

APPROVED
22-1982

Rockville, Maryland
April 26, 1982

The Board of Education of Montgomery County met in regular session at the Educational Services Center, Rockville, Maryland, on Monday, April 26, 1982, at 8 p.m.

ROLL CALL Present: Mrs. Eleanor D. Zappone, President in the Chair
Mr. Blair G. Ewing
Dr. Marian L. Greenblatt*
Mr. Jonathan Lipson
Mrs. Suzanne K. Peyser
Mrs. Elizabeth W. Spencer
Mrs. Carol F. Wallace

Absent: Mr. Joseph R. Barse

Others Present: Dr. Edward Andrews, Superintendent of Schools
Dr. Harry Pitt, Deputy Superintendent
Mr. Thomas S. Fess, Parliamentarian

Re: Approval of the Agenda for April 26, 1982

Mrs. Peyser moved approval of the agenda, and Mr. Lipson seconded the motion.

RESOLUTION NO. 331-82 Re: An Amendment to the Agenda April 26, 1982

On motion of Mr. Lipson seconded by Mrs. Peyser, the following resolution was adopted unanimously:

RESOLVED, That the Board's agenda for April 26, 1982, be amended to move the item on Student Leadership to 8:20 p.m.

RESOLUTION NO. 332-82 Re: An Amendment to the Agenda April 26, 1982

On motion of Mrs. Wallace seconded by Mr. Ewing, the following resolution was adopted with Mr. Ewing, Mrs. Spencer, Mrs. Wallace, and M-s. Zappone voting in the affirmative; Mrs. Peyser abstaining (Mr. Lipson voting in the affirmative):

RESOLVED, That the Board's agenda for April 26, 1982 be amended to move the information item on Woodlin/Woodside to after the discussion on M-ntgomery Blair.

* Dr. Greenblatt joined the meeting at this point.

RESOLUTION NO. 333-82 Re: Board Agenda - April 26, 1982

On motion of Mrs. Peyser seconded by Mr. Lipson, the following resolution was adopted unanimously:

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education approve its agenda for April 26, 1982, as amended.

Re: Announcements

Mrs. Zappone announced that Mr. Barse was out of town on business. The superintendent reported that they had received a press release from the Maryland State Department of Education and 17 Maryland high school seniors were named Presidential Scholars in 1982. Eight of these were Montgomery County Public Schools high school seniors, and three of them attended Walt Whitman High School. He indicated that

this was the highest percentage of finalists that Montgomery County had ever had.

RESOLUTION NO. 334-82 Re: Acceptance of Proposals to Reroof Piney Branch and Brown Station Elementary Schools (Areas 1 and 3)

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

WHEREAS, The Board was informed last year that potential roof problems existed at Piney Branch and Brown Station Elementary Schools; and

WHEREAS, Staff, with assistance of counsel, has negotiated a settlement with the materials manufacturer, GAF Corporation, whereby it would furnish new materials and Montgomery County Public Schools would provide a contractor to furnish necessary labor and equipment to install new roofs at the two schools; and WHEREAS, The original Piney Branch roofing contractor, Orndorff & Spaid, Inc., has submitted a proposal of \$31,661 to furnish labor and equipment at cost to install a new roof with materials furnished by GAF, and aluminum parapet coping; and

WHEREAS, GAF preferred not to work with the original roofing contractor on Brown Station Elementary and two proposals to provide necessary labor and equipment to install a new roof at this school were received; and the lowest proposal of \$35,736 from Orndorff & Spaid, Inc., was acceptable to both GAF Corporation and School Facilities staff; and

WHEREAS, These replacements are considered emergencies and work must proceed immediately; and

WHEREAS, Sufficient funds are available in the Roof Replacement Account to accept these proposals; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the superintendent be authorized to accept the proposal from Orndorff & Spaid, Inc., dated April 9, 1982, whereby the Board agrees to pay \$31,661 (approximately one-half of the total cost of the reroofing), to provide necessary labor and equipment to install metal coping and approximately 240 roofing squares of GAF Corporation furnished materials on the Piney Branch Elementary

School; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the superintendent be authorized to accept the lowest proposal of Orndorff & Spaid, Inc., dated April 7, 1982, for \$35,736 to furnish necessary labor and equipment to install approximately 261 roofing squares of GAF Corporation roofing materials on the Brown Station Elementary School roof; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the superintendent be authorized to negotiate acceptable settlement documents with GAF Corporation upon completion of this work.

RESOLUTION NO. 335-82 Re: Bid 81-82, School Buses

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 requested in FY 83 operating budget for the purchase of school buses; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That having been duly advertised March 3, 1982, Dovell & Williams, Inc., Glen Burnie, Maryland, low bidder meeting specifications, be awarded a conditional contract totaling \$203,058, subject to final FY 83 budget approval, for the furnishing of school buses for the period of April 27, 1982, through October 26, 1982, under Invitation To Bid 81-82.

RESOLUTION NO. 336-82 Re: Capital Projects to be Closed Effective
May 1, 1982

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

WHEREAS, On April 7, 1981, the Board of Education approved resolution No. 315-81 amending the contract with Touche Ross & Company to increase the scope of the audit for fiscal years 1981, 1982, and 1983 to include MCPS fixed assets; and

WHEREAS, The management letter from Touche Ross to the Board dated January 22, 1982, provided an opinion regarding open capital projects (\$74,000,000.00 as of June 30, 1981); and

WHEREAS, Board resolution dated November 10, 1981, Projects To Be Closed Effective December 1, 1981, closed 60 projects for a net capitalization of \$30,206,138.00; and

WHEREAS, The Department of School Facilities has reviewed capital projects that may be closed effective May 1, 1982, providing a capitalization of \$31,245,403.53; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the superintendent be authorized to close, effective May 1, 1982, capital construction projects listed below and to

transfer the local unencumbered balance totalling \$28,295.37, subject to financial audit, to the Local Unliquidated Surplus Account, project 997, (balance before transfer \$163,702.87):

Project No.	School	Balance
* 106-02	Fox Chapel Elementary	\$ -0-
* 211-08	Julius West Middle	-0-
* 212-07	Meadow Hall Elementary	-0-
305-07	Jackson Road Elementary	570.90
* 315-06	Paint Branch High	-0-
351-06	Darnestown Elementary	1,335.56
406-15	Bethesda-Chevy Chase High	-0-
406-16	Bethesda-Chevy Chase High	13,550.00
* 406-17	Bethesda-Chevy Chase High	-0-
422-06	Wyngate Elementary	-0-
551-09	Gaithersburg High	-0-
* 558-05	Whetstone Elementary	-0-
564-03	Area 3 Office	-0-
605-05	Area 2 Office	-0-
701-07	Damascus High	-0-
702-07	Damascus Elementary	-0-
757-17	Montgomery Blair High	-0-
759-07	Montgomery Hills Junior High	-0-
* 775-08	Eastern Junior High	-0-
* 786-06	Georgian Forest Elementary	-0-
796-06	Northwood High	-0-
799-04	Stephen Knolls	-0-
816-03	Area 1 Office	-0-
* 972-02	General Maintenance Shop	-0-
987-01	County Service Park	.24
991-01	Site Acquisition	-0-
992-01	Site Acquisition	-0-
996-04	Randolph Bus Facility	6.29
* 999-02	Stage Lighting	-0-
* 999-03	Carpet Replacement	12,540.00
999-23	Driver Simulator Education	-0-
* 999-33	Washer/Driver Installation	-0-
999-40	Mechanical Equipment	-0-
999-62	Art Room Improvements	243.51
999-64	Track Surfacing	48.87
	TOTAL	\$28,295.37

* Maintenance Renovation

and be it further

RESOLVED, That the county executive be requested to recommend approval of these transfers to the County Council.

RESOLUTION NO. 337-82 Re: Bid 102-82, Sound Reinforcement System
for Large Board Meeting Room

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 a sound reinforcement system for the large Board meeting room (ESC Auditorium); now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That having been duly advertised April 1, 1982, the contract totaling \$8,438 for the furnishing of sound reinforcement system for the large Board meeting room for the period of April 27, 1982, through July 26, 1982, under Invitation to Bid 102-82 be awarded to:

Virginia Communications & Sound, Inc., Alexandria, Virginia,

low bidder meeting specifications.

RESOLUTION NO. 338-82 Re: FY 1982 Categorical Transfer Within the American Indian Education 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, subject to County Council approval, to effect the following transfer for the FY 1982 American Indian Education Program:

Category	From	To
03 Instructional Other		\$810
06 Pupil Transportation	\$600	
07 Operation of Plant and Equipment	210	
Total	\$810	\$810

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 be sent to the county executive and County Council.

RESOLUTION NO. 339-82 Re: Utilization of a Portion of the FY 1982 Appropriation for Projected Supported Programs for a Professional Development Center Grant

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 ex-pend, within the FY 1982 Appropriation for Supported Projects of \$500,000, a \$12,000 grant from the Maryland State Department of Education under ESEA V-B for a Professional Development Center in the

following categories:

Category	Amount
02 Instructional Salaries	\$ 7,600
03 Instructional Other	3,678
09 Fixed Charges	722
Total	\$12,000

and be it further

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

RESOLUTION NO. 340-82 Re: Utilization of a Portion of the FY 1982
Appropriation for Projected Supported
Projects for Parent-Peer Workshops

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, within the FY 1982 Appropriation for Supported Projects of \$500,000, a grant of \$2,000 in Category 03, Instructional Other, from the Maryland State Department of Education under ESEA, Title IV-C to conduct a parent-peer work-shop within the Olney-Sandy Spring and Paint Branch communities; and be it further

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

RESOLUTION NO. 341-82 Re: Submission of an FY 1982 Proposal for an
Adult-Youth Weekend Workshop on Drug/
Alcohol Awareness

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 be authorized to submit an FY 1982 grant proposal to the Maryland State Department of Education under their Drug/Alcohol Education Projects to conduct an adult-youth weekend workshop on drug/alcohol awareness in the Olney-Sandy Spring community; and be it further

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

Re: Board/Press/Visitor Conference

The following individuals appeared before the Board:

1. Mrs. Suzanne Carbone
2. Mrs. Nancy Prevost, Greenwood PTA

RESOLUTION NO. 342-82 Re: National Student Leadership Day

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

WHEREAS, April 27, 1982, has been proclaimed National Student Leadership Day by the National Association of Secondary School Principals (NASSP); and

WHEREAS, Governor Harry Hughes has proclaimed April 27 Student Leadership Day in the State of Maryland; and

WHEREAS, The Board of Education acknowledges the continuing efforts of Montgomery County Public Schools' student leadership to improve the quality of life and experience in our schools; and

WHEREAS, The Board of Education is committed to continual dialogue with student leaders of individual school and countywide government organizations; now therefore be it

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

RESOLVED, That April 27 be proclaimed Student Leadership Day in the Montgomery County Public Schools; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the superintendent inform the school system employees and student governments of this proclamation of the Board of Education.

Re: Monthly Financial Report

The superintendent reported that they had continuing good news regarding the reduction of the expenditure deficit. He said that the Council had asked that they not have a supplemental appropriation out of local funds. Therefore, they were asking the Board to request a supplemental from impact aid and field trips. He said that the deficit was down to \$370,000, and they could take care of it from nonlocal tax dollars. Mrs. Peyser inquired about the partial employment freeze and the teachers who had been replaced by long-term substitutes. The superintendent replied that the freeze was implemented in midyear; however, it was a lot less stringent than previous years. He said that he would have to give the Board a follow-up report in terms of the details.

Re: Recommended FY 1982 Supplemental
Appropriation to be Used to Offset
Projected Budget Deficits

Dr. Greenblatt moved approval of the following which was seconded by Mrs. Spencer:

WHEREAS, Additional revenues are available to the school system; and

WHEREAS, The March, 1982, Monthly Financial Report is reflecting a projected deficit of \$370,000 as of June 30, 1982; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the superintendent of schools be authorized, subject to County Council approval, to receive and expend revenues amounting to \$459,000 from federal and local sources to be applied to accounts in the following categories:

Category	Supplemental
01 Administration	\$100,000
06 Pupil Transportation	359,000
Total	\$459,000

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 the County Council.

RESOLUTION NO. 343-82 Re: An Amendment to the Proposed Resolution on an FY 1982 Supplemental Appropriation

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

RESOLVED, That the proposed resolution on an FY 1982 Supplemental Appropriation be amended in the first WHEREAS clause to add "of \$363,00 in impact aid, summer school fees, and field trips (nonlocal tax money)" after "additional revenues."

RESOLUTION NO. 344-82 Re: An Amendment to the Proposed Resolution on an FY 1982 Supplemental Appropriation

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

RESOLVED, That the proposed resolution on an FY 1982 Supplemental Appropriation be amended in the first RESOLVED clause to add "anticipated deficit" after "to be applied to."

RESOLUTION NO. 345-82 Re: An Amendment to the Proposed Resolution on an FY 1982 Supplemental Appropriation

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

RESOLVED, That the proposed resolution on an FY 1982 Supplemental Appropriation be amended to add "non-tax" between "local" and "sources" in the first RESOLVED clause.

RESOLUTION NO. 346-82 Re: FY 1982 Supplemental Appropriation to be Used to Offset Projected Budget Deficits

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

WHEREAS, Additional revenues of \$363,000 in impact aid, summer school fees, and field trips (nonlocal tax money) are available to the school system; and

WHEREAS, The March, 1982, Monthly Financial Report is reflecting a projected deficit of \$370,000 as of June 30, 1982; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the superintendent of schools be authorized, subject to County Council approval, to receive and expend revenues amounting to \$459,000 from federal and local non-tax sources to be applied to anticipated deficit accounts in the following categories:

Category	Supplemental
01 Administration	\$100,000
06 Pupil Transportation	359,000
Total	\$459,000

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 the County Council.

Re: FY 1983 Operating Budget

The superintendent reported that the Council action so far had cut \$2.66 million from the budget. He said the county executive denied \$3.7 million and so far the Council had considered \$2.3 million of the \$3.7 million, and in that \$2.3 million they had agreed with the executive in the amount of \$1.5 million and had restored about \$800,000 of the executive denials. The Council still had another \$1.4 million including the computer to consider. There would be another work session on April 28 at 7 p.m. Mrs. Spencer asked whether the Board had received the Council's total list of cuts, and the superintendent replied that he thought the work papers they had received were all the Council recommendations. Mrs. Spencer asked how much more had not been considered yet, and the superintendent replied that Councilman Scull had recommended \$2 million more in cuts. The superintendent reported that Mr. Scull had said he would consider if they could cut below the \$3.7 million that the executive had cut that

he would be willing to consider the possibility of restoring some of that additional back to classroom positions.

Mrs. Wallace stated that one of the Council members was contacted in relation to the vision position which was cut. The Council member had said there was no difference if they cut a special education teacher because the Board could always put it back from the regular teacher complement. She pointed out that special education was under Category 4 and the other teachers were in Category 02. She thought they had to do a better job of informing Council members as to what state budget categories meant.

Mrs. Zappone reported that it had not been an easy time with the Council, and she hoped that more Board members could join them at the Council. The superintendent remarked that they had heard a lot about the Somerset vs. Hornbeck suit. He said the state had recently released figures to show that in Mont-gomery County there were fewer teachers per thousand students than Somerset County. Montgomery County was tenth in the state in teacher staffing. He said they did spend more per pupil because of their higher salary schedule and higher cost of living. In terms of administrators per thousand students Mont-gomery County was nineteenth out of the twenty-four school districts. He stated that the fact that their instructional results were the best in the state and getting better was a real tribute to the people in the schools.

Re: Academic Program at Blair High School

The superintendent reported that the Board had asked them to look at the academic program at Blair and what they could do to strengthen that program. He said there had been some involvement of community but basically this was a staff report based on the Middle States evaluation of Blair. They had identi-fied four groups of students needing attention. They were the upper level academic students, the run-of-the-mill mainline average academic students, the limited English proficient students, and the academically deficient students. He pointed out that Blair had over 500 students on free or reduced lunch which was over 200 students more than any other high school in Montgomery County. He said that clearly this was the most diverse student population in the county. Dr. Pitt felt that this was a very comprehensive proposal and a real effort to focus in on the diversity of the school and strengthen the program. He noted that for youngsters graduating in 1980, 81.2 percent of Blair's graduates went on to further continuing education while the average for the county was 78.7 percent.

Mr. Joseph Villani, principal of Montgomery Blair High School, explained that the structure of the proposal was to add material and human resources necessary to maintain a quality upper-level program. The second dimension was to address the needs of the average student. This would be addressed by the benefits that would accrue to the student body in programs through the addition of human and material resources and also from the specialized instruction that would be

given to the academically deficient students in the special alternative program. The fourth aspect of the program would be an improved limited English proficient program for those students who were in ESOL. Another dimension to the proposal was some specialized counseling programs.

Mr. Ewing thought that this was an interesting and useful proposal and a good start in addressing of the major concerns that many in the Blair community. expressed. His concern with it was not what it said but what it didn't He did not sense that this was a comprehensive approach which would address the larger concerns of the community and the larger purposes of the high school in the setting in which it operated. He said that he did not sense any excitement here. He did not sense any feeling that Blair High School was going to move from where it had been to some higher plane of educational excellence. He said that, in short, it was a good start but not something that was going to make people feel that Blair High School had made a real move in the direction of true quality. He said he would like to know what was going to happen to catch people's imagination that Blair was going to be a high school where their children were going to be excited, challenged, and stimulated to do their very best.

Mr. Villani felt that the proposal before the Board would be productive for students. Mr. Ewing thought there was a need for the community to understand that Blair High School was going to be more than just a place where four kinds of students got more resources than they used to have. He was worried about the four classes of students because this could turn into labeling or stereotyping. He did not see the larger statement of what the high school was to be about, whom it was going to serve, and why, and what it was to accomplish and for whom.

Dr. Paul Vance, area associate superintendent, said it was his strong feeling that the proposal was a first step in the direction outlined by Mr. Ewing. He did find aspects of the proposal exciting, exciting not only in the context of Blair but that entire feeder pattern. He said they could not deal with Blair in isolation, and he felt that the SPARC program had a tinge of excitement to it. He indicated that the fact that the superintendent was willing to bring this to the table given the deliberations of the County Council was an ex-citing step.

The superintendent reported that he had given his student intern, a junior at another high school, the assignment of visiting Blair High School. She visited the school on two separate occasions, once visiting the academic program and once the classes dealing with remedial students. Her first visit was to advanced placement English, and he quoted "I am not yet at that level in my school, but I think it would be hard for anyone to find an advanced placement English class more interesting and better taught than the one at Blair." The superintendent said that his intern had reported that the students thought that Blair was the best school in Montgomery County. She went on to state that the students got a superb academic education but an even better cultural education for life by going to Blair. The

superintendent said that Blair was a good school, but it had some needs they had to address. It was his point of view that if they could budgetarily support the staff recommendations they could go back and work with the community. He thought there had to be some kind of real understanding of what went on at Blair. He thought that if they could mount a bona fide public information campaign, people could find out about the tremendous diversity of the school. The superintendent pointed out that because of the diversity of the school they did need to keep up the size of the student body.

Mrs. Zappone commented that she was impressed with the report in that it identified needs and said exactly what would be required to address those needs. It seemed to her after addressing the needs the image or perception of the school would change. The superintendent pointed out that they were dealing with a school that had had a lot of ignorance conveyed about it simply because people had not visited the school.

Mrs. Peyser remarked that she was very impressed with the report, and she thought there was a great deal of potential for excitement here. She saw a principal and an area superintendent who were excited about the proposal, and she pointed out that there were provisions for resource teachers to have extra time to work with teachers and for departments to work together to devise exciting programs. She said that if the Council funded the budget it would up to the principal, the staff, and the school.

Mrs. Wallace said that throughout the report there were requests for equipment, and she wondered whether this was over and above the school's normal allocation. Dr. Pitt replied that this would be in addition to the normal equipment replacement budget and in the science department the equipment was a little more unique. Mrs. Wallace pointed out that the science item specifically said it was to replace several items damaged by long-term use and age. Mr. Villani replied that Blair was an old school with old equipment, and the major infusion of equipment came with state capital money when a school was first built or renovated. Mrs. Wallace wondered how many other schools were in the same boat. In regard to the percentage of students going on to higher education, Mrs. Wallace asked about the other schools that were causing the county average to drop. She said she thought that the eye wash fountains and safety showers had been done by Board action. Dr. John Pancella replied that the renovation did not include Grade 9. Mrs. Wallace inquired about the science inventory. Mr. Villani replied that they had a very old storeroom and needed someone to do a very thorough job in there. Mrs. Wallace asked whether they needed the ten additional EYE days when the resource teacher would have extra time and there would be more science teachers. She explained that she was trying to find out how they could cut this back and still be responsive to the report. She also inquired about other schools that did not have a certified physics teacher. She asked whether the electric typewriter in the foreign language department was above the regular allocation. Mr. Villani replied that it was, and it was needed to be able to type the different lan-guages. In regard to personal typing and notetaking,

she asked about other high schools having this particular capability. Mrs. Wallace pointed out that the cover memo stated that the proposal could be supported if the present budget requests were passed by the County Council. The superintendent replied that the proposal could not be supported with the actions that had been taken so far by the County Council in reducing the number of teachers in the budget. He said that if there was general consensus in terms of the resources needed he would bring this up as a separate discussion item before the Council finished action on the Board's budget. He would tell the Council they had to have more to do this, and if the Council didn't give it the Board would have to make the decision as to whether they would take from other schools to have the program at Blair.

Mrs. Spencer commented that the report set the tone to her of saying these were things that Blair needed to bring it up to snuff to be like the other high schools. She questioned whether some of the requested items were that unique. She said that, as she thought back over the exceptional teachers her children had had, that kind of spark was difficult to put into black and white. She asked whether there was any provision for the area superintendent and principal to give special attention to Blair or were they heaping this on top of their other duties. The superintendent replied that they would have help from the Department of Staff Development. There would be more time for the resource teachers to work with staff.

Mrs. Spencer pointed out that the percentages of students going on to higher education was on graduates of a couple of years ago, and they had now drained from that student body many of the students with the fewest problems. She thought they had to use a little caution in assuming any carry-over from previous years. Mr. Villani said that this year they had 1741 students and next year they were projected at 1482. Included in both figures were approximately 45 special education students. They would be losing students from Woodlin/Woodside which was a good group of students. They would also lose students from Broad Acres and Brookview, and he said they had had a lot of successful students from those communities.

Mrs. Spencer noted that they were not getting supplementary staffing in math, and it seemed to her they ought to be offering some AP math classes. Mr. Villani replied that they now had accelerated classes in calculus. In addition, the ESOL program had provision for some bilingual teaching in mathematics. He emphasized that they would continue to offer upper level math no matter how low their enrollment dropped.

Dr. Greenblatt thought the report was an important step forward in addressing the needs of the very different populations at Blair. She asked to be assured that as a result of this all of the advanced courses that were currently being offered would continue to be offered and specifically inquired about calculus. Mr. Villani replied that calculus practically funded itself at Blair, and this year they had 20 students. Dr. Greenblatt remarked that earlier the Board had talked about developing a new spirit at Blair, and one of the things they had considered was a music and art center at Blair. She said

that this apparently had not gotten any kind of support within the community. She pointed out that they had a substantial foreign student population at the school, and she wondered whether they had considered making the foreign language department a very strong program that would attract students. She explained that she was trying to think of something a little bit different from some of the other high schools that would be a very positive way of looking at the school and using the strengths of the school to develop it. The superintendent commented that he was pleased the Board had not lost sight of the magnet concept because he had not abandoned the concept of a performing arts center at Blair. He thought that one of the concerns of the community was that the performing arts center would be what they put in the school instead of the program they were discussing this evening. He felt that the community's main interest was in strengthening the academic program. He thought that if the community was convinced the Board was serious about strengthening the academic program they might be able to work through some of the objections to the performing arts magnet. Dr. Greenblatt asked whether they had considered an expansion of the foreign language program. Mr. Villani explained that the proposal was supposed to be an assessment of the current academic program and how to strengthen it; therefore, they did not address any magnet program.

Dr. Greenblatt felt that they should go to the Council with a line item for supplementary staffing for Blair High School. The superintendent explained that the Council had no line item budget control over the Board of Education. The Board of Education set educational policy. He said that he would like to identify for the Council what they had thought was needed at Blair and tell the Council they didn't think it could be done with the reductions the Council had made so far. He said he would make it very clear that this proposal was in addition to what they had in the total budget request.

Mr. Lipson reported that he had visited Blair recently with the superintendent's intern. They had visited what he would term the lower level classes, and he was impressed with the dedication he saw on the part of the teachers in reading and writing workshops and special education classes. He felt that the proposal was a good start. He commented that when he visited the school and talked with students they did not seem to realize there was a problem with their school. He said that he was impressed with the report and with Blair High School.

Dr. Pitt explained that they had gone to the area office and the principal and said their goal was to strengthen what they believed was a good academic program. He felt that the report was a beginning. He had been told that the school had some very fine advanced placement programs but was concerned about the youngster in the middle and how to provide resources to him. To do this they would have to lower the staffing level and focus in on certain places.

Mr. Ewing commented that the superintendent ought to feel he had a fair amount of support for the program as a beginning point. He

pointed out that educational improvements did not go on in a vacuum, and one of the things that was important was that parents had to know what was happening and to understand how what was happening related to their children and what was going to happen to their children in the future. He explained that he had one son who had graduated from Blair and another son who was a student at Blair. He said he probably heard more from the Blair parents than anyone in the room and they were worried about the quality of the educational program. He felt that they needed to communicate what they were doing. He noted that the Board of Education itself had taken some steps which added to the negative image. He pointed out that the state Board of Education hearing examiner had said that what the Board did with respect to Blair was arbitrary and unreasonable and the Board did not consult with the community. He said that to do something positive and constructive they had to communicate clearly that the Board had a concept about this school that went beyond just tinkering with the staffing. That this was a concept that was larger and more exciting and more long-range and a concept that committed them to quality.

Mrs. Wallace pointed out that eight of the professional personnel being requested were for the SPARC program and only 2.6 for the academic program. She felt that they had to explain to people what benefits were going to accrue to their children as a result of having the SPARC program at the school. She said that everyone gave Mrs. Zappone credit for the idea of the performing arts center and while it was brought to the Board level by Mrs. Zappone, it was originally suggested by Mrs. Barbara Cantor from the Blair community. She hoped that if they could show good faith on the Board's part towards strengthening the program at all levels at Blair then they would be able to look at other options. She hoped that the superintendent would go to the Council and try to get as much of this allocated as possible.

Mr. Lipson asked how the proposal would be affected if the state Board of Education upheld the hearing examiner's recommendation which would reverse the actions of the Board. It was the view of the superintendent that these actions would still be needed. Dr. Greenblatt called attention to the number of youngsters in Blair who were so far behind in reading, and she suggested they keep this in mind when they discussed the K-8 policy.

Re: A Motion by Mrs. Wallace Regarding Woodlin/
Woodside Interim Housing

Mrs. Wallace moved the following which was seconded by Mrs. Spencer:

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education support the superintendent's recommendation for Woodlin/Woodside interim housing of Option 1 - Provide six portable classrooms at Woodlin and house the student body at that site.

RESOLUTION NO. 347-82 Re: Tabling the Motion on Woodlin/Woodside
Interim Housing

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

RESOLVED, That the proposed resolution on Woodlin/Woodside interim housing be tabled until May 11, 1982.

For the record, Mr. Ewing stated he was in favor of Option 1 as among the options, but he would like to ask that it be clear what the Board's responsibilities are with respect to community notification and opportunity to comment on any action the Board might take under the long-range facilities plan on May 11. He said he was not suggesting there was an obligation, but he thought they had better find that out because the state Board hearing examiner said repeatedly that the Board was arbitrary and unreasonable for not doing that.

Re: Review of the Roles, Responsibilities,
Authority, and Future of the Resource
Teachers in the High Schools

Dr. Pitt stated they had provided the Board with a brief paper on the role of the resource teacher as well as a copy of the job description. In terms of the future they did not see a major change in the role of the resource teacher. They were supports to the principal and the subject matter expert in the school as well as supports to teachers. It seemed to Mrs. Spencer that this was not anything new but just how the job had evolved. Dr. Pitt felt that their primary role had stayed pretty much the same. Over the years they had been careful in their selection of resource teachers, and he felt they were much better trained now.

Mr. Ewing recalled that one of the sources of having this matter before the Board was the Lang issue. There the issue was the role of the resource teacher in dealing with teacher evaluation and teacher discipline. He said that he was not sure how clear the authority of the resource teacher had been stated. He pointed out the section about assisting the principal in evaluations and asked whether this was delegated to the resource teacher. Dr. Pitt explained that the principal was the prime evaluator, and the resource teacher was a source of information. In addition, the resource teacher could not discipline other teachers. Mr. Ewing remarked that the resource teacher was described as largely a support to the teachers and at the same time a support to the principal, and he thought there was some ambiguity here. What he did not know was what it was they told the resource teachers about how far they were to go in playing which roles and under what circumstances. Dr. Pitt agreed that this was a difficult problem and explained that they tried to communicate the

roles as clearly as they could with the principals. He explained that their goal was to have the resource teacher be a source of information to the principal and not the prime evaluator.

Mr. Ewing asked about training and workshops for resource teachers. Dr. Lois Martin, associate superintendent, replied that at times they had had extensive training. She said that the subject coordinators met with the resource teachers about once every six weeks to review policy and new programs. In addition, the Department of Staff Development had been working with the re-source teachers in planning for training next summer. Mrs. Zappone pointed out that the County Council had not been very supportive of in-service training.

Dr. Greenblatt said that at one point there was a desire to distinguish between department chairmen and resource teachers. She wondered why they couldn't call a teacher a resource teacher who would have a direct supervisory role and responsibility for what went on in their department. The superintendent explained that the Board had a chance to do that when it made the unit determination and the Board could very easily have put the resource teachers into the administrator/evaluator bargaining unit but did not. He said that in terms of the evaluation article in the collective bargaining unit there would have to be some very careful work-through on the job description. Mrs. Spencer said that this discussion had been going on for years. She explained that this was an attitude of working together for the betterment of the children and the improvement of teaching which was absent when they were talking about someone who was in charge of you.

The superintendent said that MCEA had attempted to negotiate the whole evaluation process, and the Board did not agree to that. He said that any changes would be consulted with MCEA before any change

was made. He thought if they decided to change the job description they could sustain that kind of change.

Dr. Pitt explained that the resource teacher was a key professional in a school. He said that the history of this was that they decided as a school system that they could not have a lot of supervisors like small systems did. He said that part of the supervisory role was not evaluation, and a more important part of that role was helping classroom teachers get the support they needed. The system decided that might better be done by teachers. He said that evaluation had evolved to some extent, but it was more to give help when it was needed and tell the principal what needed to be done. Dr. Martin explained that the resource teacher, unlike the department chairman, had a very definite role in teacher evaluation. There were a certain number of observations and conferences that must be conducted by the resource teacher, and the notes of those must be shared with the teacher and put in the teacher's school files.

Mr. Ewing stated that he did not have any quarrel with the model they used. On the other hand, he knew of cases where teachers had felt that in the guise of help they were being the objects of discipline.

The principal normally would side with the resource teacher. He said he was concerned that they be clear with teachers and resource teachers as to what it was they were doing here and that everybody's role was clearly understood.

Mrs. Wallace recalled that one of the major concerns about the old role of the department chairman was they ended up out of touch with the classroom. This was one of the reasons they went in the direction of the resource teacher. She agreed with the need for good evaluations with as much input as possible. She said that then they got into the negotiations process itself. She hoped that the Board would look at the idea of a task force on negotiations because this was still on the books. She pointed out that during unit determination they did not have a chance to talk to the resource teachers themselves, the classroom teachers, and the principals to find out the perspectives of each of them. She hoped that within the next two years some of them would make inquiry and find out whether there needed to be a change in this area.

Mr. Lipson commented that the philosophy behind the resource teacher was very important; however, most students were not aware of the role of the resource teacher. He remarked that from what he could see of the program that it worked well. Mr. Ewing said that Mrs. Wallace's point was one that ought to be thought about because now was the time to talk about this. Mrs. Wallace added that they should consider having a task force.

Re: Appeals of Curriculum Matters

Mrs. Spencer said there had been ten requests for reevaluation this year and these were usually made by parents. Mr. Ewing observed that the point about this was not only how much of this was there and what were the rules, but what was it that needed to be done to make sure they had a reasonable process. He suggested that it might be that there was not much information about this of a kind that people understood very well. He thought there was no sense on the part of teachers as to whether or not there was an option on their part to raise this question.

The superintendent said that teachers serving on various review committees made the initial judgment as to what the materials were. He thought that teachers assumed that when a curriculum guide came out with lists of materials that they would follow this. He suggested that they could put something in the Bulletin about procedures teachers could follow if they were not satisfied with the materials. Mr. Ewing said he would like to be sure that they did what was necessary to make certain that teachers did not get caught in situations where they unintentionally chose some materials that were not approved.

Re: Insubordination and Misconduct in Office as
It Pertains to Professional Employees

Mr. Ewing said it was not clear to him initially why it was that

some things were called insubordination and other things were called misconduct and how those were used in particular cases and why. He was not sure the school law in the State of Maryland had helped at all. He felt that the legal definitions were not much help either. He did think the procedures were clear. He said that it might be well for somebody to suggest to the Legislature that this ought to be clarified, but he said that maybe it would be just as well if they left this alone.

RESOLUTION NO. 348-82 Re: Taking up Item on Greenwood Elementary

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

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education take up a policy item on Greenwood Elementary School.

RESOLUTION NO. 349-82 Re: Boundary Change - Greenwood Elementary

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

WHEREAS, On November 24, 1981, the Montgomery County Board of Education unanimously passed RESOLUTION NO. 1073-81, changing the attendance areas for Greenwood and Sherwood Elementary Schools on and after July 1, 1982; and

WHEREAS, As a result of RESOLUTION NO. 1073-81, all students residing north and east of the Town of Brookeville would attend Sherwood Elementary School instead of Greenwood Elementary School in September, 1982; and

WHEREAS, 29 students were projected in the 15-year Comprehensive Master Plan for Educational Facilities to be affected in September, 1982, as a result of that resolution; and

WHEREAS, Only eight students are now projected to be so affected; and

WHEREAS, All of the area in which these eight students reside is significantly closer to Greenwood Elementary School than Sherwood Elementary School; and

WHEREAS, Greenwood Elementary School has adequate space for students residing in this area for the foreseeable future; and

WHEREAS, Students attending both Greenwood and Sherwood Elementary Schools articulate 100 percent to Farquhar Middle School and Sherwood High School; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the Montgomery County Board of Education hereby rescinds Resolution No. 1073-81; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the Greenwood and Sherwood Elementary School

attendance areas on and after July 1, 1982, will consist of the same attendance areas served during the 1981-82 school year, with no modification; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the affected schools and families be notified of this action immediately.

Re: New Business

1. Dr. Greenblatt introduced the following which was seconded by Mr. Lipson:

WHEREAS, The Board of Education voted to close Peary and Northwood High Schools in 1984; and

WHEREAS, To maintain the educational program: at those schools until actual closure teachers and staff have agreed to stay in their positions except in cases of promotion; and

WHEREAS, To maintain educational continuity it is often beneficial for students and teachers to move together to a newly consolidated school; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That every effort will be made for those high school teachers in Peary and Northwood who are remaining in their positions to receive first preference for positions in the newly consolidated schools along with those teachers in the receiving schools (Einstein, Wheaton and Rockville), but ahead of any teachers or staff from other schools.

2. Mr. Ewing moved that the Board of Education reconsider the Radnor decision this evening. The motion failed for lack of a second.

3. Mr. Ewing stated that the Board had received some decisions from the state Board hearing examiner which recommended that several Board decisions be overturned. He said that the question was whether or not they appeal the state hearing examiner's recommendations to the state Board of Education. He asked whether or not it was essential for the Board to vote on whether or not to proceed with those appeals. The superintendent said that the Board would be meeting in executive session on May 11 with counsel. He indicated that it would have to be a decision for the Board whether it would want to act; however, in the past the attorneys had always appeared regarding oral arguments and the Board had never taken an action. Mr. Ewing moved that the Board schedule action on whether or not it wishes to appeal on cases where the state Board hearing examiner ruled against the local Board. There was no second.

Re: Executive Session

Mrs. Zappone announced that the Board had met in executive session from 11 p.m. to 11:30 p.m. on personnel matters. Mr. Lipson left the meeting after executive session.

RESOLUTION NO. 350-82 Re: Monthly Personnel Report

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Mrs. Peyser seconded by Mrs. Wallace, 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. 351-82 Re: Personnel Reassignment

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

RESOLVED, That the following personnel reassignment be approved:

Name	From	To
Ehrenreich, Thelma	Secretary III Office Services 11 G - L3	Secretary Office Services Will maintain present salary level July 1, 1982

RESOLUTION NO. 352-82 Re: Death of Mr. James E. Gobble, Sr.,
Security Patroller in the Department of
School Facilities

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

WHEREAS, The sudden death on April 8, 1982, of Mr. James E. Gobble, Sr., a security patroller in the Department of School Facilities has deeply saddened the staff and members of the Board of Education; and

WHEREAS, Mr. Gobble had been a member of the security staff with Montgomery County Public Schools for nearly fifteen years and was highly respected by his colleagues and associates; and

WHEREAS, Mr. Gobble was an extremely valuable employee who demonstrated his worth to Montgomery County Public Schools many times over the years; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the members of the Board of Education express their sorrow at the death of Mr. James E. Gobble, Sr., and extend deepest sympathy to his family; and be it further

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

RESOLUTION NO. 353-82 Re: Death of Miss Shirley R. Van Blarcom,
Classroom Teacher at Robert Frost

Junior High School

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

WHEREAS, The sudden death on April 6, 1982, of Miss Shirley R. Van Blarcom, a classroom teacher at Robert Frost Junior High School, has deeply saddened the staff and members of the Board of Education; and

WHEREAS, For the twenty-four and one-half years that Miss Van Blarcom had been a member of the staff of Montgomery County Public Schools, she displayed that rare ability to provide maximally stimulating learning experiences through a happy, relaxed classroom environment; and

WHEREAS, Miss Van Blarcom has earned the respect of his colleagues, pupils and parents; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the members of the Board of Education express their sorrow at the death of Miss Shirley R. Van Blarcom 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. 354-82 Re: Personnel Transfer and Reassignment

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

RESOLVED, That the following personnel transfer and reassignment be approved:

Transfer	From	To
Thomas Poore	Acting Principal Brookview Elementary	Principal Eastern Junior High Effective July 1, 1982
Reassignment	From	To
William Wilhoyte	Principal Professional Leave	Principal Farmland Elementary Effective July 1, 1982

Re: Board Member Comments

1. Mr. Ewing stated that since the Board had met last they had received recommendations by the state Board hearing examiner on a number of cases. He said it was important to note that not only did the hearing examiner say particularly in the Rosemary Hills, Blair, and Eastern cases that the Board had been arbitrary and unreasonable, but that the Board had not followed its own policy and had not given

due process. He said this was unprecedented in terms of the numbers of recommendations for overruling a local Board and unprecedented in the strength of the language. He hoped that the Board would now undertake to reconsider those decisions; however, he had no illusions that the Board was likely to do that.

2. Mrs. Zappone reported that on April 25 the governor had a volunteers recognition day and the contingent from Montgomery County was substantial. She remarked that all of the volunteers were certainly deserving of the Board's appreciation and thanks.

3. Mrs. Zappone called attention to the MCPS Fair at Montgomery Mall and said they were proud of their students. She had received calls from parents who had said it was great that some of the academic endeavors of the students were being highlighted as well as the arts that are generally highlighted.

4. Mrs. Zappone said that some Board members had attended the National Association of Boards of Education conference and got something out of it although it was not as large as had been the case in the past.

RESOLUTION NO. 355-82 Re: Executive Session - May 11, 1982

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Mrs. Spencer seconded by Mrs. Peyser, 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 May 11, 1982, at 9 a.m. to discuss, consider, deliberate, and/or otherwise decided the employment, assignment, appointment, promotion, demotion, compensation, discipline, removal, or resignation of employees, appointees, or officials over whom it has jurisdiction, or any other personnel matter affecting one or more particular individuals and to comply with a specific constitutional, statutory or judicially imposed requirement 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.

RESOLUTION NO. 356-82 Re: Minutes of March 18, 1982

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

RESOLVED, That the minutes of March 18, 1982, be approved as corrected.

RESOLUTION NO. 357-82 Re: Minutes of March 22, 1982

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

RESOLVED, That the minutes of March 22, 1982, be approved.

RESOLUTION NO. 358-82 Re: Appointments to the Title IX Advisory Committee

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

WHEREAS, The Board of Education determined on July 19, 1977, that a Title IX Advisory Committee should be established; and

WHEREAS, The superintendent suggested that the committee be composed of 16 members, namely,

- 3 Montgomery County Public Schools staff members appointed by the superintendent in consultation with the employee organizations and the principals' associations
- 3 Students members appointed by the superintendent in consultation with the Montgomery County Region of the Maryland Association of Student Councils and Montgomery County Junior Council
- 8 Community members appointed by the Board of Education
- 1 Member either from the MCPS staff or the community (at the Board of Education's discretion)
- 1 Ex officio member from the Department of Human Relations; and

WHEREAS, Currently there are four community representative vacancies existing on the committee; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education appoint the following persons, effective immediately, to serve on the Title IX Advisory Committee:

Joyce Koeneman, Young Women's Christian Association
Frances Stapleton, National Older Women's League
Betsy Witte, League of Women Voters
Leila Rosen Young, Independent

RESOLUTION NO. 359-82 Re: Special Olympics Week

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

WHEREAS, The annual Montgomery County Special Olympics will be held April 30 and May 1, 1982; and

WHEREAS, The county executive has designated the week of April 25 through May 1, 1982, as Special Olympics Week; and

WHEREAS, The Special Olympics Program was created more than a decade ago, providing the mentally and physically handicapped across the nation and around the world with athletic and recreational activities; and

WHEREAS, In Montgomery County, more than 2,000 qualified Special Olympics athletes, the majority of whom are enrolled within MCPS, benefit from good health through physical exercise and good sportsmanship through competition; and

WHEREAS, The Montgomery County Special Olympics Program offers training, workshops, and clinics to prepare athletes for competition; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the school system: proclaim the week of April 25 through May 1, 1982, as Special Olympics Week in Montgomery County public schools and that the staff be urged to join in recognizing the dedicated efforts of the handicapped athletes and their coaches and in supporting the Special Olympics Program.

Re: Items of Information

Board members received the following items of information:

1. Report on School Food Services
2. 1983 Rockefeller Brothers Fund Awards in Arts Education
3. Woodlin/Woodside Student Housing

Re: Adjournment

The president adjourned the meeting at 11:35 p.m.

President

Secretary

EA:mlw