

I. Feldman and Co., Inc.	5,396
Frederick Produce Company	7,590
Save More Foods, Inc.	3,760
Smelkinson Brothers, Corp.	655

TOTAL	\$43,330

158-86	Tuna Fish	
	Institutional & Industrial	
	Food Specialists, Inc.	\$33,075
	GRAND TOTAL	\$76,406

*Mr. Foubert joined the meeting at this point.

RESOLUTION NO. 195-86 Re: RELOCATION OF STATE-OWNED MODULAR CLASSROOM BUILDINGS

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

WHEREAS, Sealed bids were received on March 19, 1986, to move a four classroom state-owned modular building to Lake Seneca Elementary School as indicated below:

	BIDDER	BASE BID
1.	H & H Enterprises	\$44,990.00
2.	South Carroll Contractors, Inc.	56,000.00

and

WHEREAS, The low bid from H & H Enterprises is consistent with the cost estimates; and

WHEREAS, The State Interagency for School Construction has approved state funds in the amount of \$260,000.00 as a state supplemental appropriation for the movement of state-owned relocatable classroom buildings; and

WHEREAS, The county executive has been requested to recommend approval of this action to the County Council; now therefore be it

Resolved, That a contract for \$44,990.00 be awarded to H & H Enterprises to move a state-owned modular classroom building from West Salisbury Elementary School in Wicomico County to Lake Seneca Elementary School, contingent upon the approval by the Montgomery County Council of the FY 1986 Capital Budget State supplemental appropriation, in accordance with plans and specifications entitled, "Relocation of State-Owned Modular Classroom Buildings," dated March 5, 1986, prepared by the Department of School Facilities.

RESOLUTION NO. 196-86 Re: SANITARY SEWER REVISIONS - FORMER CLOVERLY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL (AREA 1)

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

WHEREAS, Sealed bids were received on March 11 for sanitary sewer revisions at Cloverly Elementary School, as indicated below:

BIDDER	LUMP SUM
1. Charles W. Lonas & Sons, Inc.	\$ 18,950
2. G. Leonard Daymude Co., Inc.	21,500
3. Deneau Construction, Inc.	49,500
4. Taylor Utilities, Inc.	107,125

and

WHEREAS, The low bidder, Charles W. Lonas & Sons, Inc., has performed similar projects satisfactorily; and

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

Resolved, That a contract for \$18,950 be awarded to Charles W. Lonas, Inc., to accomplish sanitary sewer revisions at the former Cloverly Elementary School, in accordance with plans and specifications dated February 25, 1986, prepared by the Department of School Facilities.

RESOLUTION NO. 197-86 Re: EAST GERMANTOWN ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
SITE GRADING (AREA 3)

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

WHEREAS, Sealed bids were received on March 19, 1986, for site grading at East Germantown Elementary School as indicated below:

BIDDER	LUMP SUM
1. Pleasant Excavating Company, Inc.	\$662,000
2. Brigham & Day Paving Company, Inc.	747,500
3. Jesse Dustin & Son, Inc.	755,000
4. The Driggs Corporation	797,500

and

WHEREAS, The Board of Education approved a supplemental appropriation for the site development at East Germantown Elementary School on January 14, 1986; and

WHEREAS, County Council approved the supplemental appropriation on March 18, 1986; and

WHEREAS, This represents excellent bid activity and is consistent with staff estimates; now therefore be it

Resolved, That a contract in the amount of \$662,000 be awarded to Pleasant Excavating Company, Inc. for the site grading at East Germantown Elementary School in accordance with plans and specifications prepared by Thomas Clark Associates, Architects.

RESOLUTION NO. 198-86 Re: ACCEPTANCE OF SPRINGBROOK HIGH SCHOOL GYMNASIUM ADDITION (AREA 1)

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

Resolved, That having been duly inspected on March 19, 1986, the Springbrook High School Gymnasium Addition now be formally accepted, and that the official date of completion be established as that date upon which formal notice is received from the architect that the building has been completed in accordance with the plans and specifications, and all contract requirements have been met.

RESOLUTION NO. 199-86 Re: AMENDMENT TO THE FY 1986 CAPITAL BUDGET AND ARCHITECTURAL APPOINTMENT - NORTH GERMANTOWN AND MONTGOMERY VILLAGE/LAYTONSVILLE ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS (AREA 3)

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

WHEREAS, The Board of Education acted on March 11 to request both planning and construction funds for the new North Germantown and

Montgomery Village/Laytonsville Elementary Schools, with the goal of opening the facilities no later than December 1987; and

WHEREAS, In order to design the schools and bid by Fall, 1986, it is necessary to fast track the design process; and

WHEREAS, The firm of Thomas Clark Associates designed the most recent new elementary school, and staff is of the opinion that it is in the best position to rapidly design these two new schools; and

WHEREAS, Staff has negotiated a new proposal of \$479,000 for both schools; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Board of Education requests an FY 1986 emergency Capital Budget appropriation for \$479,000 to immediately begin architectural planning for the new North Germantown and Montgomery Village/Laytonsville Elementary Schools; and be it further

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 contracts for the lump sum of \$479,000; and be it further

Resolved, That the FY 1986 Capital Budget and the FY 1987-92 Capital Improvements Program be amended accordingly.

RESOLUTION NO. 200-86 Re: ARCHITECTURAL APPOINTMENT - JONES LANE
ELEMENTARY SCHOOL (AREA 3)

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

WHEREAS, On March 11 the Board of Education confirmed the selection of the Jones Lane site for the new Darnestown/Travilah Area Elementary School; and

WHEREAS, In order to bid the school by mid-1986 it is necessary to utilize existing plans; and

WHEREAS, Staff is of the opinion that designing a project similar to Flower Hill Elementary School would be most appropriate from an educational and construction point of view; and

WHEREAS, Staff has negotiated a fee proposal of \$151,762; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Board of Education terminate its contractual agreement with the firm of Thomas Clark Associates to provide the required design services and administration of the construction contract for the proposed Riffleford Road Elementary School; and be it further

Resolved, That the Board of Education enter into a contractual agreement with the firm of Grimm & Parker to provide required design services and administration of the construction contract for the lump sum of \$151,762 for the new Jones Lane Elementary School; and be it further

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

RESOLUTION NO. 201-86 Re: BETHESDA ELEMENTARY SCHOOL SITE
EXPANSION (AREA 2)

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Dr. Floyd seconded by Mr. Foubert, 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 and Mrs. Slye voting in the negative:

WHEREAS, The State Interagency Committee for Public School Construction has approved acquisition of Lots 3 through 10, Block 11, Edgemoor, to expand the Bethesda Elementary School site in accordance with the adopted Bethesda-Chevy Chase Master Plan; and

WHEREAS, The school system presently owns five improved properties and the former Bethesda library building, totaling approximately 102,560 square feet (2.35 acres); and

WHEREAS, The owner of Lot 7, Block 11, Edgemoor, has chosen to offer the property for sale through the immediate family; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the superintendent conduct negotiations to obtain the improved property at 5001 Edgemoor Lane, (Lot 7, Block 11, Edgemoor), Bethesda, Maryland.

RESOLUTION NO. 202-86 Re: FY 1986 SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION FOR
THE PRESCHOOL EVALUATION PROJECT

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 establish a 1.0 testing and evaluation assistant position (Grade 18 - 12 months) and a 0.5 model development specialist position (Grade 23 - 12 month); and be it further

Resolved, That the superintendent of schools be authorized, subject to County Council approval, to receive and expend the FY 1986 grant award in the following categories from MSDE under the Education of the Handicapped Act Amendments of 1983 for the Evaluation of the Effectiveness of Services for Preschool Handicapped Children:

CATEGORY	SUPPLEMENTAL
04 Special Education	\$105,135
10 Fixed Charges	22,041

TOTAL	\$127,176

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. 203-86 Re: FY 1986 SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION TO
PROVIDE SUPPLEMENTARY EDUCATIONAL
SERVICES TO IMMIGRANT CHILDREN

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 establish 2.0 teacher positions (A-D) and a .8 instructional assistant (Grade 10) position; and be it further

Resolved, That the superintendent of schools be authorized, subject to County Council approval, to receive and expend the \$154,770 grant award in the following categories from MSDE under the Emergency Immigrant Children Act, for the FY 1986 ESOL/Bilingual programs:

CATEGORY	SUPPLEMENTAL
02 Instructional Salaries	\$116,829
03 Instructional Other	19,681
10 Fixed Charges	18,260

TOTAL	\$154,770

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. 204-86 Re: FY 1986 SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION TO REVISE THE MCPS INSTRUCTIONAL GUIDE FOR PHYSICAL EDUCATION

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, subject to County Council approval, to receive and expend a \$4,000 grant award in Category 01, Administration, from MSDE under ECIA Chapter 2 to revise the Grades 7-12 instructional guide for physical education; 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.

Re: BOARD/PRESS/VISITOR CONFERENCE

Cornelia Atkins, Morgan Day Care Center, appeared before the Board of Education.

Re: ANNUAL REPORT OF THE MEDICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Dr. Cronin noted that the annual report had been prepared in August and asked if there were more recent issues the committee would like to bring to the Board's attention.

Dr. Nasreen Ahmed stated that the committee had spent a lot of time on sports physicals because they were required every year from seventh grade on for interscholastic athletics, but as far as the state was concerned they were required only 9-12. The committee felt that it was medically sound and appropriate to not have these

students go through sports physicals in the eighth grade, and the Montgomery County Medical Society was in agreement with this recommendation. Dr. Ann Mattern had devised a health inventory questionnaire, and their original idea was that if a student checked off any problems on that form, a physical would be warranted.

Ms. Clare Kownacki reported that the county attorney did not approve of the Health Department nurses and physicians taking an intermediary role in reviewing the questionnaire and making decisions that private doctors had not made. She believed that MCPS was working on integrating this questionnaire into its routine form. Mr. Edward Masood explained that there would be a separate form for the J/I/M level students and one for 9-12 under the regulations of the annual physical evaluation following the categories for the sports available for those students to participate in.

Mrs. DiFonzo had no problem with carrying over the results of the Grade 7 physical into Grade 8. However, when her youngsters were in junior and senior high they were required to take physicals for every tryout which was a considerable amount of money. Dr. Mattern reported that the physical was good for a year and did not have to be repeated for each sport. Mr. Masood added that this year for cheerleaders and poms on making the team they were required to provide a doctor's statement before the activity started in the fall.

Dr. Cronin asked if students were required to have a physical examination before the tryouts, and Mr. Masood replied that the state did require this for 9-12 schools. Ms. Pat Berry reported that this fall the state athletic association had sent out a survey, and 131 to 3 objected to the idea of going to an every-other-year physical.

Dr. Shoenberg asked whether the physical could be performed for purposes other than athletics. Dr. Mattern replied that the type of examination appropriate for camp or for school was not always appropriate for sports. She noted that they did have a sports medicine committee in the Medical Society, and one of their projects was to do some in-service work with pediatricians and general practitioners. She reported that physicians themselves throughout the country all felt that the yearly physical was not necessary.

Dr. Cronin asked about actions that the Board needed to take. Dr. Pitt explained that these were all administrative decisions and did not require Board approval. Dr. Mattern indicated that the health inventory form did have a section on sports, but not too many doctors did mark this off. She and Dr. Ahmed were calling doctors to make them more aware of what went on in physical education classes and sports.

Mrs. Praisner asked about how frequently the County Medical Society had programs on school system concerns. Dr. Mattern replied that it was rare. She said they had a Montgomery County/Prince George's County Pediatrics Society which met five times a year. Occasionally announcements were made from the school health division and every now

and then sports medicine was included. She suggested that if the school system did have concerns, these could be brought to the attention of this society. Mrs. Praisner thought it might be well to get physicians attuned to certain issues regarding sports physicals.

Dr. Ahmed thought this could be done through the forms which could list aspects of the physical that should be covered by the doctors. Dr. Ahmed stated that in the past they had run into problems with anaphylaxis management and felt they needed a policy in this area. For example, sometimes physicians just sent a note saying the child was allergic to insect stings and not give very specific directions. She pointed out that they did not have total health coverage in the schools, and sometimes the emergency treatment was given by school staff. At times physicians would prescribe a certain dose of epinephrine and they preferred to use a premeasured dose. The current forms had a release so that parents would not hold the school system or the health department responsible for any consequences of administration of medication.

Ms. Kownacki commented that the policy and procedures as written were written only for epinephrine for insects or nuts, and there were other things causing anaphylactic reactions. Every time they had something that deviated from the policy, those had to be handled on a case by case basis and exceptions made to their own rules. They thought the policy could be broadened so that they would not have to individually check with the county attorney. In addition, there were certain portions of the policy and procedures that could be streamlined.

Mrs. Slye questioned the number of students on record as having a history of anaphylaxis. She hoped they would relook at how they asked parents to notify them of this condition. She said that the yellow enrollment cards asked if the child was allergic to anything, and she presumed that the 264 students listed were as a result of separate statements from physicians. Ms. Kownacki explained that these were weaned out of the total pool of youngsters whose parents had indicated a history of allergy. At the beginning of the school year, a form letter was sent home and, if the letter was not returned, the school staff followed up on this. Mrs. Slye replied that she had never seen that letter, and she had always listed allergic histories. She felt they had a problem that they needed to address if this letter did not reach the home. She suggested that they look at the implementation procedures as well, especially if a school could not administer the medication because of lack of training. She had always listed allergies on the yellow card and had never been sent a letter. Three of her youngsters were subject to anaphylactic shock, but she was not concerned because the children wore bracelets and three hospitals were nearby. However, this was not true of all children and all areas of the county. Dr. Mattern reported that they had been told that most emergency medical people could get to a school within three minutes of a call. The nurses in the schools also posted emergency care cards for these students.

Dr. Shoenberg remarked that whenever he heard a discussion like this he started to get nervous because school nurses were employees of the Health Department and not all schools had nurses. Ms. Kownacki added that very few schools had full time nurses. Dr. Shoenberg said that people with no specialized medical training were responsible for acting in case of an emergency. In cases of anaphylactic shock the onset of that emergency could be very rapid. This was left to someone whose job description did not include administering emergency medical treatment and who was an employee of the school system. In some respect the schools acted in loco parentis, and he did not know the degree to which that was true in medical emergencies. Dr. Pitt suggested that the Board be brought up to date with some written information on this subject. School employees had limited responsibility. If they were trained, they could provide immediate first aid but only under certain circumstances. They did give parents the opportunity to transfer the child to a school where a nurse was available.

Mr. Ewing recalled that the Board had gone through some of the legal issues about five years ago, and he suggested that this information be shared with the Board.

Dr. Shoenberg asked about the school's health obligations to that child. Dr. Pitt replied that the school could do generally what a parent could do, and a parent was not a trained physician. They did have school health support and there were particular identified situations where a child had certain problems. They did have first aid trained people in every school. Mr. Masood reported that there was continual training for first aid/CPR in addition to annual in-service training for giving injections for anaphylactic reactions.

Dr. Pitt stated that they didn't have an opportunity to see Clare Kownacki very often. She is the director of school health, and he commented that during the period that she had been director they had had outstanding relations with the school health department. They could not say enough about how cooperative she was.

Dr. Cronin thanked the members of the committee for their report.

RESOLUTION NO. 205-86 Re: PERSONNEL TRANSFER

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

Resolved, That the following personnel transfer be approved:

TRANSFER	FROM	TO
Walter Tozier	Principal Cashell Elementary	Principal South Germantown Elem. Effective 3-25-86

Re: DISCUSSION OF PRIORITIES 3b, 3c, 3d,

AND 4

Dr. Cody commented that 3a was tied in with Priority 1, and they viewed 3b, 3c, and 3d as facilitating priorities. For each of these, he had provided a summary of activities they were pursuing in response to those three priorities.

Mrs. Praisner remarked that this was very useful as far as telling them where the school system was with each of the priorities and the activities involved. She would like to see in writing where there were specific items that were ongoing the timetable for those recommendations and also some description of the individuals who would be involved in implementation or development. Dr. Cody explained that after this meeting they intended to put this in a project management format including information on objectives, responsibilities, and a timeline. Mrs. Praiser said she would like some information on how they intended to involve the different employee organizations.

Dr. Floyd noted that 3B talked about providing some substitute time for classroom teachers to visit other classrooms or attend professional meetings. He asked how many teachers had taken advantage of this. Dr. Cody replied that that amounted to 4/10's of a day per teacher which meant four substitute days available for every ten teachers. In a school of forty teachers it would mean sixteen days, and he was quite sure that those days had been used. Dr. Cronin said he would be interested in knowing whether those teachers were allowed to attend professional meetings.

Mr. Ewing suggested the staff provide information on results to assure accountability. He commented that the paper was an excellent one, and he was pleased with the plan for exemplary practices. He would be interested in knowing what the plans were. He was also glad to see that they were focusing on the issue of recognition and reward of employees. The four items listed were what he would call formal recognition, and having spent the last seven years working on issues of management and productivity improvement, he said that while money was important to most people and awards were important, for most people some recognition of an informal kind was tremendously important as well. He noted that one federal organization had increased its productivity by training first line supervisors to be coaches rather than disciplinarians and to give praise for work well done.

Dr. Cronin commented that another Maryland county was willing to give free apartments to teachers coming into the area. They had a county newspaper establishing a reward process for information, and he suggested they might consider matching grants for classroom teachers. In regard to Priority 3c, Dr. Cronin stated that the Board was looking forward to discussing the role of the principal and evaluations. Mr. Ewing said that as some people talked about increasing teacher salaries there was in the public a very strong sense that teacher salaries should be improved and that teacher evaluation should be dramatically strengthened as well. He was

pleased to see that the Commission on Excellence in Teaching was looking at that. He said it would be worth knowing if what they were doing in teacher evaluation was what they should be doing.

Dr. Cronin said that if evaluation was to be positive it was up to the Board to provide the resources when additional training was recommended. Dr. Cody said they had received comments that the teacher evaluation criteria were okay, the process was okay, but it was not being well implemented. They had not reached the conclusion as to whether the criteria and the process itself needed to be examined. However, the evaluation process and criteria for supportive services was badly out of date and needed to be reviewed.

Mrs. Praisner noted that this section made reference to training the evaluator in the evaluation process. She did not remember that much discussion about this when they talked about the role of the principal. She hoped that someone could provide a report on the extent of the training provided to the evaluator. This included evaluation of principals as well as by principals. She was also curious about the extent to which the individuals participating in the assessment center or evaluating principals were trained. Dr. Pitt commented that they were now talking about doing more training of the assessors in the assessment center.

Mr. Ewing said that one of the most striking things in the Rand report on teacher evaluation systems was that while systems differed, what was the same when they were good was the extent to which the system devoted resources and time to the whole matter of evaluation. He said that in other bureaucracies there were a fair amount of people who gave evaluations the least possible amount of time. There seemed to be an emphasis on process and procedures rather than outcomes.

Dr. Cronin commented that he was glad they were coming back to the indicators of effective schools. Mr. Ewing suggested that they might want to take a good look with some outside help to get an independent judgment. Dr. Cody reported that one objective was to identify some individuals who had practical experience with concepts and theories that had worked with communities similar to Montgomery County.

Mrs. Praisner inquired about the MCPS writing assessment program and the timetable for this. This also tied in with looking at ways other than tests to measure student progress. Dr. Cody replied that the Grade 7 writing test provided by the State did not work, and they needed to replace that and provide prompts for writing activities throughout several grades. Dr. Cronin thought he was really talking about an assessment of the K-8 writing program. They were saying that up to Grade 7 these students appeared to be successful and these students had weaknesses.

Mrs. Praisner asked about ways other than tests to measure student progress. Dr. Lois Martin, associate superintendent, replied that the Priority 1 steering committee made some recommendations including measuring the MCPS writing program in Grades 4, 6, and 8. In

addition, they were asking the subject coordinators and others to identify possible indicators. For example, a good indicator of reading might be the student's use of the media center. Dr. Cronin was uneasy because they had arrived at this point without knowing what the measures should be.

Dr. Shoenberg saw these priorities sliding back into tests as measurements. He saw signs of the examination driving the curriculum and an examination that was suspect at that. It seemed to him that there were things that were not done under test conditions that were still objective demonstrations of students' abilities. These included summative projects done by children. He remarked that what elementary teachers were trying to do with students was not always clear to the general public. For example, most people were bad judges of children's artwork because they did not know what they should be looking for as evidence of accomplishment. He suggested they think about taking a chunk out of the third, fifth, and sixth grade and assigning students a summative project of some kind. The students would be given clear directions and goals, and the public and parents would be made aware of these goals. Each school could have an exhibition of these projects to show what the students and the school had accomplished. He felt that this public demonstration would go farther toward making clear what went on in a school than publishing test scores. For example, they might demonstrate independent learning or a group project.

In regard to Priority 4, Mrs. DiFonzo stated that many of them had spoken about parents and the role they played in the education of their children. By this she meant knowing what was going on in the school, following up on homework, and encouraging and helping youngsters. She recalled that the Citizens Minority Relations Monitoring Committee had spoken to this. She suggested that rather than developing a task force or a group that they ask the superintendent to get those strategies that seemed to be working effectively in some schools and compile them to use as a launching pad for schools that were interested in going into this more fully.

Dr. Cronin thought this would be a good example of partnership between the teachers, PTAs, and the superintendent in terms of building some outreach from the classroom to home. Mrs. DiFonzo suggested asking MCCPTA if they could come up with some recommendations, and Dr. Cronin suggested that MCEA be contacted as well.

Dr. Shoenberg said the response in Priority 4 seemed to be a little thin. He suggested that on a pilot basis they look at a few schools to try and see the degree to which teachers in the classroom did design their activities to promote the goals the Board had talked about.

In regard to Priority 5, Dr. Shoenberg commented that what was outlined was terrific. However, he was concerned that by going through so many steps they would spend so much time getting ready to do something that they would lose the opportunities to do something.

In particular, they were opening lots of new schools which gave them opportunities to do new things. He hoped that they were not going to

let this opportunity pass them by. Dr. Cronin agreed that as they looked at the up-county they would be asking where they were going.

Mrs. Praisner noted that they had to consider educating the community as well and sharing information with them to generate some interest. She remarked that gathering information on demographics and technology was only one piece of the process. She was not sure where Mr. Fosler was with his idea of a commission to look at this. She was particularly interested in a symposium on the future for Montgomery County. She felt that they spent time on the day to day operations of the school system, and they needed to spend as much time looking at long-range issues and planning for the future. She thought that Dr. Muir had done a good job in bringing these issues to the Board and MCPS, but she thought they needed to move beyond that.

Mrs. DiFonzo commented that they could not take today's youngsters and educationally back into the 20th century. She recalled that not many years ago a Board election was largely predicated on accusations that the school system was experimenting with children. She said that in the new schools they needed staffs ready to buy into a concept and while they were doing that they needed to be very careful they did not go back to where they were 12 years ago.

Mr. Ewing commented that the items listed under Priority 5 were excellent, but one thing that was less there than he would like to see it was to "provide students with the knowledge and skills they will need to adopt to a rapidly changing world." It seemed to him that one thing that could be very exciting for students would be to offer a serious course or a segment of a course on the future. The Board had been told at its retreat that the study of the future was not frivolous or unscientific, and the retreat leader make it clear that that was so. They had had a discussion with Montgomery College on a high tech training program which was based on some assumptions about future job prospects. He thought that exploring those issues with students in a systematic way in an interdisciplinary course could be very exciting. He hoped that they would think in Priority 5 about that whole issue of what they did with this in terms of the student in the classroom and not just the honors students.

Dr. Floyd referred to a statement made by President Johnson, who said "It is a lot easier to do what is right, than it is to know what is right." MCPS could approach this matter by looking back or we might take today's trends and try to predict the future. We may still be puzzled about the kinds of skills and adaptations that will be required to be effective in that environment. He cautioned that MCPS move carefully and with the best wisdom that is available.

Dr. Cody reported that next month he and the executive staff would have a retreat to talk about the priorities and look at other fundamental issues.

Because of illness, Mr. Foubert left the meeting at this point.

Re: PROPOSED REVISION OF THE LONG-RANGE
EDUCATIONAL FACILITIES PLANNING
POLICY (FAA)

Dr. Cody reported that they had considered preparing a video tape on the experience of B-CC parents and community participation. Last time they had given the Board what he considered to be a major step forward with the facilities plan; however, Mr. Charles Reese, the Board's attorney, had presented them with another perspective. He had recommended they not fold everything in under one policy. He wanted the Board's reaction on separating these policies.

Dr. Cronin recalled that when they last met the Board was being pressed for parameters for staff to begin working. Dr. Phil Rohr, director of planning, explained that they were already working with clusters with identified problems. He explained that Mr. Reese was suggesting they did not need a policy on non-closures because this created something that could be appealed. They needed more informal guidelines for this process and a school closure policy. Dr. Cody said that the key point was working with communities and asking them to propose solutions by the end of June.

Dr. Cronin asked if this proposal had been worked through with the PTAs, and Dr. Rohr replied that they had not.

Dr. Shoenberg assumed that the Board's lack of action on some formal plan would not preclude the staff's following the process of community consultation. He said that the timetable had been the major issue, and by pulling the closure piece of out it it would seem to be a lot easier to explain the timetable. Dr. Rohr said they were not pressing the Board for action as long as they all agreed that the staff was moving in the right direction. Dr. Shoenberg suggested that they had to be clear with the community about the timetable.

Dr. Rohr reported that the other factor affecting all of this was someone else's policy. They were in a growth mode, and he thought they would be seeing an annual growth policy from the County Council. MCPS staff had been working with the staffs of the county executive, County Council, and Planning Board. This would have a tremendous impact on what they did with the school system and in working with communities. In addition, they had Mr. Christeller's letter on the Adequate Public Facilities Ordinance. Dr. Cronin indicated that he had asked for a draft response to that letter.

Mrs. Praisner saw Mr. Reese's suggestion as a subset on closure incorporating the factors required by the state bylaws on closure. She did think Mr. Reese was saying they did not need to lock themselves into all of these factors in considering the issues of boundary changes. However, they did need guidelines to address such issues as high schools being 9-12 and that they would expect a minimum number of students. She would go back to the paper that the Board adopted on principles driving their facilities concerns, and she suggested those principles be incorporated in their philosophy

for addressing issues. The staff would then work with the cluster to address solutions. She would hope that at some point they could address this so that they did not have appeals to the state on boundary changes.

Dr. Muir pointed out that the Board had never had a capital budget policy or an operating budget policy, but over the years they had had four facilities policies. He suggested coming up with a few pages of goals and objectives and one page on the timetable and then modifying the present policy as a school closing policy. Mrs. Praisner said they needed a point of focus on how they addressed the buildings they operated plus there were state agencies which required a plan of some kind. She also thought that Park and Planning would be satisfied with nothing less than a policy.

Mr. Ewing did not object to Mr. Reese's suggestion that they have two policies. He did object to the suggestion in his letter that they should retreat from the kind of procedural due process which was presently in their policy. He agreed that for every requirement they imposed they had given the public an additional ground for a possible appeal, but he felt this was appropriate. He believed it would be a serious step backward if they retreated from due process guarantees they had in their present policy.

Mrs. Praisner inquired about a timetable for action on the guidelines and policy. Dr. Muir thought they could have something for Board reaction on April 15. They would pull out the school closing portion and have a detailed statement on quality integrated education. Then they would fix up the existing policy and label it as a policy on school closings. He asked for direction from the Board.

Dr. Shoenberg said that Mr. Reese had stated an important principle of not including in a policy more than you had to, but on the other hand the Board and community had a concern about knowing exactly what it was they could and could not expect. He felt that Mrs. Praisner's suggestion of a statement of purpose was a useful approach. Mr. Ewing agreed that they needed a better statement of purpose, but he also thought it did not make sense totally to separate the matter of closings from the rest of the plan. He suggested that it made better sense to have a separate section of the plan dealing with closings.

Mrs. Praisner said they needed an opportunity for at least MCCPTA to react. She hoped that the Board would be able to take action by the end of April, and she asked that MCCPTA and the cluster coordinators be given an opportunity to look at the document and react to it.

Mrs. Vicki Rafel, president of MCCPTA, indicated that she had not seen the proposal until this evening. She recalled that the reason they had a policy in the first place was to give people the feeling they had an equal chance, and she would be very uneasy if they pulled this out and left it without an appearance of equity. They did need something to give the communities and the cluster coordinators a sense of what was going to happen.

RESOLUTION NO. 206-86 Re: MANDATORY POLICY FOR THE SUBMISSION OF
PLANS FOR MAJOR CAPITAL PROJECTS TO
THE MONTGOMERY COUNTY PLANNING BOARD

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

WHEREAS, The Montgomery County Public Schools are required by Article 28, Section 7-112, ANNOTATED CODE OF MARYLAND to submit plans for the construction of major school facilities to the Montgomery County Planning Board; and

WHEREAS, An appropriate approach to this requirement has been developed in the best interests of MCPS; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Board of Education adopts the following mandatory referral policy:

MANDATORY SUBMISSION OF PLANS FOR MAJOR CAPITAL PROJECTS
TO THE MONTGOMERY COUNTY PLANNING BOARD
FOR COMMENT PRIOR TO CONSTRUCTION

A. Purpose

Section 7-112 of Article 28, ANNOTATED CODE OF MARYLAND requires that the Montgomery County Public Schools submit plans for the construction of school facilities to the Montgomery County Planning Board for comment prior to project construction. It is the intent of the school system to cooperate fully with the Planning Board staff to efficiently and effectively provide the best possible educational facilities in an adequate and timely manner by minimizing duplication of effort and undue delays.

B. Process and Content

1. Subsequent to approval of preliminary plans for major capital projects by the Board of Education, the superintendent of schools will submit those plans to the Montgomery County Planning Board for its review under mandatory referral.
2. In accordance with State law, "The failure of the Commission to act within 60 days from and after the date of official submission to it shall be deemed an approval, unless a longer period be granted by the submitting board, body, or official."
3. The superintendent of schools will review the Planning Board's comments and either adopt or reject each recommendation. A summary of the superintendent's actions will be provided to the Board of Education.
4. Recommendations involving school board policy will be brought to the attention of the Board of Education prior to final

response from the superintendent.

5. Montgomery County Public Schools will continue to submit school facility construction plans, as appropriate, to all other agencies as required by applicable law and procedure.

C. Feedback Indicators

The Board of Education will receive updates on the status of projects submitted to the Planning Board under the mandatory referral provisions of Article 28, Section 7-112, ANNOTATED CODE OF MARYLAND.

RESOLUTION NO. 207-86 Re: STATE BOARD BY-LAW ON APPEAL PROCEDURES

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education adopt its statement on the proposed State Board By-law on Appeal Procedures.

Re: BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS

1. Mr. Ewing reported that they still had the problem of fire alarms, and he thought they needed to get the problem solved by the people who made the policies and laws. He said it was ridiculous that they could not get the county government to behave in a way that made sense. He hoped that they could do something about this soon.
2. Mr. Ewing commented that one of the things important to him about a long-range facilities policy was the end results which had to do with adequate space for educational programs. He said it was important for them to plan that in such a way as to be able to answer affirmatively the question of whether they had adequate facilities to meet the real needs for educational programs. They did not have that now, and he would be asking what it would take to do that.
3. Mr. Ewing stated that he had attended on March 11 a public hearing held at the Community Action Agency. The purpose of the hearing was to obtain advice on what needed to be done to deal with issues of poverty in Montgomery County. The good news was that there were a good number of people there from Head Start and Chapter I saying positive things about those programs and urging the county government to give them full support in the budget. The bad news was the graphic description by a good many people of the increasing numbers of Montgomery County people who lived in poverty. Many of those were children, and the emergency shelters now housed increasing numbers of children. Public school children were eating meals at soup kitchens, and there was not enough public housing available. He suggested that the Board had to deal with the issue of how they handled the increasing numbers of children whose situation was not merely that they were working class poor but rather desperately poor. Their educational problems were compounded by that and frequently they were children of immigrants. He felt that the Board should discuss this in the near future.

4. Dr. Floyd noted that by memo he had flagged three articles that had come to his attention. One of them reported on research done at the University of Texas on what made good teachers good. Another was a survey of teachers who had quit the profession, and the third had to do with school administration. The question was raised as to whether it was good policy to require that principals be reassigned to different schools on a periodic basis.

5. Mrs. Praisner reported that last week she had participated in the Department of Adult Education Program to help parents understand the school system and to help them help their children. She expressed her thanks to Georgia Lewis, Diane Ursano, Cherry Wunderlich, Vicki Rafel, Judy Ackerman, Carl Smith, Lee Etta Powell, Laura Freedman, Sylvia Thomas, Michael Graben, and Cal Leonard. She said that the program was terrific, and because this program was so successful she hoped they would do more of these programs.

6. Dr. Cronin reported that in the same week they had gone to Richard Montgomery and to the B-CC Cluster. He said that the Richard Montgomery people had asked the Board if they could do a special program and provide the resources, and the charge to the Board was to deliver that program as professionally as they could so that the trust level would be there. He said that at the B-CC cluster they saw how well the people were working together having decided they could trust the Board.

7. Dr. Cronin stated the Board had met with Montgomery College on Saturday to look at a 2+2 program with a high tech aspect to it. There was a concern on the part of the vocational education people in the county that they not exclude from consideration all the varieties of traditional vocational education. They wanted to be sure that the program was a balanced program.

8. Dr. Cronin indicated that the National Education Association had a major piece on the Concord School newspaper. The program would be on nationwide television in April.

RESOLUTION No. 208-86 Re: EXECUTIVE SESSION - APRIL 15, 1986

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

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education of Montgomery County hereby conduct its meeting in executive closed session beginning on April 15, 1986, at 9 a.m. to discuss, consider, deliberate, and/or otherwise decide the employment, assignment, appointment, promotion, demotion, compensation, discipline, removal, or resignation of

employees, appointees, or officials over whom it has jurisdiction, or any other personnel matter affecting one or more particular individuals and to comply with a specific constitutional, statutory or judicially imposed requirement protecting particular proceedings or matters from public disclosure as permitted under Article 76A, Section 11(a) and that such meeting shall continue in executive closed session until the completion of business; and be it further

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

RESOLUTION NO. 209-86 Re: MINUTES OF DECEMBER 10, 1985

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

Resolved, That the minutes of December 10, 1985, be approved.

RESOLUTION NO. 210-86 Re: MINUTES OF JANUARY 14, 1986

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

Resolved, That the minutes of January 14, 1986, be approved.

RESOLUTION NO. 211-86 Re: MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 3, 1986

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

Resolved, That the minutes of February 3, 1986, be approved.

RESOLUTION NO. 212-86 Re: MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 4, 1986

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

Resolved, That the minutes of February 4, 1986, be approved.

RESOLUTION NO. 213-86 Re: MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 27, 1986

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

Resolved, That the minutes of February 27, 1986, be approved.

RESOLUTION NO. 214-86 Re: MINUTES OF MARCH 3, 1986

2. Mrs. Slye moved and Dr. Floyd seconded that the superintendent bring to the Board of Education any facilities issues which they might need to consider in implementing the plans of the B-CC Cluster on the short- and long-term basis.

Re: ITEMS OF INFORMATION

Board members received the following item of information:
Monthly Financial Report

Re: ADJOURNMENT

The president adjourned the meeting at 11:10 p.m.

President

Secretary

WSC:mlw

