

strongly that the organization was important for all of them and in no way were they trying to weaken the organization. Mrs. Sefton pointed out that the Board was one group with one opinion; however, MABE had to represent everyone in the state. Dr.

* Mr. Barse joined the meeting at a later time.

Greenblatt commented that they wanted to talk about dues, the Green Street Coalition, and the Federal Relations Network because all counties were feeling the budget crunch.

Dr. Shaw stated that the Green Street Coalition had been a concern for all of them because of the financial sharing involved. He thought that Green Street had been a plus, but only a couple of counties were underwriting it and he wondered whether it should be expanded. Mrs. Steinecke replied that there were a number of organizations that contributed financially to Green Street. She felt that they had misnamed the group because it was a clearing house for information rather than a coalition. The group did not lobby on its own at all. She said they were happy to have Dr. Muir as their chairman. She reported that the organization had begun largely because there were a number of people in Annapolis working on educational matters, and they were offered free office space. Therefore, it seemed reasonable that they sit down and plan strategy. They felt that it was necessary to have a phone, a typewriter, and someone to do mailings. She said that the group had been extremely successful, and whatever the financing was the group should continue.

Mrs. Wallace agreed that Green Street provided a useful service. However, the problem was the cost. She pointed out that they were providing staff time and had their own lobbyist down there. She felt that Green Street benefitted the whole state rather than just those paying into it. She wondered whether serious consideration had been given to MABE's paying a greater share. Mrs. Sefton replied that this year they could not make a change because their budget had been set. In regard to staff time, she said that Montgomery County people did not contribute staff time to the coalition; they represented Montgomery County. She pointed out that the smaller counties did not have the staff time to do legislation.

Mrs. Steinecke reported that MABE paid into Green Street and the smaller counties were contributing through their dues to MABE. She said that there were times when one or another member of the coalition could carry the flag. The holiday bill was a coalition effort, and MABE took the responsibility for being the sponsor. However, there were times when it was big county against the little county. She said that if Green Street were a MABE operation, it would be just that. As it was now, it was a group that went its own way. Anne Arundel, Prince George's, and Montgomery now contributed and it had autonomy. If it were supported by MABE dues, it would be a MABE organization.

Mrs. Wallace stated that Montgomery County was paying double because the three counties were among the larger dues payers to MABE. Mrs. Sefton pointed out that if MABE took over they could not have a staff person from each county and it would mean a reorganization of the coalition. Mr. Marshall said that under the current structure they could come together and be able to disagree on approaches to resolutions. Under MABE, they would have to take a middle of the road position. He felt that Green Street had independence but yet there was some unity. Under Green Street they could address particular issues confronting a particular community.

Dr. Shaw suggested that what they were really looking at was a reevaluation of the working relationships. He said that he would not like to see MABE becoming the voice for all LEAs in the state as far as legislation was concerned. Mrs. Zappone commented that Green Street was directed more at state legislation, and sometimes things would come up where there would be a consensus position of all Boards of Education in the state. She felt that although Green Street was not a lobbying effort it could be a stronger voice. Mrs. Steinecke remarked that they did not think it was a good idea for the coalition to become a lobbying group. She pointed out that if it did there would be financial disclosures that would have to be filed. She had to register as a lobbyist and file disclosures twice a year with the Ethics Board.

In regard to the dues to MABE, Mrs. Spencer pointed out that they were being told they had 105,000 students and yet their enrollment had never reached 100,000.* Mrs. Steinecke replied that this was information projected by the State Department of Education. She said that they would have to contact the state department about the enrollment projections. The superintendent thought that most projections for the counties were over. Dr. Shaw suggested that each local adjust the figures when they paid their dues.

Mrs. Wallace requested a breakout on Green Street as to what they were paying the person there, the hours worked, expenses for utilities, etc. Mrs. Steinecke indicated that they had these figures for the last fiscal year. The salary was \$8,000, and that was full-time and over-time during the session. The person put in one or two days a week during the interim. The person compiles all the data sent out to the various members of the group. This would include a summary of bills and a schedule of when these were up for hearings. Mrs. Wallace wondered whether this job had been advertised, and Mrs. Steinecke replied that it had been the first year they had hired someone.

In regard to the Federal Relations Network, Mrs. Spencer asked whether they billed MABE for the registration. Mrs. Steinecke replied that MABE would pay all costs for the delegate but not for the alternate. Mrs. Spencer inquired about how the delegates were selected for NSBA and how many Maryland would have this year. Mrs. Steinecke replied that they did not know the numbers yet, but it was their policy that the delegates would be the officers of MABE. The alternate would be the immediate past president. Mrs. Spencer

noted that Montgomery County had been concerned because this limited their participation.

Mrs. Zappone remarked that she was very pleased that three Montgomery County people were on committees this year. She wondered whether there was anything that Montgomery County could do to contribute more. Mrs. Sefton replied that she was trying to include a representative from every Board on committees. Miss Williams asked whether there was anything MABE could do to get student Board members together at the MABE convention because talking to other Board members was productive. Mrs. Sefton replied that she had suggested some type of activity for the NSBA convention.

* Mr. Barse joined the meeting at this point.

Mr. Ewing asked whether there was a single publication or piece of paper which MABE turned out on the value of their organization. Mrs. Steinecke replied that this was a very good point because they did not have any one piece of paper but it would not be difficult to put it together. She explained that the purpose of MABE was to further lay control of education and to educate Board members. She said they had attempted to broaden the type of workshops that they offered and had conducted renewal seminars. Mr. Marshall commented that education was in the midst of one of its most critical battles for available funds. He said there were other organizations spending more money than MABE in trying to get a bigger piece of the pie. Mrs. Zappone said that the renewal seminar was excellent; however, most of the people in attendance were not Board members. Mrs. Steinecke replied that these seminars were designed more for administrators than Board members because they had found that Board members did not have a great deal of time to attend workshops. For that reason, they were concentrating their Board efforts on orientation and the MABE convention.

Dr. Shaw inquired about Maryland representation on NSBA panels. Mrs. Steinecke said that MABE received a list of the clinics and responded with recommendations for people to serve on these clinics. This year she sent in 50 Maryland names. Mrs. Sefton pointed out that percentagewise Maryland did very well in having representatives on the clinics. Dr. Greenblatt pointed out that at the convention there was an opportunity to discuss statewide issues, and she wondered whether it could be done again. Mrs. Steinecke suggested that Mrs. Wallace bring this to the program committee. Mrs. Wallace felt that MABE was doing an excellent job. She said that she had found the minisessions to be very useful, and she wondered whether they could have advanced minisessions for those who had attended prior sessions. Mrs. Steinecke indicated that she would be open to suggestions for topics.

Dr. Shaw thanked Mrs. Sefton, Mr. Marshall, and Mrs. Steinecke for joining the Board and hoped that they could get together in the near future.

Resolution No. 661-80

Re: Award of Contract - Art and Science Room Modifications - Various Schools

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 November 20 to furnish and install ventilation and safety equipment in art and science rooms at Baker, Gaithersburg, Montgomery Village, Ridgeview, Argyle Junior High Schools and Redland and Farquhar Middle Schools, as indicated below:

	PROPOSALS			
	A	B	C	D
	Baker	Gaithers-	Montgomery	
Ridgeview		burg	Village	
1. Arey Incorporated	\$4,336*	\$11,918	\$12,306	
\$10,003*				
2. Maske Sheet Metal Works	4,516	12,735	12,805	
15,539				
3. G. Leonard Daymude	5,250	10,040*	10,300*	
11,600				
	E	F	G	
	Redland	Argyle	Farquhar	
1. Arey Incorporated	\$5,390	\$9,814	\$8,755	
2. Maske Sheet Metal Works	5,898	8,974	8,426*	
3. G. Leonard Daymude	5,350*	8,000*	8,600	

* Recommended award

and

WHEREAS, The low bids are reasonable and the bidders are reputable contractors who have successfully performed similar projects; and

WHEREAS, Funds are sufficient for contract award; now therefore be it

Resolved, That contracts be awarded to Arey Incorporated for \$14,339 to furnish and install ventilating and safety equipment in art and science rooms at Baker and Ridgeview Junior High Schools; Maske Sheet Metal Works for \$8,426 to furnish and install ventilating and safety equipment at Farquhar Middle School; G. Leonard Daymude for \$33,690 for furnishing and installing ventilating and safety equipment at Gaithersburg, Montgomery Village and Argyle Junior High Schools and Redland Middle School, all in accordance with plans and specifications prepared by Morton Wood, Jr., engineer.

Resolution No. 662-80

Re: Access Easement for the Goldsboro Future Elementary School Site (Area 1)

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

WHEREAS, A request has been made by the Columbia Securities Company and a formal deed of release prepared by their attorney for the purpose of releasing an existing right-of-way across their land serving our Goldsboro future elementary school site; and

WHEREAS, The Columbia Securities Company has submitted a plan of subdivision for their property, known as the Rapley Tract, containing a publicly dedicated street which will provide future access almost to our property line and includes an additional right-of-way to guarantee complete access to the Goldsboro site; and

WHEREAS, The new traffic alignment is necessary to serve the adjacent community development and will cause no permanent damage or interference with future school use of the subject school property; and

WHEREAS, The construction of the property improvements and the establishment of the relocated right-of-way will be accomplished at no cost to the Board of Education; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the president and secretary be authorized to execute a formal deed of release, as prepared by the Columbia Securities Company, effectively eliminating an existing right-of-way to our Goldsboro future elementary school site as it presently transverses the neighboring Rapley Tract; and be it further

Resolved, That the president and secretary be authorized to execute the final record plat for the subdivision of the Rapley Tract, as approved by the Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission which provides future access to the Goldsboro future elementary school site along a publicly dedicated street and through an additional right-of-way easement to our property line; and be it further

Resolved, That the performance of the necessary transfer procedures and property improvements be assigned to the Columbia Securities Company and accomplished at no cost to the Board of Education.

Resolution No. 663-80 Re: Capital Projects To Be Closed
Effective December 1, 1980

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

WHEREAS, The Department of School Facilities has reviewed each capital construction project to determine those which can be closed effective December 1, 1980; and

WHEREAS, It continues to be the intention of the Board of Education to close capital projects in a timely manner and to transfer the unencumbered balance to the appropriate account; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the superintendent be authorized to close, effective December 1, 1980, the capital construction projects listed below and to transfer the local unencumbered balance totalling \$10,614.23, subject to final audit, to the Local Unliquidated Surplus Account, Project Number 997, (balance after transfer \$108,290.72):

Project No.	School	Amount	\$
* 105-04	Ridgeview Junior High		
-0-			
* 207-07	West Rockville Elementary		
-0-			
237-02	Robert Frost Junior High		
2,119.21			
* 305-08	Jackson Road Elementary		
-0-			
* 307-04	Brookview Elementary		
-0-			
* 419-04	Burning Tree Elementary		
-0-			
* 513-03	Belmont Elementary		
-0-			
* 557-05	Montgomery Village Junior High		
-0-			
* 562-03	Redland Middle		
0-			
* 568-02	Stedwick Elementary		
-0-			
* 752-06	Woodside Elementary		
-0-			
* 776-08	Montgomery Knolls Elementary		
-0-			
* 784-04	Highland View Elementary		
-0-			
* 784-05	Highland View Elementary		
-0-			
* 787-10	Col. Joseph Belt Junior High		
-0-			
* 789-07	Albert Einstein High		
-0-			
* 794-05	Rosemary Hills Elementary		
-0-			
* 796-08	Northwood High		
-0-			
* 798-06	Springbrook High		
-0-			
* 803-05	Forest Knolls Elementary		
-0-			
* 816-02	Area 2 Office		

Resolution No. 665-80

Re: Bid 19-81, Metal Doors, Frames
and Hardware

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

WHEREAS, Funds have been budgeted for the purchase of metal doors, frames, and hardware; now therefore be it

Resolved, That having been duly advertised September 18, 1980, the contract for the furnishing of metal doors, frames, and hardware under Invitation to Bid 19-81 be awarded to:

Builders Hardware Corporation, Rockville, Maryland,

low bidder meeting specifications.

Resolution No. 666-80

Re: FY 1981 Categorical Transfer
Within the Deinstitutionalization
Project

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

Resolved, That the superintendent of schools be authorized, subject to County Council approval, to effect the following transfer within the FY 1981 Deinstitutionalization Project funded by MSDE under P. L. 89-313, ESEA Title I:

Category	From	To
05 Special Education Teacher	\$2,728	
09 Fixed Charges		\$2,728

and be it further

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

Resolution No. 667-80

Re: Utilization of a Portion of the FY
1981 Appropriation for Projected
Supported Programs for the
Continuum Education/Trinity
College Professional Materials
and Study Center

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

Resolved, That the superintendent be authorized to receive and

expend within the FY 1981 Appropriation for Supported Projects of \$500,000 an additional grant of \$16,023 from Trinity College in accordance with the internship affiliation agreement to operate a professional materials and study center for this program in the following categories:

Category	Amount
02 Instructional Salaries	\$ 5,500
03 Instructional Other	10,000
09 Fixed Charges	523
Total	\$16,023

and be it further

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

Re: Board/Press/Visitor Conference

The following individuals appeared before the Board:

1. Mr. Mark Hall, Damascus High School
2. Dr. David Eberly, Montgomery County Education Association

Re: Report of the Superintendent's Advisory Committee on the Gifted and Talented, and Program on and Plans for Implementing the Policy on the Education of Gifted and Talented Students

Mrs. Regina Greenspun, chairperson, stated that the 1980 report which the Board had seen earlier in the fall contained 21 recommendations and they were now working on some of those recommendations with QIE and Human Relations. She said that the implementation plan had been developed by Dr. Waveline Starnes and Nancy Roche. She believed it was a plan which would allow them to continue to make progress toward a fully developed program for the gifted and talented. She remarked that except in the arts they were not upset by the slowness with which their program was developing.

She said they would like to see funding continued for programs, and she indicated they did have some concerns about the core curriculum. They were pleased to see in the work on the comprehensive facilities plan some attention to the needs of gifted and talented programs.

Dr. Starnes explained that they had tried to give the Board an overview of what the current status was and to identify objectives they considered to be the most critical for the next two years. The superintendent called attention to page five of the staff paper which listed the critical objectives. Mrs. Spencer pointed out that in the staff paper the staff training did not pick up until FY

1982 and beyond, and she wondered whether they were doing minimal amounts. Dr. Starnes replied that they were doing training; however, the critical objectives listed FY 1982 because that was the budget year.

Mrs. Zappone reported that she was concerned that previous reports were not available, and she said that she had requested that these materials be placed in the Board member office. Dr. Starnes explained that these reports were working documents and for that reason the Board had not received them.

Mrs. Diane Ippolito, principal of Montgomery Village Junior High, commented that many times mandates came down the road but principals were never sure of the supports they would receive. She said that last year all the supports to this program that were promised were provided, and she thanked the Board for the commitment they had made.

Mrs. Zappone inquired about the cluster centers in Areas 1, 2, and 3. Dr. Starnes replied that last year they had three clusters. This year they had cluster centers in each area, and they were using three different models. They had magnet clusters at Burning Tree, Takoma Park, and Piney Branch. The model in which students were served in a part-time way was at Harmony Hills, Rock Creek Valley, and Lone Oak. Areas 1, 2, and 5 were using the mobile resources model. She said that areas were able to respond in terms of the numbers of gifted and talented and the ways that the schools were organized.

Mrs. Wallace remarked that she had heard a number of parents, teachers, and administrators who had said the thrust they would prefer would be lower class sizes and differentiated materials rather than pull-out programs. She asked about what they would do next year if they had the same resources as this year, and she wondered whether they would want more in-service or teacher specialists for the gifted and talented. Dr. Starnes replied that they had built in in-service in each of the models. She said that last year they had talked about the need for direct services to children. Mrs. Greenspun commented that it was very important for all teachers to deal with gifted and talented students in the regular classroom, but there was a tremendous need for a child to meet with a peer group. For this reason, the cluster center approach was so important. She said that there was a growing feeling that they needed another Burning Tree program, but in the long run they would probably get into more pull-out programs for a small number of children. Mrs. Wallace said she was concerned that they got every teacher properly trained to deal with the gifted and talented in the regular classroom setting. She felt that they were probably not serving many children because in their earlier years someone had not recognized the sign of the gifted and talented. She indicated that in some areas they had made specific moves to try to test students, but this still left a whole lot of students unidentified.

Mrs. Zappone reported that at the last meeting of the Metropolitan Area Boards of Education they had discussed gifted and talented, and she would share the materials provided by the other jurisdictions with staff.

Dr. Greenblatt inquired about the recommendation on defining the lines of authority. Mrs. Kitsy Rigler replied that part of the problem had been that the policy was on the records to be implemented, but the central office and area specialists helped only on the invitation of schools. She felt that the relationship between the central and area people was not always clear. Dr. Greenblatt inquired about the staffing required if they were to have a gifted and talented program for every high school feeder area.

Dr. Starnes replied that they were working on their budget request and felt that 16 more personnel would provide them with some flexibility. The superintendent indicated that the staff would work out the response to Dr. Greenblatt's question regarding staffing. Dr. Greenblatt explained that she thought each high school feeder area should have a Burning Tree program. The superintendent said they would develop a paper regarding the Burning Tree program and what the staffing would be as well as some assessment as to whether this was the way to go.

Dr. Greenblatt commented that if a secondary principal were held accountable for providing a gifted and talented program and there was a curriculum, she wondered why they needed a coordinator in the building. Mrs. Ippolito replied that their school had gone through the identification process, and her English resource person was the chairman of their gifted and talented committee. She said that he had given up his Saturdays and Sundays to work on the program because it did take time to do the planning and work with teachers.

Dr. Greenblatt inquired about the role of the guidance counselor. Mrs. Ippolito replied that when they talked about gifted and talented they wanted an outside body to look at the total picture. She said that having .2 position was like nothing compared to what these people did. They had screened 1,100 students and would be rescreening them. Dr. Starnes commented that some schools had been able to carve out a position, and the principals had told her that without the person they could not manage the program. Mrs. Greenspun added that in some cases it might be the guidance counselor who was responsible for the program.

Mr. Ewing stated that he had a concern about the staff response. He felt that the policy statement on gifted and talented was excellent, but he did not see the translation of that into a strategy which told them what it was they were going to do to achieve the policy. He thought there was a coherent philosophy behind what they were doing, but he was not sure it was getting expressed to the public. He felt that what the staff was doing was still less than what they should be doing, and he was disturbed by the slowness of their progress. He hoped they could develop a

statement that makes it clear what it was they were doing regarding the individual growth of programs. Mrs. Greenspun remarked that there were more children being served because she was getting fewer phone calls from parents. She thought there was progress being made, but she agreed she wanted to see more. Mrs. Rigler felt that part of the confusion was program vs. project. She said they had more pieces of a program now, but they did not have a clear statement of how they were going to get from the projects to the program the policy required. Dr. Shaw did not think that the Board itself was aware of the number of projects going on, and he suggested that the Board be provided with the list of the projects.

Mr. Barse asked whether it was necessary to have smaller class size and a more favorable pupil/teacher ratio to implement a differentiated program. For example, he would assume that the complex questioning strategies in the biography and novel units would involve more time. Dr. Starnes replied that most of the elements for differentiated curriculum were designed to be used with today's class sizes. However, if they were going to have a lot of individualization they were going to have to have a smaller class size. Mr. Barse felt there might be a tendency on the part of teachers to concentrate on the gifted students who have the differentiated program, and he was concerned about taking time away from the regular students.

Miss Williams pointed out that the committee had expressed a concern about the high school core of courses. She said that many advanced courses in the performing arts had been placed in Category 3. Mrs. Greenspun explained that they were worried about a number of Category 2 courses which they thought should be in Category 1. They felt there should be art courses and music courses as well as AP courses in Category 1.

Mrs. Spencer remarked that the discussion had focused on the academically gifted. She did not think they did enough for the students who were gifted in visual and performing arts. Her other concern was providing services to minority students who were gifted, once they had gotten over the hurdle of identifying them. She thought that they might find that many of their gifts needed to be developed to a greater degree. Dr. Shaw thanked the members of the committee for their report.

Re: Monthly Financial Report

The superintendent stated that what they had before them was a projection of their fiscal status regarding June 30. He reported that they expected to receive \$589,000 of federal impact aid of which not one penny is projected. This would help them in their funding problems. It was estimated that this was one third of the money expected which would give them over \$1 million of unanticipated revenue. He remarked that this was the good news, but on the other side they had some problems revolving around three areas. Transportation had about a \$.5 million shortage. Utilities continued to be their biggest problem, and they were anticipating a

\$850,000 deficit there. The other area was Category 15. He said they had instituted a limited employment freeze, and he thought they had to talk seriously about a supplemental request from the county.

He pointed out that they were educating 2,000 more students than anticipated and had not gone to the Council for additional funding there. He said they could also consider a broader position freeze, hiring substitutes for teaching positions, stopping all out of county travel, and freezing supply accounts. He intended to come back to the Board with a plan for action next month.

Mrs. Wallace commented that she was particularly concerned about Category 15. In FY 1980 they had spent \$5.7 million in Category 15 which was 2 percent of the total overall budget. She said that using the \$6.2 million, a million over projection, would amount of 2 percent of the total overall budget, and she wondered why they were underbudgeted to start off with. She also wondered why they had so many youngsters requiring Category 15 funds when they were providing additional services. She indicated that there were some jurisdictions which said they were only going to pay up to a certain level. The superintendent replied that they had not expended more than they had at this point; however, they did expect more youngsters to come through the pipeline. He agreed that the account was underbudgeted and pointed out that they were also underbudgeted in utilities. He explained that Category 15 costs had gone up as much as 70 percent in some placements.

Mrs. Judith Kenney, placement supervisor, stated that in Virginia, Massachusetts, and Pennsylvania the local boards had worked with the state boards of education to gain rate setting authority, and they would not pay above that rate. However, Pennsylvania was now under a class action suit. At this point in time MCPS had 533 students approved for programs which represented a significant reduction because last year at this time they had over 700. They had anticipated an 11 percent inflation rate, but the rate was coming in at 17.5 percent. Dr. Henry Shetterly, acting director of the Department of Interagency Programs and Placement, added that this was the first year they had had to fund for 0 to 3 years of age with full costs from 3 to 5.

Mr. Barse stated that this Board should not be the one to deny a child a Category 15 private placement if it were determined that this was what the child needed. He felt it was their obligation to go to the County Council for a supplemental appropriation if they had confidence in their projections. He urged the superintendent to take that action, and he pointed out that in other categories there may be other things that could be done. The superintendent replied that this was his point of view; however, he felt they might be a little high on their projection of \$841,000 because they were more up on things this year. He felt that it was legitimate to go to the Council on Category 15 and the 2,000 additional students. Mr. Barse thought they needed to look at all categories to put the brakes on in order to meet their higher priority goals.

He also requested an explanation of why the area and systemwide administrators and teachers line showed a projected deficit.

Dr. Greenblatt asked that the Board be provided with copies of the state laws that had rate scales. The superintendent commented that maybe they should consider getting the same legislation adopted in Maryland. Dr. Greenblatt said they had to consider the question of what degree the noneducational services should be paid for. She also recalled that last month she had raised the question of pupil transportation routes and pick-up points and whether they could save gasoline.

Mrs. Spencer inquired about the possibilities for additional funding in Category 15, especially for the students from 0 to 3. Dr. Roy Stern, special assistant to the superintendent for supplementary funding, revenue, and special projects, indicated that the Maurer group had not made recommendations on Category 15. However, another subcommittee had provided the alternative of the local paying the regular per pupil expenditures and anything above that would be a sharing between the state and local. He felt that if this were adopted that Montgomery County would come out very well. He said that they were talking about small increments to be added to the special education formula each year.

Mrs. Wallace thought there was not much they could do because they did have to provide for these youngsters. She pointed out that they were getting to budget season again, and she did not want to see them in the same position next year. The superintendent explained that it was his philosophy to budget very conservatively and to cut the noneducational items. He said they had underbudgeted and the staff had informed him about this.

Re: Area Consolidation

Dr. Shaw stated that the Board had had several discussions and last time had addressed the first recommendation brought in by the superintendent. He said that the superintendent had come in with a different paper, although he was standing by his original recommendations. The superintendent explained that the paper before the Board was not a recommendation, but was something that had some possibilities. He indicated that he was trying to be responsive to the ideas expressed by Board members, and the resource allocation in this case was around 170 positions. The plan attempted to provide for a mechanism to organize and operate the schools through four area offices; however, it abolished the support function presently provided by the subject teacher specialists. It would give up the concept of differentiated staffing for the areas, and it maintained present levels of staffing in human relations and transportation.

This would be 24 positions less than his earlier proposal, and he said that while it was not a proposal he recommended it was a reasonable alternative. He said they had stayed with the four areas because of their belief that they needed that span of

control, and he indicated that they would go to three areas when they got below 150 schools.

Dr. Shaw remarked that one of the things that struck him was a complete change of the philosophy regarding the area offices. He said that when they traded off the teacher specialists for supervisors they changed the whole philosophy of helping the classroom teachers because the teacher specialist was no threat to the teacher in the classroom. He noted that at the secondary level they had the resource teacher which was the counterpart to the teacher specialist. He felt that they were going back 30 years to the concept of supervision and monitoring.

Mrs. Spencer commented that the superintendent had done them a great service because the plan made them focus on what philosophy of an area office the Board supported. She said that the last time the Board had given the superintendent a dollar figure, and she felt that they had seen some unsatisfactory results because of the organization. She said that the alternative he had presented so changed the area office, she was not sure she could support decentralization in this format. She suggested that each Board member write a paper to present their views to the other members.

Dr. David Eberly, president of MCEA, said that he had brought Mr. Fred Evans, a teacher specialist, with him. He thanked the superintendent for responding to MCEA's concerns on the testing issue. He said they should think very deeply about what the plan would mean regarding delivery of services, and he pointed out that his organization represented not only teacher specialists but also all professional personnel. He said that in order to build the need for the teacher specialists they had to ask the people who were the recipients of their services, and he said that MCEA was prepared to do that. He said that if the Board was interested in knowing this, MCEA could bring a group of people in to discuss the issue. Mr. Evans explained that the teacher specialists were the only direct link between the central office and the classroom teacher. He said that he saw them daily in the classroom working with teachers and students. He felt that if they took this function away it would be a disaster. He suggested that they ponder the message they were giving to the elementary school teachers because they were taking a vital function away from them. He said that they could spend money on a MORE study and put out two books, and he wondered why they could not look at the delivery of services in some consistent way. He encouraged the Board to look at the Sentinel article about a teacher specialist.

Mr. Barse asked whether they had objective, systemwide evidence that the function of a teacher specialist did improve teacher and student performance. Dr. Eberly replied that he did not, but they did have professional judgment on this topic. Mrs. Zappone wondered about teachers who never called for a teacher specialist, and she pointed out that in the process of declining enrollment they were going to have more and more experienced teachers. Mr. Evans replied that if the school system were to have a stagnant

curriculum he would agree that they did not need these resources; however, the curriculum did not operate that way. He said that whether a teacher was experienced or not did not determine whether they needed a teacher specialist. Dr. Shaw commented that his wife was an experienced teacher and still needed the assistance provided by the teacher specialists. Mrs. Zappone asked why a supervisor would be threatening. Dr. Shaw explained that it was a psychological point because the title "supervisor" was a threat because teachers would interpret this as someone doing the evaluations.

Mrs. Wallace commented that she had discussed the proposal with some principals and had received from them statements that they were supposed to be the curriculum leader in the school. She said that she was one of the great doubters of the teacher specialists and would have preferred to call them curriculum implementation specialists. She said she had grave reservations about going with this alternative. She indicated that she would like to see more people out there helping teachers rather than supervising. Dr. Shaffner explained that the alternative was in response to the Board regarding cutting positions and cutting a specific function. He said that if the Board wanted direct instructional supports they could do that.

Mr. Ewing remarked that the issue was one of curriculum, and if one made the assumption that the curriculum never changed, one could argue that they did not need any help. However, he did not think any of these assumptions would hold. It seemed to him that to do what was proposed was to go about their business in the way that flew in the face of what they knew about how knowledge was accumulated and transferred. He said there had to be people engaged professionally in accumulating and organizing knowledge, training people to use that knowledge, and helping people once trained to apply that knowledge. If they broke the chain, they would have to rely on the accumulation of training alone and would become stagnant. He felt that if they eliminated this function it might not be sensible to retain the area offices at all.

Mrs. Zappone stated that in the alternative the superintendent seemed to take a position that the Continuum Education component of an area office was a given, and she wondered why. The superintendent explained that there was a paper written by his predecessor to the effect the Continuum Education was going out of business. The Task Force also talked about looking at the central office component. He said the Board resolution directed him to come in with a four-area proposal; therefore because of pupil services and special programs, they decided to leave Continuum Education alone. He pointed out that within a week the Board would be receiving a major report on the whole area of Continuum Education.

Mrs. Wallace asked that Board members be provided with copies of the Bernardo memorandum.

Dr. Greenblatt indicated that there had been quite a few serious issues raised. She thanked the superintendent for being responsive to the views expressed during the last discussion. She felt that one of the major problems was proper supervision of the staff. She said the primary function of the area office was to see that curriculum is being implemented and everything was working well. She said the question of how they updated staff was a different function and could be done in different ways. She did not see that they were coming to a situation they could describe as catastrophic because of the reduction of the area offices since this could be a vehicle for improvement. She felt that the other major area was the fiscal situation in the county, and she thought they were going to get to the point where they would get the master plan for school facilities and close schools this year. She stated that there had to be contraction in the administrative and supervisory areas because they could not keep pulling back on school-based personnel. She indicated that she would have a memorandum regarding a review of Continuum Education. She said that another issue was whether they had to look at the three-area model because of the financial picture. She felt that the alternative was a positive step forward. She said that another issue was the date of implementation which would have to be discussed by the Board. Another issue was the question of whether the Board had made the cuts they were supposed to as required by the County Council. She said they had frozen positions, but they were supposed to have reduced by eight positions.

Dr. Shaw commented that they had to be careful that they did not undermine the whole delivery of services. He pointed out that they were taking about people who worked with the elementary teachers, and he noted that while he would not be party to their decision he would caution the Board that they were at the crossroads regarding delivery of services to teachers. He said that the principal was not able to work with all teachers, and the teacher specialists were able to help in all subject areas.

Mrs. Wallace remarked that she had listened to both sides of this area. She had come up with a suggested plan with three areas and the teacher specialists and would like to share it with the Board. She explained that her plan would retain about 170 positions, but she felt that it did the job that needed to be done. She hoped that the Board would review her plan, and she requested staff reaction to it.

Re: Executive Session

The Board met in executive session from 11:25 p.m. to 11:45 p.m. on personnel matters.

Resolution No. 668-80

Re: Personnel Appointment

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

unanimously:

Resolved, That the following personnel appointment be approved:

Appointment	Present Position	As
Beverly J. Sangston	Acting Coordinator of Special Projects Department of Instruc- tional Planning and Development	Coordinator of Special Pro- jects Department of Instructional Planning and Development Grade H Effective November 25, 1980

Mr. Barse left the meeting at this point.

Resolution No. 669-80 Re: Executive Session - December 9,
1980

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Mrs. Zappone seconded by Miss Williams, 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 December 9, 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 and New
Business

1. Mr. Ewing requested a response to the letter from a parent involved with the Frost School regarding no additional referrals.

2. Mr. Ewing assumed that someone was paying attention to the mileage difference that had been raised by the Einstein/Newport community.

3. Dr. Shaw thanked all the Board members for their cooperation this past year. He said that it had been a challenging and interesting experience because the Board had ended up with a two-year contract with its employees which he did not think was possible. The Board had also come out well with the capital improvements program and had hired a new superintendent.

4. Dr. Shaw asked that Mrs. Wallace assume the chair. He read the following which was seconded by Mrs. Spencer:

Resolved, That the Board of Education respond to the request of MCR to reinstitute the practice of meeting with students on a geographic basis.

Dr. Shaw assumed the chair.

5. Mrs. Zappone said they had received a letter from the Urban/Suburban Boards of Education concerning the possible appointment of Dr. Ted Bell. She moved that the Board write legislators and support the nomination of Dr. Bell. Dr. Greenblatt seconded the motion. After a brief discussion, Dr. Greenblatt asked that this be scheduled for action.

6. Mr. Ewing moved that the Board of Education request the superintendent to postpone the implementation of the departmental examinations until the next school year. Miss Williams seconded the motion. Dr. Shaw agreed that this would be scheduled on the December 9 agenda.

Resolution No. 670-80

Re: Minutes of October 27, 1980

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

Resolved, That the minutes of October 27, 1980, be approved.

Re: Items of Information

Board members received the following items of information:

1. Annual Report on the Policy on Educational Accountability
2. RICA Rockville Status Report
3. Update of the Activities of the Subcommittee on Education of the State Task Force on State-Fiscal Relationships
4. Educational Program Statement--Master Plan for School Facilities
5. Audit Committee Procedures and Responsibilities
6. Annual Test Report
7. MORE - Report on Maintenance Division and School Plant

Operations
8. Recommendations for Approval of New Curriculum
Re: Adjournment

The president adjourned the meeting at midnight.

President

Secretary

EA:ml