

NUMBER: 23-1990  
STATUS: APPROVED  
PLACE: ROCKVILLE, MARYLAND  
DATE: APRIL 30, 1990  
TEXT:



Montgomery County Public Schools; and

WHEREAS, Asian 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 month of May, 1990, to be observed in MCPS as "Asian Pacific American Heritage Month."

Re: NAME FOR NEW BROOKE GROVE  
ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

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

WHEREAS, A meeting of parents, representing every section of the Brooke Grove Elementary School attendance area, and staff members was held on March 26, 1990, in accordance with MCPS Regulation FFA-RA NAMING OF SCHOOLS, to select a name for the new Brooke Grove Elementary School; and

WHEREAS, A list of names of distinguished persons and geographic locations was considered, and a vote taken to determine the favored name; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the new elementary school officially be named Brooke Grove Elementary School.

RESOLUTION NO. 264-90 Re: AN AMENDMENT TO THE PROPOSED  
RESOLUTION NAMING BROOKE GROVE  
ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

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

RESOLVED, That the proposed resolution on Brooke Grove Elementary School be amended by adding the following clause:

WHEREAS, The Board of Education at its meeting of April 17, 1990, voted to grant an exception to its codicil to the School Naming Policy to the Brooke Grove Elementary School.

RESOLUTION NO. 265-90 Re: NAMING OF BROOKE GROVE ES

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

WHEREAS, A meeting of parents, representing every section of the Brooke Grove Elementary School attendance area, and staff members was held on March 26, 1990, in accordance with MCPS Regulation

FFA-RA NAMING OF SCHOOLS, to select a name for the new Brooke Grove Elementary School; and

WHEREAS, A list of names of distinguished persons and geographic locations was considered, and a vote taken to determine the favored name; and

WHEREAS, The Board of Education at its meeting of April 17, 1990, voted to grant an exception to its codicil to the School Naming Policy to the Brooke Grove Elementary School; now therefore be it RESOLVED, That the new elementary school officially be named Brooke Grove Elementary School.

RESOLUTION NO. 266-90 Re: CAPITAL PROJECTS TO BE CLOSED EFFECTIVE JUNE 30, 1990

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

WHEREAS, As part of the capital budget process the Board of Education closes projects that are completed and transfers the unencumbered balance to other accounts; and

WHEREAS, The Department of School Facilities has reviewed capital projects that may be closed effective June 30, 1990, providing a net capitalization of \$60,785,944.89; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the superintendent be authorized to close, effective June 30, 1990, capital construction projects listed below and to transfer the local unencumbered balance totaling \$4,163.61, subject to final audit, to the Local Unliquidated Surplus Account, Project 999:

PROJECT NO.	SCHOOL	BALANCE
109-01	Waters Landing Elementary	\$2,375.15
334-01	Greencastle Elementary	11.41
514-01	Phoenix II	-0-
546-01	Goshen Elementary	192.13
569-01	Strawberry Knoll Elementary	225.97
653-01	Stone Mill Elementary	311.77
706-01	Clearspring Elementary	485.99
771-07	Rolling Terrace Elementary	471.15
791-09	New Hampshire Estates Elementary	-0-
999-10	Art Room Ventilation	101.41
999-36	P. E. Facilities Improvement	(11.37)
	TOTAL	----- \$4,163.61

and be it further

RESOLVED, That the county executive be requested to recommend

April 30, 1990

approval to the County Council of these transfers.

RESOLUTION NO. 267-90      Re:    RESURFACING OF RUNNING TRACKS AND  
FIELD EVENT RUNWAYS

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

WHEREAS, Sealed bids were received on April 17, 1990, for the resurfacing of running tracks and field event runways at Gaithersburg and Poolesville high schools, and the Northwood facility:

BIDDER	BASE BID
1. American Tennis Courts, Inc.	\$165,976.10
2. Copeland Coating Co., Inc.	172,510.00

and

WHEREAS, Sufficient funds are available to award a contract that is within the staff estimate of \$175,000; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That a \$165,976.10 contract be awarded to American Tennis Courts, Inc., for the resurfacing of running tracks and field event runways at Gaithersburg and Poolesville high schools and the Northwood facility, in accordance with plans and specifications prepared by the Department of School Facilities.

RESOLUTION NO. 268-90      Re:    FRANCIS SCOTT KEY MIDDLE SCHOOL  
KITCHEN EQUIPMENT

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

WHEREAS, On April 17, 1990, three bids containing unit prices were received for the kitchen equipment at Francis Scott Key Middle School; and

WHEREAS, Capital funds of \$78,132 are available, and Division of Food services staff have reviewed the bid results and selected necessary equipment; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That a \$78,132 contract be awarded to David B. Lewis, Ltd., for kitchen equipment at Francis Scott Key Middle School in accordance with plans and specifications prepared by Arley J. Koran, Inc., Architect.

RESOLUTION NO. 269-90      Re:    AWARD OF CONTRACTS FOR MAINTENANCE  
PROJECTS AT VARIOUS SCHOOLS

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

WHEREAS, Sealed bids were received on April 18, 1990, for projects and schools listed below in accordance with MCPS Procurement Practices; and

WHEREAS, Details of each bid activity are available in the Department of School Facilities; and

WHEREAS, The low and recommended bids are within budget estimates, and sufficient funds are available to award the contracts; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That contracts be awarded to the low bidders for the projects and amounts listed below:

PROJECT	AMOUNT
Overhead Rolling Doors Gaithersburg High School and Shady Grove Transportation Depot LOW BIDDER: Atlas Door Corporation	\$ 88,047.90
Poured Urethane Gymnasium Floors Damascus and Fallsmead elementary schools LOW BIDDER: Martin Surfacing, Inc.	37,000.00
Carpeting and Accessories Cold Spring and Fallsmead elementary schools and Tilden Intermediate School LOW BIDDER: BODE Flooring Corp.	108,017.00
Stedwick Elementary School LOW BIDDER: Carpet Experts, Inc.	44,094.00
Garrett Park Elementary School LOW BIDDER: Carpet Fair, Inc.	30,800.00
Sherwood Elementary School and Seneca Valley High School LOW BIDDER: Interiors Unlimited, Inc.	152,085.00
Resilient Flooring and Accessories Garrett Park and Sherwood elementary schools, Tilden Intermediate School, and Seneca Valley High School LOW BIDDER: Carpet Exports, Inc.	23,174.01



April 30, 1990

RESOLUTION NO. 273-90 Re: EXTENSION OF SICK LEAVE

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Dr. Cronin seconded by Mrs. Praisner, 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
Collins, Barbara J.	School Financial Sec. Long term leave from Martin Luther King IS	30
Lane, Deborah K.	Administrative Secretary Vision Services	20
Newton, Robin	Special Education Instructional Asst. Wheaton HS	20

RESOLUTION NO. 274-90 Re: DEATH OF MR. CURTIS L. RANDOLPH,  
BUS OPERATOR IN AREA I  
TRANSPORTATION

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

WHEREAS, The death on April 7, 1990, of Mr. Curtis L. Randolph, a bus operator in Area 1, has deeply saddened the staff and members of the Board of Education; and

WHEREAS, In nearly two years with Montgomery County Public Schools, Mr. Randolph demonstrated exceptional ability as a bus operator; and

WHEREAS, His cheerful and cooperative attitude and his concern for his passengers were a credit to the entire pupil transportation program; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the members of the Board of Education express their sorrow at the death of Mr. Curtis L. Randolph and extend

April 30, 1990

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. Randolph's family.

RESOLUTION NO. 275-90 Re: PERSONNEL APPOINTMENT

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 appointment be approved:

APPOINTMENT	PRESENT POSITION	AS
Neil Shipman	Supervisor of Elem. Instruction Area 3 Admin. Office	Area Director for Ed. Services Area 3 Admin. Office Effective: 7-1-90

RESOLUTION NO. 276-90 Re: PERSONNEL APPOINTMENT

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

RESOLVED, That the following personnel appointment be approved:

APPOINTMENT	PRESENT POSITION	AS
Stanley J. Klein	Principal Springhill Lake ES Prince George's Co. Board of Education Upper Marlboro, MD	Principal Piney Branch ES Effective: 7-1-90

Re: BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS

1. Mrs. DiFonzo reported on her visit to the science fair at Harmony Hills ES. She had visited a group of 7 to 8 year olds in the PADI program who had an experiment to determine the natural enemies of mealy worms. The children had taken a box and had drawn pictures of assorted insects and spiders. The children had concluded that spiders were the natural enemies of mealy worms because they crawled away from the drawing of the spider. She commented that while the children needed refinement in scientific experimentation, their hearts were in the right places.

2. Mrs. Praisner reported that several Board members had just returned from the National School Boards Association conference

in New Orleans. She had had an opportunity to participate as a member of the Delegate Assembly in the adoption of policies and resolutions and also in the election of officers for the coming year. She informed the Board that the resolution in support of bus safety and appropriate testing of buses that was introduced by this Board through the Maryland Association of Boards of Education still existed as a resolution adopted by NSBA. Alison Serino had served as a moderator for one of the panels at NSBA, and she had received very positive feedback about Ms. Serino. Mrs. DiFonzo added that she had attended that session, and Ms. Serino had done a very good job of running the workshop.

3. In regard of the 1990 census, Mr. Ewing had some concern that teachers and principals might not be placing enough emphasis on making sure parents took the time to fill out the forms or answer the interviewers. Completion of census information was important to funding decisions made at the state and federal level as to what Montgomery County might receive. He suggested that it would be worthwhile for a further message to go out so that people would know that there was still an opportunity to respond and a great need to do so. Dr. Pitt knew that Dr. Vance had sent out a number of messages along that line, but he agreed that it would be helpful to reemphasize this. Dr. Vance indicated that he had asked Mr. Brian Porter, the director of the Department of Information, to review what had been done and see what would be appropriate for them to send out at this time. This material would be shared with Mr. Ewing and the Board.

4. Mr. Ewing reported that he had raised with Dr. Pitt a question about music programs. For a decade or more, he had been concerned that MCPS did not seem to be able to field music programs in the high schools which offered students access to opportunities to play in orchestras and to play instruments in situations where they could learn and appreciate classical music.

While they had the Montgomery County Youth Orchestra and had been supportive of that and had very good programs in many schools, he thought it was worth their while, particularly now that they were growing, to take a look at how well they were doing. He hoped that the Task Force on the Arts would look at the issue, but it seemed to him important for them to focus on this. For many years they could not find enough people who wanted to enroll in such programs to justify offering the programs. It was now time to consider what they could do to encourage, support, and develop those opportunities where they did not exist.

5. Dr. Cronin stated that he had brought back copies of the NSBA conference newspapers, and he would leave those in the Board Office for other Board members. The papers summarized a number of the sessions that took place.

6. Dr. Shoenberg reported that last Friday afternoon he and Mrs.

Praisner were invited to attend the closing luncheon session of the Maryland Association for Counseling and Development. The Board of Education was presented with an award in recognition of "unparalleled and continuous support of public school guidance and counseling services." He asked that the plaque be hung in the Board Room. It was particularly pleasing to him because they were nominated for that award by their own staff and thanked them very much. In particular, he thanked Ms. Kathy McGuire and Mrs. Diane Graham.

Re: ANNUAL REPORT OF THE ADVISORY  
COMMITTEE ON COUNSELING AND  
GUIDANCE, 1988-89

Dr. Shoenberg welcomed Mrs. Diane Graham, chair of the committee, and Ms. Kathy McGuire, supervisor of guidance.

Mrs. Graham added her congratulations and that of the committee in regard to the award. They appreciated the support they had received from the Board over the years. She indicated that they were very appreciative of the Board's consideration of the needs of counselors, particularly those at the elementary school level.

Their first recommendation was an objective evaluation and measurement of the Pupil Personnel program to be sure that it was meeting the spirit and the letter of the state requirement. They were pleased that the Board had put something in place, but they wanted the Board to keep its finger on the pulse of that particular item and do a structured evaluation of the value of the program as currently established. The second recommendation had to do with the workloads carried by the resource counselors. They recommended that the workload be adjusted. Otherwise a false picture of the counselor/student ratio would be presented. Their concern had been to increase the time for student/counselor interaction. When the counselor workload was increased by the overflow from the resource counselors, the possibility for meaningful interaction diminished.

Thirdly, Mrs. Graham said they believed the Board should examine the need for increased support for the elementary counselor specialists in the Central Guidance Unit. There were 113 elementary schools, and next year there would be 118 which presented additional issues of program management and personnel training and coordination.

The fourth recommendation was that adjustments be made to the number of counselors assigned to a school. They continued to believe in the importance of considering factors in addition to the size of the student body in determining the allocation of counselors. In the fifth recommendation, they believed that the Board should continue to provide transportation to Area 3 high schools so that the Edison Center was available to all MCPS

students. Because of transportation availability, 19 students from Damascus had been able to attend the center; however, some had had to drop out because of transportation problems. She had looked at the report on dropouts, and it seemed to her that programs like those at the Edison Center were an essential part of keeping students in school.

They commended the Board for their quick and effective response to their recommendation last year to encourage counselors, and by metonymy, all MCPS employees to learn a second language. Their sixth recommendation was to expand the program so that more employees could be accommodated and more levels of proficiency could be represented. They also recommended tuition reimbursement for those who could not get into the MCPS classes or who were at a different level of proficiency than the courses offered by MCPS.

Mrs. Graham said that their seventh recommendation pertained to the future. They believed that MCPS should not just sit and wait for the counseling and guidance issues to evolve. They recommended that the Board approve extended-year employment "think" time for reflection and deliberation on the best way to address needs of the workforce and the student population in the future.

Their eighth recommendation was a review of the process of scheduling in both the mid-level and senior high schools to determine who should have the responsibility for coordinating scheduling and what the skills of that coordinator should be. The ninth recommendation was to expand the new programs for scheduling so that the time of the counselors could be devoted more directly to the interactions with the students rather than the interactions with the machine. In their tenth recommendation they continued to support the placement of printers in the guidance offices at the mid-level schools to facilitate scheduling.

They were concerned with the education and success of all MCPS students. Their eleventh recommendation was that MCPS continue sponsoring career fairs, similar to the college fair to provide an opportunity for students to learn about employers and career fields. This effort might receive support from employers in the area. In their twelfth recommendation they believed that the Board should continue to support counselor's attendance at seminars, conferences, and other job-related functions. One of the services provided by counselors was to inform students and parents of the latest developments in various fields. The Board's support had enabled counselors to provide accurate and current information.

The thirteenth recommendation was that funds be allocated specifically for the purchase of guidance materials. The PROGRAM

OF STUDIES required current and creative materials in order to be effective. In number fourteen, they recommended that the policies and procedures of MCPS be reviewed and revised as necessary to reflect the impact of the new PROGRAM OF STUDIES. The final recommendation was that the position descriptions and evaluation formats for counselors be reviewed and revised as necessary to reflect the responsibilities attendant to the PROGRAM OF STUDIES.

Dr. Shoenberg indicated that the superintendent would be responding to these recommendations. He asked if Board members wanted to focus on any particular recommendations.

In regard to Recommendation 8, Mr. Ewing asked if they had in mind a particular person who should have the responsibility for coordinating scheduling. Mrs. Graham replied that this seemed to vary in terms of who had the skills. She suggested that they determine what skills were needed and train people to have those skills rather than letting the responsibility fall wherever it did.

Mr. Ewing inquired about what was causing the problem with the workload of resource counselors. Mrs. Graham replied that the resource counselors still had a workload that they would not have if they were resource teachers. As the resource counselor performed his or her functions, their workload was being divided up among the remaining counselors. She said they needed an increase in the number of counselors so that the resource counselor's workload would not add to someone else's workload. Dr. Pitt explained that a resource teacher might teach three periods and have other responsibilities for the other two periods. When they counted the pupil/teacher ratio in that school, those two periods did not count. A resource counselor was given time to do some other things, but they did not add a period of counselor's time to the schedule. It was a legitimate issue. He commented that he agreed with most of their recommendations, but in some of them there was a problem of funding.

Mrs. Praisner remarked that this would be her last counseling and guidance report, and she was pleased to see they had made significant progress over the years. She added thanks to Judith Madden who served as president of the Montgomery County Association for Counseling and Development because she had drafted the nomination for the Board of Education. In regard to the eighth recommendation, she was not sure whether it should be a person based on the skills of the individual or a specific position within a school. Mrs. Graham replied that the Board should look at how this was done and determine what position it should be and get the skills into that position and not let it fall to the person with the skills. Mrs. Praisner said that this was also tied to previous discussions about vice principals.

Dr. Pitt commented that two things would have an impact on this.

They were expanding programs for scheduling individual high schools. In the last couple of years they had been training people in developing a master schedule. Grace Smith had done an outstanding job in that area and needed to be commended. He believed that computerized scheduling would simplify the process enormously from what it was now.

Mrs. Praisner assumed that they would be receiving a staff response to the recommendations. She asked that the response to the recommendation on foreign language include information on the numbers, the languages, and where and how the staff was able to obtain that training. She asked whether they had any recommendations coming out of that experience. She assumed that they would get a report on the number of printers in Recommendation No. 10 as well as the questions on guidance materials.

In regard to the recommendation about looking at factors other than the size of the school in assigning counselors, Mrs. Praisner asked if they had suggestions about criteria they might use. Mrs. Graham replied that one of the elements that always came up was mobility. There were some schools where the mobility rate was astronomical. Students might be in three schools in one year, and this might be used in determining what that counselor/student workload might be. This year they had received a presentation from a resource counselor in the ESOL program. The counselor/student ratio was a very high one. They had heard about the kinds of problems those counselors had to deal with and the wide range of issues that they had to deal with. There were limitations on the ability of other members of the organization to deal with that. Students might be able to speak to only one person in the entire school, and when the ESOL counselor came in there might be two people.

Dr. Pitt stated that they tried to take some of this into account. At the elementary school they were trying to have a full-time counselor in schools with a population of over 300; however, schools had moved from an average of 400 to schools of 800. Mrs. Praisner thought that the Council members were beginning to recognize that as well. She thought they might come forward with an initiative that acknowledged the larger sized schools and the need for additional counselor support.

Mrs. Praisner asked for some examples of the kinds of policies and procedures referred to in Recommendation No. 14. Mrs. Graham replied that they did not have particular examples; however, the policies and procedures had been in place long before the study was done that led to the development of the comprehensive plan. The PROGRAM OF STUDIES spread around responsibility for delivering the program, and it was important that the PROGRAM OF

STUDIES was not in conflict with pre-existing policies. Ms. McGuire added that the policies and procedures for counseling and guidance had been written in 1978 and needed to be updated.

With changes in parental participation in school activities, Mrs. Praisner wondered whether they were still successful in getting participation in the local guidance advisory committees. Mrs. Graham replied that participation varied by school and was related to the outreach in a particular school. If a principal was really interested in the program, participation was good. Mrs. Praisner suggested that the committee might want to look at some recommendations on how to strengthen the local school advisory committees on counseling and guidance.

Dr. Cronin noted that the report before the Board was dated 1988-89, and they were discussing this in April, 1990 when the budget for 1991 had already gone to the Council. He asked how they could move the process faster so that a report could be discussed in time for consideration of the budget. Mrs. Graham replied that in the past they had given their reports in September or October and then testified on the budget. The past two years the report had been given in April, and they would be ready to give the report in September. Dr. Shoenberg asked that consideration be given to scheduling their report in the early fall.

Dr. Cronin pointed out that there was reference to EMT/SARD and asked whether the committee had looked at the effectiveness of the new procedures. Mrs. Graham replied that they had not. Dr. Cronin was interested in the amount of the workload that might have been changed either up or down. Dr. Pitt replied that this was a serious problem. They had done some of the things to correct the situation and see that some young people were not put into special education where they did not belong. However, the process itself was still complex even though they had tried to streamline it. Dr. Cronin asked the committee to take a hard look at this process.

Dr. Cronin said he had another question about the difficulty of counseling students who were English language deficient. Mrs. Graham replied that this was something that would be in the report for next year. She reported that there were eight counselors connected with the ESOL program and there were problems. They might have 14-year old students who had never been to school in their native country. They could not be placed in the first grade. This had personal, emotional, and academic ramifications. They had to consider what was possible to do educationally for that student during the time that he or she was likely to be in MCPS. This was a systemwide problem which increased the workload of the ESOL counselors. Dr. Cronin commented that they had heard this issue in a number of ways in terms of hiring patterns and ability to communicate with the homes. He thought they needed to approach the Hispanic and Asian

communities to find some common solutions.

Mrs. Hobbs asked about specific concerns about the new position of coordinator of pupil services. Mrs. Graham replied that their recommendation had been that there be a separate pupil personnel program, not a part of special and alternative education. They had written a letter expressing their concern about not putting the counseling function together with that division because it was in special education. They believed that the counselors, the psychologists, and the pupil personnel workers needed to be coordinated and working very closely together. They believed that the organizational placement would not facilitate this, but they were not ready to say that yet. They were suggesting that the Board needed to keep a finger on the pulse of that to see where it was going and how it was going. Dr. Pitt recalled that this had been an issue, and he did not want to tie counseling to it. It was not an issue of placement but rather the guidance curriculum and the need to make sure they reinforced that. However, they could debate the placement of pupil services and would be looking at that after about a year.

Mrs. Hobbs was pleased to see their reference to career fairs and also to the emphasis on increasing students in math classes, especially minority students. She asked whether the committee was working with other advisory committees to make them aware of committee activities. For example, the Title IX Gender Equity Advisory Committee and the minority education committee would be interested in knowing that the counseling and guidance committee was focusing on math classes. Mrs. Graham suggested that this might be something that the Board could oversee or that the school system could do. They had incidental contacts, but as volunteers they were unable to send out copies of their reports to everyone who might have an interest. They were sharing information with Connie Tonat and with the Commission on Children and Youth. She felt that the Board was in a position to make this happen by circulating reports.

Mrs. Hobbs asked about meeting their goals for counselors in elementary schools. Dr. Pitt replied that they were two years away from meeting this goal. The next issue would be services to larger schools.

Dr. Cronin commented that committees had held joint meetings. They could consider meeting together with the other two committees perhaps every two years or so.

Ms. Serino stated that she was excited to see all these recommendations. She asked whether the committee had looked at peer counseling this year. Mrs. Graham replied that at this point they did not have any recommendations on peer counseling because this was a program that was underway. Peer counseling had come about as a result of recommendations of the committee,

and the committee continued to be a big supporter of peer counseling. Ms. Serino said that a lot of students had raised this issue with her, and she had tried to get out the word that there were stipends available and they could look for a staff member to support that. It seemed to Mrs. Graham that this was an implementation issue, and Ms. McGuire said she would be pleased to discuss this with Ms. Serino.

Dr. Shoenberg thanked Mrs. Graham and the committee for their report.

Re: MONITORING UTILITY COSTS

Dr. Pitt believed that MCPS was a pioneer in this area, and he was pleased with the progress they had made. When they had started the program, energy was not the issue because energy was cheap. As they had become more sophisticated in this area, the cost of energy had gone up dramatically. They were fortunate that they were in a program that had saved millions of dollars. It was hard to show this saving because they had started out with oil costing 25 cents a gallon and last December it was \$1.20 a gallon. If they did not have this program, they could not afford the energy costs.

Dr. Philip Rohr, associate superintendent for supportive services, introduced Mr. William Wilder, director of the Department of School Facilities. Mr. Wilder introduced Dr. James Morgan, coordinator of utilities, energy management, and telecommunications; Mr. Sean Gallagher, utilities management engineer; and Frederick Smith, energy management supervisor.

Mr. Wilder explained that this effort started in 1979, and other county agencies became involved in 1983 through the establishment of an interagency committee on energy and utilities management. The group was formed to establish utility rates to be consistent throughout county agencies and the school system and to share technology. The committee was comprised of representatives from the county government, WSSC, DOT, Park and Planning, MCPS, and Montgomery College. He believed that the sharing of technology had been one of the prime benefits of the committee.

Mr. Wilder said that the paper explained that significant savings had accrued through the plan particularly when they compared MCPS with other comparable jurisdictions. In FY 1989, MCPS was 27 percent lower than another comparable jurisdiction which meant a savings of \$2-3 million. The next part of the paper dealt with new facilities. The purpose was to assure the Board that the energy unit had a heavy involvement in plans and specifications for new schools and modernized schools. This caused attention to accountability on the part of architects and engineers. They had to account for whether they had met, exceeded, or fallen below specifications. One example showed a reduction of 42 percent or

an annual savings of \$21,000 for one elementary school.

Mr. Wilder reported that the new management information system provided managers with information to predict energy use and to manage the total energy program. The energy management system which they began to install in 1979 was still the backbone of their program. They were constantly upgrading the systems, and they now had 150 schools operating under those systems. Electricity accounted for a significant amount of their energy dollars. The reasons for that included time-of-use rates, load curtailment, and lighting. Energy audits in capital investments were now an important part of their program, and finally they had in-service training and an effort to have energy awareness on the part of all MCPS staff.

Mrs. DiFonzo asked about holding architects accountable for energy usage in new facilities. Dr. Morgan replied that architects were sent a letter indicating the performance of the building one year following construction. They compared the performance of the building to the state standard and asked the architects for an explanation when there was a discrepancy. During the last two years they had had a major improvement in the performance of new buildings. Mrs. DiFonzo asked what happened when there was a large discrepancy. Mr. Wilder replied that this would influence future architect selection; however, there were generally justifiable reasons for discrepancies. Dr. Rohr added that the real accountability was one of future appointments. One of the biggest variations was the actual use of the building. The design standards employed by the state assumed a much lower usage than was the case in Montgomery County.

Mrs. Praisner asked if they had ever decided not to hire an architect based on the energy performance of a building. Mr. Wilder replied that they had not. They had not had a school that varied that greatly from state standards when they considered other factors such as use. Dr. Rohr commented that the incorporation of energy features in the building design was a major consideration, and architects and engineers knew that this was one of the concerns of MCPS. They required an energy statement in the brochures and preliminary plans. This was something they stressed prior to appointment and all the way through the design from start to finish.

Mrs. DiFonzo recalled that Lake Seneca and Flower Hill had been built with energy conservation in mind, and she wondered how they compared to reality and to newer schools. Mr. Gallagher replied that these two schools were an improvement over the typical inventory in MCPS; however, the newer schools were even more energy efficient. Mrs. DiFonzo said that some years ago an employee had recommended changing light bulbs in exit lights to florescent lights because it was cheaper. Mr. Gallagher replied that last year they had replaced 760 lamp sockets and would

continue that program as appropriate. They were about one-third of the way through the process, and they were saving about \$15,000 a year. In addition, PEPCO was funding \$10 of the installation costs through a rebate.

Mrs. DiFonzo asked if comparisons had been made between MCPS energy consumption and that of the county government. Dr. Morgan replied that it cost MCPS approximately 75 to 85 cents a square foot for utilities; however, the county government and the college spent about \$1.35 to \$1.45 a square foot.

Dr. Cronin said that in regard to electricity cost there was a sentence which read "the trends will need to be balanced with better controls on the use of electricity to maintain costs at prior levels." Dr. Morgan replied that they were beginning to send schools reports on electricity and wanted to concentrate on that utility. Electricity was the most costly of all the utilities, and this was the utility that staffs could influence the most. With the reports, they wanted to urge schools to adopt school-wide measures in terms of cutting off lights. For example, when the community used the building they could make one wing available rather than the entire school.

Dr. Pitt commented that costs were going to increase because of technology. For example, air conditioning was a tremendous cost. As they added more energy, they had to look at how to keep the costs down to a reasonable level. Dr. Cronin pointed out that people had been upset in the last few weeks because the air conditioning had not been turned on. He wished they could explain to people that air conditioning could not be turned on and shut off on short notice.

Mr. Ewing thought this was an effort in which the staff and the superintendent could take a great deal of pride. He was delighted with what they had been able to accomplish. This was the kind of information that the public did not see or understand, and the Council might not be fully aware of this. He hoped that staff would make sure that the Council and county executive received this information with some kind of cover memo pointing out that there were places where MCPS had made dramatic savings or at least cost avoidances.

Mr. Ewing said they were moving in the direction of doing energy audits, and he understood that they would continue to pursue this on the order of energy consumption level. Mr. Ewing asked how they could do more of that sooner. Dr. Rohr replied that in the late 1970's there was a stampede by a lot of agencies to do energy audits. They initiated a program to turn things off, and they then did some energy audits which reinforced their idea that the major payback was to get into these buildings and turn the major energy off. Their goal was to get all of their secondary schools and all of the air-conditioned elementary schools on the

energy management computer, and they had now done that. They were now in the process of going back to the schools that they had hooked up and trying to save that second level of energy. They had done that audit for B-CC and now they were doing it for other schools. However, the problem now was funding. They were funding this program at \$1 million per year through the capital improvements program, and they wanted to be able to prove to themselves that a detailed energy audit would pay for itself. They were planning to move into that fairly rapidly, but funding was holding them back. Mr. Wilder added 33 schools were to be audited in the capital budget, and four of those with the greatest potential for savings would be audited this spring. Mr. Ewing indicated that he would be interested in seeing a couple of the recent audit reports.

Mr. Ewing asked if they had assessed the energy efficiency of modular construction. Mr. Wilder replied that they did not have a formal report, but he would guess that modular construction cost 15 to 20 percent more because they were heated with electricity which was the most expensive energy. Mr. Ewing asked whether it was possible to segment the costs to determine the cost of air conditioning a school. Mr. Gallagher replied that they did not have precise numbers, but it was a very substantial cost in the summertime. The new time-of-day rate instituted by PEPCO penalized air conditioning. He reported that their summer costs had risen by 35 percent due to the new rates. However, to be fair to PEPCO, Mr. Gallagher pointed out that there had been a reduction in winter rates.

It seemed to Mr. Ewing that it was really an outrage that they did not have air conditioned school buildings all around. There wasn't any other place in Montgomery County or modern America where the majority of professionals were expected to work in un-air conditioned buildings. He said that the loss in work force efficiency would probably be far greater than the cost of operating the air conditioning.

Mrs. Hobbs noted that there had been some problems with the energy management control system in new schools. She asked about a reasonable amount of time to work out the problems in these new schools. Mr. Smith replied that the energy management system was the last item in a school to be completed. Generally the contractors had left the job and the teachers and students had arrived. He thought they had done a good job in getting those systems up and running. The new schools could not have heat or air conditioning unless the system was operable. The systems were working, but the fine tuning took time. Dr. Rohr explained that balancing the system while the building was occupied was very difficult. Normally it would take at least one heating and one cooling season.

Dr. Shoenberg thanked staff for their good report and good work.

Re: STUDY OF 1986-87 MCPS DROPOUTS AND  
MCPS EFFORTS TO HELP POTENTIAL  
DROPOUTS

Dr. Joy Frechtling, director of the Department of Educational Accountability, introduced Ms. Suzanne Raber, principal investigator of the studies on dropouts. The studies were started about three years ago when it looked as if they were having an increasing problem with dropouts. Although the MCPS rate was very low, the trend for dropouts had gone up slightly. The first study looked at the question of what was a dropout because there had been various definitions in Maryland and in the nation. In addition, there were various ways of calculating dropout rates. The second study was a comprehensive look at the dropout problem in Montgomery County. She said that this was one of the most comprehensive studies that had been started at that time across the nation two years ago. She felt that although other jurisdictions had done their own studies, this still remained one of the most comprehensive studies.

Dr. Frechtling explained that the basic purpose of the study was to take a close look at a cohort of students who had dropped out to find out why, develop a profile of the dropouts, and find out what happened to them a couple of years later. They also wanted to take a close look at what services were being offered in MCPS to help students who were in danger of dropping out or who had dropped out and decided to return to the educational system. The report before the Board presented the results of that study.

Dr. Frechtling indicated that they found that students dropped out for a number of reasons, some of which were things that the schools could control and others were family or personal problems that the school system could do relatively little about. They found out that students who dropped out were not one kind of student. While there were some descriptors that were more typical of dropouts than others, all dropouts did not look alike.

About 25 percent of the students who dropped out did complete their educations about three years after the study was started. They found out that Montgomery County had a very wide range of programs aimed at helping students. As a result, they made some suggestions for additional efforts Montgomery County might want to look at both in terms of helping students to prevent students from dropping out and helping students who had dropped out.

Mr. Ewing stated that the study offered them a great deal of very helpful information, but it did not explain the increase in the rate of dropouts in the county. He would be interested in hearing staff views of that. It implied to him that what MCPS had done in the past was largely a reactive strategy. It provided programs for those who had dropped out or were returning but not nearly as much in the way of identification of those who

might be at risk of dropping out.

Dr. Frechtling stated during the past year they had had a decrease in the dropout rate. As the increase paralleled the national effort, the decrease also paralleled the national effort. When they had started the study, they were concerned about whether or not some of the increases in course demands or Project Basic had pushed some students out. However, after these added requirements, the dropout rate had decreased. In terms of the programs, she would agree with Mr. Ewing and disagree. She thought they did need to do some more preventive efforts and some more aggressive earlier efforts to identify students who were at risk. She said they also needed to do more after a student had made the decision to drop out. When a student came back into the school system, they needed to provide more supports. For the student who didn't come back, more supports needed to be given but that was an interagency question.

Dr. Pitt said that although they had not talked about this directly in terms of dropouts, he hoped that the efforts in the early childhood area would help. There was evidence that children who were successful in school tended to stay in school.

However, this was not always the case. He believed they also had to concentrate on the middle level period, and the alternative program would take a look at that. He thought they were doing a lot of good things at the high school level like the Edison Center.

Mr. Ewing pointed out that some students gave loss of credit as a reason to justify their decision to drop out. The Board had had some suggestions that they ought to review that as a Board policy. Staff did not make a recommendation along those lines to rethink this policy; however, they suggested it might be worth taking another look at it. He asked for views on the extent to which this policy drove students out of the school system. Dr. Frechtling replied that in some cases this contributed to students' leaving. The opportunities afforded to students to make up loss of credit were not always consistent across schools.

They recommended that it might be timely to look at the implementation of the policy to see whether or not all opportunities were being offered to students. Ms. Raber added that about 20 percent of the students mentioned loss of credit as being an issue for them; however, it was not the only issue. It was her feeling that it was not the policy per se but the implementation of the appeal procedures being uneven across high schools. In some cases it contributed to the feeling that students did not have a choice.

Mrs. Hobbs reported that there were 508 dropouts who were actually contacted. That number included 26 Hispanic and 20 Asian students. She wondered about efforts to try and get a good representation for all races. In the interview column, the

Hispanic population was far off the number contacted. Ms. Raber explained that they tried to contact all 1,067 students who had dropped out. The same efforts were made for all students. Initially there were six phone calls, and if they were unable to reach them they went back to schools to be sure they had the correct phone number. After that, another wave of calls was made. Unfortunately students from lower socioeconomic backgrounds were more difficult to reach. It was possible that this group of students was more highly minority. She felt that the students they were able to reach were representative of the 1,067 except with respect to race. When they contacted a family that did not speak English, they called back in the native language.

Dr. Cronin said he was taken aback in terms of preconceptions he might have had. The school system had faced criticism about its ability to deal with minority youngsters and making those youngsters feel comfortable in school. Chart 3-2 showed that the largest percentage of students disliking school was from the white community. As he looked at the chart, he was trying to figure what as a school system was in their ability to address. If 50 percent of the Hispanic reasons for dropping out were employment, there may be nothing MCPS could do in terms of assisting students except to get the community at large helping MCPS in those areas. This made the issue more complicated.

Dr. Pitt stated that they were trying to focus in on that. The Maryland's Tomorrow program focused on employment, and a couple of other programs were tied to employment. He thought that school systems could do something when a student needed to be employed. They ought to be able to negate some of those reasons for dropping out. Even though the economic reason was not directly related to the role of MCPS, they could not ignore it.

Dr. Cronin reported that at the NSBA convention he had attended a session on pregnancy, child care, and addressing at risk students. In some school systems, students were required to go to prenatal care and day care was within the school. There were a number of ways they could help this limited number of students.

Dr. Pitt indicated that he had spent a day with one of the work oriented curriculum coordinators at Springbrook High School. They had about 125 students employed while going to school. He was impressed with the focus on meaningful employment where the student earned money and learned something.

Dr. Cronin asked if staff had looked at handicapping or learning disabled classifications that might have been a part of the cause for dropping out. Ms. Raber replied that a disproportionate number of dropouts had participated in special education. However, they did not look at that history of special education but a good number came from Mark Twain.

In regard to the appeals process and loss of credit, Mrs. DiFonzo asked whether there were particular schools that stood out in that regard. If so, were they able to note any similarities such as a veteran administrator versus a younger one, an older staff versus a younger one, location in the county, student body composition, or anything else? Dr. Frechtling explained that this was an observation rather than a problem that they studied.

The questions raised by Mrs. DiFonzo might be the ones that would be looked at if there were a follow-up effort.

Mrs. Praisner commented that there were some recommendations in the report. She was not sure of the extent to which they were implementing some of the recommendations such as the procedures for following non-attendance or involving dropouts in discussions with potential dropouts. Dr. Vance replied that the executive staff had discussed the report on two occasions. After Board discussion, they planned to go back and review the recommendations. They would have a report to the Board on what they intended to do.

Mrs. Praisner noted that Dr. Frechtling had indicated that the numbers had gone down; however, this did not diminish the issue.

She asked whether they had been able to draw any conclusions about the extent to which it affected different parts of the population or different things they might be doing within the system. Dr. Frechtling replied that this was a one-year turnaround, and they needed another year or two before they could start to draw any conclusions.

Mrs. Praisner asked whether Maryland was participating in the Council of Chief State School Officers study. Dr. Frechtling replied that they were, and they had been working on new definitions of a dropout and new ways of collecting data. She hoped to see something in the next year or so. Mr. Arthur Nimitz, director of pupil personnel, added that they would have new definitions of absences and truancy. He said that anyone over the age of 16 was no longer a truant but was just illegally absent. The dropout was defined as one who had not graduated from high school. Dr. Frechtling indicated that this was part of the national effort, and MCPS had been piloting some things this year in conjunction with that effort.

Mrs. Praisner asked whether there were any comparable studies available from other school systems that might have come from the publicity associated with this report. Dr. Frechtling replied that there were other studies underway, but they were started in the same spirit that MCPS started its study. They had found that students who were over age were more likely to have been retained which had been replicated in many other places. Retention as a predictor of dropping out was very firm. Other places were beginning to look at the return rate. She pointed out that part of their study was built on some things that were going on in

Cincinnati. They had used part of their questionnaire to shape the MCPS questions.

Dr. Shoenberg said Dr. Frechtling had stated that being over age and being retained were virtually synonymous. Dr. Frechtling explained that students could be over age for other reasons. For example, parents might not register their children when they were five. Dr. Shoenberg said she had stated that being retained might be a predictor of dropping out, but being retained might also be a surrogate for that which led to dropping out. He would not want to jump from that to say they should not retain students because then they would drop out. Dr. Frechtling indicated that in their study they could only look at whether the student was over age or not, but other studies had more firmly documented the relationship between retention per se and dropping out. Again, this did not say that retention caused dropping out, but there was a firm statistical relationship. Dr. Shoenberg said that the question would be the percentage of students retained who eventually dropped out.

Mrs. Hobbs pointed out that the Board had received a memo from the state superintendent on state goals for public education. There were two important recommendations for MCPS to consider. One was increasing the compulsory school attendance to age 18. They did not have very many existing programs for 18, 19, or 20 year olds. As they looked to the middle school and planned further alternative programs, they still needed to look at the individual high schools and what they could be doing for the older student. The other recommendation had to do with providing flexible school schedules so that students could work. She knew that MCPS already did that to a certain degree. She thought that the data base in individual schools would help in the future. Dr. Pitt assumed she was talking about Dr. Shilling's report and recommendations for the year 2000. Mrs. Hobbs asked for statistics on the 1988-89 school year.

Dr. Shoenberg thanked staff for a very interesting study. Dr. Pitt thought it would be good for the Board to discuss the state superintendent's recommendations. Dr. Shoenberg suggested that this could be tied in with a discussion of the national goals for education this summer. Dr. Pitt indicated that he had requested background material on the state superintendent's recommendations.

RESOLUTION NO. 277-90      Re: EXECUTIVE SESSION - MAY 8, 1990

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 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 8, 1990, 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. 278-90      Re:    MINUTES OF MARCH 26, 1990

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

RESOLVED, That the minutes of March 26, 1990, be approved.

Re:    PROPOSED RESOLUTION TO SCHEDULE  
DISCUSSION ON MINIMUM ACADEMIC  
STANDARDS

On April 17, 1990, Dr. Cronin moved and Ms. Serino seconded the following:

RESOLVED, That the Board hold a discussion of the minimum academic standards required of students who participate in athletics or yearbook, newspaper or dramatics.

Dr. Shoenberg stated that this discussion would not occur until the superintendent had received recommendations from a group of principals working on the athletics issue. Dr. Pitt agreed to also provide information on activities other than athletics. This was projected to occur in the fall. Dr. Shoenberg reworded the resolution to state, "participate in activities with particular emphasis on athletics." Mrs. DiFonzo reworded this to add "co-curricular" before "activities."

RESOLUTION NO. 279-90      Re:    DISCUSSION ON MINIMUM ACADEMIC  
STANDARDS

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

RESOLVED, That the Board hold a discussion of the minimum academic standards required of students who participate in co-curricular activities with particular emphasis on athletics.

RESOLUTION NO. 280-90      Re:    APPOINTMENT OF ETHICS PANEL MEMBER

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

WHEREAS, The Board of Education adopted Resolution No. 162-84 which appointed three members to the Ethics Panel; and

WHEREAS, Mr. Alan Rosenthal was appointed for a three-year term which expired on February 28, 1990; and

WHEREAS, Mr. Rosenthal has indicated that he wishes to continue to serve on the Ethics Panel; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That Mr. Alan Rosenthal be re-appointed to the Ethics Panel for a three-year term from March 1, 1990, through February 28, 1993.

RESOLUTION NO. 281-90      Re:    APPOINTMENT OF OFFICERS TO THE  
TELEVISION FOUNDATION

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

WHEREAS, The Board of Education of Montgomery County has determined that it is in the public interest to accept private funds for the enhancement of educational television; and

WHEREAS, The Montgomery County Board of Education voted on January 9, 1990, to establish the Montgomery County Public Schools Television Foundation, Inc.; and

WHEREAS, Our attorney has filed the Articles of Incorporation of the Montgomery County Public Schools Television Foundation, Inc., with the State Department of Assessments and Taxation on January 11, 1990; and

WHEREAS, The Board and the superintendent have appointed members to serve on the Board of Directors of the Television Foundation; and

WHEREAS, The bylaws require the Board of Education to appoint one of the directors to serve as the chairperson and another as the secretary/treasurer of the Television Foundation; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the Montgomery County Board of Education appoint Mrs. Fran Dean as chairperson of the Montgomery County Public Schools Television Foundation, Inc., beginning at the first meeting of the Board of Directors May 1, 1990, and ending March 31, 1991; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education appoint Mrs. Jean Mallon as secretary/treasurer of the Montgomery County Public Schools Television Foundation, Inc., beginning May 1, 1990, and ending March 31, 1991.

Re: BOARD OF EDUCATION PLANNING AND  
RETREAT

Dr. Shoenberg stated that Dr. Cronin had given the Board a memo with some suggestions. He thought the Board should focus attention on the suggestion that there be a public town meeting in June or July.

Dr. Cronin commented that the Board should not keep itself hostage to elections. Five-year plans always overlapped through varieties of elections and changes on the Board. The Board of Education was a continuing corporate body, and they did not go election to election. If they were going to discuss Dr. Gordon's report this summer, they were going to be looking at those in long-term perspectives. Mr. Ewing had provided the Board with a number of pieces he had written over the past year. These were all long-term suggestions which would bind future Boards. He still thought they should have a year of planning so that a future Board would have a proposal before it. However, he did not have five votes to support his proposal.

Dr. Cronin said a town meeting would give them an opportunity to talk with citizens to gain some perspective on what the community thought ought to be future directions. However, if they heard from the community and conducted their own retreat, they were left with what did they do next.

Dr. Shoenberg explained that one of the reasons for not asking the superintendent to become involved in a planning process following the retreat was the amount of business before the superintendent already. He felt less strongly about the town meeting, but he would argue that the time for that was not now. What they were about here was an opportunity for the Board and senior staff to pull its thinking together. He said that after December 1 they could have a town meeting with people commenting



adopted unanimously:

WHEREAS, One of the finalists for the office of student member of the Board of Education has submitted written notification that he has withdrawn from the election; and

WHEREAS, The Board of Education and MCR have conferred and agreed on adjustments to the election procedure that will assure the election will result in the selection of the 13th student member of the Board of Education and an alternate; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the election procedures agreed to by the Board of Education and MCR be confirmed.

Ms. Serino announced that the new candidate was Jimmy Hung, a junior at Quince Orchard High School. May 22 was the new date for the election.

RESOLUTION NO. 283-90 Re: BOE APPEAL NO. 1989-42

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

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education adopt its Decision and Order in BOE Appeal No. 1989-42 (a transportation matter).

RESOLUTION NO. 284-90 Re: BOE APPEAL NO. 1990-7

On motion of Dr. Cronin seconded by Mrs. Praisner, the following resolution was adopted with Dr. Cronin, Mrs. DiFonzo, Mr. Ewing, Mrs. Praisner, and Dr. Shoenberg voting in the affirmative; Mrs. Hobbs voting in the negative; Ms. Serino abstaining:

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education adopt its Decision and Order in BOE Appeal No. 1990-7 (a personnel matter).

For the record, Ms. Serino stated that she had not participated in BOE Appeal No. 1990-7.

RESOLUTION NO. 285-90 Re: BOE APPEAL NO. 1990-8

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

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education adopt its Decision and Order in BOE Appeal No. 1990-8 (student records).

Re: NEW BUSINESS

1. Mrs. DiFonzo asked that the superintendent provide his analysis of and reaction to the Queen Anne's County dropout prevention program model to the Board by September 1, 1990. The

report should address whether the program could be adaptable for use in MCPS.

2. Mr. Ewing moved and Ms. Serino seconded that the Board of Education schedule a review of the loss of credit policy and its implementation with a view to assessing its effectiveness as a mechanism for keeping students in class and in school as compared with other methods of achieving the same result.

RESOLUTION NO. 286-90      Re:    COMMENDATION OF JUDGE RUBEN

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

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education request the superintendent to bring to the Board for action a resolution which commends Judge Leonard Ruben for his outstanding and highly successful efforts in his courtroom to bring home to MCPS students the lessons of the consequences of illegal drug use; and be it further

RESOLVED, That if approved the resolution be sent to all the circuit court judges in Montgomery County, the state court administrator, and appropriate other public officials.

Re:    NEW BUSINESS (CONTINUED)

3. Mrs. Hobbs moved and Mr. Ewing seconded that the Board of Education schedule a discussion with its Ethics Panel.

4. Ms. Serino requested an update on the status of the Richard Montgomery Cluster study on class rank.

Re:    ITEM OF INFORMATION

Board members received the Quarterly Change Order Report as an item of information.

Re:    ADJOURNMENT

The president adjourned the meeting at 11 p.m.

-----  
PRESIDENT

-----  
SECRETARY

HP:mlw