school facilities, reported that four were in place at Einstein, two more were due this week for Einstein, and three were due at Rosemary Hills. They would be installing about six or seven portables per week and expected to complete installation by the first week in October.

Dr. Cronin noted that they had approved the portables in the budget, and he wondered why they were so late with the installation. Mr. Wilder explained that this was a large program, and the same manufacturer of the modular construction at Gaithersburg had received the contract for the new portables. Dr. Cronin asked what they had learned from this, and Dr. Cody indicated that they would examine the work of the company and the size of the contract. Mr. Wilder added that they were looking carefully at their specifications both for modular and relocatable buildings to maintain the same level of quality and yet encourage greater participation int he bid process.

Mr. Foubert reported that all was well at Blair High School. The renovation was complete enough for students to attend classes even though there were no waste baskets and pencil sharpeners. He though that the magnet program was going well and was off to a good start.

Mr. Ewing requested specific enrollment data on the Blair and Takoma Park magnets.

RE: FOREIGN LANGUAGE INSTRUCTION

Dr. Shoenberg welcomed Dr. Myriam Met, coordinator of foreign languages, to the table. He expressed the Board's appreciation for the materials she had prepared.

Dr. Cody stated that the report contained a series of issues, described the current status of foreign language instruction in the school system, and indicated items the staff, and considering as well as policy matters, the Board might consider. He suggested they go through the report area by area.

Mrs. Praisner reported that a task force had looked at this issue several years ago. She asked that staff remind them when they got to issues that had been recommended by the task force. Mr. William Clark director of the Department of Academic Skills, commented that after the task force had submitted its report to the Board of Education, a staff response was developed and presented. The response was divided into recommendations that could be implemented immediately and those that had long-range implications.

Dr. Shoenberg suggested that they begin with the curriculum area. He asked Dr. Met to comment on what she saw as the more important and less important purposes of foreign language instruction in the schools. Dr. Met replied that at a national level the United States had a pressing need for people who could communicate with other people across the world in the area of diplomacy, the area of economics, and in the area of interpersonal relationships. She said that very often political conflicts arose from misunderstandings that stemmed from an inability to communicate openly and an inability to understand the cultural background of people. She said that at the local level, Montgomery County was particularly fortunate to have so many people from varied ethnic and cultural backgrounds. She thought it helped to be able to talk to the people who lived next door and the people you met in the grocery store. She felt this was important if they were going to build the kind of society where people really understood one another. She noted that there were some other rewards of learning another language. Research showed that early beginnings in a foreign language and the resulting bilingualism resulted in improved cognitive flexibility and divergent thinking. Children who took a foreign language and the resulting bilingualism resulted in improved cognitive flexibility and divergent thinking. Children who took a foreign language in the elementary grades tended to do better on tests of verbal intelligence later on. If children had had long experiences with foreign languages, there were positive effects on SAT scores.

Dr. Shoenberg asked what this argued for about curriculum and the way in which they designed curriculum. He asked where they should put their emphasis. Dr. Met replied that her personal agenda would include an early start for foreign language study. Young children seemed to do well in foreign languages, but learning another language was a time-consuming task. The longer the sequence they could provide students, the better the skills they would see as a result. If the early start could not begin in the elementary school, she said it certainly should begin at the middle school level and should involve every student in some

way in an experience that provided an exposure to the language and culture of other people. Dr. Shoenberg asked if the emphasis would be on language and culture. Dr. Met explained that this was all tied together. The first skill was communication, both oral and written. However, she did not know how anyone could learn another language without learning something about the people who spoke the language. She thought that culture should be with a smaller "c", de-emphasizing the monuments, the art, and literature to the benefit of the customs and traditions of the people who spoke the language.

Dr. Cronin noted that on page 4 a statement was made that Latin was a good foundation for the study of other languages. Much of that was a written rather than an oral language. He said that on page 2 they had said the future directions to condor were communication-based objectives for listening, reading, and writing. That sounded more tentative than saying they were an essential and integral part of learning. It seemed to him they were saying that oral proficiency was the baseline and they would get around to literacy later. Dr. Met explained that this was worded in this way because she had been with the school system for only two months. She said that revising the PROGRAM OF STUDIES for the speaking objectives was a primary goal because the whole foreign language profession was placing an extreme emphasis on the ability of people to talk the language that they were studying. She strongly felt that the listening, reading, and writing ought to follow, but finding out how the system worked had caused her to put that in a tentative form. Dr. Cronin commented that the complaint they often heard was that they were developing functional illiterates in English.

Dr. Lois Martin, associate superintendent, said she was overly apprehensive about putting everything on continuing to revise the PROGRAM OF STUDIES. She said that the PROGRAM OF STUDIES did have objectives and did deal with literacy in the broader sense of all four skills. It was the feeling of the earlier task force that they were shortchanging oral proficiency.

Mr. Clark reported that at a task force meeting an individual who headed up a university linguistics department had stated that essentially people studied a foreign language for one of two reasons, to look at the structure of the language or to attain some functional use of the language. It was the professor's feelings that school had been emphasizing the former and that students were not coming out with the ability to communicate with others.

Dr. Cronin noted that in the future directions section they had a reference to continuing in-service training. He asked whether they were thinking about doing this themselves or using other programs for proficiency training. Dr. Met thought it could be a combination of various sources of in-service. At the moment there were only three courses listed in the in-service catalogue that related to foreign languages, and none of them had been

offered since 1982. Dr. Cronin suggested it might be just as effective to provide tuition to UMBC. Dr. Met said they would look at the needs and see what resources were available to meet these needs.

Mr. Ewing suggested that as they considered this issue they really ought to have a statement of purposes in front of them about why it was they thought the teaching of foreign languages was important. He remarked that school systems' enthusiasm for the teaching of foreign languages waxed and waned, but it was never as great as he thought it ought to be. This was regarded by a good many people in the community as a frill. He thought they needed to make a strong case in the statement of purpose about why the teaching of foreign language was not only important but an integral part of the education of children. It was his view that they had implied that the learning of a foreign language was something only a gifted or talented student could do. However, the experience of other countries did not support this. In schools in Europe virtually everyone learned at least a second language. It was his view that they needed to make that case very strongly. He suggested some additions to the purposes Dr. Met had listed. One was that they really were in a situation in the world in which they were not only hampered in the arena of diplomacy but also in the arena of business. An argument had been made that one of the reasons why they had as big a trade deficit was because they did not have people who could negotiate contracts in the language of the countries to which they were sent. They assumed that wherever they went people would speak to them in English, and economically the United States could not afford this anymore. He thought that the argument that the public schools of the nation ought to contribute to the amelioration of that problem was a very powerful argument. He said they ought to make a strong case that not only was it desirable to communicate with people who were different, but that learning about that difference was its own reward. One of the characteristics of Americans was their intolerance of diversity at home and abroad. A very important part of learning about the other cultures included being able to read works of literature in another language which was also worth arguing for. Mr. Ewing thought they needed some kind of a statement which said why they were doing this. He thought the strongest argument for those who funded them was that the study of a foreign language improved a child's ability to master his own language. Mastery of one's own language was crucial to everything else. He felt that this case should be underscored with research findings.

Dr. Shoenberg agreed that they needed a statement like this to see, in fact, if what they were doing was something that was going to get them there. He commented that whatever they were doing now did not. He said that their students who had gone through the highest level of language instruction did not emerge from this able to communicate in any kind of effective way without some additional experience. Mrs. Praisner said that personally she did not agree with that statement. Dr. Cronin was

not sure that a statement of purpose and what was taught necessarily connected to each other. He was afraid they would never get down to the translation of this into a practical classroom experience regardless of what the statement of purpose was.

Mrs. DiFonzo thought that the knowledge of a foreign language should be an integral part of every child's literal, well-rounded education. She said that her first two children had had problems with foreign languages, but the third one was successful. She thought the key to their failure of success was the grounding that they had had in English. Her youngest child had had English teachers who drilled the classes in parts of speech, and her older children did not know what a direct object was in English, let alone in French. If what they wanted was students to be able to converse in a foreign language, then they had to go back and look at what they were doing in English instruction. They had to decide what they wanted children to know in the language. She believed that if they taught a child about the culture of another country this would sensitize the youngster to be aware of similar idiosyncrasies in other cultures. Not only did it help them to be aware of the Spanish culture if they were studying Spanish, it helped them to be aware of similar idiosyncrasies in French or Oriental.

In regard to Latin, Mrs. DiFonzo did not know what went into Rolling Terrace's idea to offer Latin in their international school. She had recently read several articles which spoke to youngsters who had taken Latin in high school being able to puzzle through words on SATs. It had also been pointed out that using Latin as a language for immigrant Hispanic children made an excellent bridge to English. She suggested they might wish to consider using a little more Latin structure with both sets of children for the same reason. She was interested in knowing whether there was a way they could longitudinally track the youngsters at Rolling Terrace who were taking Latin in the elementary school to see whether it helped Spanish-speaking youngsters in easing into the English language and whether it had an effect on standardized test scores and on SATs later.

Dr. Cronin inquired about the statement that they wanted to give major attention to the management and mechanics of testing a classroom of students individually in a valid, consistent, and equitable manner. He asked about the programs they were envisioning and the changes that were necessary in the teaching mode. Dr. Met explained that this section referred to primarily the thought that if they taught for communication, then they tested communication skills. If they were teaching oral communication, they would test orally. It was difficult to find a way to do that in a consistent and equitable manner when they had a classroom full of students who had to be tested on a one-to-one basis. The emphasis on oral communication was an emphasis rather than an exclusion of other skill areas. She pointed out that for a long time they taught foreign languages so that no one

could speak them. They were trying to put an emphasis on not just the ability to speak but to speak communicatively and to really be able to get a message across. In order to do that they had to set some time aside during the instruction period to make sure that students had real and meaningful practice in using the skills that they were getting whether through the written or the oral mode. That emphasis did not mean that they did not also teach reading, writing, and grammar. She reported that a researcher had computed the amount of exposure a foreign language student received in a high school or college setting to the amount of time a six-year old received in learning his own language. If they were going to replicate the amount of time on task, they would have to have their students listening to a foreign language for 81 years and speaking for 55 years. she said that in the nation and in Montgomery County only four percent of the student body went on to the advanced levels of foreign language.

Dr. Cronin asked how they proposed to have their foreign language teachers understand the delivery of instruction. Dr. Met thought they needed additional in-service training and that a course, teaching for oral proficiency, had been developed for the program. It was offered once and had eight participants, but they had approximately 250 foreign language teachers in MCPS. One area that had to be addressed was training people to change the way they had behaved in the past to accommodate a new methodology. Dr. Cronin requested plans on this as they were developed.

Mrs. Praisner said that to say this without knowing what was necessary and how it was to take place was to send the teachers and the community another unrealistic goals or objective. She was glad they had said there would be a balance because she was concerned that they saw in foreign languages and other areas a pendulum swing. she was wondering whether they were talking about this from the standpoint of modifications at different levels of the foreign language or a comprehensive change across the board. It seemed to her that based on the experience of her children they might have some models already available from the way the Japanese language was taught within their schools. Her daughter had studied Japanese for two years, had one well, and had gone on to study Japanese in college. Dr. Met said that more and more teachers were aware of the current trend in foreign language teaching and were teaching for communication purposes without the in-service and support they had discussed earlier. She felt they had a very excellent staff which was very sophisticated. she was particularly impressed with the resource teachers as a group, and she thought that a lot of these changes were beginning to take place within the classrooms already.

Mrs. Praisner said that when they were looking at directions to consider if they were talking about drill opportunities they were talking about having to look at the class sizes of the foreign language classes. Dr. Met commented that one of the major

changes had to do with not only early language instruction but the way language was taught to young children. She knew that Montgomery County already operated programs at Rock Creek Forest and Oak View in immersion. The research had shown that the most successful mode of teaching a foreign language was through the immersion approach, and the earlier the start the more effective it was. She thought the county was already moving in the direction consistent with current thinking in the field of research.

Dr. Cronin stated that there was a nexus he was not sure he was comfortable with on the bottom on page 3. They made the connection between increased efforts to expand the enrollment in less commonly taught languages and to encourage students to go on to the upper level in languages. He saw these as separate issues. He wondered what other less common languages they were talking about and why. He thought the reasons for the decrease in enrollment ought to be in the forefront in every academic and vocational department, and her thought the study should be in process. Dr. Martin explained that it was costly to do major studies, and she added that MCPS was in the exceptional category of having 50% of their students taking a foreign language.

Dr. Cronin asked staff to address the effect that combination classes had on whether or not a student continued in the study of the language. He also asked why they would want to teach the less commonly taught languages. Dr. Met replied that they offered Chinese, Japanese, and Russian, but the total enrollment in those three areas was less than one percent. For example, there were 8,400 students studying French and only 100 studying Russian. The enrollment in Chinese would go up this year because it was being offered in three schools. She said that everyone in the room knew the number of people speaking Chinese and Russian and the political significance of these languages. In today's market Japanese was extremely important, and students planning to go on to careers in business and in international marketing would benefit from any one of these three languages. She said that the effect of combination classes was a significant one because of the hardship it placed on students and teachers. With only 50 minutes and two levels of instruction, it was difficult for a teacher to maximize the amount of skill learning. This required a great deal of independent study and for some students that was a very beneficial mode, but not every student was inner motivated. If their goal was foreign language proficiency in communication skill and if the teacher had to divert attention between two groups of students, neither group would get the full opportunity to speak. There were even classes that combined languages as well as levels, and this year one teacher had three languages together.

Mrs. Praisner recalled that they had discussed family life and that some students were not signing up for the class. She said that this was a Category 2 class and would be offered if 15 students signed up; however, some students were told before they



started to register that the course would not be offered. She thought they had somewhat of the same situation happening with foreign languages. In some schools, students were being told that the language would not be offered. To say that less than one percent enrolled in Japanese or Chinese was not to say that less than one percent were interested in Japanese or Chinese, but to say they did not offer it. She thought that the school system had to recognize the impact of allowing students to register for whatever they wanted if it was listed in the PROGRAM OF STUDIES.

She thought they should be consistent from school to school as far as the message sent to students what was available. She said they should not have one teacher teaching three courses in one period, but she had the feeling that was the only way it could be offered at that school. When they started offering courses they might find that this was the end result, or no class would be the end result. She commented that she did not see students taking only level one or two of a language as necessarily wrong. She thought that this experience or exposure for some students was not necessarily a negative situation. She stated that they had to be clear about their objective, and this was where all of their mixed messages came into focus. She felt that their conclusions were almost contradictory as well.

Dr. Pitt pointed out that a school might get more staff based on need. If they had 10 youngsters in Spanish V and three in Spanish VI, they could not afford to have separate classes. Therefore, they ended up with a combination class, and he agreed this was a problem. If they offered Japanese and had a teacher available for one or two periods who could teach something else in the other periods, it would be possible to offer Japanese. He commented that this was not a simple problem and they did try a variety of approaches. As they increased the number of youngsters going into a program, it became less of a problem. Dr. Cody added the question was whether or not they were going to put their resources into a class of three or say that under those terms they would not make the class available.

Mr. Ewing thought it would be useful for the Board to have an opportunity to look at the situation this fall in terms of numbers of higher level classes that were multilevel and multilevel in multiple languages. He had never thought this was a good idea and had thought it would be better not to offer the class. Dr. Pitt suggested that these youngsters might be on independent study and just be assigned to that teacher.

Mr. Ewing said he wanted to come back to the point about the extent to which they wanted to commit themselves to proficiency for everyone. That issue pervaded the whole question of when they started instruction. the immersion program, and how much started instruction, the immersion program, and how much encouragement they ought to give students to go beyond the first year or two of a language. It seemed to him this was not totally a matter for the school system to decide because parents and students made choices based on a whole range of factors. He

thought they had a obligation to make clear what it was that students might benefit from if they were to learn those languages. He agreed with Mrs. Praisner that the degree of proficiency was not necessarily a goal for everyone enrolling in a foreign language. He said that there were benefits in taking a couple of years of a foreign language including learning about grammar, language structure, and another culture. Those kinds of limited objectives were legitimate and worth while for many students. He was not sure a student was better off taking six years of one language or two years of three languages. He felt that as a school system they needed to sort this out and decide how far they wanted to press in terms of setting objectives for everyone versus having multiple objectives to be met by a curriculum that was diverse and available for people to select from. He favored the latter, but he thought the former should be available for those students who needed it.

Dr. Floyd stated that they did need to keep in mind that they had 93,000 students. Secondly, they needed to concern themselves about making sure they had the offerings as to try to tailor-make one of these instances. He said they did not know a lot of the answers as to whether split classes were better than something else. He hoped that they could keep their eye on the goal and then look at the mechanism they had in place to try to get them there. In regard to the staff paper, he knows it was not appropriate to assign the importance of concepts in a document on the basis of the quantity of the words used, but it struck him as incongruous concerning the opening statement that Dr. Met made, the point Mr. Ewing made about setting up goals, and the difference between the two and a half pages for the secondary program and the few lines devoted to the elementary program.

Dr. Shoenberg explained that he did not mean to imply that proficiency ought to be their goal for all of their students or necessarily for the majority of their students. If they were going to make their argument in terms of global communication, they ought to at least offer greater opportunity for students within the high school setting to achieve a level of communication that was meaningful. He thought that generally they did not do that now. He said they needed to look for some other mechanism for doing it because 50 minutes a day, five days a week, was not enough for doing that. He suggested that if they were to take that same time, put it together, and set up some kind of immersion situation they would get a lot more accomplished. He was interested in their exploring a foreign language opportunity for everyone in the elementary school. He expected that would be very expensive not only in terms of personnel who might not be available but also expensive in terms of the time taken from other subjects. He expected that a few minutes a day devoted to language as part of the language arts time would probably have a beneficial effect on English. He said that it was very clear that if they were serious about language they had to start in the elementary school, see what would be required to do that, and factor this into their discussion.

Clearly they could not have immersion programs for everyone. He asked staff to provide him with some idea about how the second language instruction was handled in other countries. He said they had to consider what kind of structure they could establish in the secondary schools that would be an immersion opportunity for students, even if only for a semester. He said they should discuss what they could do to provide for a pooling of students in one place who wanted some of the less commonly taught languages. He pointed out that they did not allow students to transfer from one school to another in order to get a foreign language, and he suggested they could have schools in various parts of the county that were basically language schools and which might offer five levels of Russian or a semester of language immersion. He asked for information about the possibilities of both of those.

Dr. Cronin noted that the next item on the Board's agenda dealt with special education. He said that as they discussed the teaching proficiency in the classroom he would like to see how they planned to handle the education of handicapped children in language art area. He asked how they would handle children in a foreign language if the students had limitations in speaking or hearing.

Mr. Ewing reported that the Rolling Terrace program was designed to improve student mastery of English by the use of Latin and did not raise the problem of displacing something parents regarded as highly significant. The program was integrated into the English language program and was based on solid research on student achievement as a result of the program in Philadelphia, among other places. He thought it would be useful for the staff to provide information to the Board on the Rolling Terrace program.

Mr. Foubert reported that yesterday he had had a discussion with his foreign language teacher, Mrs. DeBlas. They had talked about attracting students into the foreign language program and about language labs and cable television. She thought that the language lab did not pay off because a lot of material in the lab became obsolete, and the lab also required a lot of out-of-class time. He asked whether there were other technological means for supporting classroom instruction. Dr. Met replied that there were some emerging areas especially in the area of computers although right now most programs were drills. She reported that there were some exciting software programs coming up that were interactive language programs that did allow the student to talk to the machine. In addition, there were opportunities within the community that would allow students with an interest in a foreign language to pursue that language on their own.

Dr. Martin commented that there had been discussion of foreign languages for diplomatic and for trade reasons. People who travelled came home with the impression that there was less of a need for a foreign language because everyone spoke English. However, she pointed out a line in the Washington POST which

stated that you didn't need a foreign language to buy something but you surely needed it to sell.

Mr. Foubert pointed out that there were a number of issues they did not get to, and Dr. Shoenberg thought that staff should review issues raised by Board members and that the Board should schedule an evening just to talk about foreign language. Mr. Ewing asked whether there was a scheduling issue for staff for budget purposes. Dr. Cody agreed that there were a number of things on which they had to get information, and he would add a request for information on the PTA-sponsored foreign language program. He did not recall any specific budget issues except the combination classes. He suggested scheduling the discussion in late October or early November. Dr. Shoenberg asked that they get an estimate of the availability of qualified instructors and the suitability of certification programs as preparation for the kind of instruction they were talking about. He thanked the staff for a good report and a good discussion.

RE: SPECIAL EDUCATION FACILITIES  
STANDARDS

Dr. Hiawatha Fountain, associate superintendent, stated that in the initiatives paper they had discussed with the Board in July they had an objective on adequate and appropriate housing for special education. They were asked to develop some standards and criteria for getting that done. The paper before the Board dealt with a list of factors and criteria necessary to accomplish the goal they had set forth in facilities. In their initiatives paper they had talked about the planning and facilities staffs working with them on this, but there had been no opportunity for them to analyze the feasibility of the standards.

Dr. Cody inquired about the time schedule for the next stage. Dr. Fountain hoped that some of this could be placed in the facilities plan that would be developed this year; however, he hoped no one believed they were expecting all of this to happen this year. He hoped these factors would be considered as they moved toward the optimum housing for special and alternative education programs.

Dr. Cody recalled that last year's facility update had included in the outyears some changed locations for special education programs. This came to the Board without any kind of rationale, and this activity was intended to lay some conceptual groundwork to where special education classes and programs should be in the county. This would be applied to what they had and what they thought they would need in the future. When they talked about the facility update, there would be a rationale for any proposed changes. They had in mind another document that would apply the standards, almost cluster by cluster, to show adjustments needed.

Dr. Shoenberg assumed they were discussing the particular criteria on the first page of the document. A second item was

the formats and whether they were adequately clear and responsive. He assumed they were not being asked to give any kind of endorsement to the particulars. Dr. Cody replied that the paper was for discussion only.

Mr. Ewing thought this was a useful approach, and he said the criteria made sense. It seemed to him the board should see the standards before they were applied. He indicated that he had problems understanding some of the numbers, and he suggested that when they received the final document these should be understandable.

Dr. Cronin noted that on the sample resolution it said they had criteria but 14 were listed. Dr. Fountain explained that this really dealt with the initiatives paper. The third activity was an analysis by the facilities planners which had not been done. He did not want to suggest that this list was a complete and total list until after their review. Dr. Cronin suggested that they drop "other" as the fourteenth item on the green sheet.

Mrs. Praisner recalled that she had raised the issue of the enrollment of regular students in the school and the balance with special education students. She said they had to think about the number of regular students who had to be there to have an appropriate mainstreaming experience. They had to think about how many special education classes in a school became too many. It seemed to her they had to recognize what else was in the school.

Dr. Shoenberg shared her concern. It seemed to him that what they had was a discussion of the program as contained within itself without reference to what might be going on around it. He felt that there had been enough questions raised over the years by schools that this needed to be considered. Dr. Fountain replied that this was their attempt to get at part of her concern. He agreed that they could have gone on to talk about the balance in enrollment at the school. He thought that when they produced the individual sheets on the schools they would get at some of these concerns because they had to handle the appropriate mix on an individual basis.

Mrs. Praisner commented that it might very well be that some of these categories were not applicable in certain situations. She could see some where proximity to shopping centers was very important for the program. She was not trying to get at it from the standpoint of saying they did not want the programs in a certain location, but she did want those programs to succeed. If there are certain things they wanted to happen, they had better list them.

Dr. Richard Towers, director of the Department of Interagency, Alternative, and Supplementary Programs, said that one of the programs had used "other" to list receptivity of students and staff to receiving these youngsters from their program and the

predominant number of males in their population. He said they could make sure they looked at this for every program.

Mr. Ewing said it seemed to him that what they were talking about was not part of the facilities standard per se. He thought they probably ought to have a different kind of policy statement that listed the considerations they should look at from a programmatic point of view before they made a decision about the vocation of a program. This might include minority/majority, the balance of programs, receptivity of students and staff, the mobility of the program, and the costs of moving a program. He thought they needed a separate statement which could be related to the facilities standards.

Dr. Cronin asked about the minority/majority balance in Head Start, and Dr. Towers replied that it was 40 percent minority. Dr. Cronin noted that he had said this was not applicable in the host school, but it should be applicable because as they brought in a 40 percent minority program it might kick the balance into the school higher. Dr. Towers replied that theoretically he was right, but on a practical basis it had been difficult to find schools willing to take a Head Start class. He thought they should go back and state everything on an optimal level. Dr. Cronin inquired about the authority of schools to refuse to take a Head Start program. Dr. Fountain replied that special and alternative education had not always had the best of opportunities of getting space into the school system.

Dr. Shoenberg said that at some point they would receive a full set of sheets, and the Board members were not going to be in a very good position to judge the appropriateness of the particular entries under each of the headings. The Board was going to be asked to lend approval and would have to trust the staff to bring something that standards. He asked how they would treat these once they become standards. He wanted to know how far short they were of achieving these goals, what the implication was of achieving those standards, and what was their expectation for achieving those standards. He asked what expectation they were to communicate to the public. He asked if they were going to be an ideal toward which they were headed or standards the public would expect them to implement immediately.

Dr. Cody thought that the wording on this needed to be examined carefully. He had no problem with the word "standards," but he had not viewed these as something that could be totally reached in all cases. He suggested that "guidelines" might be more appropriate. He explained that things like this were in mind when last year's facility update was considered; therefore, he did not think they were talking about a major turning upside-down of the major special education programs. He agreed that they should look at what the implications were and then answer the question of how long this would take.

Dr. Fountain pointed out that all of their youngsters were housed

right now. One of the problems over the years was deciding what program moved when a school's population increased. He thought that this was what these standards were about rather than adding a burden on the taxpayer or expanding programs. He said that in one of the new Area 3 schools there was a suite designed to house a particular program, and the superintendent and executive staff had made the decision that the rooms were designed for a purpose and would serve that purpose. What they were saying was that they should consider other options before moving something like the Forest Knolls/Lee/Kennedy pattern. Dr. Shoenberg did not know that they had to go through an elaborate exercise like this in order to accomplish the statements to determine "who takes a walk."

Dr. Cody explained that the origin of this had to do with the facility update which contained some changes in locations of special education programs. They all felt the need to know the rationale behind those proposed changes. Dr. Cronin was not sure what miscommunication occurred that special education students ended up being moved around. Dr. Fountain thought they had come a long way in avoiding this thanks to the people around the table and support they were receiving from the area offices. For example, Dr. Powell had gone back to the community and supported the use of the suite for special education. Dr. Cronin stated that some of the problem was that they talked about "regular" students and "special" students. Dr. Cody noted that for special classes the students came from a much larger geographic area and were not part of the immediate neighborhood serving a school. However, all students developed the same identity with the place they went to school and should not be moved around.

RE: ENDORSEMENT OF MCPS  
INITIATIVES FOR SPECIAL  
EDUCATION

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

WHEREAS, The superintendent and staff have evaluated a variety of recommendations concerning special education that were raised in meetings and reports by staff, parent and advisory groups, and from these have developed initiatives to meet the most pressing special education concerns over the next few years; and

WHEREAS, The Board of Education discussed these initiatives on March 25 and July 9, 1985, and found them conceptually sound; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Board of Education endorses the following goals and objectives contained in the MCPS Initiatives for Special Education:

GOAL 1: Enable all Level 4 and 5 special education students to make a successful transition from school to meaningful work and community participation

OBJECTIVE 1: Create a model of transition services that MCPS can provide to all special education students, tailored to the type and intensity of their handicap, with special emphasis on Level 4 and 5 students

OBJECTIVE 2: Determine the type, quantity, and quality of transition services presently provided to Level 4 and 5 special education students and identify unmet needs in relation to the school-to-work transition model

OBJECTIVE 3: Develop implementation priorities and action plans from the data obtained through Objective 2 to implement the transition model

OBJECTIVE 4: Implement the transition services model

GOAL 2: Ensure appropriate placement of handicapped students in special education programs through a systematic prereferral intervention process and revised placement procedures with special emphasis on minority and learning disabled students

OBJECTIVE 1: Improve and revise ACES (Access to Continuum Education Services) procedures, including the diagnostic components

OBJECTIVE 2: Improve the accuracy and consistency of assessment and placement practices by implementing an effective prereferral process and by modifying placement procedures

OBJECTIVE 3: Based on experience gained from the prereferral intervention process, employ diverse staff utilization models and program accommodations that will give teachers greater support and more options in working with children with learning and behavior problems so they are not inappropriately referred for special education

GOAL 3: Adequate and appropriate housing for special and alternative education programs will be included in the 1985 update of the MCPS Comprehensive Master Plan for Educational Facilities

OBJECTIVE 1: Develop a clear statement and rationale for all factors that influence special and alternative education programs and their locations and seek Board of Education adoption of these guidelines

OBJECTIVE 2: Based on the Board-approved facilities guidelines for each special and alternative education





Dept. of Human Rel  
Area 3 Admin. Office

Dept. of Human Rel  
Grade G  
Effective: 9-11-85

RESOLUTION NO. 419-85

RE: PROCUREMENT CONTRACTS OVER  
\$25,000

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

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

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

	VENDOR(s)	DOLLAR VALUE
181-85	Glass and Grazing Materials	
	Commercial Plastics & Supply	\$ 14,095
	Walsh & Koehler Glass Co., Inc.	<u>35,687</u>
	TOTAL	\$ 49,782
204-85	Industrial Arts General Shop	
	Brodhead Garrett Company	\$ 18,377
	Graves Humphreys Company	6,383
	McKilligan Supply Corp.	5,988
	Parent Metal Products	4,499
	Thompson & Cooke, Inc.	1,850
	Trippe Supply Co. of Wash, DC, Inc.	<u>2,155</u>
	TOTAL	\$ 39,252
209-85	Laundering of Uniforms	
	SERVISCO, Souther Uniform Rental	\$ 39,916
13-86	Computer Printed Forms	
	Associated Printers	\$ 1,699
	Formost Computer Supplies	2,852
	Globe Data Systems, Inc.	1,077
	McGregor Printing Corp.	3,268
	National Computer Systems, Inc.	20,264
	Office Electronics, Inc.	1,009
	Tray Business Systems	<u>1,657</u>
	TOTAL	\$ 31,826
17-86	IBM Personal Computers and Peripheral Equipment	
	Bohdan Associates	\$ 6,800

IBM Corporation		<u>91,351</u>
TOTAL	\$	98,151
GRAND TOTAL	\$	958,927

RESOLUTION NO. 420-85                      RE: DEDICATION OF LAND FOR PUBLIC  
STREET JULIUS WEST MIDDLE  
SCHOOL (AREA 2)

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

WHEREAS, The Maryland Department of transportation is planning to construct an interchange at Maryland Route 189 (Falls Road) and Interstate 270 and will require a public dedication of land from the Board of Education where the proposed alignment abuts the Julius West Middle School site; and

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

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

Resolved, That the president and secretary be authorized to execute a final deed for the dedication of 3,082 square feet of land for the widening of Maryland route 189 (Falls Road) where it abuts the Julius West Middle School site.

RESOLUTION NO. 421-85                      RE: PUBLIC RIGHT OF WAY -  
GAITHERSBURG HIGH SCHOOL (AREA  
3)

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

WHEREAS, The City of Gaithersburg recently acquired a former turf farm abutting the southern boundary of Gaithersburg High School; and

WHEREAS, A need exists to provide access to the area which is to be used for recreational purposes; and

WHEREAS, MCPS and City of Gaithersburg staffs have prepared plans for joint access roads which will provide safer and better traffic flow for both areas; and

WHEREAS, The City of Gaithersburg will perform all construction,

restoration, and provide future maintenance activities at no cost to the Board of Education with the City and contractors to assume liability for all damages and injury; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the president and secretary be authorized to execute an agreement to provide to the City of Gaithersburg a 1.54 acre easement for a public right of way, as shown on the plan.

RESOLUTION NO. 422-85      Re:    UTILITIES EASEMENT - GAITHERSBURG  
HIGH SCHOOL (AREA 3)

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

WHEREAS, The Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission (WSSC) has requested a right of way and temporary construction easement across the Gaithersburg High School site for the purpose of installing water mains and fire hydrant; and

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

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

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

Resolved, That the president and secretary be authorized to execute a permanent right of way and temporary access easement for the Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission at the Gaithersburg High School site, for the purpose of installation new water main services and fire hydrant.

RESOLUTION NO. 423-85      Re:    UTILIZATION OF FY 1986 FUTURE  
SUPPORTED PROJECT FUNDS FOR A  
TEACHER ASSISTANCE (TAT) WORKSHOP

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

Resolved, That the superintendent of schools be authorized to receive and expend the \$1,000 grant award in the following categories within the Education Consolidation and Improvement Act Chapter 2 for a Teacher Assistance Team workshop

CATEGORY

AMOUNT







Dr. Floyd rejoined the meeting during the budget initiatives discussion.

Dr. Schoenberg explained that this was a continuation of the Board's discussion on long-range budget initiatives. They had stated a discussion of all-day kindergarten. He said the Board had repeatedly noted that this was a good example of where their desire to do something and the physical plant came up against each other. Dr. Pitt explained that they were trying to update this in terms of future projections.

Mr. Ewing pointed out that the statement about facilities impact indicated that only 30 schools would have space for the program in September, 1986. He agreed with Dr. Shoenberg that the situation was one in which they could not do everything they expected to do. He said that putting all-day kindergarten in those spaces would be a step in the right direction.

Dr. Cody reported that there were some figures that indicated the full impact of all-day kindergarten would cost about \$65 million in new facilities which was based on a figure of \$150,000 per classroom unit which was probably higher than was really necessary. If they used \$45 million over a five year period, it would be \$9.5 million more a year. Over a ten year period of time it would be \$4.5 million per year which was still not small money. However, the fact that it was so staggering did not lead them to say they should not pursue this at some kind of reasonable rate. For example, they could do 30 rooms next year, but the questions was: Then what?

Dr. Cronin asked about the length of time they were committing for those 30 schools to have an all-day kindergarten program. Dr. Pitt replied that they were looking at a five-year projection. Dr. Cronin asked if the 30 spaces came before or after the guidelines on special education. Mr. Larry Bowers explained that the review they did was based on the project utilization for next year on special education, and no changes were made based on any long-term school by school changes in special education utilization. Dr. Cody added that they did not anticipate special education growth to exceed regular growth in the school system. Dr. Cronin asked if they would be taking space from an elementary school if they accepted the special education facilities standards. Dr. Pitt agreed to provide a report next month on this issue.

In regard to elementary counselors, Mr. Foubert asked why the figure 300 was used in terms of getting half a counselor or a full counselor. Dr. Pitt replied that this was a judgment call because the counselors themselves would say there was a need for a full-time counselor in every school. Dr. Cody added that 300 to 1 was considered to be a generally satisfactory ratio.

In conjunction with several initiatives, Mr. Ewing requested that



some thought be given at the elementary level about how many of these fit together, not in terms of facilities implications, but in terms of how they organized and managed elementary schools. They were counseling, and curriculum coordinators. Another issue related to all of this was the role of the elementary assistant principal as a stepping stone along the career path to become a principal. He suggested that at some juncture they should focus on the elementary school as well as on these specific proposals.

In regard to Head Start, Mr. Ewing asked how they knew for certain there were 1,000 children who were eligible. Dr. Cody noted that the eligibility was determined by a national income figure and to look at Montgomery County in terms of children who would benefit from Head Start which might mean 2,000 or 3,000 children. Dr. Fountain explained that they used the national Head Start figure for the first 300 children, but for the other children they did use a different figure but were still below the figure the county used for a working poor definition.

Dr. Muir said that one of the factors they needed to consider was the state superintendent's initiative to go to prekindergarten programs. He was requesting additional funds from the governor which might mean some state aid to Montgomery County.

In regard to elementary art and music teachers, Mr. Ewing asked if the estimate of adding 10 teachers a year factored in growth, and Mr. Kenneth Hill, budget director, replied that it did.

Dr. Cody reported that Chapter I was the likely title under which they would need to respond to a revised learning disabilities project where they determined that students needed other help but not under special education. Dr. Shoenberg inquired about teacher supply in art, music, physical education, Chapter I, Head Start, and kindergarten. Dr. Shaffner replied that in the short term there was no problem, but if they went beyond two to three years they could begin to experience a nationwide selective shortage in every area except physical education. Dr. Cody commented that they needed to be conscious of this now, and for that reason they had the Commission on Excellence in Teaching working on this issue.

Dr. Cronin remarked that in much of this it appeared they could be criticized by saying that more was better. He asked if they were looking at ways in which the delivery system could be improved so that they might not need to add teachers. For example, he would like to see the long-range effect of putting the TESA program into every school to see what effect that had on disadvantaged students. Dr. Pitt reported that Chapter I was an aide program. In terms of using teachers for the disadvantaged, he explained that the resource room teacher was a special education teacher. The teacher for the disadvantaged would be a highly skilled teacher who would do things similar to the performance of the resource room teacher, but the youngsters would not be identified as special education. In regard to

Chapter I, he thought there were lots of places where they could use aide support other than highly paid professional teachers and gain from it.

Dr. Cody said that one item not on this list which should be discussed came out of their experience last summer with summer school in terms of the percentage of high school students who passed the state minimum functional test in math and reading. The success rate was very high because of the intensive half-day program five days a week. However, this did cost money. Dr. Cronin pointed out that as they did this they were using their on-staff people who already had health benefits rather than using a full-time new teacher. Mr. Ewing remarked that this was desirable, but he would not want them to pursue a strategy in which the prime emphasis was on remediation following failure. He thought they should be pursuing a strategy which involved early intervention.

Mrs. Praisner asked whether the Board would receive the models for the elementary curriculum coordinators as well as the pros and cons of each of the models. Dr. Cody replied that they would receive an analysis. Mr. Foubert asked about the amount of money for clerical support for secondary counselors. Mr. Bowers explained that there was \$2,000 per high school for clerical support.

Mr. Ewing said the reduction in the number of elementary combination classes was an important issue for the Board to come to grips with. He reported that about a dozen years ago the Board had decided not to continue the allocation of additional teachers for small schools. The thought was that small schools should be closed, but that played itself out. The present situation was that they had some more small schools, but they were expected to grow in the future. Therefore, they had not always staffed these schools in a way that permitted them to avoid combination classes. He remarked that in a sense those schools had the worst of all possible worlds. They did not have staffing or closure. He felt that this was unfair to let those children go on year after year in combination classes. He said that the situation was one that looked to be expensive to remedy, but he did not know whether there were other options that would be less expensive absent closure.

Dr. Cronin asked staff to separate out two issues. The assumption was that lowering class size would reduce combination classes. He asked what would be the effect of lowering class size if they had a combination class of 30. Dr. Pitt agreed that this was a tough problem. They had said that classes should not be over a certain size, but now they were saying that elementary schools had to balance their classes. If they lowered class size, they were adding teaching staff to a school which provided more flexibility. They were lowering average class size across the county and not in the individual school. Dr. Cronin said they might end up with a combination class with a teacher and an

aide. Dr. Pitt commented that in a small school it was almost impossible not to have combination classes. He did not think they could eliminate all combination classes without allowing some classes to be larger than they allowed them to be now. They might be 33 or 34 with an aide.

Dr. Cronin pointed out another contradiction. By doing class size, they reduced the number of combination classes, but some situations would occur despite their best efforts. He asked if this was an organizational pattern preferred by a principal and staff. Dr. Pitt replied that this was not generally the case. They were saying that even with additional teachers they would still not be able to eliminate all combination classes. Dr. Cronin said that parents should understand that not every class in the county would be at the average class size level. Dr. Pitt explained that they had always focused on reducing the county average and were not talking about every school being at the average. Dr. Cody commented that the only way to eliminate combinations was to allot teachers on the basis of one to every 25 students and let classes go up to 40, but they could not do that.

Mrs. Praisner said the implication was that schools with an enrollment of 350 or less were small schools and, therefore, had more combination classes. She asked whether this was true, and Mr. Bowers explained that this was not necessarily true if they fell out the right way. Mrs. Praisner said that when they were talking about small schools they were talking about schools with no enough children to have two classes at each grade level. Mr. Bowers explained that they used 350 including kindergarten. Mrs. Praisner suggested that they should just use the Grade 1-6 figures, and she pointed out that it was the breakout rather than enrollment that caused these problems. Dr. Pitt thought that the idea of using 1-6 made sense, and he explained that they were making a statistical judgment across the board. Mrs. Praisner remarked that any efforts to reduce combination classes might mean that staff would be in flux from year to year depending on the enrollment in the school. The community might prefer combination classes or some other pattern of organization rather than lose a teacher.

Dr. Shoenberg suggested they turn to the Priority I efforts which were mostly items cut from the budget last year. Mr. Ewing remarked that the Board should consider what other strategies to pursue the objectives of Priority I might be appropriate in this budget. Dr. Cody agreed that this was not a complete list. He reported that he and staff had been having some extensive discussions about Priority 23 which should be on this list.

Dr. Cronin stated that the audit committee wanted to have a Board discussion of the financial, payroll, and accounting systems before the Board got into the Budget cycle. This might end up being a major finance item. Mrs. Praisner suggested that the special education initiatives be added to this list. She felt

that it was useful to see all these items on paper. Dr. Cody commented that there were other important items which were not on this list. He thought they should identify projects by titles, activities, and reported dates and put them in one computer program.

Mrs. DiFonzo asked staff to take the paper before the Board and provide a cumulative fiscal year projection. Mr. Ewing inquired about the area office study and suggested that Board members have the opportunity to present their views to the consultant. Dr. Cody replied that part of the process did include interviews with Board members.

Mr. Ewing agreed that it would be useful to have the projections on these budget items as a running total on a matrix. He said that although the Board would find it difficult to do this, he still thought it would be desirable for the Board to commit itself to some long-range improvement plans even if it were understood that year by year they might change. For example, he thought the Board had made a very sensible commitment on class size.

Dr. Cronin commented that the Board did work with the County Council and the county executive, and they were required by law to set the tax rate and to fund the Board's budgets. The Board had what it thought was desirable, but they also had to think about the reality of what was possible. He suggested that as they went through the budget they should make decisions of what they would like to do even though in reality the budget would not allow this. Mr. Ewing thought the Board should advocate what it thought was needed in order to make the schools as good as they could be. It was his guess that this would always exceed the willingness of the Council to fund, but he said the harder they pushed, the more they would get.

Dr. Shoenberg agreed that this would be an on-going discussion in terms of the budget.

RESOLUTION NO> 428-85

Re: STATE CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education agrees to the submission of both staff proposals to the state task force with the proviso that the Board of Education feels that the second option is far preferable to the first option.

For the record, Mrs. Praisner stated that she had abstained because as a member of the State Task Force on the State School Construction Program she would be receiving the proposal from the

Montgomery county Board of Education.

Re: BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS

1. Mr. Foubert reported that MCR staff was recently appointed. The lobbying coordinator was Howard Kass, a senior at Wootton High School, and Mark Freidman, a junior at Springbrook, was in charge of the student on the Board election.

2. Dr. Cronin said in regard to the procurement program for minority, disabled, and female businesses, he fully supported expanding the program through the NAACP business league. However, he thought they should take advantage of a number of other organizations who had lists of people and ways to contact the community.

3. Dr. Cronin offered kudos to Mr. Pioli and his Aesthetic Education Department. The Prince George's schools were using the Interrelated Arts and TAPESTRY programs as part of the foundations of their magnet programs.

4. Dr. Cronin reported that this week he, Dr. Shoenberg, and Dr. Cody would be meeting with Dr. Parilla at Montgomery College. He would like to see them reaching out to the surrounding counties to use their resources. For example, a K-12 curriculum on extremism had been developed by the MSTA, and there was work being done in other counties that MCPS should know about, and other counties should share in the work done by MCPS.

5. Mr. Ewing stated that a number of Board members had received a letter from Emilio Perche Rivas concerning his visit to New Hampshire Estates Elementary School and his concerns over conditions there. He hoped that there would be a response to him which spelled out the Board's tentative plans so that Mr. Rivas would be apprised of that and know that the Board was as concerned as he was.

6. Mrs. Praisner said that the Board had received a notice from the state superintendent about the attorney general's opinion on public and parochial school involvement beyond Chapter I. Dr. Fountain reported that they had had the lawyers looking at this. They had not done anything with 94-142, but they had submitted a plan for doing the Chapter I program out of vans. Dr. Cody asked if they had reached any agreement with the Archdiocese, and Dr. Fountain replied that they had reached an accord. There was agreement to use the vans if they received approval. Dr. Cody recalled that most of the alternatives listed by the State Department of Education were not acceptable to the Archdiocese.

RESOLUTION NO. 429-85

Re: A HANDBOOK FOR THE MONTGOMERY  
COUNTY BOARD OF EDUCATION

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

WHEREAS, An AD HOC subcommittee of the Board of Education was charged to develop a handbook on the governance and operation of the Montgomery County Board of Education; and

WHEREAS, The subcommittee has reviewed State law and bylaws as well as Montgomery County Board of Education resolutions, guidelines, practices, and procedures on the operation of the Board of Education; and

WHEREAS, As a result of its review, the subcommittee drafted a handbook for use by Board, staff, Board candidates and citizens as well as a list of resolutions to be rescinded or modified by Board action; and

WHEREAS, Members of the Board of Education and staff reviewed this draft handbook on August 26, 1985, and made suggestions for inclusion into the handbook; and

WHEREAS, The subcommittee reviewed these suggestions and made appropriate changes to the handbook; now therefore be it

Resolved, That "A Handbook for the Montgomery County Board of Education" be adopted (to be appended to these minutes); and be it further

Resolved, That this handbook be reviewed biennially by the Board of Education with the first review coming in June, 1987; and be it further

Resolved, That the superintendent of schools be requested to direct staff to have the handbook published and made available as soon as possible.

Mr. Foubert thanked Mrs. Praisner and Dr. Floyd for agreeing to show the vote of the student Board member with those of the other Board members although the student's vote would still be in parentheses.

For the record, Mr. Ewing called attention to the section on Board retreats. He wanted the public to know that except for segments of a retreat dealing with executive session items, all retreats were open to the public and to the media.

For the record, Dr. Cody made the following statement:

"Personnel Appointment Procedures, Item 2, said that by practice the superintendent also recommends the transfers of personnel to administrative and supervisory positions. These transfers are discussed in executive session and confirmed by majority vote. This was accurate and that was the practice. Part of the problem they had was with this is that in this school system the use of the term 'transfer' has applied not only to lateral transfers from one placar to another but from one level of administrative

position to another. It is the ambiguity over that, that has caused a problem. It was his understanding of state law that the superintendent recommends to the Board the appointment and assigns them to the positions. Legally, I think, the superintendent has the authority to assign people and to reassign them. This is a practice that has been established, and I just wanted to note that the adoption of this doesn't really change the fact of the law. I have no problem with the current procedure we are following."

RESOLUTION NO. 430-85

Re: RESCISSION OF BOARD  
RESOLUTIONS AS A RESULT OF  
BOARD-ADOPTION OF "A HANDBOOK  
FOR THE MONTGOMERY COUNTY  
BOARD OF EDUCATION"

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

WHEREAS, An ad hoc subcommittee of the Board of Education charged to develop a handbook for Board members reviewed resolutions previously adopted by the Board of Education; and

WHEREAS, Through this review, the subcommittee determined that many resolutions were out of date and many resolutions were included in the newly-adopted handbook for Board members; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the following resolutions be rescinded:

Resolution No. 52-55, adopted February 8, 1955  
\*Resolution No. 161-55, adopted April 22, 1955  
Resolution No. 150-64, adopted March 109, 1964  
Resolution No. 402-64, adopted August 11, 1964  
Resolution No. 6-68, adopted January 9, 1968  
Resolution No. 132-75, adopted February 11, 1975  
Resolution No. 209-75, adopted March 11, 1975  
Resolution No. 295-78, adopted April 24, 1978  
Resolution No. 513-78, adopted July 24, 1978  
Resolution No. 574-78, adopted August 1, 1978  
Resolution No. 648-78, adopted September 13, 1978

(Rescind only the third and fourth  
Resolved)

and be if further

Resolved, That Resolution 425-84, adopted August 7, 1984, be amended to substitute the following for 2.C.1:

Any resolution introduced which involves a matter of policy shall lie on the table for at least one week before being voted upon. The presiding officer rules as to whether any proposed resolution is a policy. If there is an emergency, this provision may be waived without notice if all members

are present and there is unanimous agreement.

RESOLUTION NO. 413-85

Re: MINUTES OF JUNE 12 AND 24 AND  
JULY 9 AND 22, 1985

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

Resolved, That the minutes of June 12, June 22, July 9, and July 22, 1985, be approved.

RESOLUTION NO. 432-85

Re: CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
FOR FAMILY LIFE AND HUMAN  
DEVELOPMENT

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

WHEREAS, COMAR 113A.04.01 requires that each local education agency have a Citizens Advisory Committee on Family Life and Human Development; and

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

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

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

Ms. Mary Beth Speaks  
Planned Parenthood of Metropolitan Washington  
Montgomery County Chapter

and be it further

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

Mrs. Elizabeth Varga  
Montgomery County Health Department

RESOLUTION NO. 433-85

Re: EXECUTIVE SESSION - SEPTEMBER  
23, 1985

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Dr. Cronin seconded by Mr. Foubert, 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 September 23, 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 to to comply with a specific constitutionally, statutory or judicially imposed requirement 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. 434-85                      Re: MEETING WITH CITIZENS MINORITY  
RELATIONS MONITORING COMMITTEE

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education schedule a meeting with the Citizens Minority Relations Monitoring Committee to discuss with them their recent report.

RESOLUTION NO. 435-85                      Re: APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS OF  
LOCAL ADVISORY COUNCIL FOR  
VOCATIONAL TECHNICAL EDUCATION

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

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

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

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

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

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

WHEREAS, That the Board of Education appoint the following persons to a three-year term beginning immediately and

terminating in June, 1988:

Jill Gendelman  
4757 Chevy Chase Drive, A-15  
Chevy Chase, MD 20815

Edward J. Harris  
P. O. Box 70806  
Chevy Chase, Md 20815

Timothy J. Lloyd  
20535 Strath-Haven Drive  
Gaithersburg, MD 20904

RESOLUTION NO. 436-85

Re: APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO THE  
ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON  
COUNSELING AND GUIDANCE

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

WHEREAS, In accordance with the Policy Statement on Counseling and Guidance adopted by the Board of Education on October 22, 1973, revised and adopted on June 12, 1978, the members of the Advisory Committee on Counseling and Guidance are appointed by the Board; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the following persons be appointed to the Advisory Committee on Counseling and Guidance:

STUDENTS

Caroline DuPont  
Nicole Kripotos  
Susan Olson

TEACHERS

Robert Pine  
Elizabeth Brown  
Amy Sanner

PARENTS

William Callen  
A. Diane Graham  
Susan Goldstein  
Bruce Fretz  
Carol Jeffers

COUNSELORS

Bonnie Fitzpatrick  
Joseph Monte  
Judy Petrusic

ADMINISTRATORS

Russell Gordon  
Larry Jeweler  
Margaret Keller  
Mary Helen Smith

RESOLUTION NO. 437-85                      Re: BOE APPEAL 85-7 (Employment)

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

RESOLVED: That the Board of Education adopt the decision and order in BOE Appeal 85-7 affirming the decision of the superintendent.

Re: NEW BUSINESS

Dr. Cronin assumed the chair.

1. Dr. Shoenberg moved and Dr. Cronin seconded the following:

WHEREAS, The health problems posed by Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome and related symptoms have been the subject of significant public concern; and

WHEREAS, Several jurisdictions have been faced with the problem of how to provide for the education of children affected AIDS in such a way to protect the health of others; and

WHEREAS, Those discussions have been in an atmosphere that makes dispassionate judgment difficult; and

WHEREAS, It will be more conducive to policy formulation to carry on those discussions and establish a policy before a specific case arises; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Board requests the superintendent to bring to the Board for its action a proposed policy for the school system's appropriate treatment of both students and staff with diagnosed cases of AIDS and AIDS-related Complex.

Dr. Shoenberg assumed the chair.

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education consider the proposal made by the Montgomery County Chapter of the National Organization for Women in its letter to Dr. Shoenberg, dated September 1, 1985, as contained on page 2 and consisting of items 1, 2, 3, and 6.

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education ask its representatives to oppose the elimination of state and local tax deductibility in any tax reform measure.

4. Dr. Shoenberg stated that in regard to the agenda for the Board's meeting on high schools there were two kinds of issues. One of them was special issues about kinds of special schools including an up-county math/science/computer magnet, and arts magnet, an up-county vocational program, and other kinds of special programs for the new high school. The second was change in high school models including different kinds of scheduling and curriculum organization. This would include responding to that part of the secondary school task force on curriculum report which made it possible for LEAs to have instructional and curriculum models that were not in absolute keeping with the graduation requirements that were approved by the state Board of Education. He suggested dividing the meeting into those two topics.

Re: ITEMS OF INFORMATION

Board members received the following items of information:

1. Items in Process
2. Construction Progress Report
3. Master Calendar of Board Meetings

Re: ADJOURNMENT

The president adjourned the meeting at 4:50 p.m.

WSC:mlw