

Re: Announcements

Mrs. Praisner announced that the Board had been meeting in executive session on personnel matters from 10 a.m. to 1:10 p.m. During that time, Dr. Cronin and Dr. Greenblatt had joined the meeting. Mrs. Praisner welcomed Miss Jacquie Duby, Board member-elect, to the meeting.

Resolution No. 319-84 Re: Board Agenda - June 12, 1984

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Dr. Shoenberg seconded by Mrs. Shannon, the following resolution was adopted with Dr. Cronin, Mr. Ewing, Mrs. Praisner, Mrs. Shannon, and Dr. Shoenberg voting in the affirmative; Dr. Greenblatt and Mrs. Peysner being temporarily absent (Mr. Robertson voting in the affirmative):

Resolved, That the Board of Education approve its agenda for June 12, 1984.

Re: Board/Press/Visitor Conference

Dr. Robert Skenes, PTSA president of Mark Twain School, presented the Board with a plaque honoring the Mark Twain staff.

Resolution No. 320-84 Re: Award of Procurement Contracts
Over \$25,000

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

WHEREAS, Funds have been budgeted for the purchase of equipment, supplies, and contractual services; now therefore be it

Resolved, That having been duly advertised, the contracts be awarded to the low bidders meeting specifications as shown for the bids as follows:

95-84	Physical Education Supplies and Equipment	
	Name of Vendor(s)	Dollar Value of Contracts
	American Physical Fitness Company	\$ 63
	Bacharach Rasin Company	594
	Bel Air Sporting Goods, Inc.	678
	BSN Corporation	7,459
	C & C Sports Div. of Sportsmans LTD.	932
	Cannon Sports, Inc.	4,729
	R. P. Clarke Company	11,896
	Cran Barry, Inc.	59
	DVF Sporting Goods Company	18,213
	Dekan Athletic Equipment Corporation	185
	Gold Medal Recreational Products	133

	Graves-Humphreys Company	8,662
	J. E. Gregory Company, Inc.	462
	J. L. Hammett Company	2,432
	High Tech Tools, Inc.	420
	Marlow Sports, Inc.	8,932
	Mitchell & Ness, Women's Sports	1,945
	NFA, Inc.	3,118
	Resilite Sports Products, Inc.	1,600
	Sauk Valley Sports Supply	416
	SBS Sports/Coast Marketing Group	3,216
	Sportmaster	1,702
	Tiffen Athletic Equipment & Supplies	2,118
	Warthan Recreational Equipment Co., Inc.	190
	Williams Brothers	300
	TOTAL	\$ 80,454
97-84	Data Processing Equipment (Disk Storage Devices)	
	Name of Vendor(s)	
	CMI Corporation	\$ 7,000
	IBM Corporation (Annual Lease)	40,214
	Memorex Corporation	152,904
	TOTAL	\$200,118
114-84	Vinyl Asbestos Floor Tile	
	Name of Vendor(s)	
	Marty's, Inc.	\$ 26,704
115-84	Ceiling Board and Grid Systems	
	Name of Vendor(s)	
	J. B. Eurell	\$ 25,020
	Hudson Supply & Equipment Co.	2,380
	TOTAL	\$ 27,400
121-84	Continuous Form Stock Tab	
	Name of Vendor(s)	
	O.E.I. Business Forms	\$ 2,976
	D. N. Owens	61,300
	TOTAL	\$ 64,276
130-84	Air Conditioning and Temperature Control Service Contract	
	Name of Vendor(s)	
	Boland Trane Services, Inc.	\$ 27,800
	Carrier Building Services	16,200
	Mechanical Systems Maintenance, Inc.	6,300
	Adrian L. Merton, Inc.	28,152
	TOTAL	\$ 78,452
132-84	Automotive Batteries	
	Name of Vendor(s)	
	E. J. Payne, Inc.	\$ 39,593
145-84	Classroom Furniture	
	Name of Vendor(s)	
	Douron, Inc.	\$206,218

	Glover School and Office Equipment	64,290
	Jakanna Woodworks	4,396
	TOTAL	\$274,904
147-84	Student Insurance	
	Name of Vendor(s)	
	Reliance Standard Life	\$118,695
149-84	Art Tools-Markers	
	Name of Vendor(s)	
	M. S. Ginn and Company	\$ 26,455
152-84	Asphaltic Concrete	
	Name of Vendor(s)	
	A. H. Smith Asphalt Plant	\$ 32,000
84-20	Elevator Maintenance Contract	
	Name of Vendor(s)	
	Montgomery Elevator Company	\$ 26,970
	GRAND TOTAL	\$996,021

Resolution No. 321-84 Re: Brown Station Reroof (Area 3)

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

WHEREAS, Sealed bids were received on May 31 for reroofing of Brown Station Elementary School as indicated below:

Bidder	Base Bid
1. Orndorff & Spaid, Inc.	\$ 46,122
2. J. E. Wood & Sons Co., Inc.	80,900
3. R. D. Bean, Inc.	98,000

and,

WHEREAS, The low bidder, Orndorff & Spaid, Inc., has performed similar projects satisfactorily; and

WHEREAS, Low bid is within staff estimate and sufficient funds are available in account 999-42 to effect award; now therefore be it

Resolved, That a contract for \$46,122 be awarded to Orndorff & Spaid, Inc., to accomplish reroofing at Brown Station Elementary School, in accordance with plans and specifications dated May 18, 1984, prepared by the Department of School Facilities.

Resolution No. 322-84 Re: Relocation of Portable Classroom Buildings

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Dr.

Shoenberg seconded by Mr. Ewing, the following resolution was adopted unanimously:

WHEREAS, Sealed bids were received on June 7, 1984, to relocate twenty-eight classroom units (21 state and 7 local) as indicated below:

Bidder	Base Bid	*Add Al-ternate 1	** Add Al-ternate 2	Total
1. H&H Enterprises	\$246,878	\$41,400	\$60,422	\$348,700
2. South Carroll Contractors, Inc.	204,300	69,700	117,900	391,900

* Add Alternate 1 is for the relocation of the seven locally-owned portable classrooms;

** Add Alternate 2 is for constructing pier foundations and related work for twelve new modular buildings; and

WHEREAS, The lowest bidder, H & H Enterprises, is a firm which has successfully completed contracts of this nature for the Board of Education in the past; and

WHEREAS, Sufficient funds are available to award this contract; however, additional state participation, \$14,000, has been identified and requested; now therefore be it

Resolved, That a contract for \$348,700, which is the base bid and add alternates 1 and 2, be awarded to H & H Enterprises to accomplish the requirements of the plans and specifications entitled "Relocation of Portable Classroom Buildings," dated May 15, 1984, prepared by the Department of School Facilities - Portables to be relocated as follows: Woodlin Elementary to Fox Chapel Elementary (4 rooms), Brunswick High to Brown Station Elementary (2 rooms), Great Mills High to Springbrook High (8 rooms), White Oak Junior High to Wheaton High (3 rooms), Woodfield Elementary on site (4 rooms), Stevensville Middle to Fox Chapel Elementary (2 rooms), Redland Middle to Gaithersburg Elementary (2 rooms), Gaithersburg Junior High to Gaithersburg Elementary (1 room)ó.

Resolution No. 323-84 Re: Rejection of Structural Steel Bids
for Lake Seneca and Flower Hill
Elementary Schools

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

WHEREAS, Sealed bids were received on June 5 for structural steel at Lake Seneca and Flower Hill Elementary Schools; and

WHEREAS, Four companies submitted bids, and bid activity for both schools ranged from \$885,000 to \$988,000; and

WHEREAS, Professional cost estimates indicated structural steel for both projects should approximate \$700,000; and

WHEREAS, Bids exceed estimates and staff believes the most appropriate action is to reject these bids and incorporate the requirements into the general construction documents; now therefore be it

Resolved, That structural steel bids for Lake Seneca and Flower Hill Elementary Schools be rejected and incorporated into the requirements for the general construction documents.

Resolution No. 324-84 Re: Greencastle Future School Site -
Storm Drainage Easement (Area 1)

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

WHEREAS, Montgomery County Department of Transportation has requested a right-of-way and storm water drainage easement across the proposed Greencastle Future School site for the purpose of installing storm drainage; and

WHEREAS, The proposed storm drainage improvements will benefit both the site and community and will not affect any land now planned for school programming and recreational activities; and

WHEREAS, Montgomery County will assume all liability for damages or injury resulting from the installation and future maintenance of the subject improvements; and

WHEREAS, All construction, full restoration and any future repair activities will be performed at no cost to the Board of Education; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the president and secretary be authorized to execute a permanent right-of-way and temporary access easement for Montgomery County Department of Transportation at the Greencastle Future School site for the purpose of installing storm drainage.

Resolution No. 325-84 Re: Tuition for Out-of-county and
Out-of-state Pupils for FY 1985

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

WHEREAS, Resolution 364-77 which established the basis for noncounty tuition charges provides that the per pupil cost shall be based on the current year's estimated cost, including debt service; and
WHEREAS, The basis for the calculation of cost per pupil for tuition purposes in FY 1985 is as follows:

Middle

Special

	Kindergarten	Elementary	Junior/Senior
Education			
Estimated No. Pupils	5,658	34,172	46,018
4,218			
Out-of-county Md. Pupils			
Cost:			
Regular Program	\$14,034,446	\$125,511,086	\$188,493,630
\$31,881,507			
Debt Service	408,303	4,931,959	
6,641,663	608,774		
Total Cost	\$14,442,749	\$130,443,045	\$195,135,293
\$32,490,281			
Cost Per Pupil:			
Regular Program	\$ 2,480	\$ 3,673	\$ 4,096
\$ 7,558			
Debt Service	72	144	
144	144		
Total Cost	\$ 2,552	\$ 3,817	\$ 4,240
\$ 7,702			
Out-of-state Pupils			
Cost:			
Regular Program	\$14,034,446	\$125,511,086	\$188,493,630
\$31,881,507			
Debt Service	525,831	6,351,604	8,553,439
784,004			
Total Cost	\$14,560,277	\$131,862,690	\$197,047,069
\$32,665,511			
Cost Per Pupil			
Regular Program	\$ 2,480	\$ 3,673	\$ 4,096
\$ 7,558			
Debt Service	93	186	
186	186		
Total Cost	\$ 2,573	\$ 3,859	\$ 4,282
\$ 7,744			

Comparisons with Previous Year

	1983-84		1984-85	
	Out-of-county	Out-of-state	Out-of-county	
Out-of-state				
Kindergarten	\$ 2,404	\$ 2,427	\$ 2,552	\$
2,573				
Elementary	3,624	3,671	3,817	
3,859				
Middle/Jr./Sr.	3,935	3,982	4,240	
4,282				
Special Education	7,176	7,223	7,702	
7,744				

now therefore be it

Resolved, That the tuition rates for out-of-county Maryland pupils and out-of-state pupils for the 1984-85 school year shall be:

	Out-of-county	Out-of-state
Kindergarten	\$ 2,552	\$ 2,573
Elementary	3,817	3,859
Middle/Junior/Senior	4,240	4,282
Special Education	7,702	7,744

Resolution No. 326-84 Re: Utilization of a Portion of the FY 1984 Appropriation for Projected Supported Projects for the Maryland State Functional Math Workshop

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

Resolved, That the superintendent of schools be authorized to receive and expend, within the FY 1984 Appropriation of \$250,000 for Projected Supported Projects, a \$1,163 grant award in Category 1, Administration, from the Maryland State Department of Education under the Education Consolidation and Improvement Act, Chapter 2 to conduct the Maryland State Functional Math Workshop; and be it further

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

Resolution No. 327-84 Re: Utilization of a Portion of the FY 1984 Appropriation for Projected Supported Projects within the Head Start Project

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

Resolved, That the superintendent of schools be authorized to receive and expend an \$11,180 grant award, within the FY 1984 Appropriation of \$250,000 for Projected Supported Projects, from the Office of Administration for Children, Youth, and Families through the Montgomery County Community Action Committee for the Head Start program in the following categories:

Category	Amount
02 Instructional Salaries	\$ 7,600
03 Instructional Other	2,941
10 Fixed Charges	639
Total	\$11,180

and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the county

executive and County Council.

Resolution No. 327-84 Re: Utilization of a Portion of the FY
1984 Appropriation for Projected
Supported Projects Within the Head
Start Project

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

Resolved, That the superintendent of schools be authorized to
receive and expend an \$11,180 grant award, within the FY 1984
Appropriation of \$250,000 for Projected Supported Projects, from the
Office of Administration for Children, Youth, and Families through
the Montgomery County Community Action Committee for the Head Start
program in the following categories:

Category	Amount
02 Instructional Salaries	\$ 7,600
03 Instructional Other	2,941
10 Fixed Charges	639
Total	\$11,180

and be it further

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

Resolution No. 328-84 Re: Utilization of a Portion of the FY
1984 Appropriation for Projected
Supported Projects for Coaching
for Teacher Effectiveness

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

Resolved, That the superintendent of schools be authorized to
receive and expend, within the FY 1984 Appropriation of \$250,000 for
Projected Supported Projects, a \$1,000 grant award from the Maryland
State Department of Education under the Maryland Professional
Development Academy to provide Area 3 principals and area staff with
the grant proposal entitled Coaching for Teacher Effectiveness in
the following categories:

Category	Amount
02 Instructional Salaries	\$ 916
10 Fixed Charges	84
Total	\$1,000

and be it further

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

Resolution No. 329-84 Re: Utilization of a Portion of the FY
1984 Appropriation for Projected
Supported Projects to Revise K-6
Guide: Rhythms and Games of Low
Organization

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

Resolved, That the superintendent of schools be authorized to receive and expend, within the FY 1984 Appropriation of \$250,000 for Projected Supported Projects, a \$4,000 grant award from the Maryland State Department of Education under the Education Consolidation and Improvement Act, Chapter 2 to revise K-6 Guide: Rhythms and Games of Low Organization in the following categories:

Category	Amount
01 Administration	\$3,687
10 Fixed Charges	313
Total	\$4,000

and be it further

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

Resolution No. 330-84 Re: FY 1984 Categorical Transfer
Within the Disadvantaged Program
under the Vocational Education Act

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

Resolved, That the superintendent of schools be authorized to effect the following categorical transfer within the Disadvantaged Program as funded by the Maryland State Department of Education under the Vocational Education Act in accordance with the FY 1984 Provision for Transfer as adopted by Council Resolution 10-470 on November 15, 1983:

Category	From	To
02 Instructional Salaries	\$7,100	
03 Instructional Other		\$7,100

and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to the

Resolution No. 333-84

Re: Monthly Personnel Report

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

Resolved, That the following appointments, terminations, and leaves of absence for professional and supporting services personnel be approved (TO BE APPENDED TO THESE MINUTES).

Resolution No. 334-84

Re: Extension of Sick Leave

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

WHEREAS, The employees listed below have suffered serious illness; and

WHEREAS, Due to the prolonged illness, the employees' accumulated sick leave has expired; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Board of Education grant an extension of sick leave with three-fourths pay covering the number of days indicated:

Name	Position and Location	No. of Days
Boyd, Nadine	Bus Operator Area 2	26
Munday, Patricia	Bus Operator Area 2	29
Webster, Doris	Building Service Worker Magruder High School	7

Resolution No. 335-84

Re: Personnel Reassignment

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

Resolved, That the following personnel reassignments be approved:

Name	From	To
James E. Beasley	Classroom Teacher Germantown Elem. M+30 L3	Instructional Assistant School to be determined Effective July 1, 1984 Will maintain

		present salary status and retire 7/1/85
Mary S. Bell	Classroom Teacher North Chevy Chase Elem. M+30 L2	Instructional Assistant School to be determined Effective July 1, 1984 Will maintain present salary status and retire 7/1/85
Thurlow Carey	Bldg. Service Mgr. III Westland Intermediate 12 H L3	Building Service Worker School to be determined Will maintain present salary status and retire 1/1/87
Herbert J. Lawrence	Counselor B-CC High School M+30 L3	Instructional Assistant School to be determined Effective July 1, 1984 Will maintain present salary status and retire 12/1/85
Donald C. Schuessler	Classroom Teacher Walter Johnson High M+30 L3	Instructional Assistant School to be determined Effective July 1, 1984 Will maintain present salary status and retire 2/1/85
Mary Lee Scott	Classroom Teacher Wood Acres Elemen. MEQ L1	Instructional Assistant School to be determined Will maintain present salary status and retire 8/1/85

Name and Present Position	Position Effective July 1, 1984	Positive Effective July 1, 1985
Mary Boehm Principal Cresthaven Elem.	A&S Teacher	Elementary Principal
Reed Snyder Assistant Principal Wheaton Woods Elem.	A&S Teacher	Retirement
Reassignment		
Name	From	To
Richard O'Donnell	Principal North Chevy Chase Elem.	Elem. Asst. Principal Effective July 1, 1984 Assignment effective 7/1/85 to be determined
Transfer		
Name	From	To
Jack Roach	Principal Gaithersburg Elementary	Principal Clarksburg Elementary Effective July 1, 1984
Mary O'Connell	Principal temporarily assigned as asst. principal Poolesville Elementary	Principal Cedar Grove Elementary Effective July 1, 1984
Joseph Lacy	Assistant Principal Walt Whitman High	Assistant Principal Walter Johnson High Effective July 1, 1984
Jerome Lynch	Assistant Principal Woodward High	Assistant Principal Walt Whitman High Effective July 1, 1984

Edward Allen	Assistant Principal Richard Montgomery	Assistant Principal Hoover Junior High Effective July 1, 1984
Paul Carr	Assistant Principal Hoover Junior High	Assistant Principal Richard Montgomery High Effective July 1, 1984
Wayne Smallwood	Assistant Principal Pyle Intermediate	Assistant Principal Tilden Junior High Effective July 1, 1984
Appointment	Present Position	As
Anitsa Cordon	Administrative Intern Tilden Intermediate School	Assistant Principal Woodward High School Effective July 1, 1984

Resolution No. 338-84 Re: Academic Leave

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

Resolved, That the following personnel be granted academic leave for the period indicated:

Baranick, William
Principal
Carderock Springs Elementary School
Years of Service in Montgomery County - 15
Period of Leave - July 1, 1984, through June 30, 1985
Attend University of Maryland for doctoral program in curriculum and instruction

Biedron, Virginia
Teacher, Mathematics
Bethesda-Chevy Chase High School
Years of Service in Montgomery County - 8
Period of Leave - August 28, 1984, through June 19, 1985
Attend University of Maryland to begin doctoral program in

mathematics

Bylsma, Jacqueline

Teacher, English Resource

Rockville High School

Years of Service in Montgomery County - 15

Period of Leave - August 28, 1984, through June 19, 1985

Attend University of Maryland for doctoral program in special education

Glasner, Irene

Coordinator of Elementary Art

Department of Aesthetic Education

Years of Service in Montgomery County - 10

Period of Leave - January 29, 1985, through June 30, 1985

Attend University of Maryland for doctoral program in art education

Heller, Henry

Teacher, Career Education

Walter Johnson learning Center

Years of Service in Montgomery County - 20

Period of Leave - August 28, 1984, through June 19, 1985

Attend Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University to complete doctoral program in administration

Hewitt, Jacqueline

Instructional Assistant (on professional leave)

Years of Service in Montgomery County - 8

Period of Leave - August 30, 1984, through December 21, 1984

Attend University of Maryland and complete student teacher for degree in early childhood education

Keefer, Julie

Teacher, Special Education Resource

Walter Johnson High School

Years of Service in Montgomery County - 11

Period of Leave - August 28, 1984, through June 19, 1985

Attend Middlebury College to obtain certification in Spanish

Langeler, Margaret

Program Coordinator

Mark Twain School

Years of Service in Montgomery County - 14

Period of Leave - August 28, 1984, through June 19, 1985

Attend University of Maryland to begin doctoral program in planning and supervision

Loomis, Arlette

Teacher, Grades 5-6

Oak View Elementary School

Years of Service in Montgomery County - 8

Period of Leave - August 28, 1984, through June 19, 1985

Attend University of Maryland to obtain dual certification in secondary French and mathematics

Marrae, Lynn
Teacher, Special Education
Rock Terrace High School
Years of Service in Montgomery County - 12
Period of Leave - August 28, 1984, through June 19, 1985
Attend George Washington University to complete coursework for
doctoral program in school of education and human development

Newby, Patricia
Supervisor of Elementary Instruction
Area 3 Administrative Office
Years of Service in Montgomery County - 9
Period of Leave - July 1, 1984 through June 30, 1985
Attend University of Maryland to complete doctoral program in
education policy, planning, and administration

O'Boyle, Patricia
Teacher, American History
Rockville High School
Years of Service in Montgomery County - 17
Period of Leave - August 28, 1984, through June 19, 1985
Attend University of Maryland to complete doctoral program in
special education of the gifted

Patton, Judy
Director of QIE
Cannon Road Elementary
Years of Service in Montgomery County - 12
Period of Leave - September 4, 1984, through June 30, 1985
Attend Howard University to complete doctoral program in
intercultural communication

Rogers, Vera
Teacher, Grade 3
Woodlin Elementary School
Years of Service in Montgomery County - 8
Period of Leave - August 28, 1984, through June 19, 1985
Attend Bowie State College to complete master's program in
elementary administration and supervision

Roth, Gail
Teacher, Special Education
Rock Terrace High School
Years of Service in Montgomery County - 11
Period of Leave - August 28, 1984, through June 19, 1985
Attend George Washington University for educational specialist
degree in vocational/special education

Shorts, Harriet
Teacher, Grade 5
Jackson Road Elementary
Years of Service in Montgomery County - 14
Period of Leave - August 28, 1984, through June 19, 1985

To visit and study programs of school districts throughout the country that have implemented exemplary writing projects

Smith, Jr., David
Special Education Instructional Assistant
Mark Twain School
Years of Service in Montgomery County - 10
Period of Leave - August 30, 1984, through June 18, 1985
Attend University of Maryland to complete bachelor's degree in general studies and certification in special education

Spadin, Ronald
Technical Services Assistant
Seneca Valley High School
Years of Service in Montgomery County - 9
Period of Leave - July 1, 1984, through June 30, 1985
Attend University of Maryland to complete bachelor's degree in business management

Sweeney, Francis
Principal
Rock View Elementary School
Years of Service in Montgomery County - 17
Period of Leave - August 1, 1984, through June 30, 1985
Attend University of Maryland to complete doctoral program

Zevin, Elinor
Special Education Instructional Assistant
Walter Johnson Learning Center
Years of Service in Montgomery County - 13
Period of Leave - January 1, 1985, through June 18, 1985
Attend Trinity College to begin master's degree in guidance and counseling

Re: Continuation of Legal Services
Discussion

Dr. Cody recalled that the last time they had met on this topic the staff committee had come up with a series of recommendations. The proposal was to appoint someone to spend 50 percent of their time on legal services; however, the staff committee was now proposing postponing any consideration of this and designating someone to do this for a period of up to six months. This individual would implement the tasks identified, and at the end of the six months there would be another report to the Board.

Dr. Shoenberg commented that the initial responsibilities of the position were somewhat extensive and wondered about the possibility of making the initial appointment for a somewhat longer period of time. Dr. Cody replied that the first order of business would be to develop a specific timeframe. He felt that the major policies and procedures could be in place in six months. Dr. Cronin asked that any evaluation at the end of six months show the cost savings the individual had brought about and the projections for long-term cost

savings. Dr. Cody agreed to add this to their list; however, he was not sure they could project for the long-term because so much of what was done in regard to legal expenditures was out of their hands. Dr. Cronin asked whether the Board's staff assistant could participate in the selection process of the individual, and Dr. Shaffner agreed that they would do this. Mrs. Praisner assumed that the committee would also be involved.

Mrs. Shannon thought that the temporary appointment was a good idea and asked that they look at the duties of this position in contrast with those of the general counsel. Mr. Ewing also thought that this was a move in the right direction. He said they needed to provide a mechanism to manage the whole range of legal services because the Board was not always fully aware of what the specialized attorneys were about. He suggested that this issue be addressed in any policy statement developed. He called attention to the section on program managers contacting attorneys and said they should address the issue of when the Board had an opportunity to review a decision to go to court.

Dr. Greenblatt was concerned that what they were doing here was a backdoor way of establishing a position. She asked about measures they would take to exclude this person designing a system from applying for a position. Dr. Cody assured her that he and the Board would take her point into consideration. Dr. Shaffner explained that the user committee would set up the selection guidelines, advertise, screen, interview, and make recommendations. They were not necessarily stipulating that the person had to have a legal background.

Re: Guidelines for the Reuse of Closed
Schools

Dr. Cronin moved and Mrs. Praisner seconded the following:

WHEREAS, The County Council has adopted revised procedures for the reuse of closed public school facilities; and

WHEREAS, Under these procedures the Board of Education had the opportunity to provide comments to the Montgomery County Planning Board, County Council, and county executive; and

WHEREAS, The leasing of closed school facilities by the county government to private schools continues to be of concern to the Board of Education; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Board of Education adopts the following three categories for assessing the impact of leasing closed schools to private schools by the county government:

Category 1: The Board of Education objects to the reuse of the closed school by the proposed private school(s) because such reuse would

- a. adversely impact racial balance in surrounding public

schools and/or

b. accelerate declining enrollment in surrounding public schools and/or

c. be detrimental to the educational objectives of MCPS

Category 2: The Board of Education does not object to the reuse of the closed school by the proposed private school(s) upon the condition(s) that such reuse

a. does not adversely impact racial balance in surrounding public schools and/or

b. does not accelerate declining enrollment in surrounding public schools and/or

c. is not detrimental to the educational objective of MCPS, and/or

d. provides an alternative site within the general geographic area of its present location without substantially increasing its student capacity or program offerings.

Category 3: The Board of Education does not object to reuse of the closed school by the proposed private school(s) since there is no foreseeable adverse impact on MCPS; and be it further

Resolved, That the county executive and County Council be informed of this action.

Re: A Substitute Motion by Mrs. Peyser to Amend the Proposed Resolution on Guidelines for the Reuse of Closed Schools (FAILED)

A substitute motion by Mrs. Peyser that the Department of Educational Accountability conduct a study to support the claim of impact on the public schools by the private schools failed with Dr. Greenblatt and Mrs. Peyser voting in the affirmative; Dr. Cronin, Mr. Ewing, Mrs. Praisner, Mrs. Shannon, and Dr. Shoenberg voting in the negative (Mr. Robertson voting in the negative).

Re: A Substitute Motion by Dr. Greenblatt to Amend the Proposed Resolution on Guidelines for the Reuse of Closed Schools (FAILED)

A substitute motion by Dr. Greenblatt that the Board would comment on each lease and renewal of leases of closed schools by exception only failed with Dr. Greenblatt and Mrs. Peyser voting in the affirmative; Dr. Cronin, Mr. Ewing, Mrs. Praisner, Mrs. Shannon, and Dr. Shoenberg voting in the negative (Mr. Robertson voting in the negative).

Resolution No. 339-84

Re: Guidelines for the Reuse of Closed Schools

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

Dr. Cronin, Mr. Ewing, Mrs. Praisner, Mrs. Shannon, and Dr. Shoenberg voting in the affirmative; Dr. Greenblatt and Mrs. Peyser voting in the negative (Mr. Robertson voting in the affirmative):

WHEREAS, The County Council has adopted revised procedures for the reuse of closed public school facilities; and

WHEREAS, Under these procedures the Board of Education had the opportunity to provide comments to the Montgomery County Planning Board, County Council, and county executive; and

WHEREAS, The leasing of closed school facilities by the county government to private schools continues to be of concern to the Board of Education; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Board of Education adopts the following three categories for assessing the impact of leasing closed schools to private schools by the county government:

Category 1: The Board of Education objects to the reuse of the closed school by the proposed private school(s) because such reuse would

- a. adversely impact racial balance in surrounding public schools and/or
- b. accelerate declining enrollment in surrounding public schools and/or
- c. be detrimental to the educational objectives of MCPS

Category 2: The Board of Education does not object to the reuse of the closed school by the proposed private school(s) upon the condition(s) that such reuse

- a. does not adversely impact racial balance in surrounding public schools and/or
- b. does not accelerate declining enrollment in surrounding public schools and/or
- c. is not detrimental to the educational objective of MCPS, and/or
- d. provides an alternative site within the general geographic area of its present location without substantially increasing its student capacity or program offerings.

Category 3: The Board of Education does not object to reuse of the closed school by the proposed private school(s) since there is no foreseeable adverse impact on MCPS; and be it further

Resolved, That the county executive and County Council be informed of this action.

Re: Quality Control of Elementary
Gifted and Talented Programs

Dr. Lois Martin, associate superintendent, explained that area associates and staff had been invited to summarize the status of

their programs for the gifted and talented. She called attention to the appendix to the report which updated the long-range plan for education of gifted and talented.

Dr. Waveline Starnes, educational planner for the gifted and talented, stated that they had looked five years back as well as five years forward. It was about ten years ago that a task force had been appointed to look at the needs of gifted and talented and during the first years a lot of developmental work was undertaken. Five years ago they looked seriously at staff development training and proposed a budget of 10 teachers for the gifted. Today they had identified students in all schools and had completed the developmental process. They were now looking at articulation and record keeping processes. There were area centers available in each area as well as in the Connecticut Park Center. Dr. Starnes felt that they now seemed to be on a plateau and were looking at what they wanted to have in place. For example, for the highly gifted or 1 percent of the population they did need the area centers and planned to continue the upper elementary program. For the local schools, five years ago they could have mandated one hour of service per week for every gifted and talented student and could have developed a curriculum for that program. Instead they decided these students were not gifted and talented for only that one hour a week. She called attention to Attachment B of the report which stated that a fully developed program for the gifted and talented was devised on the basis of six points and may take different physical forms, depending on the community and the students it serves. For example, in some areas there might be a sufficient number of students for a fully developed program or a center approach. In 1976 they had said the important thing was to differentiate instruction for the gifted and talented, and that instruction could be in many different forms.

Representatives of the three area offices described their gifted and talented population, their current programs and plans for the future.

Mrs. Shannon remarked that they had not discussed the PADI program and asked how many years it had been in existence and how many of the students had moved out into full-blown gifted and talented programs. Dr. Starnes replied that they had decided not to discuss the PADI program. It had been in existence for two and a half years, and most of the students had been in it for 18 months or less. Approximately 25 percent of the students had moved out at this time. She said that the main point was to identify students who had not been previously identified as gifted and talented, which was a nationwide issue. Mrs. Shannon commented that she had some problems about not including PADI in the discussion because it had potential for identifying minority students who might be gifted and talented.

Dr. Shoenberg stated that he was encouraged by the requirement that schools develop a written plan because having a program and having a plan are two different things. Having a program did not help him to

know the extent to which they were serving students who were gifted and talented. Dr. Starnes commented that all schools had identified students who were gifted and talented; however, some schools did need to refine that process. Dr. Shoenberg asked whether there were criteria in terms of percentages of identified students to be served and the needs for services at all grade levels. In other words, what are the criteria for the comprehensiveness of the programs. He asked whether the written plans indicate how the schools were going to address the needs of all identified students. Dr. Cronin commented that one of the problems they faced was how to make do with half the money in May they asked for in October. He inquired about the effects of the Board's cuts and the Council's cuts on the program.

Dr. Greenblatt commented that when they had a pull-out program, the parents and staff could say there was an identified gifted and talented program; however, there were many other types of programs for gifted and talented. She asked when they could say they had some kind of standard program for each and every gifted and talented elementary school student. She wondered when they could truly say they were running a gifted class that met five times a week. Dr. Starnes called attention to Attachment C of the paper before the Board which identified three things every program should have. She said because of staffing some schools found it difficult to have full gifted and talented programs. In order to adequately meet these needs, they were going to have to double the number of area-based teachers. Dr. Greenblatt said that this could still mean a variety of programs, and she would like to see some consistency of offerings.

Mr. Ewing stated that instruction for the gifted has never been adequately supported; however, they had made some progress. It seemed to him that one of the things they should not do was to say they would have a standard program for every child. It was much more important to focus on making certain there was a program available to meet the needs of that child. An important element was the evaluation and assessment of these programs. He knew that staff training was important, but they had to be clear about how far they had come. He hoped they would identify the resources to assess how far they had come, and he hoped that the Board would hear from the superintendent and staff on these issues.

Mrs. Praisner noted that the Board was interested in getting some answers about budget, financial implications, and the PADI program. Mrs. Shannon suggested that they receive these responses in writing. Dr. Pitt explained that because of time constraints they had dealt only with the elementary school program and would be returning to a discussion of the secondary school program.

Resolution No. 340-84

Re: Emergency Appropriation as an
Amendment to the Approved FY 1985
Capital Improvements Program

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Dr. Cronin seconded by Mr. Ewing, the following resolution was adopted with Dr.

Instructional Specialists, one Cable Television Coordinator, one Cable Television Stage Manager, two Producer-Directors, and one Technical Services Assistant (with the appropriate grades and titles to be determined by the Department of Personnel) within the following state budget categories:

Category	Supplemental
14 Community Services	\$229,394
10 Fixed Charges	89,464
Total	\$318,858

and be further

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

Re: Peary Arts Complex

Dr. Cody explained that what was before the Board was a proposed timetable that would lead to a proposal for the use of Peary High School as some type of arts complex. He explained the history of the idea which resulted in the Council's appropriating funds for such a complex. He said that the key issue was whether the Board wanted to proceed in this fashion.

Dr. Greenblatt said that the first question would be whether they wanted an arts center. If they wanted one, they had to decide on the components for such a center, what size it should be, and where was the best location for it. She pointed out that Peary was a huge building, and there were smaller junior high school buildings which might be more suitable. She thought that they were jumping the gun on this. She recalled that when she was contacted about the idea it was in reference to a "torpedo factory" type of center, and now it was suggested that the school system run this. She suggested that they delete the name "Peary" from the proposed timetable. Mrs. Shannon agreed and said she was surprised to see this item on the agenda without previous Board discussion. She felt that they needed a full-blown discussion before even considering a timetable.

Dr. Shoenberg agreed with Dr. Greenblatt that they should not focus on Peary. He suggested that the Board needs a concept paper presenting different alternatives. He felt that to accept the notion of an art center in Peary was premature. Dr. Cronin suggested that the Board refer the matter back to the County Council for the Arts Council and the County Council to discuss. Mr. Ewing reminded the Board about the litigation involved and said he was a little uncomfortable about investing Board and staff time in a substantial effort to consider an art center. He thought they might not want to invest a lot of time in pursuing this because it might not be central to the Board's goals. He thought it might be well to find out whether there was support for this because the Peary PTA had recommended it be rejected.

Mrs. Praisner thought they could discuss the art center concept but pointed out that as of June 30 the school would be conveyed to the county. Ms. Judy Bresler, Board attorney, noted that the resolution closing the school required the conveyance of the school to the county government. She said that in the past the school system had retained facilities pending a determination on whether or not the facility was needed. She said that any study for an arts center should be done with existing staff and not the Council's \$1 million appropriation. If funds were not provided as a result of the pending suit and the Board decided it wanted such a center, the Board could request a supplemental appropriation or request funds in a subsequent budget.

Mr. Robertson shared Mr. Ewing's concern about staff time; however, he would have no problem looking at the concept. He hoped that the Board would discuss this prior to asking Educational Accountability to do a feasibility study.

Mrs. Praisner recalled that when the Board discussed budget on May 21 it indicated that it would look at this, and the paper before the Board was the first phase. Dr. Greenblatt suggested that before they did anything else they should decide whether they should move ahead because maintenance of the Peary building was not in the budget as of July 1. She thought the building should be turned over to the county government, and if the Board later decided it wanted an art center they could request that the building be returned. However, she did not think they should discuss this while a law suit was pending.

Mr. Ewing stated that they had said they would consider this matter, and he thought they should following the proposed timetable while leaving out the word "Peary." The Board could look at the proposals in July and solicit community views, then decide whether to proceed with planning. He agreed that the building should be conveyed. Dr. Cronin suggested that the staff's paper should be developed in cooperation with the Arts Council. Mrs. Praisner objected to the involvement of the Arts Council because this was the staff's concept paper. Dr. Shoenberg agreed and noted that as soon as another group was involved, they would feel they had a stake in the project. Mrs. Praisner indicated that the Board would discuss a concept paper in July without the name "Peary," and that they would proceed with the normal process of conveying the school.

Re: State Superintendent's
Recommended Graduation
Requirements

Dr. Shoenberg moved and Mrs. Shannon seconded the approval of a draft of testimony to be presented to the State Board of Education:

"The Montgomery County Board of Education is in general agreement with most of the recommendations concerning graduation requirements for Maryland public high schools now before the State Board of Education. We find the process through which these recommendations

have gone in their several iterations has been responsive to many of the concerns we initially expressed.

"We do, however, still find ourselves in marked disagreement with the recommendations on two points.

"1. Despite several discussions with staff of the State Department of Education and others who have been involved with the formulation of these recommendations, we still have gotten no satisfactory explanation for the insistence that the earning of a high school diploma requires four years of study beyond the eighth grade. While realizing that there are several different sorts of provisions for students to combine the fourth year of study with the first year of post high school education, we see no reason why a student who has earned 20 units of high school credit should not be allowed to receive a diploma after three years of study in a high school building.

"2. While we strongly favor the awarding of a Certificate of Distinction for the completion of a high school program more demanding than the minimum, we believe that the grade point average for awarding that certificate should be at least a 3.0 rather than the 2.6 proposed. Some of us would even peg the required GPA at 3.5.

While supporting the Certificate of Distinction, we are not confident that the opportunity to receive this honor will be a significant incentive for students who are not now pursuing the more academically oriented program to do so in the future. Our experience in Montgomery County makes us reasonably certain that such is the case and conversations some of us have had with administrators in other jurisdictions suggests that the change in the pattern of student elections toward more rigorous courses will be marginal.

"While there is not strong disagreement among our Board members on any of the other recommendations, there were a number of concerns that were generally expressed by Board members.

"1. There is a continuing uneasiness with the idea of modifying graduation requirements and especially adding to those requirements without specifying the content or learning goals of the sources. We are somewhat disturbed to see these requirements being voted into bylaw in advance of reports from the Curriculum and Instruction Task Forces.

"2. There are some aspects of the requirement for the Certificate of Distinction that strike us as being peculiar.

A. We have considerable doubt that one year of foreign language study will have a great deal of benefit for students. Certainly the stipulation that the one year of study taken to satisfy the Certificate of Distinction requirement should be the second year offering in the language and would be an improvement over what is now proposed.

B. The description of the characteristics of the advanced courses required for the Certificate of Distinction indicates that 'assignments and class activities require more application, analysis, synthesis and evaluation than other courses' and that 'more content' or 'more depth' should characterize these courses. Our question is: More than what? To specify the nature of these courses thus vaguely means that the level of demand in these courses will be based on the prevailing local standard and that the notion of the Certificate of Distinction as representing a state-wide standard will be lost.

"3. While we find the notion of requiring LEA's to provide opportunities for public service within an academic context highly commendable and a great improvement over the initial public service proposal, we are uneasy about the logistical possibility of providing an appropriate offering in every single high school. Certainly such a learning opportunity should be available to every student in every school system but it ought to be possible here, as with many other programs we offer, to allow students to pursue the program in a school other than their own but for which appropriate transportation is provided. In our own county there are some geographically natural groupings of schools whose cooperation in identifying and monitoring public service placements in their area would be far preferable to having every school engaged in such coordinating activities and scrambling to find placements for their students. Certainly the sites at which the students might be placed would much prefer to be contacted by a single person rather than several different high school coordinators. The savings to the school system in staffing would also be significant.

"We thank you for the opportunity to comment on these proposed changes to bylaw and hope that our thoughts will find a favorable reception."

Resolution No. 342-84

Re: An Amendment to the Proposed
Statement on High School
Graduation Requirements

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

Resolved, That the proposed statement on high school graduation requirements be amended by adding a new section two as follows:

"While we agree that under most circumstances students should complete at least a five-course program each semester they are in attendance in high school, we believe that there must be allowances for exceptions to be made locally."

For the record, Dr. Greenblatt stated that there should be no exceptions to the five-course program.

Re: A Motion by Mrs. Peyser to Amend
the Proposed Statement on
Graduation Requirements
(FAILED)

A motion by Mrs. Peyser to amend the proposed statement on graduation requirements to add world history as a requirement for the Certificate of Distinction failed with Dr. Greenblatt, Mrs. Peyser, and Mrs. Praisner voting in the affirmative; Dr. Cronin voting in the negative; Mr. Ewing, Mrs. Shannon, and Dr. Shoenberg abstaining (Mr. Robertson abstaining).

For the record, Mr. Ewing stated that he was opposed to this and his reason was like the one cited by MCR. In addition, many students may well be distinguished and that to determine by this mechanism the nature of the distinction was really to narrow rather than broaden what it was they were trying to accomplish. It suggested there was only one route to the reward that one could get with this certificate. He would rather they reward students for outstanding performance in a wide range of things rather than in a narrower range.

Re: A Motion by Dr. Greenblatt to
Amend the Proposed Statement on
Graduation Requirements
(FAILED)

A motion by Dr. Greenblatt to amend the proposed statement on graduation requirements by stating that they were opposed to a formal course for community service and would support a requirement for graduation external to the school that included community service failed with Dr. Greenblatt and Mrs. Peyser voting in the affirmative; Dr. Cronin, Mr. Ewing, Mrs. Praisner, Mrs. Shannon, and Dr. Shoenberg voting in the negative (Mr. Robertson voting in the affirmative).

Re: A Motion by Dr. Shoenberg to Amend
the Proposed Statement on
Graduation Requirements

Dr. Shoenberg moved that the proposed statement on graduation requirements be amended by the addition of the following:

4. Awarding a certificate rather than a diploma to special education students continues to raise questions about the effect on the public perception of these students that lies in making such a distinction. In particular, we feel that a group who can perform on the job and manage in the community but cannot pass competency tests will be unduly stigmatized by receiving an indication of high school completion that

has a different name. MCPS staff members have raised a series of corollary questions which we attach for your consideration.

Resolution No. 343-84 Re: A Substitute Motion by Mr. Ewing
on the Proposed Statement on
Graduation Requirements

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

Resolved, That the following be added to the proposed statement on graduation requirements:

4. We are opposed to awarding a certificate rather than a diploma to special education students because of the effect on the public perception of these students when making such a distinction. In particular, we feel that a group who can perform on the job and manage in the community but cannot pass competency tests will be unduly stigmatized by receiving an indication of high school completion that has a different name. MCPS staff members have raised a series of corollary questions which we attach for your consideration.

Resolution No. 344-84 Re: An Amendment to the Proposed
Statement on High School
Graduation Requirements

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

Resolved, That the proposed statement on high school graduation requirements be amended by adding the following:

4. With regard to the graduation requirements themselves, we favor the addition of one-half credit to the social studies requirement to be specified as a course in non-United States history. We believe that the high school program needs to reinforce the awareness of cultures other than the student's own.

Resolution No. 345-84 Re: Statement on Graduation
Requirements

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education approve the following

statement as amended and edited:

TESTIMONY BY THE MONTGOMERY COUNTY BOARD OF EDUCATION ON COMAR
13A.03.02 GRADUATION REQUIREMENTS FOR PUBLIC HIGH SCHOOLS IN
MARYLAND

I am Robert Shoenberg, vice president of the Montgomery County Board of Education which is in general agreement with most of the recommendations concerning graduation requirements for Maryland public high schools now before the State Board of Education. We find the process through which these recommendations have gone in their several iterations has been responsive to many of the concerns we initially expressed.

We do, however, still find ourselves in marked disagreement with the recommendations on four points.

1. We believe that students who have completed at least three years of high school, at least 20 credits, and all requirements should be eligible to receive a diploma. Despite several discussions with staff of the State Department of Education and others who have been involved with the formulation of these recommendations, we still have gotten no satisfactory explanation for the insistence that the earning of a high school diploma requires four years of study beyond the eighth grade. While realizing that there are several different sorts of provisions for students to combine the fourth year of study with the first year of post high school education, we see no reason why a student who has earned 20 units of high school credit should not be allowed to receive a diploma after three or three and one half years of study in a high school building.
2. While we agree that under most circumstances students should complete at least a five-course program each semester they are in attendance in high school, we believe that there must be allowances for exceptions to be made locally.
3. While we favor the awarding of a Certificate of Distinction for the completion of a high school program more demanding than the minimum, we believe that the grade point average for awarding that certificate should be at least a 3.0 rather than the 2.6 proposed.

Though we support the Certificate of Distinction as a recognition of student effort, we are not confident that the opportunity to receive this honor will be a significant incentive for students who are not now pursuing the more academically oriented program to do so in the future. Our experience in Montgomery County makes us reasonably certain that few additional students will elect more challenging courses. Conversations some of us have had with administrators in other jurisdictions suggest that the change in the pattern of student elections toward more rigorous courses will be marginal.

4. We are opposed to awarding a certificate rather than a diploma to special education students because of the effect on the public perception of these students when making such a distinction. In particular, we feel that a group who can perform on the job and manage in the community but cannot pass competency tests will be unduly stigmatized by receiving an indication of high school completion that has a different name. MCPS staff members have raised a series of corollary questions which we attach for your consideration.

While there is not strong disagreement on the part of the Board members on any of the other recommendations, there were a number of concerns that were generally expressed by Board members.

1. There is a continuing uneasiness with the idea of modifying graduation requirements and especially adding to those requirements without specifying the content or learning goals of the courses. We are disturbed to see these requirements being voted into bylaw in advance of reports from the Curriculum and Instruction Task Forces.
2. There are some aspects of the requirement for the Certificate of Distinction that strike us as being peculiar.
 - A. We have considerable doubt that one year of foreign language study will have a great deal of benefit for students. Certainly the stipulation that the one year of study taken to satisfy the Certificate of Distinction requirement should be the second year offering in the language would be an improvement over what is now proposed.
 - B. The description of the characteristics of the advanced courses required for the Certificate of Distinction defeats the purpose of achieving a statewide standard of excellence. The criteria indicate that "assignments and class activities require more application, analysis, synthesis and evaluation than other courses" and that "more content" or "more depth" should characterize these courses. Our question is: More than what? To specify the nature of these courses this vaguely means that the level of demand in these courses will be based on the prevailing local standard, not a statewide one.
3. While we find the notion of requiring LEA's to provide opportunities for public service within an academic context highly commendable and a great improvement over the initial public service proposal, we are uneasy about the logistical possibility of providing an appropriate offering in every single high school. Certainly such a learning opportunity should be available to every student in every school system but it ought to be possible here, as with many other programs we offer, to allow students to pursue the program in a school other than their own but for which appropriate transportation is provided. In our own county there are some geographically

natural groupings of schools whose cooperation in identifying and monitoring public service placements in their area would be far preferable to having every school engaged in such coordinating activities and scrambling to find placements for their students. Certainly staff at the sites at which the students might be placed would much prefer to be contacted by a single person rather than several different high school coordinators. The savings to the school system in staffing would also be significant.

4. With regard to the graduation requirements themselves, we favor the addition of one-half credit to the social studies requirement to be specified as a course in non-United States history. We believe that the high school program needs to reinforce the awareness of cultures other than the student's own.

We thank you for the opportunity to comment on these proposed changes to bylaw and hope that our thoughts will find a favorable reception.

Re: Board Member Comments

1. Mrs. Shannon stated the Board had been meeting with clusters having high minority concentrations, but in those meetings she saw few, if any, minority parents. The views the Board had that these clusters were working were not coming from the minority community. She asked whether there was some way the Board or the school system could make an attempt to find out from the minority parents how they thought the magnets were working. She requested data on that same issue in terms of how many minority children from that home school were participating in magnet schools in those clusters and whether they were given any priority.
2. Mr. Ewing reported that last week he had attended the opening of the Scotland Parent Resource Center which is a result of school system, Recreation Department, and community joint effort. However, they were still in need of books and tapes in case anyone wanted to contribute.
3. Mr. Robertson said he was confident that Jacquie DUBY would do a superb job as his successor on the Board. He thought that the higher turnout in the election was a result of new procedures enacted by the Board which gave students better access to the polling places. However, he had heard about a number of troubling things that indicated that some schools were not fully committed to the process. He hoped that when the Board received the special elections report they would look at it very seriously and with MCR see what could be done to address these issues.
4. Mrs. Peyser requested information on why high schools were so much in debt regarding their athletic programs. She noted that at one school the debt was \$17,000, and she asked what could be done about this. She had suggested before that they might have to

eliminate some sports because while they had put money into this, it was not making it. Dr. Cody replied that he had been meeting with a group of high school principals in reviewing the whole financial status of athletic programs. He agreed to supply the information requested by Mrs. Peyser.

5. Mrs. Praisner reported that she was the Board member who participated in the final commencement exercises for Peary High School. She thought the Board owed a debt of gratitude and appreciation to the staff of Peary High School who did a fine job of keeping the school together and having a positive attitude. Dr. Cronin added that he had been impressed by the actions of the parents in the community. They needed to look to those parents for support in the transition.

Resolution No. 346-84 Re: Executive Session - June 25, 1984

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

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 June 25, 1984, 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. 347-84 Re: Board Appeal 84-07

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

WHEREAS, Section .7-304 of the Public School Laws governing suspension and expulsion of students and MCPS Local Rules of Procedure indicate that the local Board of Education may, but is not required, to accept appeals of student suspension unless the suspension is for more than ten school days; and

WHEREAS, Appeal 1984-07 is an appeal of a one-day in-school

suspension; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Board of Education will not entertain this appeal and instructs the ombudsman/staff assistant to communicate to the appellants in writing the decision of the Board.

Resolution No. 348-84 Re: Equity/Discipline

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education schedule a discussion in the very near future on the area of equity in application of the discipline policy.

Resolution No. 349-84 Re: Montgomery County Ethics Panel
Financial Disclosure Form

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

WHEREAS, The Board of Education, in conformity with state statutes, has adopted an Ethics Policy; and

WHEREAS, The Board of Education has established an Ethics Panel; and

WHEREAS, The Ethics Panel must develop and approve a financial disclosure form for formal approval by the Board of Education; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Board of Education herewith adopt the Financial Disclosure Form as approved by the Ethics Panel.

Re: New Business

1. Mrs. Shannon said she would like to discuss the staff response to the Title IX Committee report. Dr. Cody explained that this was a regular staff response. He said that the staff had been developing an affirmative action plan with specific goals for the school system. He would like to schedule this when they were ready.

2. Dr. Greenblatt requested an update on the Pleasant View situation, a background statement, the status of the building, the law suit, general environment of the area, the costs to MCPS over a series of years including staff and legal fees, the cost to the community, the impact on the county, and possible recommendation for action by MCPS. She asked that this come to the Board as an item of information.

Re: Items of Information

Board Members received the following items of information:

1. Items in Process

2. Construction Progress Report
3. Staff Response to Title IX Report
4. Unisex Retirement Factors
5. Joint Occupancy Fees for 1984-85
6. Patient Management Program
7. Progress Report on the Survey of the MCPS Honors Program
8. Status of Guidance Function Study

Resolution No. 350-84 Re: Adjournment

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education adjourn its meeting at 5:50 p.m.

President

Secretary

WSC:mlw