

announced that on the sixth ballot for vice president, Mr. Ewing and Mr. Goldensohn voted for Mr. Goldensohn. Dr. Cronin, Mrs. DiFonzo, (Mr. Herscowitz, if counted), Mrs. Praisner, and Dr. Shoenberg voted for Dr. Cronin. Dr. Cronin was the new vice president.

On behalf of the Board, staff, students, and teachers, Dr. Pitt presented Mrs. Praisner with a crystal vase in honor of her second term as Board president. He commended her for an outstanding job as president.

Re: STATEMENT BY MRS. PRAISNER

Mrs. Praisner made the following statement:

"I find it hard to believe that it has only been one year as president. Some times during this year it seemed like a lot longer. Certainly it has been a very eventful year for the school system and for me, and it has probably been the busiest year of my life. Some people in the last month or so have asked me whether I would have done it had I known what was going to happen over this past year, and I guess my answer is, 'you bet yah.' I loved it, and it has certainly been a challenge and never dull.

"There have been very many high points: the superintendent search process - very successfully completed, an excellent Urban Suburban conference, just the daily time on task focusing on our priority - the students and the school system. I have enjoyed every moment of it, especially the opportunity to meet and work with people from this school system and to represent the school system at school, community, county, state, and even national level.

"I want to thank my colleagues around the Board table for their support and cooperation and for always being there for me this past year. I want to thank my hosts at the various functions I have attended representing the Board. I want to thank the staff at local schools, area offices, and central office and especially a few people with whom I have worked most closely this year: Phil Rohr, Bill Henry, Lois Stoner, Bob Cooney, Carl Smith, Dr. Vance and the members of the staff in the deputy superintendent's office. Harry, I have really enjoyed working with you as Board president and everyone in the superintendent's office, and especially the Board Office - Tom, I can't say anything other than thank you; Mary Lou; David even though you are not with us anymore; Nancy, thank you for coming on board and doing such a super job; Lillian and Ann and Kelly; and Midge who isn't with us anymore having left the school system to the beautiful Eastern Shore.

"A special note of thanks to someone who isn't here and who hasn't spent very much time with me this year, and that is my husband. Maybe we will get to know each other again. It has been a very busy and a very hectic year as I said, but if nothing else this year has convinced me about something that I probably never doubted and that's that we have one terrific school system and the best part of it is the people who make up this school system, they are giving, they are

committed, they are enthusiastic, they go that extra mile time and time again, and I have also learned how much I love this county and how much this county's future and the school system's future are intertwined, and I enjoy being a part of that. So thank you all very much and thank you for the vase, it is really beautiful."

Re: STATEMENT BY MRS. DIFONZO

Mrs. DiFonzo made the following statement:

"I would first like to thank my colleagues on the Board for the confidence and trust that they have shown in me by their votes this morning. I hope a year from now they feel the same.

"I believe the role of the president of the Board of Education is one of representation, representing the Board at official as well as unofficial functions, at the table, in the schools, and in communities, and representing the Board's position as a corporate body before individuals as well as groups. I do not believe the role of the president is to use that office to further one's personal, private or political agendas. Therefore, when reporters come marching up here en masse a little later in the day, I will tell them then as I am telling you all now, I have no private agenda. My agenda for the next year will be to represent the Board in the best way I know how in whatever decisions the Board as a corporate body has made, and I have absolute faith in my colleagues that if and when I fail to do that, one, if not more of them, will certainly let me know.

"I think I am the same person I am today as I was yesterday. I have always tried to be. Of course, we all grow, mature, are affected by events that touch us and by definition those events change us. We become wiser, more sensitive, a better person, but inherently we are the same. I still cry at supermarket openings, grin like a total fool at little kids. I still love visiting schools, speaking before MCPS groups, being a member of this Board of Education. I still dislike mornings. I do not believe in an imperial board, and I certainly do not subscribe to an imperial president of the Board. I do not intend and will not try to become one. Please do not treat me as one, and furthermore when and if I begin to act like one, I beg each of you to let me know. I trust 1988 will be a good year for all of us in MCPS. I look forward to working with the entire staff, Dr. Pitt, with Dr. Vance, with the other professionals in the school system, with the community, and with PTA. And I thank you all very much."

RESOLUTION NO. 584-87 Re: BOARD AGENDA - DECEMBER 8, 1987

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

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education approve its agenda for December 8, 1987, with the addition of an item on Oak View Elementary School.

RESOLUTION NO. 585-87 Re: APPROVAL OF CALENDAR FOR STUDENT BOARD
MEMBER ELECTION

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

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education adopt the calendar proposed by MCR for the election of the student Board member for 1988-89.

Re: OAK VIEW AND NEW HAMPSHIRE ESTATES
ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS

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

WHEREAS, The Board of Education adopted an educational facilities plan in 1985 involving the pairing of Oak View and New Hampshire Estates elementary schools which has been affirmed by the Maryland State Board of Education; and

WHEREAS, The approved plan is not yet fully implemented; and

WHEREAS, The superintendent of schools believes it would be prudent for staff to reevaluate the present plan together with possible alternatives; and

WHEREAS, The Long Range Educational Facilities Planning Policy permits Board-deferral of educational facilities decisions beyond final Board action on the superintendent's proposed six-year Capital Improvements Program pending further study; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the superintendent's recommendation to form a staff committee to consider possible alternatives to the Board-adopted plan involving Oak View and New Hampshire Estates elementary schools, in consultation with affected communities, is accepted and authorized.

RESOLUTION NO. 586-87 Re: AN AMENDMENT TO THE PROPOSED RESOLUTION
ON OAK VIEW AND NEW HAMPSHIRE ESTATES
ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

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

RESOLVED, That the proposed resolution on Oak View and New Hampshire Estates Elementary School be amended to add the following after the Resolved clause:

"provided that any alternatives are consistent with applicable Board policies, including the Long Range Facilities Planning Policy and the Policy Statement on Quality Integrated Education."

RESOLUTION NO. 587-87 Re: AN AMENDMENT TO THE PROPOSED RESOLUTION
ON OAK VIEW AND NEW HAMPSHIRE ESTATES
ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS

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

RESOLVED, That the proposed resolution on Oak View and New Hampshire Estates Elementary School be amended by the addition of the following:

"and be it further

RESOLVED, That the Board reserves its full right and authority to continue the present plan or to accept, reject, or modify any alternatives which may be presented or recommended by the superintendent."

RESOLUTION NO. 588-87 Re: OAK VIEW AND NEW HAMPSHIRE ESTATES
ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS

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

WHEREAS, The Board of Education adopted an educational facilities plan in 1985 involving the pairing of Oak View and New Hampshire Estates elementary schools which has been affirmed by the Maryland State Board of Education; and

WHEREAS, The approved plan is not yet fully implemented; and

WHEREAS, The superintendent of schools believes it would be prudent for staff to reevaluate the present plan together with possible alternatives; and

WHEREAS, The Long Range Educational Facilities Planning Policy permits Board-deferral of educational facilities decisions beyond final Board action on the superintendent's proposed six-year Capital Improvements Program pending further study; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the superintendent's recommendation to form a staff committee to consider possible alternatives to the Board-adopted plan involving Oak View and New Hampshire Estates elementary schools, in consultation with affected communities, is accepted and authorized provided that any alternatives are consistent with applicable Board policies, including the Long Range Facilities Planning Policy and the Policy Statement on Quality Integrated Education; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the Board reserves its full right and authority to continue the present plan or to accept, reject, or modify any alternatives which may be presented or recommended by the superintendent.

Re: BUDGET ISSUES

Dr. Pitt explained that he had made some comments regarding streamlining and efficiency. He had three basic objectives having to

affirmative; Dr. Cronin being temporarily absent:

WHEREAS, The architect for the Highland Elementary School Modernization/Addition has prepared the schematic design in accordance with the educational specifications; and

WHEREAS, The Highland Elementary School Planning Committee has approved the proposed schematic design; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the Montgomery County Board of Education approve the preliminary plan report prepared by Duane, Elliott, Cahill, Mullineaux and Mullineaux.

RESOLUTION NO. 590-87 Re: PRESENTATION OF PRELIMINARY PLANS
MONTGOMERY KNOLLS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
ADDITION/MODERNIZATION (AREA 1)

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

WHEREAS, The architect for the Montgomery Knolls Elementary School Addition/Modernization has prepared the schematic design in accordance with the educational specifications; and

WHEREAS, The Montgomery Knolls Elementary School Planning Committee has approved the proposed schematic design; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the Montgomery County Board of Education approve the preliminary plan report prepared by S H W C, Incorporated.

RESOLUTION NO. 591-87 Re: PRESENTATION OF PRELIMINARY PLANS
CLOVERLY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL MODERNIZATION
(AREA 1)

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

WHEREAS, The architect for the Cloverly Elementary School Modernization has prepared the schematic design in accordance with the educational specifications; and

WHEREAS, The Cloverly Elementary School Planning Committee has approved the proposed schematic design; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the Montgomery County Board of Education approve the preliminary plan report prepared by William H. Doggett.

RESOLUTION NO. 592-87 Re: SHERWOOD HIGH SCHOOL FEASIBILITY STUDY

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Dr. Cronin

seconded by Mr. Goldensohn, the following resolution was adopted unanimously:

WHEREAS, The Sherwood High School Modernization Feasibility report, prepared by Strang and Samaha, AIA, has been reviewed and endorsed by the superintendent, staff, PTSA, and community; and

WHEREAS, The architect and staff have recommended that the Board approve a modernization program for Sherwood High School; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the Board approve the inclusion of architectural planning funds for the modernization of Sherwood High School in the FY 1989 Capital Budget, in accordance with Scheme A identified in the feasibility report.

Re: SPECIAL UP-COUNTY MATHEMATICS/SCIENCE/
COMPUTER SCIENCE PROGRAM

Dr. Pitt commented that he had probably spent more time on this issue than any other issue with the exception of the budget. After careful analysis and thought, he was presenting this paper to the Board. He reported that in August, 1986, the Board directed the superintendent to consider with staff and others the need for a special program in math/science/computer sciences for the up-county area. A couple of committees were involved and looked at the need for such a program, location, and impact on other high schools especially the Blair program. Both committees reported their findings and this was shared with the Board on November 19 along with two other papers articulating dissenting views of the Area 1 and Area 2 representatives to the community advisory committee's findings and conclusions.

Dr. Pitt said he had studied all of the written reports. The first question was whether a special up-county math/science/computer science program was needed. Tied to the answer were several issues including the probable impact on comprehensive high schools, which is a serious concern, and the secondary magnet and special programs along with others in other parts of the county. His response to this question was a cautious one. With the growth projected for the up-county during the next ten years, he believed there might well be a cadre of students in the up-county area who could benefit from such a program. This was a relatively small group of highly able students whose educational potential could not be fully addressed with the resources provided in the regular school setting. He believed that for this group, a special program keyed to high-tech research industry operating along the I-270 could provide a positive educational experience for them and the opportunity for productive collaboration with that industry and possibly higher education.

Dr. Pitt said such a program was much smaller than recommended by staff and community. The idea of having 100 students per grade level was not based on the number of students thought to be able to profit from this program. The Blair program was set up as a magnet to draw

majority students into the program and fill up that school. This gave them 100 students per grade level, and the same was true of the IB Program at Richard Montgomery. Here they had to ask questions about the need for the program and for whom it should be designed. He believed that if they looked at their truly gifted population, the idea of 25 to 40 per grade level was reasonable.

Dr. Pitt noted that there were other factors which argued to proceeding slowly. They had to consider the impact on other special programs, particularly the Blair High School magnet. They had created magnet and special programs, not as a matter of course, but to address specific needs in specific communities. The magnet programs in the Blair and B-CC clusters were designed to address racial balance issues in the down-county area by attracting magnet students to the clusters and by stabilizing enrollment within the clusters. That was the issue and that was the need, and this Board made a pioneer effort in that area. This allowed them to move forward without getting involved in any court desegregation efforts. He said that any new program that would have a serious, long-term, adverse impact on the Blair magnet program and on desegregation efforts in the down-county area should be rejected. He believed that they had both a fundamental obligation to foster our desegregation efforts and avoid any action which might impede them. In a sense, he would make a similar case for Richard Montgomery although the key issue there was declining enrollment and not desegregation.

Dr. Pitt commented that the most important dimension of this issue was long-term impact. As he looked at projections for the next five to ten years, he believed that a small up-county program would likely not have a long-term adverse impact on the Blair magnet. He believed the pool of prospective candidates for both programs was projected to be far larger than it was now.

Dr. Pitt said they had to look at the impact on comprehensive high school programs and up-county high schools. From his point of view, every high school must have programs and courses in places that challenged academically talented students and enabled them to achieve their potential. He remarked that there were principals in the county who were concerned about the comprehensive high school. He believed they could have a small program without endangering that, but he agreed that the comprehensive high school had to be protected, developed, and improved upon. Honors programs were now established in all high schools and contained rigorous courses in the five academic areas as well as in other subjects. In addition, they were in the process of implementing honors level courses in computer science and adding second computer labs at each high school. The aim was to allow youngsters to use the computer creatively as a tool in these honors courses. He believed that the programs now in place in computer science had the potential for meeting the needs of most academically talented students. However, they must continue to work to ensure that the honors programs were implemented effectively and provide the challenge that academically talented students needed to make the most of their potential. While they had come a long way in this regard, much remained to be done to make the programs more

equitable across the county. For example, the Board had added extra teachers at Poolesville High School and next year, with the help of industry, there would be a special computer program at Damascus High School.

Dr. Pitt commented that they had to begin making countywide use of the work being done by students and staff at the Blair magnet program to augment present science and mathematics instruction. That program was already recognized nationally for its innovative and sophisticated approach to science and mathematics education. To him it seemed natural to incorporate the way they taught physics and mathematics in all of their honors programs. It was about time they integrated those programs as they were now doing at Blair. Dr. Martin and Ms. Meyer had already begun discussing ways to strengthen science and mathematics instruction in the up-county high schools by utilizing some of the Blair experiences and looking at a closer collaboration with the high tech industry. Even with these initiatives, the impact of a special up-county program would need to be weighed carefully in light of its effect on the continued strength and viability of the comprehensive high school.

Dr. Pitt explained that another issue was timing. While he was optimistic that the Blair program could continue to prosper and compete effectively with a small up-county program, he felt a sense of caution here also. He believed they needed to wait until the Blair program and the IB at Richard Montgomery were fully implemented and had had time to stabilize and become established before any new programs were added. In addition, they would be opening two new high schools up-county in 1988 and 1989. They needed to get those programs established. He noted that next year they would be opening one high school and six elementary schools which was more than most schools systems had.

Dr. Pitt believed they ought to wait until 1990 before deciding whether a special program up-county was needed. This would allow time for the new high schools to become established and for the Blair and Richard Montgomery programs to be looked at. There was also the issue of where such a program should be located. The recommendation of the committee was to locate it at Gaithersburg High School in a wing to be added to that school. Also, there was consideration of Quince Orchard High School. However, the projections for Gaithersburg High School had increased significantly. Given their capital improvement needs including modernizations and new schools they faced in the next five to ten years, he was not sure that building additional facilities to house special programs would have as high a priority as other projects. If the growth up-county exceeded present projections, they might need to build additional secondary facilities.

Dr. Pitt thought they might want to look at other options such as a special off-site location close to high tech research industry. In addition, other educational institutions might support such a program. Most important, he believed it was too soon to make that determination. He recommended that any decision on location be

deferred.

Dr. Pitt explained that he was in favor of a small, up-county mathematics/science/computer science program for high talented students. However, he believed they should wait until the academic programs in the two new high school had been established, the continued efforts to strengthen the existing honors programs were on track, the Blair magnet and the Richard Montgomery High School IB programs were fully subscribed and stable, and the demographic profile in the up-county actually developed. If these things occurred, he would propose they put in such a program.

Dr. Cronin expressed his appreciation for the paper the superintendent had presented. It was tempting to come in on the side of equity and make a statement about up-county needs versus down-county needs. They should, instead, talk about what the Board owed students. They owed them an excellent education in a comprehensive classroom. He did not believe they owed students a special program because it existed anywhere else in the county. He liked using what was learned at the Blair program and sharing that in the regular classroom and upgrading honors programs in the comprehensive school. A while ago, he had proposed using the life sciences area up-county and tapping in on the existing professional expertise in that area. He suggested using the skill base in the Shady Grove area which might offer a program as attractive to students in the Blair community as the Blair program was attractive to students up-county. He hoped they could avoid the issue of equity. They should look to the improvement of the comprehensive program and the utilization of the facilities at Shady Grove as a general school system program.

Mr. Goldensohn agreed they should not say there had to be an up-county program simply because the down-county had one. If the Blair program did not exist, he would say they needed a special math/science program at each end of the county to serve all students. The primary function of the Blair program was desegregation, and he had no intentions of seeing that program falter. He believed it could be strengthened. The superintendent had recommended waiting until 1990 before deciding whether a special program up-county was needed. Mr. Goldensohn recalled that this process had started five or six years ago. It was now something that up-county residents felt they needed, not because the down-county had it, but because county students needed it. He did not like the idea of waiting until 1990 to make the decision and not implementing it until 1992. This meant that the current fifth graders would be the first children who had an option to attend such a program. He liked the idea of a limited program which would curtail any potential impact against Blair or the Richard Montgomery program. He was not concern about depleting a given school's achieving students. He had not seen anything in the recommendations about a percentage limitation being imposed on potential feeder schools. For example, if they had a limit of .5% this would mean a high school of 2,000 students could send no more than 10 students and a 1,200 student school could provide no more than six. He thought that the impact on any school could be

controlled.

Mr. Goldensohn suggested that the process needed to go forward. He did not know how they got community input on this. He hoped that they would continue with a positive approach and work out the timing. He agreed that the comprehensive high school needed to be strong and adequate to service all students. However, the special program was not for all students. It was for the small number of students needing more than any comprehensive high school could reasonably be expected to give.

Dr. Pitt hoped it was clear that he was not saying they should not do this program. He was saying they ought to wait until the conditions he had described existed. If these conditions existed, he would make this recommendation.

Mr. Herscovitz asked if Dr. Pitt was suggesting two separate programs be established, one at Blair and one up-county. He wondered if there would be one program where students would apply to it and be assigned based on their geographical location. Dr. Pitt replied that it would not. The Blair program was in existence for desegregation. The up-county program would be separate from the Blair program. Mr. Herscovitz thought it might be better to have the students apply to one program and be placed geographically to avoid competition between the two programs. He wanted to avoid having students say, "are you part of the 'deseg' program or part of the 'gifted' program up-county." Dr. Pitt hoped that the Blair program would stand on its own.

Mr. Ewing reported that the Board had plans to talk about its policy on K-12 education in the early part of next year. When it did that, it ought to focus on the issue of special programs in general. He thought it was important for them to make clear that the comprehensive high school was the basic approach they took to high school education. Where they established special programs, they did so for extraordinary reasons. The community was concerned about the possible tendency to multiply programs with the resultant difficulty of administration and loss of excellent students. He thought there was a need to be clear as a school system as to their posture on the comprehensive high school. He suggested they had to decide on that before they came to a conclusion on this issue.

With regard to the Blair program, Mr. Ewing agreed with the superintendent that whatever they did they needed to protect it, promote it, and make sure it succeeded. He remarked that there was a lot of difference in community views as to what it meant to do that. He was bothered by the issue of recruitment for Blair because he did not think they had been very successful at that thus far. He did not mean this as a criticism, but he hoped that the superintendent would examine this closely and recommend any additional steps that needed to be taken. He remarked that probably a major element was transportation. If they were short of buses, they should make that point in the next budget.

Mr. Ewing wanted to address the twin issues of access and equity. It was clear that the program was established for, not desegregating, but integration which they pursued because they wanted to. He recalled that they had some justifiably adverse decisions from the state Board of Education. The state had said they needed to take some action to expand the geographical base. Once having established the Blair program, it created a clear beacon to people from all over the county and a message that it was an excellent program. If fairness was to be served, access must be made available. It was his view that once they had a program, if access was a problem, then fairness was a problem. If they were not going to move on this at the present time, they had to address the issue of access which was a transportation issue.

In regard to disseminating the lessons learned, Mr. Ewing hoped the superintendent would be more precise about how he expected to do that. He said it was important for them to have a clear cut mechanism for doing that. He suggested a science institute in the summer with a faculty drawn, in part, from the Blair magnet and from the schools and the private sector. He did not believe the approaches employed at Blair were solely applicable to the gifted. He thought they were usable in a variety of ways throughout the school system.

Mr. Ewing stated that the superintendent's proposal needed further debate. He hoped that this would be back on the Board's agenda again. He thought the Board should have the opportunity to raise questions and to hear from the community. They had to be sure they were meeting expectations across the county ranging from K-12 policy, to recruitment, to scientific knowledge dissemination, etc. Dr. Shoenberg said that Mr. Ewing had talked about the integration effort. He was concerned that they not do harm to their integration efforts. He commented that Mr. Ewing's amendments to the Oak View plan reaffirmed the Board's continuing commitment to integration and its desire to keep on with that policy. Dr. Shoenberg remarked that the superintendent's remarks here went a long way toward making him feel easier about that issue. They had to see how the Blair magnet developed over the next couple of years; therefore, the delay was probably a good idea.

In regard to capital costs, Dr. Shoenberg said he would have to draw a parallel with the vote they did not take the other night about the communications magnet and extending it to the secondary school. One of the virtues of the communications magnets was the program integration which had been of particular concern of his as far as their curricula in general were concerned. He was anxious that what they had learned from both programs with regard to curricular integration be spread throughout the county. He felt that the superintendent's comments about using the lessons of Blair elsewhere were important.

Dr. Shoenberg commented that they had heard talk about "need" for a program in the up-county. The question he would raise was, "who needs the program and for what purpose?" By bringing students into

the program who had particular strengths in math and science they would be confirming that interest. He doubted if those students would be turned off by not having the program. They would find their outlets elsewhere and get their training as mathematicians and scientists in colleges and in graduate schools. What they could do was give students a different kind of taste as to what it meant to take math and science seriously. They had a strong classroom program and it was getting stronger. Using some of the lessons they had learned at Blair would make it stronger yet. Dr. Shoenberg commented that the superintendent saw an up-county program as being different in nature from the Blair program in that it was highly experiential. What they did not offer to their students was sufficient laboratory experience, and this would be far more possible in cooperation with a number of science technology firms.

In regard to the communications program, Dr. Shoenberg explained that he had not seconded Mr. Goldensohn's motion because he did not think they could do the thing at Blair because there was a capital cost involved. There was also the question of creating a larger high school in a large physical plant. This did not reduce his interest in that program, and he hoped they would find some way to use what they had learned there, either through a continuation of that program elsewhere and some use in other school situations. In the same way, he hoped that they going to learn the lessons from the Blair program. In the same way, he had a concern about incurring an additional capital cost on this.

Mrs. DiFonzo stated that the next logical time to discuss this was to tie it into the discussion in February on the K-12 policy.

Re: STATEMENTS BY MRS. PRAISNER AND DR.
CRONIN

Mrs. Praisner reported that she would not be present for the afternoon session. She would be in Baltimore with Dr. Rohr testifying before the IAC in a request for additional planning and construction funding, especially for six of their new elementary schools.

Dr. Cronin stated that he also had to leave at the lunch break. There had been requests from some communities, particularly in Frost, for some Board information or discussion. He thought they did need some responses to some issues: the commitment for transportation for those who wished to go from Frost to West early, the issues of the transition and programs at Frost and West and Richard Montgomery and Wootton, and whether or not student population predictions were showing up. Dr. Pitt thought that staff had already responded to some of those questions. Dr. Cronin explained that the community had met with some Board members, and at some point they had to say the Board was committed to this or would entertain changes.

Re: EXECUTIVE SESSION

The Board met in executive session from noon to 2:15 p.m. to discuss

appeals and personnel matters. Dr. Cronin and Mrs. Praisner left the meeting during this time.

Re: BOARD/PRESS/VISITOR CONFERENCE

The following individuals appeared before the Board of Education:

1. Janet Garrison, Community Advisory Committee for Special Programs
2. Ron Wohl, Community Advisory Committee for Special Programs
3. Holly Geddes, Community Advisory Committee for Special Programs
4. Barry Korb
5. Aaron Lightman, Citizens Against Tobacco Smoke
6. Ray Py, Montgomery JOURNAL

RESOLUTION NO. 593-87 Re: PROCUREMENT CONTRACTS OVER AND UNDER
\$25,000

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

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

39-88	Motor Vehicles - Trucks	
	AWARDEES	
	Beal GMC Truck, Inc.	\$ 98,400
	Lanham Ford, AMC, Jeep, Renault	81,975
	Norris Ford	92,953
	Dick Stevens Chevrolet	79,749

		\$353,077
	TOTAL CONTRACTS OVER \$25,000	\$353,077

RESOLUTION NO. 594-87 Re: TELECOMMUNICATIONS/CABLE TV NETWORK
INSTALLATION AT VARIOUS SCHOOLS

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

WHEREAS, Sealed bids were received on November 30, 1987, for installation at Beverly Farms Elementary School, Goshen Elementary School, Parkland Junior High School, and Seneca Valley High School as indicated below:

BIDDER	BID AMOUNT
B & L Services, Inc.	\$145,700

and

WHEREAS, The recommended bid is within staff estimate and sufficient funds are available to effect award; and

WHEREAS, B & L Services, Inc., has completed satisfactory work for us before, and they are a reliable company; and

WHEREAS, The low bidder met all requirements of the specifications; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That a contract for \$145,700 be awarded to B & L Services, Inc., for installation of a cable television/telecommunications network at Beverly Farms Elementary School, Goshen Elementary School, Parkland Junior High School, and Seneca Valley High School in accordance with plans and specifications of Von Otto and Bilecky, P.C.

RESOLUTION NO. 595-87 Re: ELEMENTARY ART ROOM VENTILATION IN VARIOUS SCHOOLS AND CHEMISTRY AREA VENTILATION IN ROCKVILLE HIGH SCHOOL

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

WHEREAS, The following sealed bids were received on November 24, 1987, for art room kiln ventilation in various schools and chemistry area ventilation in Rockville High School:

BIDDER	BASE BID A 20 Schools	BASE BID Rockville
1. Arey, Inc.	\$62,010*	\$6,510
2. W. B. Maske Sheet Metal Works, Inc.	91,477	3,865*

*Recommended award

and

WHEREAS, The low bids were within staff estimate and sufficient funds are available in Account 999-52 to effect award; and

WHEREAS, The low bidders are reputable contractors who have successfully performed similar projects for MCPS; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That contracts be awarded to Arey, Inc., for \$62,010 for art room kiln ventilation in 20 schools and W. B. Maske Sheet Metal Works, Inc., for \$3,865 for chemistry area ventilation in Rockville High School, all in accordance with plans and specifications prepared by Morton Wood, Jr., engineer.

RESOLUTION NO. 596-87 Re: MONTGOMERY VILLAGE JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL
REROOFING (AREA 3)

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

WHEREAS, The following sealed bids were received on November 24, 1987, for reroofing Montgomery Village Junior High School:

BIDDER	LUMP SUM
1. Orndorff & Spaid, Inc.	\$310,582
2. Raintree Industries, Inc.	316,675
3. J. E. Wood & Sons Co., Inc.	317,023
4. R. D. Bean, Inc.	320,325
5. Agmilu & Company, Inc.	368,737

and

WHEREAS, The low bidder, Orndorff & Spaid, Inc., has performed similar projects satisfactorily for MCPS; and

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

RESOLVED, That a contract for \$310,582 be awarded to Orndorff & Spaid, Inc., for reroofing Montgomery Village Junior High School in accordance with plans and specifications prepared by the Department of School Facilities.

RESOLUTION NO. 597-87 Re: AUTHORIZATION TO TRANSFER FUNDS FOR
VARIOUS CAPITAL PROJECTS

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

WHEREAS, The following capital projects have been identified for closing; and

WHEREAS, Surplus funds in these projects can be transferred to the Local Unliquidated Surplus Account as indicated in the following:

PROJECT NUMBER	SCHOOL	AMOUNT
999-93	Future School Sites	\$350,000
999-13	Auditorium Renovations	127,000

		\$477,000

now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That local appropriation authority for \$350,000 from Future

School Sites (Project 999-93) and \$127,000 from Auditorium Renovations (Project 999-13) be transferred to the Local Unliquidated Surplus Account (Project 997); and be it further

RESOLVED, That local appropriation authority for \$477,000 be transferred from the Local Unliquidated Surplus Account (Project 997) to the following projects in the amounts indicated:

PROJECT NUMBER	SCHOOL	AMOUNT
999-28	Asbestos Abatement	\$200,000
569-01	Strawberry Knoll Elementary	87,000
968-07	Portable Classrooms	190,000

and be it further

RESOLVED, That the county executive be requested to recommend approval of these fund transfers to the County Council.

RESOLUTION NO. 598-87 Re: CHANGE ORDER ACTIVITY OVER \$25,000
STRAWBERRY KNOLL ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

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

WHEREAS, The bids for Strawberry Knoll Elementary School contained an alternative to provide classroom shelving; and

WHEREAS, The add-alternative was deferred until the sitework was completed to ensure that adequate contingency funds were available; and

WHEREAS, The sitework has been completed and funds are available to provide shelving; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That \$40,185 be added to the Board's contract with Commercial Modular Systems, Incorporated, to fund the shelving identified in Alternative 3 of the bid for Strawberry Knoll Elementary School.

RESOLUTION NO. 599-87 Re: AMENDMENT TO FY 1988 CAPITAL BUDGET
STADIUM LIGHTS QUINCE ORCHARD HIGH
SCHOOL

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

WHEREAS, On October 28, 1987, the Board of Education approved the installation of stadium lights at Quince Orchard High School; and

WHEREAS, Subsequently, the County Council adopted a fiscal policy on stadium lights at high schools; and

WHEREAS, The county's policy stipulates, in part, that the county government and the booster clubs each provide funds for one-half the cost of the stadium lights; and

WHEREAS, It is necessary to amend an appropriate Capital Improvements Program for this purpose; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the FY 1988 Capital Improvements Program be amended for Quince Orchard High School to reflect reimbursement of one-half the cost of the stadium lights, \$25,000 in county bonds from private contributions; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the county executive be requested to provide a favorable recommendation to the County Council on the amendment to the FY 1988 Capital Improvements Program.

Mr. Ewing assumed the chair.

RESOLUTION NO. 600-87 Re: ACCEPTANCE OF CEDAR GROVE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL (AREA 3)

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

RESOLVED, That having been duly inspected on November 30, 1987, Cedar Grove Elementary School 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. 601-87 Re: ACCEPTANCE OF S. CHRISTA MCAULIFFE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL (AREA 3)

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

RESOLVED, That having been duly inspected on November 30, 1987, S. Christa McAuliffe Elementary School 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. 602-87 Re: ACCEPTANCE OF JONES LANE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL (AREA 3)

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

RESOLVED, That having been duly inspected on December 1, 1987, Jones Lane Elementary School 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.

Mrs. DiFonzo assumed the chair.

RESOLUTION NO. 603-87 Re: FY 1988 SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION TO
RESTORE \$1.7 MILLION HEALTH MAINTENANCE
ORGANIZATION REDUCTION

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

WHEREAS, The County Council reduced the FY 1988 Operating Budget by \$1.7 million in anticipation of savings to be achieved by negotiations with HMO providers; and

WHEREAS, The final briefing report of that study submitted to the County Council/Personnel Committee on November 23, 1987, indicated that no significant savings were to be achieved; and

WHEREAS, The current analysis of MCPS projected cost for its Employee Benefit Plan program indicates a need for an additional \$1.7 million to provide sufficient funds to meet projected expenses during FY 1988; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education hereby request an FY 1988 supplemental appropriation of \$1.7 million in Category 10, Fixed Charges, from the County Council to provide sufficient funds to meet projected Employee Benefit Plan expenses; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the county executive recommend approval of this resolution to the County Council and that a copy be send to the county executive and the members of the County Council.

RESOLUTION NO. 604-87 Re: FY 1988 SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION FOR
THE CONSTRUCT VALIDATION OF THE
CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTS

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

RESOLVED, That the superintendent of schools be authorized, subject to County Council approval, to receive and expend an FY 1988 supplemental appropriation of \$78,221 from the United State Department of Education under the General Education Provisions Act (Field-initiated Studies) for the construct validation of the criterion-referenced tests in reading and mathematics in the

following categories:

CATEGORY	AMOUNT
02 Instructional Salaries	\$62,798
03 Instructional Other	10,400
10 Fixed Charges	5,023

TOTAL	\$78,221

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 transmitted to the county executive and the County Council.

RESOLUTION NO. 605-87 Re: APPROVAL OF CHANGES IN THE FIRST AID AND CPR UNITS IN THE PROGRAM OF STUDIES FOR HEALTH EDUCATION

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

WHEREAS, The public school laws of Maryland specify that the county superintendent shall prepare courses of study and recommend them for adoption by the county Board (THE ANNOTATED CODE OF THE PUBLIC GENERAL LAWS OF MARYLAND, EDUCATION VOLUME, Sec. 4-205); and

WHEREAS, The public school laws of Maryland also state that the county Board, on the written recommendation of the county superintendent, shall establish courses of study for the schools under its jurisdiction (IBID., Sec. 4-110); and

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

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

WHEREAS, Recent changes in program standards and instructor certification requirements by the American Heart Association and the American Red Cross affect curricula for First Aid and CPR; and

WHEREAS, The Council on Instruction, charged by the superintendent with considering recommendations for curriculum change, has recommended approval of changes in the PROGRAM OF STUDIES for Health Education Grades K-12, to continue with a modified Grade 7 First Aid Unit in physical education and move the CPR Unit from Grade 9 physical education to Grade 10 driver education; and

WHEREAS, The superintendent recommends that the Board approve these

changes; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education approve the revisions for First Aid and CPR Units presented to the Board of Education on November 10, 1987, for inclusion in the PROGRAM OF STUDIES for Health Education, Grades K-12, effective September 1, 1988.

RESOLUTION NO. 606-87 Re: MONTHLY PERSONNEL REPORT

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

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

RESOLUTION NO. 607-87 Re: DEATH OF MR. CLARK E. DAYHOFF, TECHNICAL ANALYST IN THE DIVISION OF SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT

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

WHEREAS, The death on November 10, 1987, of Mr. Clark E. Dayhoff, technical analyst in the Division of Systems Development, has deeply saddened the staff and members of the Board of Education; and

WHEREAS, In the more than twenty-six years that Mr. Dayhoff had been a member of the staff of Montgomery County Public Schools, his leadership abilities, supervisory qualities, and his valuable contributions to the various projects he participated in and supervised were widely recognized; and

WHEREAS, Mr. Dayhoff was an outstanding staff member, giving of himself in time, energy, and services to provide the necessary leadership to accomplish whatever task he was assigned to; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the members of the Board of Education express their sorrow at the death of Mr. Clark E. Dayhoff and extend deepest sympathy to his family; and be it further

RESOLVED, That this resolution be made part of the minutes of this meeting and a copy be forwarded to Mr. Dayhoff's family.

RESOLUTION NO. 608-87 Re: DEATH OF MR. VERNER D. JEFFERS, CLASSROOM TEACHER AT MILL CREEK TOWNE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Mr. Goldensohn seconded by Mr. Ewing, the following resolution was

adopted unanimously:

WHEREAS, The death on December 1, 1987, of Mr. Verner D. Jeffers, a classroom teacher at Mill Creek Towne Elementary School, has deeply saddened the staff and members of the Board of Education; and

WHEREAS, In the twenty-two years that Mr. Jeffers had been a member of the staff of Montgomery County Public Schools, he provided a rewarding learning experience for his students; and

WHEREAS, Mr. Jeffers was respected by the staff, student body, and community as a challenging teacher and true professional; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the members of the Board of Education express their sorrow at the death of Mr. Verner D. Jeffers and extend deepest sympathy to his family; and be it further

RESOLVED, That this resolution be made part of the minutes of this meeting and a copy be forwarded to Mr. Jeffers' family.

RESOLUTION NO. 609-87 Re: DEATH OF MR. DANA A. LABOSSIÈRE,
 CLASSROOM TEACHER AT JACKSON ROAD
 ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

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

WHEREAS, The death on November 22, 1987, of Mr. Dana A. LaBossiere, a classroom teacher at Jackson Road Elementary School, has deeply saddened the staff and members of the Board of Education; and

WHEREAS, Mr. LaBossiere was a highly effective teacher with Montgomery County Public Schools for over sixteen years; and

WHEREAS, Mr. LaBossiere's understanding and humorous manner with students earned him a great deal of respect from parents, staff, and students; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the members of the Board of Education express their sorrow at the death of Mr. Dana A. LaBossiere and extend deepest sympathy to his family; and be it further

RESOLVED, That this resolution be made part of the minutes of this meeting and a copy be forwarded to Mr. LaBossiere's family.

RESOLUTION NO. 610-87 Re: DEATH OF MRS. NELLIE B. ROBINSON,
 SPECIAL EDUCATION TEACHER AT BROAD
 ACRES ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

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

WHEREAS, The death on November 18, 1987, of Mrs. Nellie B. Robinson, special education teacher at Broad Acres Elementary School, has deeply saddened the staff and members of the Board of Education; and

WHEREAS, In the twenty-three years Mrs. Robinson taught in Montgomery County Public Schools, she was a dedicated professional who took personal pride and pleasure in the successes of her students; and

WHEREAS, Mrs. Robinson provided opportunities for her students to display their skills so they could get positive reinforcement from others; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the members of the Board of Education express their sorrow at the death of Mrs. Nellie B. Robinson and extend deepest sympathy to her family; and be it further

RESOLVED, That this resolution be made part of the minutes of this meeting and a copy be forwarded to Mrs. Robinson's family.

RESOLUTION NO. 611-87 Re: PERSONNEL REASSIGNMENT

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

RESOLVED, That the following personnel reassignment be approved:

NAME	FROM	TO
Arthur Hugglestone	Classroom Teacher Gaithersburg HS M+30-18	Assignment to be determined To retire 3-1-89 Will maintain salary status

RESOLUTION NO. 612-87 Re: PERSONNEL APPOINTMENT

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

RESOLVED, That the following personnel appointment be approved:

APPOINTMENT	PRESENT POSITION	AS
Margaret Rifkind	Per Diem Psychologist MCPS	School Psychologist Area 3 Admin. Office Effective: 12-9-87

Re: RESPONSE TO THE ANNUAL REPORT OF THE
MEDICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Dr. Pitt explained that there were three requests in the report of

the Medical Advisory Committee. These had to do with Down Syndrome, mental health referrals, and participation in interscholastic athletics.

Dr. Pitt reported that the other issue was his recommendation that the use of tobacco by students be banned on the Montgomery County public school property beginning this next school year. He was recommending that students not be permitted to use tobacco; however, he realized the problems the high schools would face in implementing a student smoking ban. The current policy on smoking gave schools the authority to determine whether they would be a smoking or nonsmoking school. To date, Whitman and Seneca Valley had implemented local school smoking bans.

Dr. Pitt indicated that he had met with the senior high school principals and discussed the proposed ban and implementation issues. He recognized that a ban on student use of tobacco would require that principals and other school staff take additional steps to ensure enforcement. Principals were concerned that a ban could lead to additional disciplinary incidents and suspensions. He recognized that these were legitimate concerns. He had told high school principals that he would provide support for school efforts if the Board supported the ban; however, this would be short of providing additional security staff. The support could include funds for antismoking campaigns and stipends to support smoking cessation clinics. They would also look at other ways of disciplining students rather than suspending them.

Dr. Pitt stated that the majority of the principals felt that the time had come to ban tobacco use by students. He thought it was time to end the program of having smoking areas for students. It would be his intention to ask the Board to act on this in January or February. Mr. Herscovitz stated that he was opposed to this for several reasons. He was not opposed to ever banning tobacco use on school property. He had met with students last year and this year. At an MCR meeting, students were 50/50 in their views on banning tobacco. Everyone was unanimous that the education program had to be approved in the junior high schools so that tobacco use would be prevented before it actually began. He thought that students would rather see a phase out of smoking by improving the education programs and then phasing out smoking altogether. He thought that the recommendation defeated the purpose because it did not apply to teachers and administrators. They were role models, and he did not want to see a student being given detention while the administrator was sitting in the office having a cigarette. He realized that there were contractual implications here, but he did not feel it was fair to the students to do this because students at age 16 did have the right to purchase tobacco products. He asked if students were consulted in making this recommendation. Dr. Pitt replied that they had not been. Normally he would make a recommendation, and the consultation would come after the recommendation. This was now the opportunity for anyone to comment on his recommendation.

Mr. Herscovitz thought that the recommendation would increase the number of students who skipped classes in order to have a cigarette. It would also increase the number of students who were smoking in the bathrooms, making it difficult for other students to use these facilities. By having designated smoking areas, administrators and hall monitors would know who the students who were smoking were and approach them with programs to help them quit smoking. He noted that smoking was addictive, and it would be very difficult for these students to stop smoking.

Dr. Shoenberg commented that he had been resistant to banning smoking for a couple of reasons. The first was the danger of what Mr. Herscovitz suggested actually happening. Instead of having smoking confined to an area where they could control it, it would go on in areas where they could not control it. Like the superintendent, he was unwilling to put any money at all into the enforcement of a regulation. His second reason was more of an educational one. He did not feel that better education programs were going to make a lot of difference. He did not think that teenagers smoked because they did not know any better. MCPS started teaching about the harmful effects of tobacco in the fifth grade health education program. Everyone in society knew that smoking was harmful, but the problem was convincing people, particularly teenagers, emotionally that this was in fact true. He wondered what responsibility they had to students who knew the better and chose the worst. Did the system stand in loco parentis in this respect since a number of students had parental permission to smoke. He did not have an awful lot of faith in effecting any changes through better education programs. He thought their education programs were very good, and he did not know what more they could do.

As far as enforcement was concerned, Dr. Shoenberg said that if students did not want other students to smoke they had the obligation to do what other people did in other kinds of public situations. This was to ask people to stop smoking. The students themselves were not without obligation if they really did not want people to smoke. He did not know if this would work until they tried it. It would be his tendency to support the superintendent and principals if they were willing to try this. As far as also banning smoking for teachers and administrators in schools, he thought there was a distinction. Their right to put restrictions on the lives of those people was to some degree different. Teachers and administrators could deal with this situation in their schools if they did not want others to smoke. In some schools this had been dealt with fairly successfully.

Mr. Ewing remarked that in the past he had concluded that the practical problems of banning smoking were such that they would probably have more difficulty if they tried it than if they didn't. However, as the evidence accumulated about the damage to others as well as smokers, he had become convinced that actions that public bodies took to protect the public in public buildings made sense. He had concluded they probably ought to attempt to do what they could to deal with the problem in the public schools. This wasn't to say that

he did not have concerns about how they were going to manage this. In fact, he was concerned about supporting an action before he knew how it was going to be implemented. Therefore, he would hope they would have a recommendation as to how it was going to be implemented, with what kinds of resources, and with what methods before he would vote for it. He felt that unless they had a good plan of action in place they were going to find they had legislated and nothing had happened.

Mr. Ewing commented that the distinction that Dr. Shoenberg made between teachers/administrators and students was an important one. However, he was not sure he was completely convinced by it. He liked the point raised by Mr. Herscowitz about an administrator with cigarette in hand issuing orders for detention to a student caught smoking. This raised an important question, and he believed it should be addressed more fully than it had been. Two years ago he had been prepared to support a ban on smoking if they had done it for everyone. He did not know that they should do that, but he was not convinced that they shouldn't. He thought this created a great deal of resentment. He thought that the issue was a serious one that needed to be dealt with seriously in the proposal.

Mr. Ewing hoped that Dr. Pitt would present the Board with a much more definitive proposal before they were asked to act. He hoped they would consult with their attorneys about any issues relating to contracts with employee organizations, and they would solicit the views of secondary school principals, employee organizations, MCCPTA, and others.

Mrs. DiFonzo stated that much of what Mr. Ewing said was exactly where she was coming from; however, she would be interested in knowing what the sanctions were for students who violated the policy. Dr. Pitt replied that they were going to have a problem because he was not prepared to do that. He had talked with principals and had come to the Board with a recommendation. He had told the principals that if the Board approved the recommendation, they would sit down and work through a number of possible proposals. He expected the principals would work them, but they would not have a full-fledged proposal in one month. He believed that whatever they recommended here would not be a total solution to the problem. They would still have students smoking, and they would still have a problem.

Mr. Goldensohn said that the issue had been around for a while in society and now at long last in the Montgomery County Public Schools. He remarked that the time was here, and the action was overdue. He fully expected to have a smoking ban in effect on July 1 to be implemented at the beginning of September. The details of punishment and enforcement would have to be worked out, but he was not worried about those details now. He did not think there was a problem in restricting adult smoking to a designated area so that the principal could not smoke when a child was present. Dr. Pitt explained that was the case now. Mr. Herscowitz explained that he was referring to an administrator in his office, signing off on a student's detention,

not with the student present. Mr. Goldensohn thought there could be no smoking in the offices because smoking was banned in many offices in government and in private industry.

Mr. Herscowitz cited another example of a high school coach who chewed tobacco. Students thought it was ok to chew tobacco because the coach did it, and he wondered what atmosphere they were setting up when they said it was ok for coaches to set examples for their players by allowing them to chew tobacco. Mr. Herscowitz explained that he was not opposed to banning tobacco use on school grounds, but he was hoping for a phase out. He would be meeting with staff next week about the possibility of developing a J/I/M school peer counseling program where high school students would talk about not smoking.

Mr. Goldensohn commented that when the current high school students were in elementary school, the world was not as attuned to the idea of banning smoking. He believed that junior high school students who had participated in the fifth grade health unit did not smoke. Mr. Herscowitz disagreed and point out that he had gone through the same fifth grade program, but when he and his friends got to junior high school there was a tendency to rebel. Students began smoking because they were taught not to smoke.

Dr. Pitt commented that he understood the concerns raised by Mr. Herscowitz; however, phasing would take five or six more years, and they would never get there. He said they were coming up with a plan for implementation in September and, while they would have problems, it was time they took a stand on this. He did believe that some young people did learn to smoke in smoking areas, and this was a problem that really bothered him.

RESOLUTION NO. 613-87 Re: EXECUTIVE SESSION - JANUARY 12, 1988

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

WHEREAS, The Board of Education of Montgomery County is authorized by Section 10-508, State Government Article of the ANNOTATED CODE OF MARYLAND to conduct certain of its meetings in executive closed session; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education of Montgomery County hereby conduct its meeting in executive closed session beginning on January 12, 1988, 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 that prevents public disclosures about a particular proceeding or matter as permitted under the State Government Article, Section 10-508; 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. 614-87 Re: APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON COUNSELING AND GUIDANCE

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Mr. Goldensohn seconded by Mr. Ewing, 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 for a term to expire in June, 1990:

TEACHERS

Paula Stant Marple
Edith J. Gregg
Carole S. Lowe

PARENTS

Susan W. Nichols
Gayle Diane Kessler
A. Diane Graham (reappointment)
Ed Schultze (reappointment)
Bonnie D. Ulmer

COUNSELORS

Tom Ladbush
Bernice Slaughter
Culleen Tobin
James Gorman (reappointment)
Joe Monte (reappointment)

ADMINISTRATORS

Judith Docca
Madeleine Coleman
Dee Jolles
Diana Phelps

RESOLUTION NO. 615-87 Re: APPOINTMENTS TO THE TITLE IX ADVISORY COMMITTEE

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

WHEREAS, The Board of Education determined on July 19, 1977, that a Title IX Advisory Committee should be established; and

WHEREAS, The committee has been composed of 16 members, namely,

- 3 Montgomery County Public Schools staff members recommended by the superintendent in consultation with employee organizations and the principals' associations

- 3 Student members recommended by the superintendent in consultation with the Montgomery County Region of the Maryland Association of Student Councils and the Montgomery County Junior Council
- 8 Community members appointed by the Board of Education
- 1 Member either from the MCPS staff or the community (at the Board of Education's discretion)
- 1 Ex officio member from the Department of Human Relations; and

WHEREAS, Currently there are five vacancies on the committee, namely,

- 1 Staff Member
- 3 Community Members
- 1 Member MCPS staff or community

now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education appoint the following persons, effective immediately, to serve on the Title IX Advisory Committee for a two-year term ending December 31, 1989:

COMMUNITY

Lawrence Caruso (reappointment)
Myrna Goldenberg (reappointment)
Hallie S. Lovett

COMMUNITY/STAFF

Antoinette Negro (reappointment)

RESOLUTION NO. 616a-87 Re: APPOINTMENTS TO THE AUDIT COMMITTEE

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

WHEREAS, On September 13, 1978, the Board of Education passed a resolution creating an Audit Committee, which was given responsibility for reviewing internal audit reports, meeting with the external auditors to discuss the scope of their work and their audit findings, and reviewing reports generated by the Department of Financial Services; and

WHEREAS, Regular meetings of the Audit Committee are held quarterly, and special meetings may be called by the chairperson or at the request of either of the other members to the chairperson; and

WHEREAS, The Audit Committee consists of three members, appointed by the president of the Board of Education, serving staggered terms of three years each, and the term of office begins on the date of the first all-day Board meeting in December of the year of appointment and ends three years later on November 30; and

WHEREAS, Eligibility for appointment to the Audit Committee is limited to members of the Board of Education whose remaining terms of office with the Board are equal to or greater than the terms for

which they are appointed to the Audit Committee; and

WHEREAS, One vacancy now exists on the Audit Committee; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That Mrs. Sharon DiFonzo continue her appointment until her term expires on November 30, 1988; and be it further

RESOLVED, That Mr. Bruce A. Goldensohn continue his appointment until his term expires on November 30, 1989; and be it further

RESOLVED, That Dr. Robert Shoenberg be appointed to serve until November 30, 1990; and be it further

RESOLVED, That Mr. Goldensohn serve as chairperson of the Audit Committee until November 30, 1988.

RESOLUTION NO. 616b-87 Re: APPOINTMENTS TO THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON RESEARCH AND EVALUATION

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Mr. Herscovitz seconded by Mr. Goldensohn, the following resolution was adopted unanimously:

WHEREAS, On January 14, 1986, the Board of Education established a Subcommittee on Research and Evaluation; and

WHEREAS, On September 22, 1986, the Board of Education adopted the following guidelines charging the Subcommittee on Research and Evaluation to:

Develop a recommended agenda of research and evaluation studies based on the superintendent's recommendations that relate to policy issues for consideration by the Board of Education.
Review major proposals to ensure that questions appropriate to policy development or implementation are included in the study.
Review and react to draft reports of major studies in terms of whether they are responsive to policy-relevant issues prior to publication of such reports, with a two-week prior distribution going to committee members and with copies being sent to the Board.
Make other recommendations to the Board of Education and the superintendent about policy and problem issues to be addressed through research and evaluation;

and

WHEREAS, The Subcommittee on Research and Evaluation consists of three members appointed by the president of the Board of Education, serving staggered terms of three years each, and the term of office begins on the date of the first all-day Board meeting in December of the year of appointment and ends three years later on November 30; and

WHEREAS, Eligibility for appointment to the Subcommittee on Research and Evaluation is limited to members of the Board of Education whose remaining terms of office with the Board are equal to or greater than the terms for which they are appointed to the Subcommittee on Research and Evaluation; and

WHEREAS, One vacancy now exists on the Subcommittee on Research and Evaluation; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That Mr. Blair Ewing continue his appointment until his term expires on November 30, 1988; and be it further

RESOLVED, That Dr. James Cronin continue his appointment until his term expires on November 30, 1989; and be it further

RESOLVED, That Marilyn Praisner be appointed to serve until November 30, 1990; and be it further

RESOLVED, That Dr. Cronin serve as chairperson of the Subcommittee on Research and Evaluation until November 30, 1988.

RESOLUTION NO. 617-87 Re: BOE APPEALS Nos. 1987-23, -24, AND -28

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

RESOLVED, Based on the request of the appellants, Appeals Nos. 1987-23, -24, and -28 are dismissed.

Re: ROLE OF THE SCHOOL PRINCIPAL -
RECRUITMENT, SELECTION, PROFESSIONAL
DEVELOPMENT, EVALUATION AND
OPERATIONAL CONSTRAINTS

Dr. Pitt reported that in November the Board had asked that the discussion on the role of the principal continue. He would assume the discussion would start where it left off with the subsection entitled, "Training." He commented that they had a substantial training program now. They did have different training programs for elementary and secondary principals, and the recommendation was that the programs be extended in time and scope.

Mrs. DiFonzo said she would be interested in staff views about returning to the two-year training model rather than the one-year training they had now. She wondered what the financial implications of that would be. Dr. Pitt did not think they had ever had a two-year plan. They had had a six-month plan which they had expanded to one year, and the new recommendation was that it be two years. He recalled that in previous years they did have a training program using assistant principal slots which was probably what Mrs. DiFonzo meant.

Dr. Pitt reported that at the elementary level they were going to have a problem because they were going to need more people than they

could find in a few years. They did have to recruit harder and encourage people more. At the secondary level, there were fewer people appointed to the principalship, but again they would need more people. Now at the elementary level, they selected people to be trainees. A principal was selected to train with these people for a year. At the end of the time, the principal was pulled out of the school and the trainee ran the school by himself or herself. Staff reviewed this group to determine whether they were principal caliber. If they were, they were put on the list from which principal selections were made.

Mr. Ewing said he read the section of the memo dealing with training as if everyone was in hand. He wondered whether this was true. Dr. Kay Holliday replied that at the elementary level they were talking about a person who trained with another principal for period of one year. The person was pulled out frequently for a staff development program and then served for a month or two as an acting principal. In the next year, that person was selected to run a school. That person had never opened or closed a school. She felt they were asking too much of that person, and she noted that today they were getting people right out of the classroom who had few other experiences. At one time, people had assistant principal or supervisory experiences. For this reason the suggestion had been made for a second year of training to give the person more experiences, especially in opening and closing a school.

Ms. Terrill Meyer reported that at the secondary level the committee was suggesting add-on positions so secondary trainees might have the luxury of working in other areas such as the central office as a rounding out experience. Dr. Pitt said that these people were put in slots held for assistant principals; therefore, they were acting in that role. However, if that person were pulled out for training, the school would be short-handed. At this point, the elementary trainee was an additional person in the school. The problem was one of cost. Dr. William Wilhoyte added that at the secondary level that role could be distinctively different from one school to another. Therefore, trainees might get a very limited perspective. Dr. Pitt said that while they did try to place people at the secondary level and move them around for a varied experience, it was really a matter of chance depending on the vacancies.

Dr. Dianne Mero said they sort of danced around the issue of the distance between the first year of the internship as a quasi-assistant principal and the years before that person would be appointed as a principal which might be as few as three and as many as ten or fifteen. They did very little training specifically for the principalship, although they had a number of excellent A&S staff development programs, but they were not specifically to train people to be principals.

Mr. Ewing pointed out that they talked about training, education, and developmental experiences as if they were interchangeable. In his mind, they were three distinct things. They should be clear that their strategy included elements of all three, and they should identify which elements were doing what for preparing people for

these roles. For example, working in a central office position was a developmental experience. They had to say how much of what seemed to make reasonable sense in training to be a principal.

Dr. Pitt thought that the elementary internship focused on the selection process. The trainee was put in a school with a principal who also was involved in the training process. The question was whether the program was long enough. He agreed that at the secondary level they were not focused the way they should be. However, they did have the principal and a central office person involved.

Mrs. Karolyn Rohr, staff training coordinator, commented that after people were interns they got very specific experiences. Dr. Wilhoite added that the committee tried to deal with this by recommending an add-on year at the secondary level to make it much more specific.

Mrs. Rohr said they would have an assessment at the end of that time as to whether that person could make a transition to the role of principal.

Dr. Shoenberg said he had a kind of overall response to the various reports that could be made in relation to almost any section. It seemed to him that if you were given a task to do you had a tendency to include in the recommendations all the good things you could possibly think of. Indeed, they could do all those good things as far as additional training and experience were concerned. He doubted that they made a set of recommendations they felt went beyond the point of diminishing returns. He wondered if they weren't starting to get into that area with the second year of experience. For example, they wanted to add a year onto teacher certification. He asked if some of that didn't begin to infect some of their recommendations. These would all be good things for a principal to know about, but he wondered if they could deal with them in a way that was that much more effective by adding a year of experience that would achieve enough beyond what they now did to make that effort worth while.

*Mr. Ewing left the meeting at this point.

Dr. Pitt explained that they would have to carry the salary for one year. Dr. Halliday added that it depended on how well they wanted the school run. If they were putting someone in there with very limited experiences and asked them to take a school with 500 or 600 students, she thought that the second year would help. Dr. Shoenberg commented that there were probably some people they could pluck out of a classroom and put into a principalship where they would function very well. Dr. Halliday agreed but felt these people were few and far between. Dr. Shoenberg remarked that another year's experience always did some good, and it was tough to make a judgment as to how many people would be sufficiently identified by the additional year who would make the investment worthwhile. He did not think 100 percent of the people would benefit from another year. He wondered whether 20 or 30 or 50 percent would benefit.

Mrs. DiFonzo asked about the nature of the difference between a principal trainee and an assistant principal. What would happen that

would make the investment of an additional year that much more valuable? Dr. Halliday explained that at the elementary level, people went from an internship to a principalship. If the person went to an assistant principalship and it were a well-rounded experience, it would serve the same purpose. Dr. Pitt explained at the elementary level the assistant principalship was no longer the basic training ground for selection. He said that part of the confusion was that they were talking about two groups, elementary and secondary. At the elementary level, they selected people and put them in a training program for one year. The recommendation is to keep them in that training program for two years. They would not be assistant principals; they would be trainees.

Dr. Wilhoite added that the recommendation was, wherever possible, that the second year would be in an assistant principal role. There would not be an additional cost factor. Dr. Pitt pointed out that they had to have a vacancy to do this. At present they had nine trainees, and if they added another year it would be \$400,000 to \$500,000 a year. Dr. Pitt hoped that by the end of the summer they would have some suggestions on what might be done to enhance the principalship. He would like to see them come up with some kind of intermediate approach which would save the \$500,000 but provide more support. For example, this year all new principals were meeting on a regular basis with Alan Dodd and other mentors. He had been thinking of a more structured mentor approach, but that had problems because of the time involved. The people out there now were doing very well, but each year the group had a little less experience. He would like to provide more support for this group, but he could not recommend anything that would increase costs.

Dr. Wilhoite reported that the committee had taken the position that the assistant principal role at the elementary level would not be a career position any longer. This opened it up for people in training. However, the same schools would have a turnover in personnel every year.

Mr. Goldensohn asked what the criteria were for a school to have an assistant principal, and Dr. Pitt replied it would be 600 or more students. Mr. Goldensohn noted that many of the new schools started up with an assistant principal position. Dr. Pitt reported that if the trainees were not selected the first year, they were being put in assistant principalships. He said that he would like to see this put in place with the new people in positions with some flexibility so that it could be used as a training ground rather than a career position.

Dr. Shoenberg observed that no principal was perfect, and everyone had strengths and weaknesses. However, people did continue to work on their areas of weakness, but everyone had their own style. One of the problems with that in an elementary school was that the elementary principal was the only administrator in the school. Whatever strengths or weaknesses could not be made up for or supplied by a second person in the school. This seemed to be one argument for a uniform system of assistant principals because there were not many

small schools left. In a high school, they did have assistant principals who could be chosen in such a way as to complement the strengths and weaknesses of the principal. He wondered how often they did this. Dr. Mero replied that this was rarely done because the low turnover rate in the secondary positions impinged on their flexibility to do this. However, in the case of an administrative intern, they did get closer to doing this. The principal and the area associate superintendent could try to get a good match when assigning an intern.

Dr. Pitt reported that during the period of declining enrollment at the secondary level, there was very little opportunity for choice. This was starting to change a little bit, and he agreed that they did need to have a process for picking these people.

Dr. Shoenberg remarked that they were advocating evaluation in terms of six functional areas of the principal's role as opposed to ten broad performance criteria. He asked whether they thought this would make a difference in the quality of the evaluation, the fairness of the evaluation, and the thoroughness of the evaluation in purely operational terms. Dr. Patricia Newby, supervisor of elementary instruction, replied that in looking at the proficiency of the principal, they attempted to identify the skills and the knowledge and use it for selection and evaluation. They felt if people demonstrated these skills, they would be better principals. As they reviewed the present ten items, they noticed that the elementary principal's role in working with students was not mentioned at all. Therefore, they felt they had to relook at these. They did not feel the broad categories covered everything a principal should be able to do. They felt there should be some consistency between elementary and secondary principals, and that these skills were needed by all.

*Mrs. Praisner rejoined the meeting at this time.

Dr. Newby reported that their new proposal was consistent with national data. Dr. Wilhoyte added that this was internally consistent with what they wanted to do through the entire process. When they looked at all the pieces driving the evaluation system, there were inconsistencies. Therefore, they tried to clarify the entire process rather than a single piece. Dr. Shoenberg asked if it seemed to them that the current system resulted in their making less good choices in evaluations than another one would. Dr. Holliday replied that she would characterize the present system as "less helpful" in terms of professional development. Dr. Newby added that a potential administrator could not look at the list and determine the skills needed to become an administrator.

Mrs. DiFonzo stated that she had served on the task force on area reorganization when the Board went from five to three administrative areas. In the task force, she had voted against going to three areas because she was concerned about the span of control. This continued to be her concern, particularly in the up-county area where they were adding schools. She believed that if an evaluator was going to do an effective job, the evaluator had to make frequent observations of

that evaluatee. She asked if they had recommendations as to how they would redefine the evaluator and who that person might be if it were not to be the area associate superintendent. Dr. Mero replied that the secondary principals had gone on record saying they would not want anyone except the area associate doing the evaluations. Dr. Holliday added that the elementary principals had said the same thing. It seemed to Mrs. DiFonzo that one option was to create more area superintendents. Dr. Mero remarked that another way was to reduce the span of control by looking at what area associates were being asked to do at the central level.

Dr. Pitt stated that they had an executive staff made up of only eight people. The question was when did a person take orders or when did a person get involved in decision-making. They did try to involve people, including principals. A long time ago they had assistant superintendents who reported to the associate superintendent for administration, and these people were working out in the field. Now in MCPS, the six associate superintendents were considered equal in importance. In a sense they ran the school system, and if these people were removed from this role, their input would be reduced.

Mrs. DiFonzo asked about next steps. Dr. Shoenberg pointed out that they had not discussed the role of the high school assistant principal. Mrs. DiFonzo said that she would like to come back to this topic because she had a lot of questions. Mrs. Praisner suggested they come back to that issue and spend some time on it. She said they might want to tie in what they were doing at the elementary school level with the trainee. She said that she appreciated the memo on the demographic profile; however, it dealt with numbers and not the quality of the individuals they wanted. She asked where they were with their review of the assessment center model. Dr. Pitt replied that they had been discussing this for months and months. He thought he should get together with some principals and look at the recommendations that had been made. He said he could sit down with the recommendations and come up with some ideas they might put into effect. He hoped that by the following budget season, he would have some recommendations. In the meantime, he would give the Board some interim feedback in spring or summer.

Mrs. Praisner commented that she was interested in seeing some recommendations that they could talk about. Dr. Shoenberg explained that he had asked a lot of questions because the process of redoing systems was very time consuming. He would hate to see them spend a lot of time on redoing systems that would make a marginal difference. He would like them to look at this recommendation from the point of view of which things would make a difference. For example, he suggested looking at where the shoe really pinched even if it were not a systematic look at the whole problem. Dr. Pitt thought they could focus in on what they were doing and improve it rather than taking apart something that was working. However, one place where they should look at the system was in the area of evaluations. Mrs. DiFonzo thanked the committee for its work and participation.

Re: BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS

1. Mr. Herscovitz stated that when they approved the CIP, it was established that next year there would be four junior high schools. He wondered about options for athletics for students who were in ninth grade. He explained that he had already requested that information from staff. He also asked that emphasis be given to sex equity and options sought for teams for girls. Dr. Pitt replied that he was concerned about this, too, but he thought it would be a problem.
2. Mr. Herscovitz reported that the school profiles sent to colleges contained a list of AP and honors courses offered by the county, but not the offerings of the individual school. This made admissions offices believe that these courses were being offered and students were not taking advantage of them. He asked why they were using the county list, and Dr. Pitt indicated that he would reply in writing.
3. Dr. Shoenberg reported that Board members would be receiving a letter from parents at Bel Pre and Kemp Mill Elementary Schools with regard to the conversion of Lee to a middle school. They were asking that this conversion be delayed. One question raised was the instruction given to the parent members of the committee regarding consulting with their own schools. For example, were these people asked to vote without consultation or were they asked to go back to their own PTA. The letter suggested not converting Lee, delaying it until an addition is built on Lee, or delaying the K-5 transition for these particular schools. It seemed to him that not doing it or delaying it had been precluded by the Board's actions; however, he did not know about delaying it for those two particular schools. He asked for Dr. Pitt's reaction to this proposal. Dr. Pitt explained that the superintendent could not do this without Board action, but he would try to get an answer to the question about the study committee.
4. In regard to the issue above, Mr. Goldensohn stated that the community had used the 1986 numbers. It might take a few minutes of staff time to compare these to 1987 figures which might throw out much of their argument. He wondered how information got passed down to segments of the community, and he noted that the same situation arose in the East Deer Park community when school representatives knew what was going on, but the community did not. Dr. Pitt replied that they had tried every way they could to communicate, and he thought the staff had done a better job of communicating than ever before. He thought they would set a bad precedent if they said they would reconsider this. Mr. Goldensohn thought that if something came up where it looked as if the Board were wrong, he would like to take a good look at that. He agreed that they should be careful about doing this, however.
5. Mrs. Praisner asked about the status of the review of the kindergarten bus in the Burtonsville area. Staff had agreed to look into this at the last Board meeting.
6. Mrs. Praisner stated that it was her pleasure to represent the Board last week at the Washington POST ceremony honoring principals from the metropolitan area school districts. She congratulated Dr. Frank Masci, principal of Gaithersburg High School, on his selection. Dr. Masci also delivered remarks on behalf of all the principals

being honored.

Re: ITEMS OF INFORMATION

Board members received the following items of information:

1. Items in Process
2. Construction Progress Report
3. Recommendation to Approve Revisions to and Granting Fine Arts Credit for Commercial Art I and 2
4. Annual Report - Administration
5. Annual Report - Curriculum and Instruction
6. Annual Report - Special Education
7. Annual Report - Supportive Services
8. Recommended Approval of a Reallocation of Credits in the Classroom and Internship Components of the High School Fire Cadet Program
9. Recommended Approval of a Program Title Change from Health Occupations to Medical Careers Program
10. Description of the Mobile Education Team (METS) Program

Re: ADJOURNMENT

The president adjourned the meeting at 4:45 p.m.

PRESIDENT

SECRETARY

HP:mlw