







Resolved, That the superintendent of schools be authorized to receive and expend under the FY 1981 Appropriation for Supported Programs of \$500,000 a grant of \$50,000 from the Department of Education to conduct an ESEA Title II program for the Development of a Parent Involvement Support System for Basic Skills, Preschool to Grade 3 in the following categories and to establish a 10-month teacher specialist position (A-D):

Category	Amount
02 Instructional Salaries	\$39,147
03 Instructional Other	3,369
09 Fixed Charges	7,484
Total	\$50,000

and be it further

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

Re: Monthly Financial Report

The superintendent reported that they would be receiving additional money from the state for transportation costs. He said that their big concern was in the operation of the school buildings. They had \$4.4 million budgeted; however, last year they spent \$4.6 million for fuel. He indicated that they had cut down on fuel consumption, but the unit price per gallon was still rising. The other concern was the financing of special education youngsters in private placement. He said that the major problem areas in this year's budget which add up to a \$1.3 million deficit were transportation and utilities.

Mrs. Wallace called attention to Attachment 4 and noted the transfers from supplies into contractual services. She inquired about what contractual services were being purchased and what supplies and materials they were going to have to do without. Dr. Shaw noted that they would have a \$137,000 deficit under instructional salaries which was partially caused by the \$300,000 deficit attributed to hiring additional teachers. He said that the employment freeze savings would be out of instructional salaries, and he wondered how they would get this amount. The superintendent explained that they should really be saying they would obtain this from noninstructional positions in Category 2 because as Dr. Shaw pointed out they were not freezing teacher positions. Dr. Greenblatt asked if there were any way of knowing how transportation was affected by the 1900 additional students. The superintendent agreed to check into this. Mrs. Spencer asked whether they had had to add additional bus runs. Dr. Pitt said they would look into this.

Resolution No. 622-80

Re: Recognition of Outstanding  
Scholars

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Mrs.

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

WHEREAS, Each year the National Merit Scholarship Corporation provides an opportunity for able students to demonstrate their scholastic ability and to compete for a variety of scholarships for their higher education; and

WHEREAS, Each year students from Montgomery County Public Schools are well represented among the national semifinalists which are, according to the National Merit Scholarship Corporation, among the top one-half of one percent of the graduating seniors in United State high schools; and

WHEREAS, One hundred seventeen seniors from nineteen Montgomery County public high schools are among this year's semifinalists; and

WHEREAS, Eight other students have been named semifinalists in the seventeenth National Achievement Scholarship Program for Outstanding Negro Students; and

WHEREAS, The achievements of these students have brought honor to themselves, their families, their teachers, and the Montgomery County Public Schools; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Montgomery County Board of Education, on behalf of the school system staff and the citizens of Montgomery County, extends to each of the students named who are semifinalists in the 1980 National Merit Scholarship Qualifying Examination or the seventeenth National Achievement Scholarship Program for Outstanding Negro Students, sincere congratulations and its best wishes for future personal and academic success; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution shall be presented to each of the students honored.

Bethesda Chevy Chase  
Ian M. Aberbach  
Eve Abraham  
Renee N. Brooks  
Lisa Chertkov  
Daniel J. Edelson  
Clifford J. Eskey  
Russell F. Ford  
Jed J. Gaylin  
Deborah S. Kalb  
Simon G. Kaplan  
Mark C. Nelson  
Roland B. Ninomiya  
Douglas W. Pinsky  
John A. Richter  
Pamela G. Smoot  
Noam Y. Stadlan

Winston Churchill  
Byard J. Bennett  
Michael P. Cassidy  
David Dea  
Daniel W. Forden  
Richard M. Joyce  
Benjamin E. Sauer  
Jeffrey S. Urbach

Damascus  
Grace E. Mueller

Gaithersburg  
James R. Hughes

Walter Johnson  
Elizabeth W. Davies  
Rachel J. Givelber

Montgomery Blair  
Jeffrey H. Dunn  
Geoffrey R. Harris  
Jeffery N. Park  
Ralph B. Robinson  
Peggy J. Slover  
John F. Kennedy  
Rose M. Eiland

Zadok Magruder  
Elaine L. Barbour  
Amelia M. Dillon

Richard Montgomery  
Edward E. Manouelian  
Blaise Scinto

Northwood  
Robin L. Goldberg  
Avery G. Jackson  
Jeffrey P. Naimon  
Laurence Peiperl  
Michelle Schultz  
Valerie E. Stone

Paint Branch  
Margaret M. Barry

Robert E. Peary  
Bonnie A. DeBold  
David B. Fialkoff  
Daniel L. Gilly  
Michael E. Lyons  
Edward E. Thompson

Walt Whitman  
Christopher Scott Bodde  
Susan D. Booth  
Michael Macedo  
Patrick Byrne  
Arjun S. Chanmugam  
Raymond C. Chen  
Alison E. Colwell  
Keven C. Gaffney  
Marc H. Goldstein  
Gaile G. Gordon  
Robert Haddon  
John C. Harte  
Sanford L. Israel  
Morris M. Jackson  
Hilde E. Kahn  
Craig A. Lapine  
Nicholas J. Leavitt  
Joshua Z. Levin

Mohan M. Nadkarni  
Sean O'Malley  
Eleanor A. Prouty

Rockville  
Alice R. Blackburn  
Gregory J. Raley  
Christianna S. Williams

Seneca Valley  
David E. Bengtson  
Michael Cannon  
Jamie R. Goldstein  
Albert C. Torek  
Edward White

Sherwood  
John M. Bowman  
Anette M. Emery  
Randall A. Kaylor  
Tomas Oblonsky  
Signe M. Peterson  
Elizabeth M. Welch

Springbrook  
Mark Davis  
Matthew M. Lih  
David T. Okamoto  
David A. Riseberg  
Rebecca J. Zastrow

Wheaton  
Nannette W. Isler  
Vincent D. Rougeau

Charles W. Woodward  
Steven M. Kearns  
Martin C. Offutt  
Roy I. Peterkofsky  
Beth E. Roberts  
Todd E. Rockoff  
Karen L. Swanson

Thomas S. Wootton  
David F. Allan  
Cynthia J. Cupples  
Sarah M. Diamond  
Robert J. Hotes  
Babu Krishnamurthy  
Jeffrey V. Kuo

Louise H. Lofquist  
Antony G. Maniatis  
Jason M. Mayerfeld  
Bethany S. Pray  
Michael B. Richman  
Michael Richter  
Dorothy B. Rony  
Elizabeth T. Roth  
Ruth A. Rudel  
Evan R. Smith  
Richard A. Sowalsky  
Marie J. Sullivan  
Andrea M. Wilson  
David R. Woodman\*

Perry Lessing  
Jay T. Miller  
Frederick M. Proctor  
Lily L. Shiue  
Steve C. Shiue  
Marc T. Silver  
Victor H. Wu

\*Mr. Ewing joined the meeting at this point.

Re: 1980 Annual Report of the  
Citizens' Advisory Committee for  
Career and Vocational  
Education

Mrs. Gail Rubinson extended the committee's thanks to the staff for a great deal of help. She explained that their executive committee was comprised of chairmen of the three subcommittees. They did meet as a full committee but the executive committee got together before these meetings. She called attention to the items that were of special interest to the committee: (1) programs for special populations, (2) in-depth discussions of the Vocational/Technical Center, (3) job availability for communication technicians, a report of the Vocational Guidance Conference, and (4) a house tour of the construction trades site in Bethesda.

Dr. Shaw inquired about the evaluation of the career and vocational/technical programs. Mrs. Lois Parker, coordinator of career education, explained that this was a five-year process with a certain percentage of the programs being evaluated each year. Dr. Shaw asked about the information they were not receiving from the state. Mrs. Parker explained that they did receive a summary report from the state; however, they felt that additional information would be helpful. Dr. Shaw noted that it would be desirable to get local school PTAs involved in the evaluations.

Dr. Frank Carricato, director of the Division of Career and Vocational Education, replied that they were asking principals to invite local PTA members to be a part of the monitoring at each school. Mrs. Rubinson added that they were also contacting business and industry. Dr. Shaw inquired about the possibility of having a warm-up session for these people, and Dr. Carricato said they did have a preevaluation conference.

Dr. Greenblatt inquired about the relationship between this committee and the other vocational committee. She wondered whether there was sufficient manpower to maintain both committees and

whether it would be advisable to combine them. Dr. Carricato explained that the local advisory committee on vocational technical education was mandated by the state. They appointed nine members and Montgomery College appointed nine members. This committee looked at the articulation between secondary and postsecondary programs. He indicated that there was a linkage between the two committees, and he felt that the task was sufficiently large that the two committees could be justified. He said that in the future, however, it might be possible to integrate the two committees and they would continue to look at this. Mrs. Parker explained that the mandated committee was the vocational committee, while this committee was for career and vocational education.\*

Mr. Ewing asked about how they were getting ongoing forecasting of vocational and career opportunities within both the society as a whole and in the metropolitan area. He wondered whose responsibility it was to update this information. Dr. Carricato replied that the primary data was provided to them by

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

the Maryland State Department of Education. He said that this information was made specific to each local education agency, and the LEA must show by each code how many students they had in the public schools and in the college by each category to make sure they were not oversupplying the job market figure. He indicated that there were concerns expressed that these figures were not always current. For example, the state had said no more auto mechanics should be trained and yet the Auto Trades Foundation was a success. He reported that there was a project underway to collect data from all employers in Montgomery County, but they were only allowed to use the figures that the state provided them.\* Mr. Ewing stated that he was concerned that no one was doing any systematic forecasting of need. He felt that if they were going to plan for five years they should forecast for five years. He suggested that this might be a task the committee might want to take a look at.

Mrs. Wallace noted that the committee had 20 members and asked how active these members were. She also asked whether it was a unanimous report of the committee. Mrs. Rubinson replied that last year they did see all 20 members at one meeting or another. She explained that the report was put together by the committee chairmen. Mrs. Parker indicated that every person on the committee received a copy of the report and could critique the report. They also could have attended the meeting where the report was discussed. Mrs. Wallace asked whether they planned to fill all eight vacancies. Mrs. Rubinson replied that the larger the committee the more they could get a cross section of the county. Dr. Carricato indicated that the Board would be asked to fill the vacancies on November 11. Mr. Larry Connery reported that their next meeting would be at Blair High School, and in the coming year they planned to evaluate the trades and vocational assessment center. He hoped that next year's report would be meaningful to the Board. Dr. Shaw thanked the committee for their report and their good work.

Re: MCCPTA Forum Report

Mr. Ron Wohl stated that he and his group appreciated the support they had received from the superintendent and his staff. He indicated that the background statement provided to the Board summarized everything the group had gone through since the citizens' advisory committee had been appointed. They had continued the process of community involvement and had had individual meetings with members of the Board of Education. They had organized and conducted a forum which over 200 people attended to discuss the problem of school closures and consolidations. They had formed six research committees on June 9 and had provided the Board with a set of the suggested topics for these groups to consider. Their work resulted in a list of criteria and factors to be considered. Mr. Wohl said their position was that of organizer, not editor or filter. He assured the Board that there was no loading on any of the committees. He assured the Board that the information developed by these individuals was developed in such a way that it could be evaluated by others. He said there were 62 factors and six criteria. Mr. Wohl remarked that they were impressed with the citizen involvement in the process. They had people working together and working very hard.

In a series of graphs shown on the overhead projector, Mr. Paul O'Connor described how the criteria were ranked. He explained that the main purpose of the ranking was to put important factors in some sort of numerical outline. Mr. Wohl commented that back in March the superintendent had asked them whether this process would end community disruption, and he had replied that he hoped it would lessen the disruption. Now they did believe it would lessen the disruption. He said that it was up to the Board and staff to use the work the committee had done. He reported that 68 people had worked on this project throughout the summer. He indicated that the Board Office would receive one complete set of the answer sheets they had received if Board members wanted to review them.

Mrs. Wallace asked whether of the schools responding they tried to do anything about their involvement as an LEC. Mr. Wohl replied that they did not and had tried to play this as fair as possible to all schools. He reported that on the research committees all areas of the county were represented with representatives of rival schools serving on the same committee.

Mr. Barse expressed his appreciation to the committee and all the participants. He said that Mr. Wohl had stated it was up to the Board to use the material. He felt that before they responded they had to know how it might be used and how they put it all together to reach a decision. They had to know the steps in the decision-making process. He asked whether two people approaching the same set of problems using this information could come out with different conclusions. He wondered to what extent it was an aid to decision making or an objective method of reaching a decision. Mr. Wohl replied that their primary consideration in developing the material was to provide input to the Board and the planning

process. It was the first time they had this broadbased community involvement taking place. He said there were 62 factors listed, and 34 of these were ranked primary or secondary by 54 percent of the respondents. Mr. Barse asked whether this information could be made available to two different groups with two alternative schools to close, and one group would say close school "A" and the other would say close school "B." Mr. Wohl replied that they did not feel they had the expertise to develop magic numbers. One item they decided on was no one major factor should be the killer for the school. They agreed that the two schools should be merged into one new school; however, this was something that could not be quantified. They did not set up the process to name which schools to close. The process was meant to provide the factors the community considered important.

Mr. Barse asked whether the committee would be willing to give the Board an illustration of how this set of criteria would be used in the decision-making process. He asked if they would have a dry run of the decision-making process and an actual real world situation. He suggested that they take the decision process they had gone through in the recent past and say how the decision would come out. Mr. Wohl felt that this use should be left up to the staff to determine. He thought the staff could do a dry run because the committee did not have the facilities to do this.

Mrs. Zoe Lefkowitz pointed out that they had given the Board a whole group of facts, and they hoped these criteria would be considered when the master plan was developed. Mr. O'Connor said they hoped they had been able to smoke out all of the factors to be considered because they had input from Board members, civic associations, taxpayers groups, etc.

Dr. Greenblatt thanked the committee for the tremendous effort they had put into their report. She asked whether they could put the title of the factors and the numbers of the factors in rank order with the name and how each group ranked it. Mr. Wohl explained that they were limited by time, money, and personnel. He agreed that to put the data in that kind of display would be helpful. He said they were afraid of putting out a report with the findings and having people look only at the findings. Mr. O'Connor commented that they would do what Dr. Greenblatt had requested although they did not want to detract from the report. Mrs. Jean Hubbell explained that this was a twofold process. They wanted to get a uniform set of criteria on which the Board was going to base any change which had not been done before. They also hoped to get a broad-based community involvement. She said that when a school had to be named hopefully the Board would have some backup data.

Mr. Peter Meleney reported that the 68 people who had participated were tired of politics and their mood was one of "let's get the job done." He said his subcommittee felt that the optimum capacity range should be defined for three facility levels. They thought that the need for renovation should not lead to automatic closure but should be examined by looking at cost savings. They also

thought the MCPS community survey was full of holes and was something they could not use.

Mr. Richard Silver reported that the cost committee had ten members from different parts of the county. He said they had addressed the problem in two ways. The first was countywide and the second addressed each area of the county and looked at a number of alternatives. They suggested the only way to do the job was to put all the data on the computer. They had included many of the factors that past models had included since 1973. They felt that they had to look at capital costs which had not been done in previous models. In addition, they all agreed that they did not want to see actual salaries used. Mr. O'Connor added that there were four cost appendices which they had not reproduced for the Board.

Mrs. Linda Burgin reported that her committee on geographics, boundaries, and transportation had membership from all over the county and came up with the same conclusions. They had looked at specific schools on a map of the county and specific feeder areas to see if they could end up with a pattern. Their basic conclusion was that there are a lot of children who were bused who could walk to school. They felt that there were a number of factors where substantial impact could be made. They had found out through a report prepared by Ann Briggs that 48 percent of the children were bused, and they recommended strongly that the Board take a look at the overall geographic pattern. Mr. Dennis Cain stated that the Board should consider the issue of stability. Most people wanted a plan that would last for at least five years and others mentioned 10 to 15 years. Mr. Barse pointed out that there was no mention of articulation in their report. Mrs. Burgin replied that they had talked about existing feeder patterns and potential feeder patterns and were trying to stay away from the term "articulation."

Mr. Kenneth Moritsugu stated that his committee was on enrollment and utilization and as they discussed the topic they found it difficult to treat these as a unit. Therefore, they had two separate work groups. He remarked that it was impossible to determine how large the cup was by taking only one measure. They recommended the utilization of several measures to determine how full the cup was. Mrs. Wallace pointed out that in one section of their report it was stated that the burden of proof should be on the staff of Montgomery County Public Schools to justify the closing of a school, rather than on the community to prove that a school should be kept open. She remarked that this was the first time she had seen this put into words. Mr. Moritsugu said that his group had looked at modification of boundaries and at educational structure. He said that if there were several schools in a cluster which happened to have innovative programs that could be supported by the cluster, it might be possible to retain these good educational programs that could have broad impact.

Mr. Bill Pepper explained that his committee was on educational program considerations. They had divided their committee into

senior high, junior high, middle, and elementary, and they had found that each subcommittee had come to similar conclusions. He stated that educational programs were important in school closure decisions but were not tied to any one particular building. They felt it was very important that the educational program should be continued at a receiving school or at some other school if the school were closed.

Mrs. Betty McCord stated that her committee was on social considerations and they ranked racial balance as crucial. They felt that the public had to have confidence in the reliability of statistical data provided by the school system. They felt that it was disruptive to have the same groups of students uprooted time and time again. Mr. Ewing commented that he was a little surprised to see social factors rated as relatively low. Mrs. McCord replied that like the work of the educational program committee their topic was very subjective.

Mr. Wohl remarked that they had now given the Board a process, and they hoped the process would be given to the planning staff so that they could do some dry runs. Dr. Shaw thanked the people who had participated in the process. Mrs. Joyce Constantine remarked that under the aegis of MCCPTA they had provided an opportunity for as many citizens as possible to participate in the process. She hoped that the staff could take the plan now.

Re: Progress Report of Automotive  
Trades and Construction Trades  
Foundation

Mr. Howard Menditch of the Construction Trades Foundation reported that their last year's activities started off with a dinner meeting. The student design competition for Young American V was held and the architecture students from Springbrook won the competition. Young American V was now under construction. In May they had held their annual field day, and in June Young American IV was completed and an open house was held. He indicated that they had had television coverage by Channel 4 and "P.M. Magazine." They accepted sealed bids and the house was sold for \$203,600.

Mr. Menditch stated that their dinner meeting this year was combined with the Automotive Trades Foundation. He said that Young American V was now under construction and Open House was scheduled for the first part of June. The design competition for this year involved two sites, one was the last lot in Bethesda and the second was for the lot in Laytonsville. The design program for Laytonsville include the study of passive solar techniques. They were also looking into renovation projects for historical buildings and small structures. He reported that the foundation had purchased six school buses to assist in transporting students to and from the job site. They also wanted to provide the school system with funds to pay the salary of a vocational education teacher so that an existing teacher might be given leave to work

with vo-tech programs in the county on special related projects. The foundation's budget this year would be close to \$30,000. Dr. Shaw inquired about the school buses. Mr. Larry Shulman replied that these were used school buses that had been purchased for their trade-in value and reconditioned in the minidealership. Mrs. Wallace inquired about the number of people that might be accommodated in an open house at Young American V. The superintendent pointed out that the Board would be hosts for the Metropolitan Boards of Education in June and wanted them to see the house. Dr. Shaw reported that he and staff had attended the Metropolitan Area Boards meeting in Springfield, Virginia, and had been impressed by the program and the food which was served by their hotel management students.

Mr. Gerard Murphy of the Mini-Dealership and Automotive Trades Foundation stated that they were in the business of career training and were selling used cars instead of houses. He said that the dealers were now beginning to see the fruits of their efforts because they had had a couple of graduating classes and the students were doing quite well. They were now at the point of departure of expanding the program and now had a body shop. Recently they were considering moving into the challenge of having distributive education students sell the cars and business students handle the accounting work for this facility. He felt that the program fulfilled a vital need for skilled technicians. They were going to pursue a dealer visitation program which would supplement the instruction the students now received by putting them out in the field in dealerships to see an actual dealership in operation. They also had at least one field trip planned to the General Motors Training Center in Fairfax, and they were planning another career day.

Mrs. Zappone recalled that at the luncheon last year there were a number of programs pointed out that aimed at students who wanted postgraduate work. She wondered how many of their students had gone into this. Dr. Michael Wilson, coordinator of the Trades Projects, reported that there was a program at Montgomery College which was similar to the General Motors training program and Northwood Institute had a four-year program. They had four youngsters taking part outside of those participating in the General Motors program. He felt that they could turn out twice as many youngsters and place them all. Mr. Murphy indicated that there was a crying need for automotive technicians.

Mr. Shulman thanked the Board of Education for its cooperation. He reported that they had taken an interest in the vocational/technical center. He hoped that when the center did open that the combination of the foundations would help the programs substantially and give students a wider variety of programs. He said that they had received many requests for consultant help from other states and other countries, and he indicated that one of their houses had won an energy star award and their programs had received publicity on a national level. He

presented the Board with a joint resolution of the Construction Trades and Automotive Trades Foundations which showed how they planned to expend money and which authorized the funding of the salary of a vocational education teacher up to \$16,000.

Resolution No. 623-80

Re: Retailing/Merchandising Project  
FY 1981

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

WHEREAS, Representatives from the business, banking, and professional community and MCPS staff members recognize the educational value of establishing a model entrepreneurship program for MCPS vocational students which would combine instruction with realistic experience in the retailing and merchandising field; and

WHEREAS, Citizen interest in the project has advanced to the level of committing time, personnel, and expertise to the planning for the project; and

WHEREAS, Staff from the Maryland State Department of Education Division of Vocational-Technical Education have expressed verbal approval of the entrepreneurship program as an advanced extension of MCPS' cooperative vocational education programs; and

WHEREAS, There is an immediate and continuous need for MCPS staff to participate full-time in the planning and implementation of this project; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Board of Education approve the initiation of the retailing merchandising entrepreneurship project with a target date of September, 1981, for the beginning of the instructional program; and be it further

Resolved, That the Board of Education approve the formation of a Retail Trades Foundation consisting of members of the business, banking, and professional community to operate and manage the project under the direction of a foundation board composed of approximately ten (10) community representatives and the coordinator of cooperative education; and be it further

Resolved, That the Board of Education recommend that the superintendent establish one teacher/planner position in January, 1981, to assume planning responsibilities for the project; and be it further

Resolved, That subsequent to the achievement of satisfactory progress in the planning of the proposed program, the Board of Education recommend that the superintendent request that both the teacher/planner position and a second teacher position for on-site



WHEREAS, There are 1,900 more students enrolled in MCPS this fall than was projected by the County Council; and

WHEREAS, The Board has already approved 29 additional teaching positions above the FY 1981 budget; and

WHEREAS, The Board has approved on October 14, 1980, the addition of 5.0 teacher positions for those 472 additional students who require ESOL services above the 2,250 students projected in the FY 1981 budget; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Board of Education present these facts to the County Council and indicate that these facts will influence our need for a supplemental appropriation during this fiscal year.

Resolution No. 628-80                      Re: Meeting with MCEA

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education reserve one hour on the November 11 agenda to meet with MCEA.

Re: Executive Session

The Board met in executive session from 12:40 a.m. to 12:55 a.m. to discuss an appeal.

Resolution No. 629-80                      Re: Board of Education Case 1980-16

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

Resolved, That Board of Education Case 1980-16 be referred to a hearing examiner.\*

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

Resolution No. 630-80                      Re: Executive Session - November 11,  
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 November 11, 1980, 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, 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; 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.

Re: Board Member Comments

1. In regard to the High School Policy and attendance, Miss Williams said that in some cases students had received two or three unexcused absences. These students then transferred to another course, and she wondered whether the absences followed them to the other course.
2. Miss Williams reported that MC201-81 regarding the student Board member receiving a restricted vote was defeated, and she was rather sorry that it failed. She said that she would support a bill dealing with executive session privileges rather than a voting bill.
3. Mrs. Wallace reported that she and Mrs. Zappone had attended the Urban/Suburban Boards of Education meeting which was very good. At another time she would be giving a lengthy report on the meeting.
4. Mrs. Wallace hoped that the information item on class size would be scheduled for Board discussion.
5. Mrs. Wallace noted that the information item on the data processing facility referred to the Abernathy Study. She asked that Board members receive copies of the study. She also hoped that the superintendent would offer some ideas as to where major meetings could be held if the Board were to give up the auditorium.
6. Dr. Greenblatt called attention to a MABE meeting on November 3 at 3:30 p.m. Dr. Shaw indicated that Mrs. Wallace would be attending. Mr. Fess reported that the president and staff of MABE would be visiting Montgomery County on November 24 at 7:30 p.m.

Resolution No. 631-80

Re: Minutes of September 22,  
1980

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

Resolved, That the minutes of September 22, 1980, be approved as amended.

Re: Items of Information

Board members received the following items of information:

1. Class Size
2. Data Processing Facility - FY 1982 Capital Budget
3. Joint Occupancy Quarterly Report
4. MCPS Participation in Statewide Survey of Drug Abuse
5. County Council Action to Establish a Local Drug Abuse Advisory Council

Re: Adjournment

The president adjourned the meeting at 1:05 a.m.

President

Secretary

EA:ml