

Wisconsin Avenue Metro site. She had been invited to a luncheon in regard to this project, and representatives of business had indicated they would like to see more cooperation with the school system. She said that art students from Einstein High School had participated in the project.

4. Mrs. Peyser indicated that she had been invited to speak to the sixth grade gifted and talented class at Stedwick Elementary. She believed that they had visited the superintendent as well. The students would like to see more computers in the classroom, smaller classes, less vandalism, better teacher salaries, better lunches, and more health aides.

5. Mrs. Peyser recalled that last year she had commented about the results of a survey on discipline conducted by the Task Force on Discipline. The results showed that 80 percent of the teachers reported that discipline was a problem. Last summer she had asked the superintendent to work with principals on this problem, and she had heard there was to be another survey. However, they had not heard about the survey or from the Task Force on Discipline. She asked that a discussion be scheduled of discipline in the schools as well as the survey.

6. Dr. Cronin commented that at the last meeting in July the Board took an action to appeal the driver education decision. He believed that this was a mistake, and he said that had he been present he would have voted against this.

7. Dr. Cronin reported that he had met with the March of Dimes regarding their Reading Program. Dr. Pitt agreed that this could be in the schools on a school by school basis, and he would support this. He asked that Board members lend their support to such a program.

8. Dr. Greenblatt stated that she would have a new business item based on issues that had been raised by the French Immersion Program.

9. Mr. Ewing said that he would be providing the Board with a memorandum regarding the Minority Affairs Advisory Committee and its membership.

10. Mr. Ewing called attention to the August 3 memo from Dr. Cornell Lewis which updated activities regarding Chevy Chase, North Chevy Chase, and Rosemary Hills. He felt that this was a very heartening memo because Rosemary Hills had a kindergarten enrollment of 77 which was close to the projection. There were 45 majority students and 32 minority students. He was pleased with all the work that staff had done to make that happen.

11. Mr. Ewing said that at its August 22 meeting the Board will be considering a position regarding the use of closed public schools.

12. Mr. Ewing reported that the Board was continuing to work on developing priorities and goals and objectives. They expected to

have a statement for public discussion by the end of August.

13. Mr. Ewing stated that the Board had talked about changing the way in which it put together its agendas. For example, it would try to cluster like items and items of policy issues.

14. Mr. Ewing reported that he had met with parents from Rock Creek Forest regarding the Spanish Immersion Program.

15. Mr. Ewing said he had also met with a group of leaders from the Chinese-American community.

Resolution No. 667-83 Re: Executive Session - August 22, 1983

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Mrs. Peyser seconded by Dr. Cronin, 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 August 22, 1983, at 7:30 p.m. to discuss, consider, deliberate, and/or otherwise decide the employment, assignment, appointment, promotion, demotion, compensation, discipline, removal, or resignation of employees, appointees, or officials over whom it has jurisdiction, or any other personnel matter affecting one or more particular individuals 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.

Resolution NO. 668-83 Re: Executive Session - September 9-10,
1983

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Mrs. Peyser seconded by Dr. Cronin, 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 September 9, 1983, at 2 p.m. to conduct collective bargaining negotiations or consider matters and issues in connection therewith as permitted under Article 76A, Section 11(a) and that such meeting shall continue in executive closed session until the completion of

Resolution No. 671-83 Re: BOE Case 83-12

On motion of Mrs. Praisner seconded by Dr. Cronin, the following resolution was adopted with Dr. Cronin, Mr. Ewing, Mrs. Praisner, and Dr. Shoenberg voting in the affirmative; Dr. Greenblatt and Mrs. Peyser voting in the negative:

Resolved, That the Board of Education deny the appeal in BOE Case 83-12, student transfer.

Resolution No. 672-83 Re: BOE Case 83-15

On motion of Mrs. Praisner seconded by Dr. Cronin, the following resolution was adopted with Dr. Cronin, Mr. Ewing, Mrs. Praisner, and Dr. Shoenberg voting in the affirmative; Dr. Greenblatt and Mrs. Peyser voting in the negative:

Resolved, That the Board of Education deny the appeal in BOE Case 83-15, student transfer.

Resolution No. 673-83 Re: BOE Case 83-16

On motion of Mrs. Praisner seconded by Dr. Cronin, the following resolution was adopted with Dr. Cronin, Mr. Ewing, Dr. Greenblatt, Mrs. Praisner, and Dr. Shoenberg voting in the affirmative; Mrs. Peyser voting in the negative:

Resolved, That the Board of Education deny the appeal in BOE Case 83-16, student transfer.

Resolution No. 674-83 Re: BOE Case 83-17

On motion of Mrs. Praisner seconded by Dr. Shoenberg, the following resolution was adopted with Dr. Cronin, Mr. Ewing, Dr. Greenblatt, Mrs. Praisner, and Dr. Shoenberg voting in the affirmative; Mrs. Peyser voting in the negative:

Resolved, That the Board of Education deny the appeal in BOE Case 83-17, student transfer.

Resolution No. 675-83 Re: BOE Case 83-18

On motion of Mrs. Praisner seconded by Dr. Cronin, the following resolution was adopted with Dr. Cronin, Mr. Ewing, Mrs. Praisner, and Dr. Shoenberg voting in the affirmative; Dr. Greenblatt and Mrs. Peyser voting in the negative:

Resolved, That the Board of Education deny the appeal in BOE Case 83-18, student transfer.

Resolution No. 676-83 Re: BOE Case 83-19

On motion of Mrs. Praisner seconded by Dr. Cronin, the following

resolution was adopted unanimously:

Resolved, That the Board of Education deny the appeal in BOE Case 83-19, student transfer.

Resolution No. 677-83 Re: BOE Case 83-20

On motion of Mrs. Praisner seconded by Dr. Cronin, the following resolution was adopted with Dr. Cronin, Mr. Ewing, Mrs. Praisner, and Dr. Shoenberg voting in the affirmative; Dr. Greenblatt and Mrs. Peysner voting in the negative:

Resolved, That the Board of Education deny the appeal in Case BOE 83-20, student transfer.

Resolution No. 678-83 Re: BOE Case 83-21

On motion of Mrs. Praisner seconded by Dr. Cronin, the following resolution was adopted with Dr. Cronin, Mr. Ewing, Mrs. Praisner, and Dr. Shoenberg voting in the affirmative; Dr. Greenblatt and Mrs. Peysner voting in the negative:

Resolved, That the Board of Education deny the appeal in Case BOE 83-21, student transfer.

Resolution No. 679-83 Re: BOE Case 83-22

On motion of Mrs. Praisner seconded by Dr. Cronin, the following resolution was adopted with Dr. Cronin, Mr. Ewing, Mrs. Praisner, and Dr. Shoenberg voting in the affirmative; Dr. Greenblatt and Mrs. Peysner voting in the negative:

Resolved, That the Board of Education deny the appeal in BOE Case 83-22, student transfer.

Resolution No. 680-83 Re: BOE Case 83-23

On motion of Mrs. Praisner seconded by Dr. Cronin, the following resolution was adopted with Dr. Cronin, Mr. Ewing, Dr. Greenblatt, Mrs. Praisner, and Dr. Shoenberg voting in the affirmative; Mrs. Peysner voting in the negative:

Resolved, That the Board of Education deny the appeal in BOE Case 83-23, student transfer.

Resolution No. 681-83 Re: BOE Case 83-24

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education deny the appeals in BOE Case 83-24, student transfers.

Resolution No. 682-83 Re: BOE Case 83-25

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education refer BOE Case 83-25 back to the superintendent.

Resolution NO. 683-83 Re: BOE Case 83-26

On motion of Mrs. Praisner seconded by Dr. Cronin, the following resolution was adopted with Dr. Cronin, Mr. Ewing, Mrs. Praisner, and Dr. Shoenberg voting in the affirmative; Dr. Greenblatt and Mrs. Peyser voting in the negative:

Resolved, That the Board of Education deny the appeal in BOE Case 83-26, athletic waiver.

Resolution No. 684-83 Re: BOE Case 83-27

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education refer BOE Case 83-27 back to the superintendent.

Resolution No. 685-83 Re: Utilization of a Portion of the FY 1984 Appropriation for Projected Supported Projects for the TOUCHE' Project

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

Resolved, That the superintendent of schools be authorized to receive and expend within the FY 1984 Appropriation for Supported Projects of \$250,000, a grant of \$5,000 from the Maryland State Department of Education under the Arts in Education of the Education Consolidation and Improvement Act, Chapter 2 for the TOUCHE' Project at Fox Chapel Elementary School in the following categories:

Category	Amount
01 Administration	\$4,779
10 Fixed Charges	221
Total	\$5,000

and be it further

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

Resolution No. 686-83 Re: Revision of Architectural Contract - Woodlin Elementary School Addition

(Area 1)

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

WHEREAS, On June 21, 1982, the Board of Education appointed the firm of Victor Smolen & Associates to provide architectural design services and administration of the construction contract for the Woodlin Elementary School addition at the lump sum of \$40,000; and

WHEREAS, Subsequently the scope of the project was revised to include additional site work and storm drainage improvements; and

WHEREAS, Staff has negotiated an additional fee of \$7,000 for additional design work associated with this change; and

WHEREAS, There are sufficient funds in the account to fund this change; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Board of Education amend its contractual agreement with the firm of Victor Smolen & Associates to provide required design services for additional site work and storm drainage improvements for a fee of \$7,000.

Resolution No. 687-83 Re: Property Easement - Germantown
Future Junior High School Site (Area 3)

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

WHEREAS, The Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission has requested a right-of-way and temporary construction easement across the Germantown Future Junior High School site for the purpose of installing new sanitary sewer services; and

WHEREAS, The proposed sewer improvements will benefit both the school community and extended areas and will not affect any land now utilized for school programming and recreational activities; and

WHEREAS, The WSSC will assume all liability for damages or injury resulting from the installation and future maintenance of the subject utilities; and

WHEREAS, All construction, full restoration, and any future repair activities will be performed at no cost to the Board of Education and will result in a negotiated payment to the school system in return for the subject property rights; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the president and secretary be authorized to execute a permanent right-of-way and temporary access easement for the Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission at the Germantown Future

Junior High School site, for the purpose of installing new sanitary sewer services for the surrounding community; and be it further

Resolved, That a negotiated fee be paid by WSSC for the subject right-of-way and easement, said funds to be deposited in the Rental of Property Account 32-108-1-13.

Resolution No. 688-83 Re: Catastrophe Insurance Plan for Interscholastic Team Athletes

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

WHEREAS, The Executive Council of the Maryland Public Secondary Schools Athletic Association recently voted to accept and offer an

excess liability/lifetime medical insurance plan to affiliated school districts; and

WHEREAS, The cost of this plan is \$1 per individual athlete as defined in the coverage; and

WHEREAS, An estimated 8,000 students participate in interscholastic athletics at the high school grade level; and

WHEREAS, The sum of \$8,000 is available in Category 10 Fixed Charges to cover the cost of this program; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Montgomery County Public Schools pay the annual premium for an excess liability/lifetime medical insurance plan (catastrophe) for FY 1984 as acquired by The National Federation of State High School Athletic Associations through the Ideal Mutual Insurance Company of New York, to insure athletes who participate in interscholastic athletic events at the high school level under the jurisdiction of the Maryland Public Secondary Schools Athletic Association.

Resolution No. 689-83 Re: Bid 161-83, Building Materials

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

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

Resolved, That having been duly advertised July 6, 1983, the contracts for furnishing building materials for the period of August 12, 1983, through August 11, 1984, under Invitation to Bid 161-83 be awarded to the low bidders meeting specifications as follows:

Dollar Volume Line Items Awarded

Allied Plywood Corporation		
Alexandria, Virginia	\$ 7,576	2
Boyer & Cramer's Inc.		
Damascus, Maryland	7,450	5
Devlin Lumber & Supply Corporation		
Rockville, Maryland	13,360	3
Leland L. Fisher, Inc.		
Rockville, Maryland	2,986	1
Mizell Lumber & Hardware Company		
Kensington, Maryland	6,250	1
Parrs Ridge Supply Company		
Mt. Airy, Maryland	484	2
Thomas W. Perry, Inc.		
Chevy Chase, Maryland	1,566	2
	Total	\$39,672
		16

Resolution No. 690-83 Re: Bid 174-83, Glass and Glazing Materials

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

WHEREAS, Funds have been budgeted for the purchase of glass and glazing materials; now therefore be it

Resolved, That having been duly advertised June 22, 1983, the contracts for the furnishing of glass and glazing materials for the period of September 1, 1983, through August 31, 1984, under Invitation to Bid 174-83 be awarded to the low bidders meeting specifications as follows:

	Dollar Volume	Line Items Awarded
Chromalloy Glass Division		
Alexandria, Virginia	\$ 461	1
Commercial Plastics & Supply Corp.		
Hyattsville, Maryland	18,736	3
Miles Glass Company, Inc.		
Silver Spring, Maryland	15,026	5
Walsh & Koehler Glass Co., Inc.		
Mt. Rainier, Maryland	20,918	5
	Total	\$55,141
		14

Resolution No. 691-83 Re: Bid 177-83, Tires, Tubes, and Tire Retreading

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

WHEREAS, Funds have been budgeted for the purchase of tires, tubes,

and tire retreading; now therefore be it

Resolved, That having been duly advertised June 22, 1983, the contracts for furnishing tires, tubes, and tire retreading for the period of September 1, 1983, through August 31, 1984, under Invitation to Bid 177-83 be awarded to the low bidders meeting specifications as follows:

	Dollar Volume	Line Items Awarded
Ezrine Truck Centers, Inc. Baltimore, Maryland	\$107,764	13
B. F. Goodrich Company Washington, D.C.	81,153	32
Metropolitan Fleet Service, Inc. Gaithersburg, Maryland	142,723	55
Stidham Tire Company, Inc. Landover, Maryland	573,552	35
Total	\$905,192*	135

* MCPS \$311,231

* MCG 593,961

Resolution No. 692-83 Re: Bid 178-83, Scaffolding System

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

WHEREAS, Funds have been budgeted for the purchase of a scaffolding system; now therefore be it

Resolved, That having been duly advertised June 26, 1983, the contract for the furnishing of a scaffolding system under Invitation to Bid 178-83 be awarded to the low bidder meeting specifications as follows:

	Dollar Volume	Line Items Awarded
Upright Scaffolds, Inc. Washington, D.C.	\$6,964	5

Resolution No. 693-83 Re: Bid 179-83, Electric Pallet Trucks

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

WHEREAS, Funds have been budgeted for the purchase of electric pallet trucks; now therefore be it

Resolved, That having been duly advertised June 26, 1983, the contract for the furnishing of electric pallet trucks under Invitation to Bid 179-83 be awarded to the low bidder meeting

specifications as follows:

	Dollar Volume	Line Items Awarded
Potomac Industrial Trucks, Inc. Capitol Heights, Maryland	\$23,900	1

Resolution No. 694-83 Re: Bid 181-83, Bread and Rolls

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

WHEREAS, Funds have been budgeted for the purchase of bread and rolls; now therefore be it

Resolved, That having been duly advertised July 7, 1983, the contract for the furnishing of bread and rolls for the period of August 16, 1983, through August 15, 1984, under Invitation to Bid 181-83 be awarded to the low bidder meeting specifications as follows:

	Dollar Volume	Line Items Awarded
I.T.T. Continental Baking Co. Washington, D.C.	\$328,368	16

Resolution No. 695-83 Re: Bid 182-83, Cafeteria Disposable Supplies

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

WHEREAS, Funds have been budgeted for the purchase of cafeteria disposable supplies; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the following items for Bid 182-83 be awarded to the low bidders meeting specifications:

	Dollar Volume	Line Items Awarded
Acme Paper and Supply Co., Inc. Savage, Maryland	\$ 8,394	2
Kahn Paper Company, Inc. Hyattsville, Maryland	3,903	1
Monumental Paper Company Baltimore, Maryland	35,944	4
Total	\$48,241	7

Resolution No. 696-83 Re: Bid 184-83, Prepared Cereals

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

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

Resolved, That having been duly advertised July 7, 1983, the contracts for the furnishing of prepared cereals for the period of August 10, 1983, through May 31, 1984, under Invitation to Bid 184-83 be awarded to the low bidders meeting specifications as follows:

	Dollar Volume	Line Items Awarded
Quaker Oats Company Chicago, Illinois	\$2,434	3
Smelkinson Brothers Corporation Jessup, Maryland	2,695	1
Total	\$5,129	4

Resolution No. 697-83 Re: Bid 189-83, Frozen Juice Bars

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

WHEREAS, Funds have been budgeted for the purchase of frozen juice bars; now therefore be it

Resolved, That having been duly advertised July 11, 1983, the contract for the furnishing of frozen juice bars for period of August 10, 1983, through May 31, 1984, under Invitation to Bid 189-83 be awarded to the low bidder meeting specifications as follows:

	Dollar Volume	Line Items Awarded
Mazo-Lerch Co., Inc. Alexandria, Virginia	\$23,016	4

Resolution No. 698-83 Re: Bid 191-83, Ground Beef Mix and Related Products

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

WHEREAS, Funds have been budgeted for the purchase of ground beef mix and related products; now therefore be it

Resolved, That having been duly advertised June 26, 1983, the contract for the furnishing of ground beef mix and related products for the period of August 10, 1983, through November 30, 1983, under Invitation to Bid 191-83 be awarded to the low bidder meeting specifications as follows:

	Dollar Volume	Line Items Awarded
Doughties BBQ of Md., Inc.		

Tuxedo, Maryland	\$41,338	2
Silver Springs Farm		
Devault, Pennsylvania	16,250	1
Total	\$57,588	3

Resolution No. 699-83 Re: Bid 193-83, Milk, Milk Shake Mixes,
Cottage Cheese, Yogurt, and Fruit Juices

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

WHEREAS, Funds have been budgeted for the purchase of milk, milk shake mixes, cottage cheese, yogurt, and fruit juices for the period of August 16, 1983, through August 15, 1984, under Invitation to Bid 193-83 be awarded to the low bidder meeting specifications as follows:

Dollar Volume Line Items Awarded

Shenandoah's Pride Dairy		
Springfield, Virginia	\$543,564	8

Resolution No. 700-83 Re: Additions on Previously Awarded Bid
193-83, Processed Meats

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

WHEREAS, Funds have been budgeted for the purchase of processed meats; and

WHEREAS, A major number of items on the processed meat bid (195-83) were approved on July 25, 1983, with some items deleted to allow time for testing; and

WHEREAS, The testing has been completed; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the following items for bid 195-83 be awarded to the low bidders meeting specifications:

Dollar Volume Line Items Awarded

Mazo Lerch Company, Inc.		
Alexandria, Virginia	\$ 5,010	1
Oscar Meyer & Company		
Laurel, Maryland	20,655	2
Total	\$25,665	3

Resolution No. 701-83 Re: Bid 197-83, Snack Foods, Chips, and
Popcorn

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

WHEREAS, Funds have been budgeted for the purchase of snack foods, chips, and popcorn; now therefore be it

Resolved, That having been duly advertised July 5, 1983, the contract for the furnishing of snack foods, chips, and popcorn for the period of August 15, 1983, through May 31, 1984, under Invitation to Bid 197-83 be awarded to the low bidder meeting specifications as follows:

	Dollar Volume	Line Items Awarded
Mann's Potato Chip Company Washington, D.C.	\$266,400	6

Resolution No. 702-83 Re: Bid 199-83, Canned Tuna Fish

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

WHEREAS, Funds have been budgeted for the purchase of canned tuna fish; now therefore be it

Resolved, That having been duly advertised July 5, 1983, the contract for the furnishing of canned tuna fish for the period of August 10, 1983, through May 31, 1984, under Invitation to Bid 199-83 be awarded to the low bidder meeting specifications as follows:

	Dollar Volume	Line Items Awarded
Frederick Produce Company, Inc. Frederick, Maryland	\$31,590	1

Resolution No. 703-83 Re: Contract for Fuel Oil for 1983-84

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

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

Resolved, That having been duly advertised June 17, 1983, the contract for an estimated 1.7 million gallons of No. 2 fuel oil and 3.3 million gallons of No. 5 fuel oil for the period of August 10, 1983, through June 30, 1984, under COG Invitation To Bid IFB 4-0043-21-00 be awarded to the low bidder meeting specifications as follows:

Dollar Volume Line Items Awarded

Steuart Petroleum Company
Washington, D.C.

\$3,032,034 2

Resolution No. 704-83

Re: FY 1983 Operating Budget Appropriation
Categorical Transfer

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

WHEREAS, Category 2 Instructional Salaries reflected a deficit condition as of June 30, 1983, primarily due to underbudgeting of substitute salary accounts, failure of lapse and turnover to materialize because of reduced staff turnover, and the placement of surplus staff; and

WHEREAS, Category 4 Special Education reflected a deficit balance as of June 30, 1983, due to the unanticipated increase in costs for the payoff of unused sick and annual leave to terminating employees; and

WHEREAS, Category 7 Student Transportation reflected a deficit balance as of June 30, 1983, due to the underbudgeting of funds for substitute drivers' salaries; and

WHEREAS, The required funds are available from Category 1 Administration, Category 3 Instructional Other, Category 8 Operation of Plant/Equipment, Category 9 Maintenance of Plant, and Category 10 Fixed Charges; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the superintendent be authorized, subject to the approval of the County Council, to effect the following transfer:

Category	Description	To	From
1	Administration		\$ 86,000
2	Instructional Salaries	\$145,000	
3	Instructional Other		63,000
4	Special Education	100,500	
7	Student Transportation	122,000	
8	Operation of Plant/Equipment		25,000
9	Maintenance of Plant		68,500
10	Fixed Charges		125,000
	Total	\$367,500	\$367,500

and be it further

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

Resolution No. 705-83

Re: Monthly Personnel Report

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Mrs. Peyser seconded by Dr. Cronin, 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. 706-83

Re: Personnel Reassignments

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

Resolved, That the following personnel reassignments be approved:

Name	From	To
Robert Hamilton	Teacher Stedwick Elementary M+30-L3	Instr.Assistant To be determined To maintain salary To retire Feb. 1, 1984
Dorothy A. H. Laney	Teacher Meadow Hall Elementary MEQ-L2	Instr.Assistant To be determined To maintain salary To retire July 1, 1985

Resolution No. 607-83

Re: Personnel Appointments, Transfers, and
Temporary Reassignments

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

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

Transfer	From	To
Merrill E. Fisher	Principal Martin Luther King Jr.	Principal Damascus HS Eff. 8/10/83
Appointment Laura Hart	Present Position Teacher Specialist Inservice Unit - Lynnbrook Center	As Asst. Supervisor of Special Services Area Admin. Office

		Grade M Eff. 8/10/83
Donna J. Holt	Social Worker D.C. Public Schools Washington, D.C.	Social Worker McKenney Hills Learning Center Grade G Eff. 8/26/83
Lois E. Bell	Elementary Principal Trainee Brookhaven Elementary	Asst. Principal Julius West Middle Eff. 8/10/83
Mary Theofield	Assistant Director Secondary Learning Center Walter Johnson	Asst. Principal Rock Terrace H.S. Eff. 8/10/83
Name and Present Position	Position Effective August 10, 1983	Position Effective July 1, 1984
Stanley Kaplan Principal temporarily assigned to Area 1 Office	Assistant Principal Diamond Elementary	Principal
Robert Bertin Employee Assistance Specialist Emp. Asst. Program	Teacher Placement Asst. Division of Staffing	Consid. for A&S position for which qualified
Mary M. O'Connell Principal McKenney Hills Learning Center	Assistant Principal Poolesville Elementary	Principal McKenney Hills Learning Center
Appointment	Present Position	As
Rudolph Patrick Savage, Jr.	Therapeutic Counselor Project PACT II Area 3 Admin. Office	Employee Assistance Specialist Employ. Asst. Program Grade G Eff. 8/10/83
Rosemary Hilberg	Career Info. Asst. Springbrook H.S.	Employee Assistance Specialist Employ. Asst. Program Grade G Eff. 8/10/83
Transfer	From	To
David G. Fischer	Adminis. Asst.	Staff Asst. to the

Associate Supt. Board of Education
Supportive Services Eff. 8/29/83

Re: Board/Press/Visitor Conference

The following individuals appeared before the Board of Education:

1. Mrs. Marcia Feinleib, Cabin John PTA
2. Mrs. Sarah Schaechter, Seven Locks PTA
3. Mrs. Mary Ann Baily, Parents for Spanish Immersion

Re: Oral Report on Retail Trades Foundation

Mr. Barry Scher, president of the Retail Trades Foundation, reported that two years ago he had appeared before the Board of Education to talk about establishing the Retail Trades Foundation which was to be a hands-on-project with students operating their own retail store. He said that they had looked at shopping centers from Gaithersburg to Silver Spring, and after two years they were planning to open a retail flower store at Wheaton Plaza. The store would open in September or early October. They expected to have sales of \$200,000 in the first year, expenses of \$160,000, and a profit of \$40,000. The retail project would be combined with the classroom-on-the-mall project.

Mr. Larry Shulman explained that the business community and the merchants of Wheaton Plaza had been supportive. He showed the Board plans of the actual store which resembled a greenhouse. Mr. Floris Davisson, coordinator of cooperative education, indicated that they had 30 students from 12 high schools participating in the classroom-on-the mall. The new program would serve as a laboratory for these students and would use the horticulture program in the high schools. Accounting students would keep the books, and the construction trades students would build the kiosk.

Mr. Ewing asked that Board members be invited to the opening of the school, and Mr. Scher assured them that they would receive an invitation.

Re: Budget Coalition Activities

Mr. Ewing said that the Board had received the report of the Budget Coalition and wanted to discuss some of the issues raised in the report. Mr. Shulman reported that they wanted to come to the Board, the County Council, and county executive with some ideas that had grown out of experiences of the Budget Coalition. He said they had found they had begun their activities too late in the budget process. What they needed to focus on was developing a group which supported excellence in education. They felt there was a need to improve communication among the various government entities. This communication could be done by the Coalition involving the League of Women Voters, AAUW, and the Suburban Area Study Group. They felt the Coalition needed to look at a "macro" approach to the situation, reporting to the Board and making suggestions to the Council and

county executive. They had developed a number of timetables for the year, showing what things needed to be done. They had outlined suggested monitoring activities and working toward an overall approach to the budget. They had raised questions about whether their activity was worthwhile and should be continued.

Mrs. Elizabeth Spencer noted that most of the groups in the Coalition were not active in the summer; therefore, they had not received essential feedback on the activities of the Coalition. She said they needed some authorization before they started; however, they had heard from a number of groups that the activities started last spring were worthwhile. If they were to get into monitoring and reporting, they might need funds or a part-time person to assist them in their work.

Mr. Shulman explained that he had met with Mr. Gilchrist who suggested members of the executive's staff would be willing to meet with MCPS staff and Council staff to discuss these ideas. He had also met with Mr. Scull who agreed that someone from the Council would attend such a meeting. He and Mrs. Spencer could call a meeting early in September. He explained that they were not looking for more work but were willing to help improve the budget process.

Dr. Shoenberg stated that he appreciated the work done by the Coalition and would be disappointed if the group's efforts were dissipated. He agreed that the Coalition should distance itself from the Board. However, it was important that the Coalition not come closer to the Council and the executive in this process. It seemed to him they were asking for some kind of quasi-official status. He thought that one advantage to the Coalition was that it was not granted that status but assumed it. He would be concerned if the group received some sort of official sanction. Mr. Shulman explained that he was not looking for a quasi-official status. They were concerned about not duplicating any efforts that already existed and thought their activities should be independent in terms of their approach.

The Coalition was looking for educational excellence in Montgomery County and that would be its charter. He and Mrs. Spencer wanted to share their experiences with the three entities involved in the budget process. He personally was not looking for any sanction. Mrs. Spencer said there was no point in their exerting any effort if it was not going to be observed by the Board, the Council and the executive. They were asking if they should pursue the activities they had suggested. It should be clear that they did not have a special relationship with the Board of Education.

Dr. Shoenberg said he was a little concerned about the use of the word "monitor" in their paper. Mr. Shulman replied that they would be performing the services of a newsletter in informing all of their member groups. He did not know that there was an effective medium to do this. They wanted to make people aware of the issues. Dr. Cronin commented that the integrity of the Coalition was the best thing they had going for them. He said he would like to include an assessment of the final budget in their spring activities.

Mrs. Praisner had some concerns about where they were going with this. She would like to see their energies spent at the state level. She wanted to discuss the type of information they had difficulty in obtaining and ways in which they could prepare information more easily understood by the Council. She was afraid they might spend too much time communicating when they should be focusing on what needed to be done. Mr. Shulman agreed that they were concerned about creating another entity duplicating functions of other organizations. He did not think the Coalition should be a spokesperson for the Board because then it would not have integrity. It was their intent to look at the budget independently and see whether it met the needs identified by the Coalition. Mrs. Spencer added that this year they were reactive. They would like to study the positions taken by MCPS and decide whether or not to support that position.

Mr. Ewing stated that the Coalition had done a magnificent job and had contributed to understanding of budget issues. Personally he thought it would be a good idea to have a meeting and talk about the budget process. He believed there did need to be an organization reflecting community views which could speak to educational issues in an informed way. It was his guess that there still would be advocacy views expressed. It seemed to him that the Board should encourage the Coalition without taking formal action and see how the process went. Mrs. Spencer asked whether the superintendent had any objection to a budget meeting at the staff level, and Dr. Cody replied that he did not.

Dr. Greenblatt thought the Coalition had done an excellent job last year; however, she had some concerns about the Coalition's expanding into other areas. She said they had to decide whether they were an advisory group or an independent citizens group. If they were going to be arranging meetings, they would be creating a quasi-independent group with a lot of implications to that. She felt that if they were a citizens group, they should "do their own thing." She, too, had a problem with monitoring. The elected officials and staff should work through the budget process and have something to present to the public. At that point, the public should become involved. She said that for a group to be involved in the staff budget process gave them special status.

Mrs. Spencer said it would be useful if the Board was aware of the county budget projections earlier than had been in the past. She explained they were not saying they should monitor the Board. They wanted to watch the entire process. They were not a group of their own. They were a coalition of other groups, and instead of having 15 observers, there should be one reporting and serving in a liaison capacity to other organizations. She agreed they needed clearly established directions.

Mr. Ewing asked whether the Board should schedule this topic for action, and Dr. Shoenberg indicated that he had trouble with the idea of a formal action by the Board. Dr. Cody thought that the meeting proposed might be helpful to bring people together earlier to talk

back and forth. Dr. Greenblatt thought they should take the initiative in setting up a meeting rather than have a citizens group do this. Mr. Ewing said the Coalition might contribute some useful observations to such a meeting. It seemed to Mrs. Praisner that if the Council and executive said they would like to share in the experiences of the Coalition that would be useful. However, she had reservations about going beyond that type of meeting. Dr. Cronin commented that the Board was receiving the report of the Coalition and if the superintendent had a way of using the efforts of the Coalition he should do so.

Mr. Ewing remarked that the Board was receptive to the continuation of the efforts of the Coalition much along the lines they proposed. If they continued, the Board would be happy to hear from them and provide the kind of information provided to any group. He thanked the Coalition for sharing their views.

Re: Video Tape on Special Olympics

Mr. Ewing asked that the video tape be rescheduled for August 22.

Re: Report of the Commission on
Excellence in Education

Mr. Ewing explained that although the report had been discussed in June when Secretary Bell had been present, and that had been very useful, Board members hadn't had much time to talk about the report either to each other or to staff it and, therefore, it had been scheduled again along with proposals to increase graduation requirements and also in conjunction with the Maryland Functional Math Test.

Dr. Lois Martin, associate superintendent for instruction and program development, reported that staff's basic reaction had been that they didn't find anything new or surprising in the Commission's recommendations. She said staff felt many of the recommendations were things they were already doing and that others, some specifically dealing with staff, were either being done, had been considered, had been done in the past, or perhaps some variation was being done right now. She noted, for example, the Commission's recommendation on an eleven-month contract for teachers and pointed out that MCPS has a number of staff who by contract have extended year employment dates and that a secondary resource teacher who receives a stipend and guaranteed EYE days and a reduced classload is seen as a master teacher. She noted also, on the recommendation for increasing graduation requirements, that staff saw themselves basically in Maryland as having rigorous graduation requirements compared with other states. She pointed out that Virginia has raised their higher level diploma to 20 credits and Maryland has had that requirement since 1972. However, she did see a continued need for improvement in science and math.

Dr. John Pancella, coordinator of secondary science, stated that MCPS knew what its problems were and was working on them, that this was an

attractive area for the few people that were out there and MCPS was still getting its share of teachers. He believed that they would have to do something significant in the new two or three years, but that right now they were high.

Dr. George Usdansky, coordinator of new program development, felt the school system was doing very well quantitatively, and he was disappointed to see the Commission recommending more courses, more hours, more days, and so on. He felt the problems lie more with quality and that discussion of improving curriculum should dwell with how to improve quality and tailor it better for various groups of students.

Dr. Cody thought the report was useful as a symbol because it struck a chord in this country and that was healthy. He said it caused many leaders across the country to view education as a more important and more fundamental part of society, but he was a little concerned that so much of the report tied the problem and its statement of the poor conditions we are in to economic productivity in our relationship to international trade and in competing with other countries. He believed there was surely more to public education than that and they should keep in mind other roles for education to play in the United States. He said that even though some of the recommendations on curriculum course selection had already been implemented, it shouldn't relieve the school system of the concern of whether more could be taught in science, math, social studies and English because young people need to be more equipped in English and writing skills, in science, math, foreign language and computers. He said that just because the report was phrased in how many years each course should be taught and they were already doing that didn't mean they don't have a job to do.

Dr. Cronin thought the report was saying there were important levels of education, whether related to job orientation or that there are ideas that students need to know regardless of practical attitudes. He believed they needed to ask the citizenry of the county what they wanted their children educated toward. They have to meet several different criteria now, make them theoreticians and give them a practical background. He pointed out there was only one reference made to the crucial eight grades and that K-8 preparation was absolutely critical because it did no good to require more if students were not ready for it. He thought the Board needed to go back to K-8 before they looked at 9-12.

Mrs. Peyser understood Dr. Cronin's concern about the attention needed to K-8 but that the Board had adopted a K-8 policy. She thought they needed to give a lot of attention to senior high, that they needed time to go into the recommendations. She said staff members should fill out the questionnaire, "A Checklist of Excellence," that Board members had received from the Maryland Association of Boards of Education. She noted that staff said in their paper that a substantial majority of MCPS graduates complete three years of science and math and that 70% were taking more than two years of math and two years of science and she asked staff for

those figures. The staff paper also stated that less than 50% of the students were enrolled in foreign language this year and she suggested the Board would want to seriously consider a requirement there. In regard to a newly developed course, Introduction to Algebra, for students who have completed 8th grade but are not quite ready for full-year algebra, she pointed out that students taking two semesters of algebra over a two-year period were doing very badly. She also noted that while social studies courses were among the most widely selected courses in MCPS, history was not and they needed to include history. She added that while the staff paper stated there was no shortage of textbooks in MCPS, she had heard from teachers that there was a shortage.

Dr. Martin said that staff had been addressing the availability of textbooks from publishers at different levels, and that in fact she had talked to some principals who had told her they were well off when it came to textbooks.

Dr. Greenblatt thought some textbooks had been watered-down to a reading level below that expected at a high school program and she asked about the books in social studies and English.

Dr. Martin replied that they do evaluate library books as textbooks and they do have some "easy to read" books for students with reading disabilities and also some published for use at the college level. Mrs. Praisner remarked that they were trying to focus on Montgomery County issues and this was not seen as a problem.

Mrs. Peyser pointed out that the Commission recommended students be assigned more homework and that staff's only comment on that was that Board of Education policy required homework in MCPS.

Mrs. Praisner commented that the Commission seemed to be grasping at old answers for new problems and the report did not reflect the diversity of students now in the school system, and it brushed over the elementary element before the high school element and the requirements of funding. She stated they should stay not only with graduation requirements and what students need to get into college, but they should be deciding what they wanted to require in high school and what preparation is needed in K-8. They should be asking, what should a high school look like down the road. She wanted to echo Dr. Shoenberg's remarks in the Board's curriculum discussion that the crucial element of any course selection was counseling for placement in the appropriate program.

Dr. Shoenberg was concerned about the assumption that what was in the Commission's report was a blueprint by which they should judge the quality of the school system and he didn't think "more" was an issue for MCPS. Before they started thinking about content, he suggested they think about the organization of education, about how they hold school, the organization of the school day, school week, school year. He noted that what doesn't go on in that structure is homework and he didn't understand why the amount of homework got into the discussion at all. He thought the Paideia proposal was very useful and

provocative about the ways in which schools are made up and the kinds of students who make up schools, but he also thought it was dead wrong. He suggested secondary students needed more coaching or clues as to how to learn on their own and not lectures which have a limited usefulness. He also suggested the school system needed to think about the ways in which courses are set up in compartments so that they don't relate to each other. He cited math, which is a useful tool in science and yet not very much effort is made to coordinate what is done in math class with what is done in science class. He believed it would be useful to think about combining science and math courses and teach math within the science framework. He was concerned that more attention should be given to the development of the skills of citizenship and individual responsibility and the development of cognitive complexity.

Dr. Greenblatt said that it was unfortunate that this session was for discussion only because she did not see any focus for action which to her would be their next step. She was concerned that many of them had read the report in a defensive way. She felt that there were problems in the school system, but they had a good potential for solving these problems. They started with a crop of very bright students who should do well. She questioned why it was their children were not performing as well as they should be performing. She thought there was a need to improve their schools and that there had been a reduction in the need for rigor in the public schools. She said they should put rigor back in so these students could perform to their maximum potential. She said that this lack of rigor had an impact on the grades of students in college and their performance when they were out in the world of work. She asked whether their students had the attitudes they should expect from students from a leading nation or where their students saying they would work to the minimum. She asked whether their students were going to have good study habits and a good academic background beyond the basic skills. If they did not have this, students would not be able to do critical thinking. She stated that they were now seeing challenges from other countries and would probably find out that they were doing things in their schools that used to be done in our schools. She cited the K-8 and High School policies as two methods of getting at these problems. She suggested they look at specific recommendations such as graduation requirements. They should talk about standards of expectation and more time on the basics. In regard to the Maryland Functional Mathematics Test, she asked whether they were giving students enough time to learn math and if they were requiring enough homework. She asked whether they were organized so that teachers had the maximum amount of time to teach. She reported that she had had an article in the Washington Times which she would submit for the record.

Mr. Ewing explained that his chief concern with the report was how it applied to Montgomery County, and for a number of reasons he had trouble seeing that. He thought that the report took a narrow view of what education ought to be about. There were many purposes to public education. One was education for those going to college and another was preparation for work. The third was preparation for

adult life, and the fourth was citizenship and community life. The fifth was learning things which would add to the richness of the lives of students and including art, music, and literature. He said that all of those were educational purposes which belong to the public schools; however, the report focused on education as preparation for college. It implied that students should learn in order to be a cog so that the nation could function in competition with other nations of the world which was not much of a motivator for students. He noted that work was not something people did because they wanted the United States to compete with Japan. Some people worked because they found pleasure and joy in work. Missing from the report was a concern for the education of minorities which was a real concern in Montgomery County.

Mr. Ewing said the report spoke of increasing graduation required in terms of increasing numbers of courses. His question would be how certain subjects related to the rest of what a student was learning. He felt that they could not motivate students to learn more by increasing graduation requirements. He did think the things they focused on were not the mechanics of how much homework, etc. but rather on the question of what they were doing, why they were doing it, and how they were going to do this in the future. They needed to spend more time teaching students to ask questions, to learn to reason, to learn to analyze, etc. It was his view that these were extremely important areas for students. He said it was important for them to be concerned about the reputation of the educational enterprise. He thought that this reputation was related to paying decent salaries to those working directly in educating children. In regard to Dr. Greenblatt's question, Dr. Cronin explained that the Board was reacting to the report of the Commission and proposing new business items. Each of these was a piece of the puzzle which would focus on the concept of the effective school. He commented that he favored Dr. Cody as the new superintendent because he was someone who could lead the school system intellectually. As a beginning, Dr. Cronin would like to see a definition of an effective school. Then they should define methods by which they could achieve effective schools. He felt that matters such as homework should be left to the discretion of the school. If they had a problem of getting across that high standards were important he would look to MCEA and the PTA to get this point across. He said they needed people in the classroom who would say they had the backing of the Board to do what was needed. He was concerned about students' retaining information and the fragmentation of curriculum. He suggested that homework needed to be done with quality rather than quantity.

Mrs. Praisner said that there should be some recommendations for the future. She would like to see something about professional planning time and materials availability, options for professional development. She hoped that the superintendent would be able to bring the Board comments and suggestions. She called attention to the elementary school study proposed and suggested they might want to look at this. Mr. Ewing noted that this was a discussion topic; however, there were some themes the Board might want to reflect on as it considered establishing priorities. Dr. Shoenberg asked about

sentiment for looking at ways they structured the curriculum, the school day, and the school year. He hoped that the superintendent would be suggesting to the Board some ways they might start to think about schools that were different. Dr. Greenblatt said she would like to see the superintendent's plan for changes. She also inquired about the involvement of PTAs and parents in supporting the work of a school. Mr. Ewing asked that the superintendent develop a response in the form of recommendations to the Board.

Re: Proposals to Increase Graduation
Requirements

Dr. Lois Martin, associate superintendent, explained that they wanted to find out the nature of the problem by having the Department of Educational Accountability look at the issues raised about what students were taking. They had to know which students were in need of stronger academic programs. The second thing was to wait until the State Commission on Secondary Education made its recommendations to the state superintendent regarding graduation requirements. It appeared that the Commission was going in the direction of recommending an increase in the number of graduation requirements and was considering differentiated diplomas. Dr. Cody concurred and drew attention to the work going on concerning priorities for the school system. He commented that it was almost a temptation to have an immediate reaction to the ideas in "A Nation at Risk;" however, equally important was to hammer out statements about priorities and objectives. Dr. Cronin said he had listed three reasons: the priorities of the Board, the graduation requirements report, and the absence of the student member. For these reasons, he would move to table the proposals.

Dr. Greenblatt stated that at a minimum she was disappointed. She noted that this was a formal Board resolution in November, 1982 but had been discussed for a few years before that. She said they did not appear to be willing to come to grips with this. They could spend a lot of time discussing but meantime students were passing through high school without the increased requirements. She noted that at least three other jurisdictions in the state had already put in higher graduation requirements, and she thought that information should have been before the Board. She explained that the reason they had dragged their feet years ago was they were told by staff they could not increase beyond the 20 required by the state. She called attention to the two papers before the Board which proposed an increase in graduation requirements. Another aspect of this was the proposal from many years ago to have a certificate of excellence adjunct to the diploma for those taking a more challenging program.

Dr. Shoenberg reported that the graduation requirements task force was going to make a recommendation for two different diplomas. He said that if the state requirement was 20 for graduation no local jurisdiction would be able to require more. He explained that he would vote against the proposals now because he wanted to talk about the way in which they defined content areas before he talked about requirements.

Tests would both have reduced items. Dr. Steve Frankel, director of the Department of Educational Accountability, explained that a number of LEAs felt that one possible reason for poor scoring on the tests was the length of the test. Some of the trial items for next year's test would be cut. Dr. Shoenberg said that Dr. Cronin had asked whether the problems with mathematics performance were really reading problems. Dr. Frankel replied that the longest reading item on the test was five lines or two sentences. He said they would be doing an item analysis, but they suspected the items missed were the more difficult mathematical concepts.

Mr. Al Brown, Takoma Park Junior High School, noted that his school was one of the lowest in scores. They took the county test and redesigned it to make it a final examination for all eighth graders. They did an item analysis and a math teacher developed devices they could use in the classroom in September to work with the specific problems they were having at his school. He was optimistic that his algebra and geometry students would have 100 percent success; however, they might find more problems in the introduction to algebra with the greatest problem in their Math 9 classes. They had set improved functional math scores as the objective for their math department.

Dr. Cronin commented that they had no idea as students entered the school system as to what their level of functioning was in mathematics. He asked whether they had a diagnostic test in Grades 1 or 2. Dr. Martin replied that they did have the instructional system in mathematics in about four different versions. If the school had computer capability, the school would find out where the student was. However, they did not mandate any one diagnostic test.

Dr. Cronin asked whether there was a mandate for any test in Grades 1 or 2 to be kept as part of the student profile or a mandate for a child entering MCPS at any future time that they would be diagnostically tested. Dr. Martin replied that every school was supposed to maintain a record on the K-8 math objectives. Mrs. Marie Heck, Area 1, added that placement tests did exist, and at the elementary level these tests would be scored and indicate where a child should begin a program. Dr. Frankel commented that neither in reading nor in math did they have any kind of a uniform measure to find out where students were on a system-wide basis.

Dr. Cronin asked how they tested for retention. Dr. Martin replied that again they had a number of support materials but no mandate to use these in any one way. However, they did have placement tests for students entering the school system which could be used in the beginning of the year to see what students had retained. Dr. Cronin asked whether they had a way of demonstrating which schools' graduates were finding success in the math program by passing the MFMT. Dr. Frankel replied that they had supplied the area associates with the percent of students passing in elementary schools based on 7-9 results on the MFMT. However, because there was not a consistent program there was no way to tie that back to methods. Dr. Lee Etta

Powell, area associate superintendent, said that the elementary and junior high schools were working together in sharing data so as to be able to strengthen the program in the elementary schools. In regard to math, each school would be developing a plan which was due in by the end of August.

Dr. Cronin inquired about when remedial would take place. Dr. James Myerberg explained that this year the data had been held; however, in the future the schools would have this information by Christmas. Dr. Powell commented that with the math they would be doing the same type of thing they did with the reading test. They would identify the weaknesses and work with the youngsters. Mrs. Praisner asked about how the remediation process reacted with the regular studies of ninth graders. Ms. Joy Odom, supervisor of mathematics, replied that last year their Math 9 or Algebra I courses allowed the functional mathematics to continue. She suggested that the best way to handle this was to start each math class with warm-up exercises based on the MFMT.

Dr. Cody asked if they would be better served if they had a systematic criterion-referenced test in mathematics given at the end of the second or third grade. Dr. Martin thought that they probably would. She explained that cost had prevented them from going to full implementation of the computer version of the instructional system in math. She thought that they should investigate the feasibility of such a test, but she would also like to look at the other kinds of models available.

Mrs. Peyser asked what happened to students given special help who were pulled out of other classes. She asked if anyone had considered an afterschool program. Mr. Brown replied that in his school teachers volunteered to conduct an afterschool program of remediation. Dr. Frankel pointed out that they were talking about one third of the ninth graders having failed the test, and in many schools 50 percent of the students would need remediation. Mrs. Peyser asked what the rest of the students would do when the teacher was providing remediation. Ms. Odom explained that teachers tended to remediate the entire class in terms of warm-up rather than devote

the entire class period. She reported that they were considering offering another course for these students.

Mrs. Peyser commented that she was sorry they had not recommended more practice in the way of homework. She had suggested homework of three kinds: one a practice of what was currently taught, the second practicing the skills that would be reviewed, and the third the kinds of test questions that students would face. Dr. Martin indicated that ninth grade parents would receive a letter from the superintendent which would inform them that students were expected to practice math skills.

Dr. Cody asked what would be different this fall in classes where students did not pass the test. Mr. Otis White, Area 2, reported that they were analyzing the data and had concluded they wanted to

get representatives to plan a program for remediation and for infusing the functional math objectives into the regular school objectives.

Ms. Odom said that this summer they had developed subtests for math and would be sending one out with the letter. They had talked with the schools that seemed to be doing things right, and they seemed to have better motivational factors for students. The teachers thought it was important that these skills be reviewed daily.

Dr. Cronin reported that the Board had received a status report on math and science programs. The report stated that elementary teachers were required to have only six hours of college math for certification. Dr. Martin commented that they had surveyed 100 transcripts of teachers and found they did not exceed the six credits. They believed they needed to address some models for organizing math instruction in the elementary schools, and they planned to do some pilot studies. Dr. Cronin asked when they could see the results of the pilot, and Dr. Martin replied that this would begin this year.

Dr. Frankel commented that if the same passing standard had been used in reading, they would have a crisis in reading. It looked to Dr. Shoenberg as if a third of their students scored 90 or better. Dr. Frankel replied that it was one-third. Dr. Shoenberg asked whether it held up from school to school and indicated that he would like to look behind that in some way or another. He asked what did passing the math test or the reading test say about a student other than they could pass them. In other words, it was a functional test designed to demonstrate ability in everyday life. Dr. Frankel replied that there was general agreement that students should be able to do the items on the test and that these were important skills.

Dr. Greenblatt said she would be interested in knowing the relationship between those students in ninth grade and how they did on the grade-level assessments from elementary school up. In other words, were these students on grade level when they were passed to junior high school. She pointed out that the Board was concerned about promotions and if students were more than a year behind they were supposed to be getting intensive remediation in the junior high school. Dr. Frankel replied that there was no computer data, but this could be done manually. They could take a sample and pull the records of students. He said that this would have to be done for six schools at least.

It seemed to Dr. Greenblatt that because of the statewide test they were reevaluating their program and what would be the instructional program this fall. Therefore, the test was serving a very useful

function. She would expect to see an improvement in the scores next fall.

Dr. Cronin commented that in the range of plans he saw a way to approach the student who had failed, and yet there seemed to be a disparate impact in the black and Hispanic communities. Therefore,

he saw nothing in the plan to address that impact. Dr. Frankel said that there was a piece in the county and outside the county. So far the state had not agreed to release any data by race, and they had no way of knowing whether this was Montgomery County or the state as a whole. The other was what was taking place in MCPS on how they were going to reduce gaps in the school system and improve overall. Dr. Cronin felt they needed to see something more in the timeline and approach to elementary schools when they saw the failures in the seventh grade. He noted that MFMT would be a graduation requirement by 1989 for Level 4 and 5 special education students. The passing rate for Levels 3, 4, and 5 was 11, 3, and 10 percent. Dr. Hiawatha Fountain, associate superintendent, believed that Levels 1, 2, and 3 students could pass the test with few exceptions. In regard to Levels 4, 5, and 6, he thought they would have no problem with many of those students. However, his major concern was identifying the students early enough in the process. They should be able to identify potential high risk youngsters. He reported that they were trying to beef up their instructional program in special education across the board. Then they had the students who were severely handicapped who might not ever be able to pass the test.

Mr. Ewing suggested that the staff provide the Board with answers to the questions that had been raised.

Resolution No. 709-83 Re: Revision of Montgomery County
Public Schools Drug Abuse Policy IGN

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

WHEREAS, Montgomery County Board of Education recognizes that alcohol abuse is a serious community and nationwide problem; and

WHEREAS, Existing Board of Education policy does not specifically use the word "alcohol" in addressing the drug/alcohol problem; and

WHEREAS, Montgomery County Board of Education wishes to continue to emphasize its participation in programs to combat alcohol as well as drug abuse; now therefore be it

Resolved, That MCPS Policy IGN be modified by including the words "drug/alcohol" in each instance where the word "drug" is used.

Re: Review of Revisions to Quality
Integrated Education and Long-range
Facilities Policies

Mr. Ewing stated that the Board would review the policies, give the public an opportunity to comment, and act in late September. Mrs. Praisner said that they had two major documents with substantial changes, and she was concerned that a September 26 action and a September 19 hearing might not be sufficient for both community input and the review necessary. She would not like to see people testify on both policies in one evening. She would like two evenings

scheduled for this purpose and asked about the last date by which these policies had to be adopted by the Board. Dr. George Fisher, director of educational facilities planning, replied that it would be the latter part of September. Mr. Ewing agreed that the

superintendent and Board officers would discuss this at agenda-setting.

Dr. Shoenberg asked Dr. Fisher what he saw in the facilities plan that would change the manner in which his job was done. He noted the addition of racial balance to the screening criteria as one aspect. He could also see the problem of deciding what they meant by educational impact. Dr. Fisher replied that he would add an attempt to put more emphasis on special programs and the community impact paper. These four items were above and beyond what they had done before.

Dr. Greenblatt commented that given the Board's schedule it might be wise to ask for comments in writing rather than hold public hearings. Mr. Ewing felt very strongly about public hearings and found them to be very useful.

Mr. Ewing suggested they begin a paragraph by paragraph review of the Quality Integrated Education policy. Mrs. Praisner expressed objection of a "well integrated student body" and suggested a return to the original language. Dr. Shoenberg and Mrs. Peyser supported "integrated student body."

Mr. Stephen Derby pointed out that the old title was quality education/racial balance which focused on quality education and on achieving a degree of racial balance and/or preventing a degree of racial imbalance. He said there was a subtle change expressed in the redraft for the purpose of focusing the Board's attention on what the policy was supposed to do. The policy focused on the affirmative which was quality integrated education. This was combined with taking out the second threshold. They had tried to debate the purpose and function of the second threshold, and it was hard to know whether it was a negative or a positive. This expressed a policy, and the question was what was the policy. It started with a title change, and he thought Mrs. Praisner's question was beginning to get at this. There was a question of what "well integrated" meant. It seemed to Mr. Ewing that if the focus of the policy was only on the effort to achieve integration and not on the effort to prevent isolation he was bothered greatly by that. Mr. Derby explained that by talking in terms of trends this did provide the flexibility and the intention to prevent racial isolation. It focused on the affirmative of integrated education and defined a positive objective. It did not by dealing with numbers put down an absolute backstop. The policy would stop racial isolation.

Dr. Cody commented that the revised policy dealt with two sides of the same coin. The avoidance of isolation was a major purpose. The earlier version defined the problem in terms of schools getting too many minority children. The discussion centered on whether that

should be definition of the only problem. The focus shifted to the problem of racial isolation. Mr. Derby added that by avoiding defining a problem as minority imbalance they started looking at all the schools in the county. It seemed to Mrs. Praisner they were looking at more numbers and more schools. Mr. Derby explained that the justification for the policy was education. The Board was not responsible for the racial imbalance that might exist in the county in a legal sense. The Board had to avoid actions that discriminated on the basis of race.

Dr. Shoenberg called attention to lines 42-48 which suggested they were going to look not only at where there were 20 percent more students from minority groups but where there were 20 percent fewer as well. He said it expanded the definition of racial isolation in ways that addressed educational issues.

In regard to the first paragraph, Mr. Ewing suggested adding "in each school" to the first sentence. Mrs. Praisner felt that the original wording of "integrated education" was better, and Mrs. Peyser agreed.

Dr. Cronin proposed moving lines 10-12 to line 3. Mr. Ewing suggested that a record be made of all suggestions made by Board members to see what support there was for them in an action session. Dr. Shoenberg indicated that he had a problem with the phrase "have an opportunity to achieve to their highest potential" in lines 11-12. He suggested changing to "are achieving to their highest potential" and change "interact" to "interacting." Mr. Ewing suggested "students from diverse backgrounds are given strong support which will permit them to achieve...." Mrs. Peyser suggested deleting "The Board believes that" and beginning the sentence with "A quality integrated education...."

Dr. Shoenberg thought that the sentence on line 23 was a nonsequitur. Mr. Ewing suggested that the word "special" be added to read "faces a special challenge." Dr. Shoenberg suggested substituting "disproportionate" for "predominant." Ms. Judy Patton, director of QIE, explained that these sentences tried to get at concerns about socioeconomic issues. Dr. Shoenberg suggested deleting "when the predominant number of students can be identified by socioeconomic indicators such as housing costs or income and/or racial and ethnic factors" and adding "regardless of socioeconomic status" after "all students." Mr. Ewing thought that the sentence was confusing because it did not talk about "low" cost housing or income.

Mrs. Praisner felt they might have created a policy that had them addressing every single school in the county. She asked whether they wanted to do that. If not, then they needed to rephrase the policy to make it positive about minority students.

Dr. Cronin suggested substituting "disproportionate" for "predominant" in line 23. Dr. Greenblatt thought the Board needed two documents, one showing the changes and the new document standing on its own. Dr. Cody suggested it would be helpful to have another discussion of the major thrust of the policy. Dr. Cronin thought

that each Board members should prepare a memo on suggested changes and share it with staff. Mr. Ewing explained that the issue was not the views of each Board member, but the views of the Board as a group.

Dr. Shoenberg thought the thrust of the policy was appropriate. However, in some places the new wording was unclear and raised questions. Ms. Patton called attention to lines 59-64 in terms of the approaches that would be considered in looking at schools. On line 43, Dr. Cronin suggested that "student" be added after "majority/minority." Dr. Shoenberg asked for views on omitting "socioeconomic" from the policy. Mrs. Peyser thought they should take it out because she did not know how they could identify this. She pointed out that line 53 said there would be actions dealing with socio-economic and ethnic diversity.

Mrs. Praisner commented that the statement before the Board was a more positive one. She did have a concern about starting to look at housing costs. Dr. Martin explained when they set up school attendance areas they did look at housing costs. For example, this had been done in setting up the attendance area for Martin Luther King Junior High School. She said they did not have any school that was totally affluent. She noted that they wanted to look at the basis on which they provided compensatory education. Mrs. Peyser left the meeting at this point.

Mr. Ewing said there was some discussion on whether or not the policy should speak to the issue of what they did about a community where the population was 60 percent minority and 40 percent majority. However, the minority population was of multiple minorities. The argument had been made by Takoma Park that their situation was a healthy one. Mr. Derby explained that this was dealt with in lines 53 to 56 which would cause them to look at the whole picture including the socioeconomic and ethnic diversity of students. Mr. Ewing asked whether it was an issue for them when the minority population was diverse within itself. Dr. Shoenberg thought the paper made a statement that the answer to the question could be defined by case law. Mrs. Praisner stated that she was worried about the community's interpretation of the policy and what the community expected to happen.

Dr. Greenblatt thought that when dealing with the issue of socioeconomics they could use "educationally disadvantaged" which was a better term and more easily defined for the school system. Dr. Shoenberg said he had trouble with that term because of the question of who had disadvantaged the students educationally if they had been in the Montgomery County Public Schools. He said he would not mind it too much if they used "educationally and economically disadvantaged." Mr. Ewing pointed out that you could be poor and not educationally disadvantaged.

Dr. Greenblatt pointed out that there were lower minority proportions in the upper county, and she asked whether they would look at these as individual schools or areas. It seemed to Mr. Derby she was

saying that in view of the fact the county was different in different places they ought to have some absolute limits; however, the upper threshold did not work. He said they had put in a look-at percentage of 20 percent which was in the federal regulations. Dr. Greenblatt asked whether they would acknowledge that one area of the county would be over 20 percent no matter what. Dr. Cronin explained that this was in the second ring of schools, and there were a number of statements that they would not require long-distance busing but rather would adjust by the other mechanisms.

It was Mr. Ewing's view that the proposed policy captured most of the things he thought they needed to do. However, he was bothered by the notion that they had to examine everything else in the county in addition to the down- county area. Dr. Cody thought staff should look at questions raised by the Board and propose alternate wording that dealt with the Board's concerns.

Dr. Greenblatt left the meeting at this point.

In regard to the the facilities policy, Mrs. Praisner asked about resolving differences of opinion. Dr. Martin replied that sometimes they did discover errors and corrected them. In some cases she and the area superintendent had to sit down and talk through a situation; however, she hoped that they would not have any of these situations. Mrs. Praisner called attention to lines 212-225 where everything was referred to as a "tentative" decision. She suggested one sentence explaining "tentative" rather than using the word in several sentences. She had a concern about forums rather than public hearings. Ms. Bresler thought that the Board preferred the more informal forums rather than the structured public hearings. She said that the bylaw stated that hearings would be held and testimony given; however, the intent was to provide citizens an opportunity for input in a face-to-face dialogue. Mr. Ewing felt that they should have public hearings.

In regard to school utilization, Mrs. Praisner said she would like information about a school's special population as well. Dr. Cronin agreed and felt that boundary changes might be more appropriate before moving a special population out of a school. Dr. Shoenberg thought that they were getting locked into the kind of specificity that was unwise. He pointed out that under the educational impact of proposed changes, the examples cited were only facilities and special/alternative program considerations. He said that almost any school could make an argument for its special "art program" or high test scores. He did not know by deliberately not including this whether they were minimizing the argument for that type of special program. He suggested that staff rethink this section.

Mr. Ewing suggested that the superintendent provide the Board with a list of issues that had been raised in connection with the policies.

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

WHEREAS, Dr. Kenneth K. Muir has been director of information for the Montgomery County Public Schools for 17 years, serving not only as one of the superintendent's top advisers, but as spokesman for the school system and Board of Education; and

WHEREAS, Dr. Muir has expanded the role of the public relations person from media relations and news release writing to include budget translation, legislative lobbying, policy writing, and communication advice; and

WHEREAS, Dr. Muir has advanced the cause of school public relations not only by serving as a good example, but also by being elected president of the National School Public Relations Association and developing its national accreditation program for public relations professionals; and

WHEREAS, Dr. Muir was this year given the Chesapeake Chapter of the National School Public Relations Association's first annual Golden Helm Award for "meritorious service to education;" now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Board of Education commends Dr. Muir for his work as director of information for the Montgomery County Public Schools and congratulates him on the Golden Helm Award.

Re: New Business

Mrs. Praisner assumed the chair.

1. Mr. Ewing moved and Mrs. Praisner seconded that the Board adopt his proposed memo on the Minority Affairs Advisory Committee which would lead to the reconstitution of the committee and a redefinition of its role and mission.

2. Mr. Ewing moved and Dr. Shoenberg seconded that the superintendent be requested to inquire into the feasibility of arranging for transportation into the B-CC and Blair Cluster Schools for elementary school programs which were magnets including the possibility of doing that for FY 1984, and that the Board also obtain information about what it might take to provide that in the future, and that the Board discuss this as soon as possible once information was available.

Mr. Ewing assumed the chair.

3. Dr. Cronin moved and Mrs. Praisner seconded that the transfer policy be placed on a future Board agenda for discussion and that a worksession be scheduled.

Re: Items of Information

Board members received the following items of information:

1. Items in Process
2. Construction Progress Report

Resolution No. 711-83 Re: Adjournment

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education adjourn its meeting at 6:40 p.m.

President

Secretary

WSC:mlw