

APPROVED  
25-1980

Rockville, Maryland  
July 8, 1980

The Board of Education of Montgomery County met in regular session at the Educational Services Center, Rockville, Maryland, on Tuesday, July 8, 1980, at 10:30 a.m.

ROLL CALL Present: Dr. Daryl W. Shaw, President in the Chair  
Mr. Joseph R. Barse  
Dr. Marian L. Greenblatt  
Mrs. Elizabeth W. Spencer  
Mrs. Carol F. Wallace  
Miss Traci Williams  
Mrs. Eleanor D. Zappone

Absent: Mr. Blair G. Ewing

Others Present: Dr. Edward Andrews, Superintendent of Schools  
Dr. Harry Pitt, Deputy Superintendent  
Dr. Robert S. Shaffner, Executive Assistant

Re: Executive Session

Dr. Shaw announced that the Board has been meeting in executive session from 9 a.m. to 10:30 a.m. on personnel matters. He said that Mr. Ewing had informed them sometime ago that he would be unable to attend this meeting.

Resolution No. 404-80 Re: Approval of the Agenda for July 8, 1980

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education approve its agenda for July 8, 1980, with changes in times due to the late start of the meeting.

Resolution No. 405-80 Re: Executive Session - July 21, 1980

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

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education of Montgomery County hereby conduct its meeting in executive closed session beginning on July

21, 1980, at 7 p.m. to discuss, consider, deliberate, and/or otherwise decide the employment, assignment, appointment, promotion, demotion, compensation, discipline, removal, or resignation of employees, appointees, or officials over whom it has jurisdiction, or any other personnel matter affecting one or more particular individuals, to consult with legal counsel, and to comply with a specific constitutional, statutory or judicially imposed requirement protecting particular proceedings or matters from public disclosure as permitted under Article 76A, Section 11(a) and that such meeting shall continue in executive closed session until the completion of business.

Re: Board Member Comments

1. Mrs. Spencer called attention to the item of information on the Youth Act. She noted that the arguments were those of NSBA's, and the "we" or "our" in the paper referred to NSBA.
2. Mr. Barse indicated that he would not be present for the afternoon session of the Board meeting. In regard to Board member evaluations, he did object to confidentiality in this process because he believed it should be done publicly. He said that while it was up to the individual he would prefer to receive signed evaluations which would be open for public view.
3. In regard to the Wheaton Vocational/Technical Center, Dr. Shaw said the Board had received a letter from Leo Ritter, executive director, the Interagency Committee for State Public School Construction. The letter stated "The Interagency Committee at its meeting of June 27, 1980, discussed the request of the Montgomery County Board of Education to proceed with planning of the approved Wheaton High School FY'79 renovation project and the approved Vocational-Technical Center FY '80 project. The committee approved the above request and concurred with the proposal to convert Wheaton High School space to a vo-tech center. The estimated budget is \$5.1 million, and the other part is \$5 million." The superintendent pointed out that this was not a budget decision; it was a planning decision and whether they would be able to get \$11 million from the state remained to be seen.

Resolution No. 406-80

Re: Minutes of June 3, 1980

On motion of Miss Williams seconded by Mrs. Zappone, the following resolution was adopted unanimously:

Resolved, That the minutes of June 3, 1980, be approved.

Resolution No. 407-80

Re: Tuition for Out-of-County and  
Out-of-State Pupils for FY 1981

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

WHEREAS, Resolution 364-77 which established the basis for noncounty tuition charges provides that the per pupil cost shall be based on the current year's estimated cost, including debt service; and

WHEREAS, The basis for the calculation of cost per pupil for tuition purposes in FY 1981 is as follows:

	Middle	Special	Education
Kindergarten			
Elementary			
Juni or/Seni or		5,001	
Estimated Number of Pupils			37,246
50,012		3,778	
Out-of-County Maryland Pupils			
Cost:			
Regular Program		\$8,851,409	\$
98,739,150	\$146,870,801	\$21,859,928	
Debt Service		221,155	3,294,193
4,431,279		334,142	
Total Cost		\$9,072,564	\$102,033,343
\$22,194,070			\$151,302,080
Cost Per Pupil:			
Regular Program		\$ 1,770	\$ 2,651
2,932		\$ 5,787	
Debt Service		44	88
88		88	
Total Cost Per Pupil		\$ 1,814	\$ 2,739
3,020		\$ 5,875	
Out-of-State Pupils			
Cost:			
Regular Program		\$8,851,409	\$
98,739,150	\$146,870,801	\$21,859,928	
Debt Service		352,870	5,256,148
7,070,450		533,151	
Total Cost		\$9,204,279	\$103,995,298
\$153,941,251		\$22,393,079	
Cost Per Pupil:			
Regular Program		\$ 1,770	\$ 2,651
2,932		\$ 5,787	
Debt Service		70	141
141		141	
Total Cost Per Pupil		\$ 1,840	\$ 2,792
3,073		\$ 5,928	

Comparisons with Previous Year

1979-80

1980-81	Out-of-County	Out-of-County	Out-of-County
	Out-of-County	Out-of-County	Out-of-County
Out-of-County			
Kindergarten		\$1,601	\$1,628
\$1,814	\$1,840		
Elementary		2,350	2,403
2,739	2,792		
Middle/Juni or/Seni or		2,650	2,703
3,020	3,073		
Special Education		5,623	5,676
5,875	5,928		

now therefore be it

Resolved, That the tuition rates for out-of-county Maryland pupils and out-of-state pupils for the 1980-81 school year shall be:

	Out-of-County	Out-of-State
Kindergarten	\$1,814	\$1,840
Elementary	2,739	2,792
Middle/Junior/Senior	3,020	3,073
Special Education	5,875	5,928

Resolution No. 408-80

Re: Rejection of Bid 103-80, for  
Bread and Rolls

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

Resolved, That having been duly advertised May 21, 1980, the contract for the furnishing and delivering of bread and rolls under Invitation to Bid 103-80 be rejected.

Resolution No. 409-80

Re: Bid 107-80, Printing, Adult  
Education  
Course Bulletin

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

WHEREAS, Funds have been budgeted for the purchase of printing of the Adult Education Course Bulletin; now therefore be it

Resolved, That having been duly advertised May 22, 1980, the contract for the furnishing of printing of the Adult Education Course Bulletin for the period of July 13, 1980, through July 12, 1981, under Invitation to Bid 107-80 be awarded to:

Comprint, Gaithersburg, Maryland,

low bidder meeting specifications.

Resolution No. 410-80

Re: Award of a Contract for Two  
Boilers  
Under Bid 112-80

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

WHEREAS, Funds have been budgeted for the purchase of boilers; now therefore be it

Resolved, That having been duly advertised June 4, 1980, the



- Prince George's County and Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission,
- Prince George's County and Housing Authority of Prince George's County,
- Prince George's County and Hospital Commission of Prince George's County.

All of our clients' information is treated in a strictly confidential manner; it is the basis of our profession. Our staff is trained to understand the importance of maintaining client information in strict confidence. Our livelihood as independent certified public accountants hinges significantly upon our integrity and confidentiality.

To further insure the confidentiality of MCPS' records and information, we will perform the following steps:

1. We hereby agree not to assign any staff to the MCPS audit who have worked on the Montgomery County audit, and vice versa.
2. Once again, we will stress your specific concerns regarding confidentiality to the staffs on both engagements.
3. We will include a special section in the programs of examination of both organizations that stresses the importance of confidentiality of information between the two organizations.

We believe the above measures, in addition to our normal understandings and staff training, will be adequate to cover MCPS' concerns.

Differences of opinion or conflicts regarding accounting issues or financial reporting matters have arisen during concurrent engagements in the past, and have been successfully resolved as a normal part of the overall audit process. When these circumstances have arisen, our approach to solving these issues has been to apply the following guidelines:

1. The financial statements, including the related footnotes, we examine are those of the client. The client is responsible for the fair presentation of the financial statements in conformity with generally accepted accounting principles.
2. As auditors, we are engaged to examine and express an appropriate opinion on our clients' financial statements. Our engagement responsibilities include an objective evaluation of significant transactions and related underlying documentation. In effect, we represent, from an independent and objective point of view, all parties interested in our clients' financial statements.
3. We perform our examination and express our opinion on the basis of all information requested by and made available to us. If during our examinations,

we become aware of a conflict between entities, we do have the advantage of knowing the position of both entities. We attempt to resolve the conflict, not as an intermediary, but as an independent third party. We may seek to bring the parties together to reach a mutually agreeable conclusion. However, under no circumstance would information be passed from one organization to another through Touche Ross.

4. If a mutually agreeable conclusion between the parties cannot be reached, we then express independent opinions on each entity's financial statements based upon the underlying facts and circumstances, materiality considerations and disclosure standards applicable to each separate entity.

We would apply the same approach described above to any situation which may arise in connection with MCPS and the County engagements. In summary, the information we obtain in the course of our audit is confidential. It would be a violation of our standards to share such information with anyone else without MCPS's specific approval. Obviously, we would have to comply with any subpoena, court order, etc. We would inform you of any such situations. We would be pleased to meet with you to discuss this matter further if you so desire.

Very truly yours,  
/s/ Touche Ross & Co.  
Certified Public Accountants

Resolution No. 412-80

Re: Increase in Scope and Price of  
Contract No. RFP-DEA-79-01 for FY  
1980 MCPS Audit by Touche Ross  
and Company

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

WHEREAS, On May 8, 1979, the Board of Education authorized the award of a contract to Touche Ross and Company for conducting the annual audit of MCPS; and

WHEREAS, It has become necessary and advantageous to MCPS to expand the scope of the audit under that contract; and

WHEREAS, Sufficient funds are included in the FY 1981 operating budget; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the contract price for conducting the audit of MCPS for Fiscal Year 1980 be increased, not to exceed \$34,670.

Resolution No. 413-80

Re: Asbestos Abatement - Col. Zadok  
Magruder High School Gymnasium

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

WHEREAS, Sealed bids were received on June 26 to furnish and install new ceiling for asbestos abatement in the Magruder High School gymnasium as indicated below:

Bidder	Base Bid
1. Samuel C. Rosner, General Contractor	\$49,254*
2. Fulton Construction Company, Inc.	60,000
3. Deneau Construction, Inc.	61,483

\* Recommended Award

and

WHEREAS, The low bidder is a reputable contractor who has performed similar projects in this area; and

WHEREAS, Funds provided through the FY 1981 Capital Budget are sufficient for contract award; now therefore be it

Resolved, That a contract be awarded to Samuel C. Rosner, General Contractor, for \$49,254 to furnish and install new ceiling for asbestos abatement in the Col. Zadok Magruder High School gymnasium, in accordance with plans and specifications prepared by Victor Smolen & Associates.

Resolution No. 414-80                      Re: Modifications for the Handicapped Educational Services Center

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

WHEREAS, Bids were received on June 30 to make modifications to the Educational Services Center to accommodate the handicapped as indicated below:

Bidder	Total Base Bid
1. Patrick Quinn, Inc.	\$198,000
2. Robert J. Henley Construction Co., Inc.	242,445
3. Deneau Construction, Inc.	306,995

and

WHEREAS, low bidder, Patrick Quinn, Inc., has performed satisfactorily on other MCPS projects including Bethesda and Ritchie Park Elementary School physical education facilities; and

WHEREAS, Funds provided through the FY 1980 capital budget are sufficient for contract award; now therefore be it

Resolved, That a contract be awarded to Patrick Quinn, Inc., for



the FY 1981 Early Education Project for the Continuum Model for Direct Services to Handicapped Children Project:

Category	From	To
03 Instructional Other	\$5,000	
05 Special Education		\$5,000

and be it further

Resolved, That the county executive be requested to recommend approval of this resolution to the County Council and that a copy be sent to the county executive and County Council.

Resolution No. 417-80                      Re: Utilization of a Portion of the  
FY 1981 Appropriation for  
Projected  
Supported Programs for the Head  
Start Child Development Program

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

Resolved, That the superintendent of schools be authorized to receive and expend under the FY 1981 Appropriation for Supported Projects of \$500,000 a supplemental grant of \$14,000 from the Administration for Children, Youth, and Families through Montgomery County Community Action Agency to enhance the Head Start program in the categories below and to establish the position shown.

Category	Position	Amount
02 Instructional Salaries	.5*	\$ 6,728
03 Instructional Other		3,900
06 Transportation		1,450
09 Fixed Charges		1,922
	Total	\$14,000

\* Psychologist (G) 10-month .5

and be it further

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

Resolution No. 418-80                      Re: FY 1981 Supplemental  
Appropriation  
for a Summer Work Program Grant  
for Mark Twain School

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

Resolved, That the superintendent of schools be authorized, subject

to County Council approval, to receive and expend a grant of \$65,082 in FY 1980 and FY 1981 from the County Division of Labor Services to accomplish a work experience program for students at the Mark Twain School in the following categories:

Category	Supplemental
03 Instructional Other	\$ 8,700
05 Special Education	52,520
09 Fixed Charges	3,862
Total	\$65,082

and be it further

Resolved, That the county executive be requested to recommend approval of this resolution to the County Council and that a copy be sent to the county executive and County Council.

Resolution No. 419-80                      Re: FY 1981 Categorical Transfer for  
the Early  
Childhood Education Project

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

Resolved, That the superintendent of schools be authorized, subject to County Council approval, to effect the following transfer for the FY 1981 Early Childhood Education Project (including establishment of the positions shown):

Category	Positions	From	To
03 Instructional Other	1.4*	\$21,950	
05 Special Education			\$12,725
09 Fixed Charges			9,225
Total		\$21,950	\$21,950

\* Occupational Therapist (A-D) 10-month      .7  
Physical Therapist (A-D) 10-month              .7  
Total    1.4

and be it further

Resolved, That the county executive be requested to recommend approval of this transfer to the County Council and that a copy of this resolution be sent to the county executive and County Council.

Resolution No. 420-80                      Re: Constitution of Position of  
Special Assistant to the  
Superintendent for  
Supplemental Funding, Revenue and  
Special Projects

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Mrs.

Zappone seconded by Mrs. Wallace, the following resolution was adopted unanimously:

WHEREAS, The Department of Federal, State, and Private Grants was eliminated from the FY 1981 Board of Education Operating Budget, and two positions were established in the Department of Budget Planning and Development to assume responsibilities formerly located in the abolished department; and

WHEREAS, It is desirable that responsibilities for seeking grants and matching funds be combined with responsibilities for coordinating specially identified projects on behalf of the superintendent and projecting revenues available for funding the operating budget; and

WHEREAS, Location of these responsibilities in the Office of the Superintendent will facilitate coordination of activities with all Montgomery County Public Schools organizational units; now therefore be it

Resolved, That a position of grants specialist, pay grade 24, and a position of secretary III, pay grade 11, be transferred from the Department of Budget Planning and Development to the Office of the Superintendent and be reconstituted to special assistant to the superintendent for supplemental funding, revenue, and special projects, unscheduled, and secretary IV, pay grade 12 respectively, effective July 15, 1980; and be it further

Resolved, That the major responsibilities of the position of special assistant to the superintendent include: establishing and maintaining liaison with county, state, federal and private agencies on all programs of the MCPS funded by grants or matching funds; reviewing laws and regulations to assure that funds intended for educational programs and services in MCPS are sought; encouraging designation of funds for educational purposes; identifying fund sources; and annually projecting amounts available to fund the MCPS operating budget; and be it further

Resolved, That the major objectives of the position will be to aggressively seek out and obtain funds from a variety of sources to augment revenues generally available for use by MCPS; to stimulate and encourage MCPS staff to develop promising approaches, practices and materials to deal with currently identified needs and match these to external funding sources so they can be put into effect; to serve as liaison between MCPS and its funding sources; to serve as a coordinator, on behalf of the superintendent, for specially identified projects; and be it further

Resolved, That the position of special assistant to the superintendent for supplemental funding, revenue and special projects be included in the negotiators' group and excluded from the bargaining unit.

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Mrs. Wallace seconded by Mrs. Zappone, 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. 422-80                      Re: Extension of Sick Leave

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Mrs. Wallace seconded by Mrs. Zappone, 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 period indicated:

Name	Position and Location	No. of Days
Jose H. Garcia	Long Term Leave	11
Mark W. Gaither	Building Service Worker Georgetown Hill	30

Resolution No. 423-80                      Re: Personnel Reassignments

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

Resolved, That the following personnel reassignments be approved:

Name	From	To
Barker, John	Construct. Plans Examiner Construction & Capital Projects  20 G L1	Plant Equipment Operator To be determined Will maintain present Salary level July 1, 1980
Caputo, Esther	Secretary III Academic Skills 11 G L3	Secretary II Area 5 Office Will maintain present Salary level August 4, 1980

Edwards, Kenneth	Classroom Teacher Bethesda Chevy Chase H. S.  M+30 L3	Teacher Assistant Bethesda Chevy Chase High School Will maintain present salary level July 1, 1980
Fehler, Helen P.	Classroom Teacher Washington Grove Elem.  M+30 L3	Teacher Asst. To be determined Will maintain present salary level July 1, 1980
Gross, Rosalie	Classroom Teacher Personal Illness Leave MEQ L1	Teacher Asst. To be deter. Will maintain present salary level July 1, 1980
Matloff, Gertrude	Classroom Teacher Personal Illness Leave  M-14 L1	Instructional Materials Aide (.5) To be determined Will maintain present salary level July 1, 1980
Stephanos, Gerry	Budget Analyst I  Budget Planning and Development 15 G L3	Account Clerk III Division of Accounting Will maintain present salary level July 1, 1980

Resolution No. 424-80

Re: Death of Mrs. Ruth M Ryan,  
Classroom Teacher at Albert  
Einstein High School

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

WHEREAS, The sudden death on June 15, 1980, of Mrs. Ruth M Ryan, a classroom teacher at Albert Einstein High School, has deeply saddened the staff and members of the Board of Education; and

WHEREAS, In the eleven years that Mrs. Ryan had been a member of the staff of Montgomery County Public Schools, she had made a valuable contribution to the school program; and

WHEREAS, Mrs. Ryan's pride in her work and her pleasant attitude were recognized by staff and associates; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the members of the Board of Education express their sorrow at the death of Mrs. Ruth M Ryan and extend deepest sympathy to her family; and be it further

Resolved, That this resolution be made part of the minutes of this meeting and a copy be forwarded to the family of the deceased.

Resolution No. 425-80                      Re: Personnel Appointments and Transfers

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

Resolved, That the following personnel appointments and transfers be approved:

Appointment Ira LeRoy Stern	Present Position Associate Superintendent for Program Development Office of Program Development	As Special Assistant to the Superintendent for Supple- mental Funding, Revenue and Special Projects Office of the Superintendent Effective July 15, 1980
Lois A. Martin	Area Associate Superintendent Office of the Deputy Superintendent	Associate Superintendent for Instruction and Program Development Effective July 15, 1980
Joseph S. Villani	Principal Eastern Junior High	Principal Montgomery Blair

	School	High School Effective July 9, 1980
Transfer	From	To
Robert A. Dornburg	Principal Highland View Elementary	Principal Rock Creek Valley Elementary Effective July 22, 1980
Gerald W. Johnson	Principal Rosemary Hills Elementary	Principal Maryvale Elementary Effective July 22, 1980
Appointment	Present Position	As
F. Thornton Lauriat	Principal Bethesda-Chevy Chase High School	Acting Supervisor of Secondary Instruction Area 3 Administrative Effective July 22, 1980
Office		
Irene C. Glaser	Acting Coordinator of Elementary Art Division of Aesthetic Education Department of Instructional Planning and Development	Coordinator, Elementary Art Division of Aesthetic Educa- tion Department of Instructional Planning and Development Grade H Effective July 9, 1980
Frank W. Fernandez	Acting Foreign Student Admissions Officer Department of Interagency programs	International Student Admissions Officer Department of Interagency Programs Grade G Effective July 9, 1980

Resolution No. 426-80

Re: Personnel Transfer

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Mrs. Spencer seconded by Dr. Greenblatt, the following resolution was adopted with Dr. Greenblatt, Dr. Shaw, Mrs. Spencer, and Mrs. Zappone voting in the affirmative; Mr. Barse and Mrs. Wallace abstaining (Miss Williams affirmative):

Resolved, That the following transfer be approved:

Transfer	From	To
Joseph H. Byrnes	Assistant Principal Springbrook High	Assistant Principal Sherwood High Effective July 9, 1980

The superintendent stated that he would consider the possibility of interns being assigned to those schools not staffed because of Council budget cuts such as Springbrook High School.

Resolution No. 427-80                      Re: Personnel Appointment

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

Resolved, That the following personnel appointment be approved:

Appointment	Present Position	As
Dorothy Jackson	Teacher Specialist, Elementary Social Studies Division of Academic Skills Department of Instructional Planning and Development	Coordinator of Elementary Social Studies Division of Academic Skills Department of Instructional Planning and Development Grade H Effective July 9, 1980

Re: Personnel Assignment

The superintendent announced that he was temporarily assigning Dr. Thomas R. Peters to the position of acting associate superintendent for Area 5 effective July 15, 1980.

Re: Board/Press/Visitor Conference

On behalf of the Board and staff, the superintendent welcomed back Ms. Jeannette Belliveau of the Montgomery County Journal.

Resolution No. 428-80                      Re: Rules of Procedure in Contested Matters

On motion of Mrs. Zappone seconded by Mrs. Spencer, the following resolution was adopted unanimously:

Resolved, That Section 4 and other references to Continuum Education hearings be deleted from Regulation 201-8, Rules of Procedure in Contested Matters.

Re: A Motion by Mr. Barse to Amend  
the  
Continuum Education Hearing  
Procedures (FAILED)

A motion by Mr. Barse to amend the Continuum Education Hearing Procedures by substituting "the Board of Education has the right to request that the associate superintendent for continuum education forward specific cases for their informal review" for Section VII, Board of Education Review failed with Mr. Barse and Mrs. Wallace voting in the affirmative; Dr. Greenblatt, Dr. Shaw, Mrs. Spencer, and Mrs. Zappone voting in the negative (Miss Williams negative).

Resolution No. 429-80                      Re: Continuum Education Hearings

On motion of Mrs. Spencer seconded by Mrs. Wallace, the following resolution was adopted with Dr. Greenblatt, Dr. Shaw, Mrs. Spencer, Mrs. Wallace, and Mrs. Zappone voting in the affirmative; Mr. Barse voting in the negative (Miss Williams affirmative):

Resolved, That the superintendent be instructed in writing by the Board to bring to the Board prior to the decision of the LEA for its review all such cases where there would seem to be issues of great import as seen by the parents or staff.

Re: State Law on Conflict of Interest

The superintendent reported that there was a new state law on the books that dealt with conflict of interest for superintendents and school Board members. This grew out of the Kent County case. Mr. Charles Reese, school Board attorney, explained that this was not really a new law but rather a new title to an old law. The law changed the words "minor child" to "dependent." It also required Board members to notify the Board in writing of potential conflicts, and the notification should be included in the minutes of the meeting. He said that they did not have to report an interest in a company that was less than 3 percent.\* He said that as contracts came before the Board every Board member should review whether they had a conflict of interest on a particular matter. If Board members had problems as to whether the conflict of interest

was direct or indirect, they might want to contact him

Miss Williams pointed out that she was a dependent and under the responsibility of her parents. Mr. Reese advised her that it might be a good habit for her to disclose any potential conflicts of interest.

\* Mr. Barse left the meeting at this point.

Re: Proposed Resolution for Maryland  
Association of Boards of  
Education

Dr. Greenblatt moved approval of the following proposed resolution.  
Mrs. Spencer seconded the motion.

WHEREAS, The Maryland Association of Boards of Education recognizes the essential role of local Boards of Education in determining policies and procedures not inconsistent with federal and state laws and state Board bylaws; and

WHEREAS, There is an increase in appeals to the state Board of Education dealing in particular with local Board policy issues; and

WHEREAS, The state Board of Education is now holding legal hearings to determine whether there will be a hearing; and

WHEREAS, There is an increase in the number of hearings heard by the state Board of Education; and

WHEREAS, Local Boards of Education are now faced with many difficult decisions and have declining resources; and

WHEREAS, Such appeal matters incur substantial costs for legal representation; now therefore be it

Resolved, That a select task force comprised of members of the state Board of Education and members of the Maryland Association of Boards of Education be commissioned to inquire into the hearing processes employed by the state Board of Education in order to make recommendations for improvement of communication, reduce the trend toward encroachment on local control of education and reduce the use of taxpayers' funds when engaged in said appeal processes.

Resolution No. 428-80

Re: Amendment to the Proposed  
Resolution for the Maryland  
Association of  
Boards of Education

On motion of Mrs. Wallace seconded by Mrs. Spencer, the following resolution was adopted unanimously:

Resolved, That the proposed resolution for the Maryland Association



WHEREAS, The Board of Education adopted a Policy Statement on the Senior High School; and

WHEREAS, That policy established a Task Force on Student Behavior and Discipline as an advisory group to the Board of Education; and

WHEREAS, The Board of Education determined the membership of that task force to include eight parents and/or community members, four students, three principals, three teachers, one central office administrator, one area office administrator, and three supporting services employees; and

WHEREAS, Persons have indicated a willingness to serve on this task force either by application or by recommendation from various associations or staff; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Board of Education appoint the following individuals to serve on the Task Force on Student Behavior and Discipline:

**Parents/Community Members**

Mr. Michael Carozza	2 years
Mrs. Mary Haley	2 years
Mr. Earl McDonald	2 years
Mrs. Rita Rumbaugh	1 year
Mrs. Rosalie Sherbrooke	1 year
Mrs. Anita Smith	1 year
Mrs. Suzanne Underwood	1 year
Vacancy to be filled	2 years

**Students**

Miss Cindy Corley, Richard Montgomery High School	1 year
Miss Grace Lee, Churchill High School	2 years
Mr. Mark Lerner, Whitman High School	1 year
Mr. Artie Williams, II, Springbrook High School	2 years

**Principals**

Mrs. Sylvia H. Hudes, Seven Locks Elementary School	1 year
Mr. Ed Clements, Takoma Park Junior High School	1 year
Dr. Frank Bready, Churchill High School	2 years

**Teachers**

Ms. Marilyn Lev, Belt Junior High School	2 years
Mr. Donald Maxey, Seneca Valley High School	1 year
Mr. John Spitzberg, Mark Twain School	2 years

**Central Office Administrator**

Dr. Henry Shetterly, acting director, Department of Interagency Programs	2 years
---	---------

**Area Office Administrator**

Mrs. Patricia E. Newby, supervisor of Special Services	1 year
--	--------

Supporting Services Employees

Mr. James Howard, building services manager, JFK H. S.	1 year
Ms. Margaret Love, instructional materials aide, Longview/Stephen Knolls	2 years
Ms. Nancy Tetlow, bus operator, Area 5	1 year

and be it further

Resolved, That the task force shall select its own chairperson.

Resolution No. 433-80                      Re: Deferral of Item on Blue Ribbon  
Commission

On motion of Mrs. Wallace seconded by Dr. Greenblatt, the following resolution was adopted with Dr. Greenblatt, Dr. Shaw, Mrs. Spencer, and Mrs. Wallace voting in the affirmative; Mrs. Zappone being temporarily absent (Miss Williams affirmative):

Resolved, That the item on the Recommendations of the Blue Ribbon Commission be deferred to a future meeting.

Re: Board Member Evaluations

Mrs. Spencer explained that the paper carried just her name because she had written it late yesterday afternoon and did not have time to consult with Mrs. Wallace. She said that she had tried to order some of the questions which must be addressed and noted that this was not an action item.

Mrs. Wallace commented that she believed evaluation was a means of self-improvement, and she didn't necessarily agree with Mr. Barse that these evaluations should always be public. She thought that evaluations should be done every two years especially for Board members seeking re-election. Dr. Shaw reported that Mr. Barse had felt that evaluations should be open and public. Mrs. Spencer pointed out that the Blue Ribbon Commission spoke to the evaluation of the Board as a Board and its officers, which would be public information. She noted that she was the only Board member who had been evaluated twice, and she appreciated the comments she had received on the evaluations. Dr. Shaw said that he had been through it only once, and he, too, appreciated the comments. He was not sure it made much difference if people signed the evaluations. He recalled that they did have a problem because immediately after the evaluations the press called individual Board members about the evaluations. Mrs. Zappone wondered whether people would be as frank if they knew the evaluations would be public information.

Mrs. Wallace reported that there were several ways of going at the evaluation process. One would be no evaluation, evaluation of the individual Board member, looking at the Board as a whole, and a combination, which she favored. She said they could have one form for individual Board members and one form for the Board as a whole and its officers. She felt that they had to see themselves as well

as how they interrelated as a Board. Dr. Greenblatt distributed a sample evaluation from the East St. Louis Park School and suggested they might want to consider this format. She remarked that there was a difference between the evaluation of the Board of Education and looking at members. She suggested that they could always add a sheet for individual comments to a Board member.

Dr. Shaw said that one question was how often the evaluation should be done. He pointed out that they had a problem with the time of the year as well. Mrs. Wallace pointed out that they also had to consider the evaluation of the student member. Miss Williams suggested that in addition to evaluation as a Board member, the student member should be evaluated by the Board, MCR, and MCJC as to how the student member related back to students. Mrs. Spencer said they could have a form of how the office of student member worked in cooperation with the Board rather than evaluating the individual student member.

Mrs. Wallace suggested that they could have the evaluation of the Board yearly with members being done every two years. Dr. Shaw felt that the evaluation should be done in the spring of the year.

Mrs. Wallace thought the evaluations should be done in May. Mrs. Spencer suggested they might want to evaluate a Board member after they had served a year and a half. Dr. Greenblatt commented that if the purpose of an evaluation was to improve Board action then after six months on the Board there would be some time to do this.

She suggested evaluations in the first and third years of a term of office. If they decided to do officers, she said this would have to be done annually. Mrs. Spencer pointed out that they should not do the student members in May. Miss Williams said that the evaluation could be more in terms of functioning within the Board. Dr. Shaw remarked that he liked Miss Williams' idea that the students develop their own instrument and include the student on the Board-as-a-whole evaluation. Mrs. Spencer suggested that when they returned to this topic that a fiscal impact statement be provided because there were costs involved in mailing out the evaluation forms. She said that they might want to do a limited pilot to test out evaluation items. They could get this out as an item of information and have people react to it. Dr. Greenblatt noted that she had attended a session at NSBA on the evaluation of the superintendent. Mrs. Spencer suggested that they might want to include the superintendent on the evaluation forms as secretary-treasurer of the Board of Education.

Re: Montgomery County Citizens for  
Vocational/Technical Education

The superintendent announced that the Board had written a letter giving the group 15 minutes for a presentation and allowing 15 minutes for questions. He stated that this was not a hearing before the Board.

Mrs. Joyce Parrico stated that they represented Montgomery County

Citizens for Vocational/Technical Education. They advocated a realistic and viable approach to vocational/technical training to enable Montgomery County students to successfully enter into employment following high school. In the spring of 1979 a group of parents realized that their children, who would be graduating in two years, were receiving less than appropriate vocational training. At the same time they learned of highly successful programs at vocational/technical high schools in neighboring counties. They presented a proposal to MCPS in May 1979, and they organized into MC/VOTE in June 1980 because the MCPS response to their original proposal failed to meet the needs of 22 high school students identified as needing vocational training.

Mrs. Parrico said they were requesting the Board of Education to establish a cooperative program through the Department of Interagency Programs and the Department of Alternative Centers to include a half-day MCPS program (English, social studies, science, and math) and a half-day placement at the Howard County Vocational Technical High School. She said that a significant number of students had demonstrated minimal academic progress over a period of years and were in need of vocational preparation which would provide job entry level skills upon graduation. She pointed out that there were also students whose handicapping conditions prevented them from benefiting from the fragmented vocational courses scattered about the county.

She noted that these were the same students who were guaranteed the right under PL 94-142 to an appropriate education based on their individual needs. She stated that to spend a major portion of the school budget appropriately preparing MCPS students for college entrance, while failing to appropriately prepare handicapped students for job entry-level skills was discriminatory. Section 504 of the 1973 Vocational Rehabilitation Act said that a school system must provide services to handicapped students of equal benefit or as effective as services provided to others.

Mrs. Parrico stated that in response to Dr. Fountain's statement that MCPS would need to go beyond the Learning Centers and look at students from all programs, they had modified their original proposal to include any student who needed vocational education. They acknowledged that MCPS was making new efforts in the area of vocational technical education; for example, a vocational assessment center for handicapped students at Walter Johnson and a decision to establish a vocational/technical center at Wheaton High School. She said that after a series of delays the vocational assessment center opened to serve students late in March. Less than 30 Walter Johnson Learning Center and B-CC Level 4 students were served during the remainder of the school year. She pointed out that the assessment center, funded with state/federal funds, was a pilot program which did not ensure the continuation of the program. She said the vocational/technical center was still in the planning stages and the implementation date of 1984 overlooked the vocational needs of the 15-18 year olds currently in high school. Mrs. Parrico said that vocational support for the handicapped at

Blair, Rockville, Wootton, Peary, Sherwood, Damascus, and Gaithersburg presently operative were non-MCPS funded. She said that provision of a vocational aide for the handicapped, whether working independently or attached to the already existing support team for the disadvantaged, did not demonstrate a strong commitment on the part of MCPS to the handicapped. She felt that voluntary in-service training workshops did not assist in breaking down the attitudinal barriers toward vocational education in Montgomery County. She said that the 1979 summer workshops were attended by less than 12 persons.

She reported that attendance for the 1980 workshops was larger, approximately 300, but they questioned if even this was really large enough participation to prepare all the vocational teachers and counselors serving handicapped students.

Mrs. Parrico stated that most of the students they were concerned about were receiving inappropriate education because they were either (1) receiving no vocational training that would enable them to obtain a job after graduation; (2) sweeping floors or performing school maintenance; (3) failing in a vocational program because there were no supports for handicapped; (4) in inappropriate programs because vocational assessment had not been provided; (5) now a school dropout; or (6) receiving career exploration but not vocational training that provided job entry skills. Mrs. Parrico felt that the response they had received from MCPS was splintered and piecemeal.

They saw the response as a preoccupation with administrative practices in lieu of meaningful education and training for students.

She detailed the meetings they had had and the appeals they had filed.

Mrs. Parrico explained that they were a committed group of citizens who continued to experience deficit for students in the educational system with regard to vocational/technical education. They intended to pursue this until vocational/technical education was available to any student who needed and/or desired it. They felt that MCPS was fostering unequal educational opportunity by failing to provide vocational/technical education and training commensurate to that available to students in neighboring Maryland communities. She felt that implementing this proposal would also serve to provide MCPS much-needed experience with consolidated vocational/technical training, in preparation for the operation of the 1984 Wheaton vocational/technical high school.

Mrs. Zappone asked how many students could be accommodated at the Howard center. Mrs. Parrico replied that they did not know what number Howard could take. Mrs. Spencer pointed out that Howard was probably setting its tuition rates for the next year, and they had indicated that 22 students would be involved. Ms. Sue Hodinko replied that the original 22 students were set forth as examples of

the type of students who would need the program. Dr. Greenblatt noted that they had a letter from the state Board denying MC/Vote's appeal. She wondered how they had decided on Howard County. Mrs. Parrico replied that Howard was close to the Montgomery County border; however, there could be other centers involved. Dr. Greenblatt asked if they were talking about this as a class of students or each individual student being placed in a program. Ms. Hodinko replied that it would be a pilot project for the 22 students, but each child would be individually served.

Dr. Greenblatt commented that they were in process now of establishing their vocational/technical center. She said the issue was whether students were now being adequately served and whether there were places within MCPS that would do the job. She pointed out that the arrangements with Howard County could be very precedent setting and very expensive. She said that she would like to hear from MCPS staff about the individual IEPs to place these students where they would get the skills they needed.

Mrs. Parrico stated that she had had children in the school system since 1964, and her children had not had the training they needed. Dr. Greenblatt suggested that they had to look at what they could do as an interim measure. She asked staff whether there had been IEPs for these students to see whether there were programs. Ms. Hodinko replied that there was no follow-up about any individual on the list. Dr. Greenblatt pointed out that these students were supposed to have an annual evaluation. She thought that the students could appeal as individuals. Ms. Hodinko replied that some students were no longer attending school and some parents were fearful and unable to carry through the process as self advocates.

Dr. Hiawatha Fountain, associate superintendent for continuum education, called attention to services provided to one student. Ms. Hodinko agreed that there were very beneficial things that occurred for that young man. She said that if Montgomery County were willing to provide that support for every child they would have no problem. However, they had sat in meeting after meeting and had been told it was a unique situation and could not be done for all.

Mrs. Wallace remarked that although it might be true that it would cost more in Montgomery County to provide services than to send the students out of county they might be able to learn from their current programs to help them when they had the program operating at Wheaton. She wondered about the number of the 22 students who were seniors.

Ms. Hodinko replied that it was the decision of the group not to get into individual cases. The issue was whether Montgomery County was going to provide an appropriate opportunity for these students.

Mrs. Wallace stated that she was trying to get at what the fiscal impact might be. Ms. Hodinko replied that only one student was in the twelfth grade; however, some of these children were no longer in the public schools. Mrs. Wallace asked that they provide the

Board a list of what they were talking about over the next three years. Ms. Hodinko replied that they could give the Board information on how many students had filed appeals.

Dr. Shaw commented that they had identified 22 individuals but had indicated it was a pilot group. He said there could be a couple of hundred students out there. Mrs. Parrico replied that they had looked at people they knew had children in this age range. Dr. Greenblatt asked whether they were all parents. Mrs. Irma Calhoun replied that they were all parents.

Dr. Greenblatt requested a breakdown on each of the students, the conclusion of the IEP regarding job skills, and how this was being met. She said that she did not want the name of the student but would like to know about the case. Ms. Hodinko explained that before they could get the IEP to say vocational training was needed they had to get a teacher to do that. She felt that parents ran into a wall because teachers did not want to talk about vocational training. She said that where they had no vocational component teachers did not want to write vocational goals.

As a former special education teacher, Mrs. Wallace said teachers said they did not have enough vocational education. They were well aware of the needs for vocational training. She said that in the past 15 years they had made great strides in programs. She felt that they had raised a legitimate issue and the Board had to explore the options of providing support in Montgomery County and out of the county and what the fiscal impact would be. Dr. Greenblatt thought that once they had more information on the 22 students then perhaps they could resolve something for September. She asked to hear from staff on what plans they had and on what programs existed for the handicapped.

Dr. Frank Carricato, director of the Division of Career and Vocational Education, stated that for three years they had been trying to expand opportunities for all children. The vocational/technical center was one effort. They had moved from one support team to four support teams for disadvantaged students. They planned, pending receipt of federal funds, to add the aides for the handicapped to these teams. He said that until they knew the specific cases he did not know what help they could be to these students. He indicated that he had spoken to principals who understood that they would be receiving students from other schools.

He said they were trying to focus on schools that already had the larger programs, and they were looking at the issue of placement and follow-up. He explained that they had talked about having people sitting on the IEP panel. He agreed that this summer they had only in-serviced 300 staff members, but he pointed out that around the state that was a significant number. He said that next year they could promise more services to youngsters. He indicated that 50 percent of vocational education was funded through funds coming through the state, and every county had to wait for these

funds.

Dr. Greenblatt requested an analysis or write-up of what Howard County was doing for handicapped students. The superintendent remarked that everyone knew that vocational education services in Montgomery County had been second class; however, they were trying to get out of that mode. He agreed that they had some youngsters who could not wait for these centers. He thought they should look at these students and see what could be provided. He felt they needed to look at the specific youngsters and then look at the broader group as soon as possible. He said they had had some linkage problems between special education and vocational education in the county, but he did not think there was any real debate about services being needed.

Re: Items of Information

Board members received the following items of information:

1. Items in Process
2. Construction Progress Report
3. Planning for K-12 Health Curriculum
4. Fall Administration of the California Achievement Tests
5. TEMCO Proposal on Teacher Testing
6. Follow-up Study of 1979 High School Graduates
7. Driver Education Automobiles
8. Ad Hoc Task Force on Mental Health Referrals
9. Educational Accountability Oversight Committee
10. Retail Trades Foundation
11. Youth Act -- Bill H. R. 6711

Re: Adjournment

The president adjourned the meeting at 4:40 p. m.

President

Secretary

EA: ml