

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education join with the superintendent and county executive in proclaiming the week of April 25, 1988, as Student Leadership Week in Montgomery County; and be it further

RESOLVED, That our student leaders be commended for their efforts and achievements on behalf of Montgomery County Public Schools; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the superintendent inform school system employees and student government organizations of this action and encourage appropriate recognition activities.

RESOLUTION NO. 204-88 Re: ASIAN PACIFIC HERITAGE WEEK, MAY 1-7,
1988

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

WHEREAS, May 1-7, 1988, will be proclaimed "Asian Pacific Heritage Week" by President Ronald Reagan and by a joint resolution of Congress; and

WHEREAS, The purpose of this week is to recognize Americans of Asian and Pacific descent and their continued and invaluable contributions to this nation; and

WHEREAS, The heritage of Asian and Pacific Americans enhances the diversity and richness of the student body and staff of the Montgomery County Public Schools; and

WHEREAS, Asian and Pacific American students and staff contribute to the success of the Montgomery County Public Schools through their participation in all aspects of education; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That on behalf of the superintendent and staff of the Montgomery County Public Schools, the Board of Education hereby declares the week of May 1-7, 1988, to be observed in MCPS as "Asian Pacific American Heritage Week."

Re: BOARD/PRESS/VISITOR CONFERENCE

The following individuals appeared before the Board of Education:

1. John Mason, Pines Community Association
2. Arthur Levine

RESOLUTION NO. 205-88 Re: SUBMISSION OF AN FY 1989 GRANT PROPOSAL
TO RECEIVE ENTITLEMENT FUNDS FOR
SUBSTANCE ABUSE PREVENTION EFFORTS

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

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

RESOLVED, That the superintendent of schools be authorized to submit an FY 1989 grant proposal for \$227,867 to MSDE for a substance abuse prevention education project; and be it further

RESOLVED, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the county executive and the County Council.

RESOLUTION NO. 206-88 Re: SUBMISSION OF AN FY 1989 GRANT PROPOSAL
FOR A DRUG AND ALCOHOL PREVENTION
WORKSHOP FOR SPECIAL AND ALTERNATIVE
SCHOOLS

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

RESOLVED, That the superintendent of schools be authorized to submit an FY 1989 grant proposal for \$20,204 to the Northeast Regional Center for Drug-Free Schools and Communities under the USDE Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act, to conduct a school team workshop for the prevention of alcohol and other drug abuse; and be it further

RESOLVED, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the county executive and the County Council.

RESOLUTION NO. 207-88 Re: PROCUREMENT CONTRACTS OVER \$25,000

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

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

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

BID	AWARDEE	
Resolution	Twelve-Place Driver Education Simulation System, Model L-225	
	Doron Precision Systems, Inc.	\$ 71,521
53-88	Truck Chassis and Compactor District International Trucks, Inc.	\$ 46,193
85-88	Physical Education Equipment Aluminum Athletic Equipment Company	\$ 3,370

American Institutional Sales Corporation	451
BSN Corporation	2,043
Dikan Athletic Equipment Corporation	900
DVF Sporting Goods Company	21,771
Fisher Athletic Equipment, Inc.	627
Fitness Industries	41,721
Bill Fritz Sports	2,067
Forever Sports	4,283*
Gerstung/Gym-Thing, Inc.	19,976
Marty Gilman, Inc.	990*
Lafayette Instrument Company	140
Marlow Sports, Inc.	1,141
McKillen Sports	199
Sportmaster	990
Springriver Corporation	640
John W. Taylor Assoc.	2,850
TOTAL	\$104,159

109-88	Air Conditioners and Compressors	
	Melchior/Armstrong/Dessau	\$ 2,927
	R. E. Michel Company, Inc.	7,109
	Parco, Inc.	17,203
	H. M. Sweeny Company	2,070
	TOTAL	\$ 29,309
	TOTAL OVER \$25,000	\$251,182

*Asterisk denotes MFD vendors

RESOLUTION No. 208-88 Re: BANNOCKBURN ELEMENTARY SCHOOL (AREA 2)
REDUCTION OF RETAINAGE

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

WHEREAS, The Gassman Corp., general contractor for Bannockburn Elementary School, has completed 97 percent of all specified requirements as of March 31, 1988, and has requested that the 10 percent retainage, which is based on the completed work to date, be reduced to 2 percent; and

WHEREAS, The project bonding company, Seaboard Surety Company, by letter dated March 28, 1988, consented to this reduction; and

WHEREAS, The project architect, William Doggett, by letter dated April 13, 1988, recommended that this request for reduction be approved; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the contract's specified retainage withheld from periodic payments to The Gassman Corp., general contractor for the Bannockburn Elementary School, currently amounting to 10 percent of the company's request for payment to date, now be reduced to 2 percent, with the remaining 2 percent to become due and payable after formal acceptance of the completed project and total completion of

all remaining requirements.

RESOLUTION NO. 209-88 Re: CHANGE ORDERS OVER \$25,000

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

WHEREAS, Change orders exceeding \$25,000 for various projects have been received by the Department of School Facilities; and

WHEREAS, Staff and the project architect have reviewed these change orders and found that costs are equitable; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the Board approve the following change orders for the amounts and contracts indicated:

ACTIVITY 1

Project: Goshen Elementary School
Description: Install Computerized Energy Management System
Contractor: Kimmel & Kimmel, Inc.
Amount: \$74,416

ACTIVITY 2

Project: Muddy Branch Elementary School
Description: Install Computerized Energy Management System
Contractor: The Gassman Corporation
Amount: \$67,301

ACTIVITY 3

Project: Gaithersburg Junior High School
Description: Install Computerized Energy Management System
Contractor: Kimmel & Kimmel, Inc.
Amount: \$85,180

ACTIVITY 4

Project: Moyer Road Elementary School
Description: Install Computerized Energy Management System
Contractor: Kimmel & Kimmel, Inc.
Amount: \$88,748

ACTIVITY 5

Project: Waters Landing Elementary School
Description: Install Computerized Energy Management System
Contractor: Waynesboro Construction Co., Inc.
Amount: \$74,416

RESOLUTION NO. 210-88 Re: WORKS OF ART FOR GREENCASTLE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

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

WHEREAS, Authorization for the selection of artists to receive commissions to produce works of art is delineated in Article V, Section 1, Chapter 8, "Buildings," of the MONTGOMERY COUNTY CODE; and

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

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

WHEREAS, Funds have been appropriated for this purpose in the FY 1988 Capital Improvements Program; and

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

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education enter into the following contractual agreements subject to County Council approval:

ARTIST	WORK	COMMISSION
Steven Weitzman	Spatial Treatment	\$20,000
Marcia Billig	Relief	\$10,000
C. Z. Lawrence	Stained Glass	\$ 7,000

and be it further

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

RESOLUTION NO. 211-88 Re: WORKS OF ART FOR GAITHERSBURG JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL

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

WHEREAS, Authorization for the selection of artists to receive commissions to produce works of art is delineated in Article V, Section 1, Chapter 8, "Buildings," of the MONTGOMERY COUNTY CODE; and

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

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

an easement document for the necessary right-of-way to install and maintain a gas pipeline at the future Hadley Elementary School site.

RESOLUTION NO. 213-88 Re: CHANGE ORDER FOR GREENCASTLE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

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

WHEREAS, Staff has determined that a walkway from Gateshead Manor to Greencastle Elementary School will provide safe access to the site and result in significant annual transportation savings; and

WHEREAS, Sufficient funds are available in the Greencastle Elementary School appropriation to construct this walkway; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That a change order to the contract between the Board of Education and Dustin Construction Company for \$95,572 be approved to construct a walkway on the site.

RESOLUTION NO. 214-88 Re: MONTHLY PERSONNEL REPORT

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Mrs. Praisner seconded by Dr. Cronin, 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. 215-88 Re: PERSONNEL REASSIGNMENTS

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

RESOLVED, That the following personnel reassignments be approved:

NAME	FROM	TO
Gertrude Galten	Cafeteria Mgr. II Piney Branch ES	Cafeteria Worker III Lee IS Will maintain salary status To retire 7-1-89
Laurena Lyons	Classroom Teacher DuFief ES	Instructional Asst. Assignment to be determined Will maintain salary status To retire 4-1-90

Philip Stromowsky	Principal McKenney Hills ES	Administrative Asst. Special Ed. and Related Services or other assignment to be determined Will maintain salary status To retire 7-1-90
Noel Thornburg	Supervisor Svcs. for Physically Handicapped Students	Physical-Occupational Therapist Will maintain salary status to retire 7-1-89

RESOLUTION NO. 216-88 Re: EXTENSION OF SICK LEAVE

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

WHEREAS, The employees listed below have suffered serious illness;
and

WHEREAS, Due to the prolonged illness, the employees' accumulated sick leave has expired; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education grant an extension of sick leave with three-fourths pay covering the number of days indicated:

NAME	POSITION AND LOCATION	NO. OF DAYS
Halper, Lisa	Art Teacher Diamond ES	10
Sondak, Lois	Classroom Teacher Frost IS	10

RESOLUTION NO. 217-88 Re: DEATH OF MR. CHARLES A. CARTER
BUILDING SERVICE MANAGER I AT
KENSINGTON-PARKWOOD ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

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

WHEREAS, The death on March 13, 1988, of Mr. Charles A. Carter, Building Services Manager I at Kensington-Parkwood Elementary School, has deeply saddened the staff and members of the Board of Education;
and

WHEREAS, Mr. Carter had shown diligent effort in his positions for

Area 1 Admin. Office
Effective July 1, 1988

Neil J. Shipman Principal Supervisor of Elementary
 Travilah ES Instruction
 Area 3 Admin. Office
 Effective July 1, 1988

Daniel L. Hayes System Software Group Technical Support
 Leader Supervisor
 Comsat Corporation Dept. of Management
 Clarksburg, MD Info. & Computer Svcs.
 Effective: 5-16-88

Re: PREK-GRADE 12 POLICIES

Mrs. DiFonzo reported that the Board had discussed this issue many times, and the purpose of the meeting was to give staff specific direction. Dr. Carl Smith, executive assistant, added that the Board had received two papers on what was in and what was out of the policies. In some cases there was not uniform agreement on where policy issues could be traced. Staff was going to take these documents and try to come to one position on what had been carried over into the new policies versus those things that were not.

Mr. Goldensohn called attention to the attachment showing what was not in the policies; however, sometimes the references to where they would be in a policy or regulation was not clear that it was that specific item that was carried forward somewhere else. One example was the original policy stated that there would be gifted programs in each high school district available to all qualified students at the elementary and intermediate level. The reference was to Policy IOA, but he wondered whether the specific items were in that policy. Mr. Clifford Baacke replied that this was the kind of thing that staff would be looking at as soon as the Board adopted the policies. If that specific wording wasn't already in IOA, that they would present this information to the superintendent who would share material with the Board. Mr. Goldensohn was concerned that they not lose something they wanted to keep.

Mr. Ewing hoped that staff had received copies of comments that Board members had written. He was concerned that the Board's policy on policymaking eliminated reporting on the impact of the policy itself. He suggested that the Board might want to go back and look at its policy on policymaking. He was not of the view that they should just say they would review the policy. They should be reviewing the impact of the policy on the schools. It seemed to him the Board ought to have the opportunity to review the impact at least annually. This did not mean a comprehensive review of everything that went on in every school, but the policy should be reviewed in terms of its major propositions.

Dr. Cronin asked if Mr. Ewing was suggesting the Board should receive this information at least annually. Mr. Ewing replied that he would

not want to know less than once a year about the impact that the policies were having. He was concerned about the language in the high school policy that talked about extraordinary remedies that would justify something in the way of a special program. He felt that this was unclear. He suggested, "the establishment of special programs shall not be undertaken except to meet needs to further racial integration, socioeconomic balance, and a need to meet the special needs of a particular population." He thought they should avoid "extraordinary" and "remedies" because these conveyed a negative view of special programs.

Dr. Smith explained that it was not their intent to suggest that magnet programs and other programs should not be established and did not have a positive purpose. The issue here was the reaffirmation of the place of the comprehensive high school as the unit of organization for the school system as well as the real concern about special programs taking from the populations of schools and cause an erosion of the basic comprehensive high school program.

Dr. Dianne Mero added that they did not want to guess at all of the possibilities of where these kinds of programs should be established. They could insert Mr. Ewing's list in their language. It seemed to Mr. Ewing that the point about emphasizing the comprehensive high school as the basic structure was good, but he was not sure they had stated it strongly enough. Mr. Ewing recalled that last time they had talked about being specific about what the policy included and what it didn't include and what it was intended to achieve. In regard to "extraordinary remedy," Mrs. DiFonzo thought that if it were reworded it would avoid opening a door for every community to come in with their unique situation requiring a special program.

Mrs. Praisner noted that the staff had her memo on this subject. She was concerned that there be an overall purpose statement, and she thought there were some phrases in the existing policies they might want to look at. She would echo what Mr. Goldensohn said about making sure people understand that the green sheet would rescind the other policies. She suggested they might hold them in abeyance until they had gone through the formal process of making sure they hadn't left something out. She agreed that they needed something to say that the policy was in effect and that it was working. She thought they would have to determine what they wanted a report on and then determine the timing for that reporting. Under accountability, she thought they were talking about a second phase of planning rather than an accountability measure.

In regard to the comments about why something was not in the policy, Mrs. Praisner noted that there were two references to facility issues. One she knew was not in the facilities policy. The present middle school policy called for a local school planning group, and she was not sure the facilities policy was that explicit. She also pointed out that in the middle school policy there was a reference to the optimum size of a middle school. The facilities policy spoke to

classes, grades, and utilization issues. She did not know if it said "a middle school should not be larger than...." She suggested that the Board would have to address these issues. She hoped that the Board would see a draft and give feedback before they were asked to vote on it.

In regard to feedback indicators, Mrs. Rafel asked that they be very careful about figuring out a new set of paperwork and generating more work for the schools. Mr. Ewing commented that he was not in favor of more paperwork, but he felt it was important for the Board to make a determination of what information it needed. He was not convinced that it was difficult to develop a very simple kind of set of feedback indicators on this which would require relatively little in the way of paperwork. There were major organizational and structural dimensions to the policies, and one could let the Board know from time to time the degree of success the school system was having in achieving those organizational and structural purposes. He was not suggesting that the policy lent itself easily to quantitative reporting. It was his view that the policy lent itself to judgmental statements which would be legitimate and valuable feedback for him.

Dr. Smith saw these as policies that would not sit on the shelf. They would be used in schools and communities. They viewed these as working policies used by the people organizing and operating the schools. Dr. Pitt asked the committee to think about possible feedback indicators. Mr. Ewing asked the committee to look at what kind of information and judgments would most likely be helpful to the Board in order to understand whether the policy was working well.

Re: ROLE OF THE ASSISTANT PRINCIPAL

Dr. Pitt thought they would limit the discussion to the role of the secondary assistant principal because they saw that as different from the role of the elementary assistant principal. The elementary assistant principalship was not a permanent job; it was a training position. In regard to the secondary position, they saw it both as a training role and as a career position.

Dr. Donna Stephens appreciated the opportunity to discuss the secondary assistant principalship. This topic had been discussed at state and national conferences regarding the role ambiguity, the lack of recognition, and the lack of professional growth experiences. The National Association of Secondary School Principals had proclaimed 1988 as the "Year of the Assistant Principal." She reported that Wayne Whigham would describe some of the aspects of the role of the assistant principal and Fred Lowenbach would describe some of the current efforts to modify and enhance the position in MCPS.

Dr. Stephens said that she had recently moved from the assistant principalship to the principalship. She would suggest that they look at the assistant principalship as a part of the principalship. The literature on school excellence continually spotlighted the importance of the school principals, and they did not propose to dilute the role of the principal. However, they did propose that the

role of principal in a large secondary school was too complex and too diverse for one person to accomplish single-handedly. They suggested that the principal and assistant principals be viewed as an administrative team working together to fulfill all the requirements of the principalship. Often the assistant principals worked with teachers, students, and parents to resolve problems, monitor programs and ensure that policies were carried out.

Mr. Whigham reported that many people in the general public had a narrow view of assistant principals based on their experiences as students. However, as assistant principals, they saw themselves as key managers and dedicated professionals who facilitated the daily operation of schools. He said their tasks tended to fall into (1) instructional programs, (2) staffing concerns, (3) pupil personnel, (4) daily management duties, and (5) community and parent involvement.

Mr. Whigham reported that they assisted in the implementation of the MCPS curriculum as defined by the PROGRAM OF STUDIES and often worked directly with resource and classroom teachers. They were also involved in the implementation of the Board's priorities, and they worked with the staff of feeder schools to provide for program articulation. They were involved in building the school's master schedule and in deciding which courses would be offered. Many of them had been involved in the implementation of new courses. They also had responsibilities for implementing the policy on evaluating and reporting student progress. Assistant principals played key roles in selecting and assigning professionals and supporting services staff. They were actively involved in observing and evaluating staff performance and in making suggestions for improving staff effectiveness.

Mr. Whigham said that their most important function was direct services to students. In addition to handling discipline problems, they provided counseling designed to assist students in making good choices. Many assistant principals chaired EMT's and SARD's. They conducted parent conferences and used the services of other county agencies to aid students. They established procedures for student behavior consistent with the goals of the school. Because they shared direct responsibility for implementing the student rights policy, they protected the academic and emotional rights of their students by interpreting rules and regulations and resolving conflicts.

In regard to daily management, Mr. Whigham reported that they observed and implemented state school laws as well as MCPS policies and procedures. They coordinated the school activity calendar, they scheduled assemblies, and they attended and supervised athletic events and other school-related activities. They also completed the required reports for the school and "other duties as assigned." Mr. Whigham stated that assistant principals were the day-to-day ambassadors for the schools they served. They spent many hours working with parent and community groups. They worked with community-based anti-drug and alcohol programs, mentoring programs,

and PTSA, and they represented principals as liaisons to other county agencies and volunteer organizations.

Mr. Lowenbach reported that he was at Springbrook after having served as an assistant principal at Parkland Junior High School. The roles were different, but still they were very much the same. NASSP had already dedicated one of their journal issues to the role of the assistant principal. In addition, several national meetings had been held on this topic. Two years ago Dr. Vance had established an assistant principals Area 1 committee for training and mutual support. Over the last two years, the other areas had formed operating committees. In addition, Mr. Michael Glascoe was heading up a Professional Development and Training Committee which was drawing up a set of recommendations concerning the role of the assistant principal. Staff Development was presently considering the implementation of several training modules for assistant principals. The Secondary School Administrators Association was preparing a paper on the role of the assistant principal. He hoped that all of this would result in the further enhancement of the role of the assistant principal.

Mr. Lowenbach reported that considerable time and resources were invested in interns as they began the secondary administrative experience. Assistant principals felt that this training should not be dropped at the end of the intern experience but rather carried on throughout the assistant principal's tenure in office. Training should be on-going, and there should be additional line and staff experience provided assistant principals on a rotational basis. They would also like additional experiences on various MCPS committees and task forces. He commented that whether they were called assistant principals, vice principals, or associate principals, they asked that they not be overlooked because they felt they were invaluable to the successful operation of schools.

Mrs. Praisner requested demographic information on assistant principals at the secondary level. She wanted to know how many years they had been in those positions, their ages, sex, race, and also their experience as to how long people stayed in those positions. She wanted to know how they anticipated what their needs were going to be in the future. She asked if they had an expectation for how long people remained assistant principals. She wanted to know what kind of long-range planning they did as far as anticipating their needs.

Dr. Pitt explained that this was a unique position because many of their head principals would come from this group, but on the other hand it was also a career position. Mrs. Praisner asked if the recommendations would be a core of both experiences and training that they would hope all assistant principals would be expected to have. Mr. Lowenbach was not sure that everyone would want the exact experiences or training, but they thought a number of different opportunities should be provided from which people could select. Dr. Pitt added that as interns they got a good, flexible training experience. The part that was missing was what happened after the

internship. He agreed to provide the Board with background and information.

Mrs. Praisner asked how they made sure that the strengths of the principal and those of the assistant principals complemented each other unless they mandated a core of experiences. Dr. Stephens replied that last year they had suggested listing experiences that over a period of years each assistant principal could participate in. There might be some individuals who would prefer not to take advantage of this. Mrs. Praisner commented that this was where they got into a problem. She wondered if these were experiences for a future principal or things you should experience as an assistant principal. There might be things that people would want to do to broaden their experience even though they had no desire to be a principal. She wanted to make sure they did not send the wrong message to people.

Dr. Cronin reported that the paper before the Board stated they should encourage individuals to receive school-based experiences before moving into staff positions. This was almost a requisite to go somewhere else rather than a job in itself. In another section it appeared they were downplaying the role of teachers by putting them in a track. It could be, for example, that people could enter without going through this process. They might enter from the business world. Dr. Stephens noted that this was a "typical" career path, but it was not the only way. Dr. Mero pointed out that you had to be a teacher because the state required this.

Mr. Ewing inquired about next steps. Dr. Pitt replied that they intended to focus on a more diverse training experience for the assistant principal. They needed to do further training at the intern level. The major focus had to be on the diverse training for people who did not end up in the role of head principal. He hoped to be able to report to the Board in six months or so.

Mrs. Praisner suggested that at their next meeting they spend more time on the discussion of the differences between J/I/M schools and senior high schools. She also wanted more discussion on the training and professional development activities. Mrs. DiFonzo said she would like to hear about what assistant principals learned in terms of style and approach from their principals.

Mr. Glascoe reported that the recommendations from the committee would be ready for the superintendent in June and would touch on some of those items. Mrs. DiFonzo suggested that the Board might want to schedule a discussion on the committee report. Mr. Ewing hoped that at the next session they would talk about the issue of career paths. He felt they should not lock in a rigid notion of a single career path which required everyone to march in step through a series of positions.

Mrs. DiFonzo thanked the staff for an enjoyable report and presentation.

Re: REPORT OF THE STUDY GROUP ON COMPUTER
EDUCATION

Dr. Pitt stated that he was pleased to present the report of the committee to you. They had asked a group of people to take a look at their five-year computer plan to determine how good it was, where it needed to be improved, what they could be doing better, and what they were doing well. The committee had had only a short time frame, but they had produced an excellent report. The report said that they had the right idea of using computers as tools of instruction. Secondly, MCPS needed to speed up the process somewhat and spend more money, especially in elementary schools. The third was the need to tie in the whole concept of technology. After the report, he would come back to the Board with modifications relating to the recommendations. Ms. Beverly Sangston, director of the Department of Computer-related Instruction, noted that they had nine of the ten experts here this evening representing business, government, and higher education. She introduced Ms. Beverly Hunter, study group leader.

Ms. Hunter commented that the members of the group came from very diverse backgrounds. While they did not know each other before, they came to a surprisingly rapid agreement on the recommendations in the study. They did not have a lot of time to do a systematic survey or to spend time over priorities. With those provisos, she felt the points made by the group should be useful. In general, they found the school district had done a surprisingly intelligent job of establishing the infrastructure for using computers in the schools. They felt that the schools, teachers, and children were ready to take advantage of computer technology.

Ms. Kathleen Fulton reported that she was participating in a Congressional study on technology in the schools. In looking at Montgomery County, they saw things similar to what they were finding nationwide. They saw some very positive things including word processing, scientific laboratory experiments, and complex problems with data bases. They were also very concerned that there were problems with equity, and there were unmet needs. Computers could open up opportunities for handicapped children, and they would like to see a broader opportunity for handicapped students and ESOL students. She said that some exciting things could go on in social studies using computers, and this was another area that MCPS should focus on. She reported that computer science courses were not available in all high schools. In the higher level courses, blacks, Hispanics, and female students were not proportionately represented because in many cases they did not have the prerequisite math courses. She pointed out that children who had computers at home had greater opportunities, and she reported that at Takoma Park Intermediate School children were able to take computers home on the weekend which was not available in most schools.

Mrs. Odessa Shannon stated that when she had been on the Board of Education she had wanted an emphasis on computers in the elementary school, and she had lost. While she would not argue that the high schools had made good use of the computers, she would argue for what

she saw in the elementary schools and how that related to Priorities 1 and 2. Children having access to computers were eager and motivated and anxious to move ahead. She had looked at the computer as a tool for teaching children. She had asked teachers how long it took a student who came from a home with no computer to catch up in terms of computer literacy. She had expected the answer to be weeks or months, and she had been told anywhere from 30 minutes to one day. If they could close that gap, then other gaps could be closed. She observed that the child's pride and self esteem were protected when the child used the computer for learning. The teacher could help the child without having to embarrass the child in front of a classroom. The computer had unlimited patience in instruction. She hoped that the Board would be convinced that the computer as a tool was a great way to go about helping some of the children who were having a little trouble learning. Schools differed in the number of computers they had, and some had six while others had 30. Some students had 20 minutes a day on the computer and some students had 20 minutes a week. She urged the Board to look at the elementary school level as a way to start children off on a more even footing with the proper motivation.

Dr. John Gannon stated that the high school teachers he had talked to had unanimously praised the CRI Department for a comprehensive approach to the use of computers in high school computer science courses. They were praised for providing a comprehensive package that included hardware, maintenance, curriculum development, and in-service courses. He felt that the curriculum was very appropriate, and there was a wide variety of courses to serve different interests. They ranged from computer applications courses dealing with spread sheets, graphics, and data bases to advanced placement computer science. The CRI Department had invested heavily in curriculum development and had a state-of-the-art computer science curriculum in the high schools. One of the key points was the importance of not just teaching the same course again in one computer language after another. They focused on a single language to allow them to develop more time to speak about computer science concepts rather than programming language details. As a result, students did well on AP tests. At Springbrook, 70 percent of the AP computer science students scored five which was a perfect score on the AP test, and 100 percent scored three or above which was an excellent score. Dr. Gannon reported on the struggle for whether there should be computer science departments or not in high schools. The other issue was teacher certification because there were few computer science teachers with undergraduate degrees in computer science. Dr. Ida Owens reported that she had visited schools to look at how they used the computer as an aid in teaching science. The magnet program at Blair High School was perfect. She also visited Gaithersburg High School. At Blair students were doing experiments on sophisticated equipment, analyzing the data, and were enthusiastic. In the biology program, students were writing high-level research papers where they were interacting with the media specialist gathering resources for their papers. In fact, the students were anxious to get into research summer programs. She also saw reinforcement in the interlocking program in physics and

engineering.

In regard to Gaithersburg High School, Dr. Owens said that the biology program was in competition with the Blair program. They were doing experiments and analyzing data. They were using the computer to simulate experiments and writing original research papers. The negative part at Gaithersburg was that the physics class and chemistry class had no access to the computer. She understood that for a teacher to develop lesson plans around the computer, the teacher must have daily access to the computer. The physics and chemistry instructors yielded to the biology program to make that a success. Dr. Pitt hoped that next year's budget would permit them to add to the high school computer laboratories.

Dr. Dianne Martin reported that the primary change agent was the classroom teacher. Ten years ago when they got their first computers in the high schools the obstacle was a generation of teachers educated before computers. MCPS has been a national leader in developing excellent teacher training programs to help teachers become computer literate. She had spoken with 16 different teachers and looked at over 500 evaluations from the in-service courses. She found that hundreds of teachers had received excellent in-service training over the past five years as a result of efforts of CRI. The training had been changed to meet changing technology, and many teachers were retaking the new courses. MCPS was fortunate to have very high quality and readily available training for teachers. She reported that many teachers had not been trained because some teachers had chosen not to be trained. This was a policy issue for the Board. Teachers also thought that computer labs required lab aides to manage the labs. There was also a need for more equipment. They also felt that each school needed to have a school-based computer coordinator. Right now most schools had teachers volunteering to do this on their own time. All of this had to do with helping teachers become more and more professional and rewarding them with released time and extra pay.

Ms. Hunter understood that a large number of teachers would be hired by the system in the next several years. They recommended that these people have some training in technology when they joined the system or the opportunity to acquire this training.

Dr. Walter Plosila reported that the use of the resources provided for computer instruction and computer education had been wisely and efficiently used. CRI had done an excellent job of managing what the committee considered to be scarce resources to deal with an emerging tool that was going to be key to all occupations and professions in the years ahead. In particular, they found that the centralized procurement system working and the maintenance function was an excellent idea. He explained that one problem was as they procured additional computers, those computers became obsolete, but they had no provisions for replacing obsolete equipment. The committee also felt there needed to be an increased top-level commitment to technology and the use of technology throughout the school district. He suggested that as they constructed new buildings and renovated old

ones, they should build in wiring and support systems essential for the new technology. He felt that the school system had done a good job of providing some computer equipment to all schools; however, they did not have enough equipment to saturate each school to the point where computers were part of the daily curriculum and teaching methods. He noted that other districts had embarked on three to five year intensive programs. He suggested that resources needed to be identified to do this in Montgomery County because computer usage had to receive increased priority.

Dr. Lewis Perelman said that the final section of their report had a long list of recommendations for broadening and strengthening the planning process in this area. MCPS was doing a pretty good job in this area; therefore, the problem was not a lack of quality or dedication of effort. The current plan was probably adequate unless they really wanted to be the best school system in America. He explained that when they talked about technology in education, they were not talking about adding on something to an existing process. They were really talking about a revolution and transformation of the entire process of teaching and learning. They should not think with computers they were going to do the same thing they did before with just another tool. This new training was going on in the military, in industry, in the home, in higher education, and in vocational training. There was no question that these things were going to happen. The only question was whether they were going to happen in the public school system. Dr. Perelman pointed out that within their community there were people who had opportunities to get these tools elsewhere. If they did not move swiftly enough, the gap between the have's and the have-not's might grow. The gap between the schools and the real world would also grow. When students left the classroom, they were surrounded by technological resources and opportunities. He pointed out that students had more computers in their cars than in their classrooms. The rate of progress in the public schools was vastly slower than it was in the economy; therefore, the rate of the gap growing was increasing.

Dr. Perelman pointed out that in the next decade the power of computers would increase by 10,000 times. Education was not keeping up. He explained that simply adding on computers or other tools to the existing structure was not to get to the real transformation of the process that would enable the world of the school to catch up with the rest of the world. Now they had what was essentially a budget planning process. They had policy level problems. They had to look at the problem of technology in education with a much broader view. They had to look at technology not as a tool but as a design for the entire system. He reported that in industry 80 percent of the benefits did not come from hardware, software and tools, it came from changes in organization, management, and human resource policies. If the county wanted to be a national leader, they had to take a much stronger approach.

Mr. Jack Lopez explained that they were talking about getting ready for change. They were in a position where they were not behind significantly, and they had an opportunity to move ahead. In

focusing, they had to bring in community members and get them involved. They also had to get business leaders involved which had been lacking in the past. They recommended shortening the spending horizon on the five-year plan by making it a three-year process. In addition, they should do a better job of educating the MCPS staff, the Board of Education, and the County Council. He felt that in many cases recommendations were turned down because people did not understand how important the recommendations were. He noted that parents would be asked for advice on what computers and software to buy for the home. He believed they had not made any serious mistakes, and they had an opportunity to plan for the future.

Mrs. DiFonzo said that Dr. Pitt had commented that the next steps would be to follow through by coming back to the Board with modifications and recommendations of the report. She suggested having the discussion when Dr. Pitt returned with his recommendations. Dr. Cronin agreed. He said that this was an extremely professional report which was a pleasure to read. He thought it was a tribute to Ms. Sangston and her department. Mrs. Praisner thanked the committee for the information and suggested they thank the Council for having asked for the report. It seemed to her when they had this resource available to them that it would be important for the Board to have an opportunity to have a discussion with the committee. They had a lot to talk about including how to make a best case for what they wanted to do. She thought it was appropriate for them to have another discussion with the committee if their schedules would permit. She thought they should have the superintendent's reactions when they had another opportunity to have the committee with them.

Mr. Goldensohn stated that he was very impressed with what he had read and what he had heard. He noted that to move any large mass such as a bureaucracy it took a lot of pressure, but once it started to go it picked up speed. He said that a lot of parents were still afraid of computers, but the next generation would not have to be educated about computers.

Mrs. DiFonzo asked Ms. Sangston to check with the committee to find another time for a meeting with the Board. She thanked the committee for their work and fine observations. Dr. Pitt said he was convinced they needed to spend more money, but that was going to be a problem. Secondly, he needed to make sure his top staff had some better understanding and training in this whole area of technology.

Re: A MOTION BY DR. CRONIN TO ENDORSE
THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE COMMISSION
ON CHILDREN AND YOUTH

Dr. Cronin moved and Mr. Ewing seconded that the Board endorse the recommendations in III. of the Commission's report and where feasible and supported by the County that they cooperate and develop these programs in the school system.

RESOLUTION NO. 220-88 Re: TABLING OF PROPOSED RESOLUTION ON THE

RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE COMMISSION ON
CHILDREN AND YOUTH

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

RESOLVED, That the proposed resolution on the recommendations of the Commission on Children and Youth be tabled until the superintendent provided his recommendations.

RESOLUTION NO. 220a-88 Re: COUNTY COUNCIL HEALTH DEPARTMENT BUDGET

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

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education take a position of positiveness toward the \$500,000 proposed for health services and find out whether the Board would be privy to the information in the consultant's management study and have an opportunity to review that and provide input.

Re: BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS

1. Dr. Cronin pointed out that a letter had come from the Title IX committee asking for a liaison in the Office of Instruction and Curriculum Development as well as Human Relations. He asked if the liaison had been appointed. Dr. Vance replied that he was in the process of reviewing that request because he was not too clear about the specifics of that request. He planned to meet with the chair of that committee.
2. Mr. Herscowitz said that the policy for dropping courses stated that in order for a student to drop a course without a grade appearing on the transcript, this had to be done within 20 days. Interims were sent out 23 or 25 days into the marking period. When parents found out their child was failing, the grade was already on the report card. He asked if this was a Board policy or an administrative policy. He also wanted to know the reasoning behind this. Dr. Pitt agreed to check into this.
3. Mr. Herscowitz reported that he would be bringing up an item under new business having to do with final examinations. He would move that the Board discuss the final exam policy and possibly amend it in the future. He thought they should also look into converting to numbers for grades instead of letter grades. He indicated that he would provide a memo with several actions for the Board members and superintendent to react to.
4. Mrs. Praisner reported that as part of the National School Boards Association Delegate Assembly one of the resolutions the delegates voted on was a resolution requesting crash tests from the federal government on school buses. This resolution had started at the Montgomery County Board table and went through the Maryland Association of Boards of Education to NSBA. This was voted on as a continuing resolution by NSBA.
5. Mrs. Praisner said that some Board members had just come back

from the National Federation of Urban-Suburban School Districts. There they had an opportunity to see what some other jurisdictions were doing with computer management systems. Montgomery County had held the NFUSSD conference in October, and many of Board and staff members at both conferences again expressed their appreciation for the "Students at Risk: They can Succeed" conference held in Montgomery County. They especially talked about the mentoring programs they were trying to duplicate. This should be conveyed to Barron Stroud, who had conducted such a successful workshop.

6. Mrs. Praisner recalled that in the setting of boundaries between Fairland and Galway Elementary Schools they had drawn the line at a day care center which had students attending both schools. She asked for a staff review of the transportation arrangements for students attending DeeDee's Place.
7. Mr. Ewing noted that Mrs. Harriet Bernstein, now Harriet Tyson, had published a study for the Council for Basic Education of texts in use in public schools. Her findings generally were that textbooks were themeless and dull. He suggested staff should look at and review her study.
8. Dr. Pitt said that having attended the NFUSSD conference he was also impressed with some of the computer operations they saw. They were looking into some of the projects.

RESOLUTION NO. 221-88 Re: EXECUTIVE SESSION - MAY 10, 1988

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

WHEREAS, The Board of Education of Montgomery County is authorized by 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 May 10, 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. 222-88 Re: MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 25, 1988

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

RESOLVED, That the minutes of February 25, 1988, be approved.

Re: POLICY ON PUBLIC HEARINGS

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

WHEREAS, On March 9, 1988, the Board of Education reviewed its present policy on public hearings and made several suggestions for amendments to the policy; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the portion of Resolution No. 429-85, A HANDBOOK FOR THE MONTGOMERY COUNTY BOARD OF EDUCATION, dealing with public hearings be rescinded; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the following policy on public hearings be adopted by the Board of Education:

PUBLIC HEARINGS -- OTHER THAN FACILITIES HEARINGS

A. PURPOSE

To establish a policy for the conduct of public hearings other than facilities hearings

B. PROCESS AND CONTENT

The Board of Education schedules public hearings on issues it determines to be of widespread interest and concern.

In addition to special public hearings, the Board holds hearings on its annual capital and operating budgetsó annual operating budget. General guidelines for these public hearings are as follows:

1. Whenever possible, a public hearing will be scheduled one month in advance of the hearing date. The subject and date of the hearing will be publicized through the Board's customary communications channels and by a release to the news media.
2. The public may sign up to speak beginning at 9 a.m. on the day three weeks prior to the hearing. The agenda for the hearing is closed when the maximum number of speakers is registered (hearings begin at 7:30 p.m. and conclude at 11 p.m.) or at the close of business the day before the hearing.
3. The following time limits for testimony apply:

Organizations/Municipalities/Elected Officials	5 min.
Individuals	3 min.
4. The order of speakers at the hearing is determined by the order in which they sign up. A person calling to speak may reserve only one space. Only one speaker will be registered for any organization unless the Board provides otherwise. Elected officials are given the courtesy of being placed at the time of their choice on the agenda.
5. Speakers are encouraged to provide a predetermined number of

copies of their statements at the hearing for distribution to Board, staff, and press.

6. Public hearings are tape recorded, and arrangements can be made to listen to or purchase the recording at a later date, if desired.
7. If the speakers are not present at their designated time, every effort will be made to accommodate their testimony prior to adjournment of the meeting.
8. To expedite the hearing, Board members and the superintendent will limit their participation solely to asking clarifying questions of the speakers.
9. Written statements submitted in lieu of testimony will be given equal consideration. Whenever possible, the public record will remain open for two weeks following the public hearing.

See also the Policy on Long-range Educational Facilities Planning for the procedure for facilities hearings.

C. REVIEW AND REPORTING

This policy will be reviewed every three years in accordance with the Board of Education policy review process.

Re: DEFERRAL OF PROPOSED POLICY ON PUBLIC HEARINGS

Board members agreed to defer the proposed policy on public hearings to allow time for public comment.

RESOLUTION NO. 223-88 Re: REAPPOINTMENT TO INTERAGENCY COORDINATING BOARD

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

WHEREAS, Montgomery County Council Bill No. 43-78, enacted October 17, 1978, created a School Facilities Utilization Act by adding a new Article I to Chapter 33, title "Schools and Camps," of the Montgomery County Code (1972 edition, as amended); and

WHEREAS, This act created The Interagency Coordinating Board for Community Use of Educational Facilities and Services; and

WHEREAS, The Interagency Coordinating Board's nine members include the chief administrative officer of the county government, superintendent of schools, president of Montgomery College, a member of the County Planning Board, staff director of the County Council, two citizens appointed by the county executive and confirmed by the County Council, and two citizens appointed by the superintendent and confirmed by the Board of Education; and

WHEREAS, On July 7, 1986, Mrs. Linda Burgin was appointed to a two-year term on the ICB which expires on June 30, 1988; and

WHEREAS, Mrs. Burgin has agreed to continue to serve on the ICB for

another two-year term; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That on the recommendation of the superintendent of schools, the Board of Education confirms the reappointment of Mrs. Linda Burgin to the ICB for a two-year term ending on June 30, 1990; and be it further

RESOLVED, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the Montgomery County Council, county executive, the director of Community Use of Educational Facilities and Services, and to members of the Interagency Coordinating Board for Community Use of Educational Facilities and Services.

For the record, Dr. Cronin stated that the ICB terms were now four years. Mrs. Burgin joined the ICB in 1986 and would complete what would be the equivalent of a first term in 1990; therefore, she would be eligible for a second term of four-years in 1990.

Re: NEW BUSINESS

1. Mr. Herscowitz moved and Mr. Goldensohn seconded that the Board schedule some time at a future Board meeting to discuss and possibly amend the final exam policy and the grading policy.
2. Mr. Ewing moved and Mrs. Praisner seconded that the Board schedule time at a future meeting to discuss the report of the advisory committee on assertive discipline and the superintendent's response.

Re: ITEMS OF INFORMATION

Board members received Graduation Requirements, Policy ISA, as an item of information.

Re: ADJOURNMENT

The president adjourned the meeting at 11 p.m.

PRESIDENT

SECRETARY

HP:mlw