



Dr. Davidson explained that the committee's central recommendation was to urge the Board to continue to follow the existing plan for meeting the needs of gifted and talented students in Montgomery County. They thought the plan was a sound one and was being phased sensibly. The committee felt that in three to five years they would be doing what ought to be done for gifted and talented students in the county. They thought that in the last few years more attention had been paid to the needs of gifted students, and they were beginning to see the cumulative efforts of a phased plan.

Dr. Davidson said that programs did differ from school to school, and some schools had better programs than others. They thought a lot could be done by looking at what happened school to school and intended to address this issue in the coming year. This year they had operated with subgroups looking at the elementary schools and the high schools; therefore, they did not have a lot to say about the JIM schools. Each subgroup made its own recommendations to the full committee.

Dr. Davidson reported that the elementary school group looked at the primary grade program and offered recommendations. It was difficult to identify young children as gifted and talented, and this had led schools to have informal programs or no programs at this level. In addition, parents whose children came to school with advanced skill levels felt that their children were not well served. While there was provision for students skipping a grade, the committee did not think this was a good solution. They thought there should be strong academic programs for gifted and talented students in the primary grades and that this was also the place to deal with underachievers. Dr. Davidson reported that the elementary principals had made this one of their highest priorities and had requested half-time teachers of gifted and talented in every elementary school. The committee discussed this and, while they were sympathetic to the needs, the committee did not think that extra staff was the most efficient way of delivering these programs. The committee thought that help should come from area-based teachers who could be used where needed.

Dr. Davidson commented that the committee did agree that all of the people involved in delivering services needed training. Training was needed for schools attempting to put programs together or trying to improve existing programs. The committee also agreed that it was important to look at ways to increase participation by minority students. The committee recommended that when programs were provided away from the home school that transportation should be provided. They were concerned about cluster programs for the highly gifted and thought these programs should be continued through the sixth grade. He also pointed that some students who were highly gifted in mathematics were running through the computerized system of assessment before they were out of elementary school. In these cases they studied math in junior high school, and the committee thought it would be useful to the schools serving these students to have the assessment extending through the rest of the math

program.

Dr. Davidson reported that a highly active group looked at the pilot high school honors program. They had worked with the Department of Educational Accountability and had come up with a series of recommendations. Their general assessment was that the honors program worked remarkably well in its first year; however, some schools did not go through the full formal identification process for honors students. The committee felt that the selection process continued to need attention.

Dr. Davidson said that they had to look at the grading policy for honors students as to whether they were graded against other students or against county objectives. They suggested that the model of the Connecticut Park Center be used to provide instruction in other areas because it was cost effective. They thought that the summer instructional program was adequate, but they noted that the program did not serve all grades.

Dr. Davidson stated that they continued to need developmental support for honors courses. He pointed out that the gifted and talented training budget had been cut this year, and the committee agreed that training was very important. It was particularly important to have training for the administrators who were the school leaders. The committee thought they had in place a very systematic system for identifying the academically gifted, but this system required continuous support. He said that the people in the central office had played a catalytic role and that the secondary coordinators of gifted and talented programs should be continued. To support programs at the elementary level, they would recommend additional area-based teacher specialists.

Dr. Davidson noted that the committee was also charged with encouraging the development of programs for the gifted and talented in the visual and performing arts. He said that the school system now had TAPESTRY and if it were to expand, they would have to increase some positions. However, there were some recommendations that did not require additional personnel. For example, teachers of honors courses ought to be able to get advanced training in their content areas. They needed better methods of identifying students, especially those difficult to identify. The committee thought that transportation was essential for the area programs. In the field of evaluation, they agreed that self-evaluation was the way to do this and pointed out that generally this would not require the development of new methods of evaluation. The committee said that the summer school opportunities could be helpful to students who had the aptitude but might have skill deficiencies.

Dr. Davidson stated that a study had been done on minority students in the gifted and talented programs; however, the committee had been unable to obtain a copy of the study. The committee also thought that more information about gifted and talented programs should be provided to parents. They recommended that the school system receive input from the community and make sure that the area

advisory committees were active.

Mrs. Praisner requested staff to supply budget cost figures for each recommendation as well as information about other implications of the recommendations before the Board considered its budget. Dr. Shoenberg commented that he was encouraged to see that they now had a coordinated program and called attention to the number of recommendations beginning with "maintain." However, he continued to be disturbed about the consistency of the offerings from place to place. He hoped that they could obtain detailed school by school information about this as they looked at costs. He said they had talked about differences in teachers of the gifted and talented, and he thought that a lot had to do with the style of teaching. This called to mind comments on underachievers, and he thought that they were underachievers because they found the style inappropriate. He would be interested in the degree to which principals were asked to be self-conscious about hiring teachers to get a staff with complimentary abilities in teaching children. He wanted to know if they had teachers experienced in dealing with various groups of students in all schools. He felt that the principals were asking for extra staff because they had no one to deal with gifted and talented students. Dr. Cody believed that principals did consider this when hiring, but he had no idea how widespread this consideration was.

Dr. Davidson remarked that this committee was one that did not testify before the Board against closing small schools because it was difficult to have diversity of teachers in a small school. Dr. Shoenberg asked whether the principals were asking for additional staff because they needed more teachers or needed the opportunity to have a diversification of styles of teaching in an elementary school. Mrs. Ippolito replied that it was a combination of needs, and she thought that principals were cognizant of hiring needs. However, there were no criteria for hiring teachers of the gifted and talented. Dr. Shoenberg indicated that a state task force had made some minimal recommendations about certification, and this was something staff should look into.

Mrs. Peyser had heard that in one area in order for a student to be placed in a program for the gifted, that student needed to be voted upon by his or her classmates. Mrs. Praisner asked that staff check into this. Mrs. Peyser called attention to large class sizes in honors and advanced placement courses. She asked whether staff had evidence that able learners learned better in classes over 30. Mrs. Ippolito replied that this was not the case. In her school she did ask for additional teachers; however, at times it was difficult to find a teacher with the schedule to take a particular class.

Mrs. Peyser commented that many students did not sign up for honors courses because the grades were not weighted. She asked whether the committee had seen the survey done by guidance counselors. Dr. Davidson replied that the committee was not ready to suggest weighted grades until the present policy was enforced.

Dr. Cronin listed a series of questions for the committee and for the staff. He asked about the study the committee had been unable to obtain. Dr. Davidson explained that the study was confidential and, therefore, could not be released to the committee. Dr. Cronin inquired about the possibility of abstracting information from the confidential study in order to help the committee. Mrs. Praisner explained that this was the superintendent's committee, and it would be his prerogative to share information from the study.

Mr. Ewing stated that he was pleased with the report, especially the emphasis of continuing to work on the business of identification of students. He agreed that it was important to focus on the elementary schools because this was a weakness in the current program. He noted that the report called for monitoring and evaluation, and he wanted to know what staff was doing to follow up on assessment recommendations. He felt that it would help them to have specific outcome data which would show over time how well students were doing. Dr. Cody replied that Dr. Martin and Dr. Starnes were looking at the gifted and talented program in a long-range format. He suggested that the committee might want to look at outcome information they thought should be done annually.

Dr. Joy Frechtling reported that they had data for two years on what was going on in the classroom and on certain outcome measures. They were in the process of analyzing that data and writing a report; however, this was not a monitoring system. Dr. Steve Frankel, director of the Department of Educational Accountability, thought that what Mr. Ewing wanted could be gained from existing data. Dr. Floyd stated that he had read the report with interest. He wanted to know how many students were in the program and how many remained in it and exited from the program as twelfth graders. He asked for this information by race, sex, and handicapping condition.

\* Miss Duby joined the meeting at this point.

Mrs. Praisner remarked that she was a little disappointed that the committee could not focus on the JIM level. She shared their concerns about the elementary level; however, she was concerned about the middle group and hoped that the committee would be able to focus on this next year. She asked whether the committee saw a difference in the delivery system and identification of students in the different JIM school configurations such as 6-8, 7-8, etc. She asked if they were going to watch a group of students up through the system from Grade 3 on. Dr. Davidson said that there were data gathered from the Area 2 program because the first class graduated two years ago. Mrs. Praisner shared Mr. Ewing's concern about the early elementary school program and primary grades; however, she had a misgiving about identifying students too early in the primary grades. She thought this was why they decided the area programs would start at the fourth grade, and she asked if the committee could share their thinking about this with the Board. At the high school level, she was concerned about identifying a student as gifted and talented before that student could enter an honors

course. She thought the courses were for the gifted, but she hoped they were not dismissing students who wanted to work from taking these classes. She asked the committee for some additional information on Recommendation 18. She thanked the committee for its work. On behalf of the committee, Dr. Davidson thanked Mrs. Ippolito for the work she did for the committee.

Re: Reading Study: First-year  
Report

Mrs. Praisner recalled that Dr. Shoenberg had asked that the Board discuss this report in terms of implementation issues. Dr. Cody remarked that in terms of implementation they were approaching this through the task of planning to pursue Priority 1A. There had been a number of discussions which persuaded him that a reasonable approach was to continue to work on programs that had already been designed. A steering committee had been formed, and the A&S meeting would be devoted to Priority 1A in the context of achieving full implementation of the K-8 curriculum. He thought that by early December they would have an overall report with a schedule of activities on a multiyear basis.

Dr. Joy Frechtling explained that the purpose of the reading study was to look at the narration component of the new reading/language arts program in the context of implementation issues. They selected schools, interviewed staff, submitted questionnaires, and did a lot of in-class observations. They had three questions: (1) were the supports needed for implementation in place, (2) was implementation occurring, and (3) what was the impact of implementation. The data before the Board was on the first year, and they now had data from the second year and were collecting data on the third year. As far as supports were concerned, they found a number of questions in this area. There were questions as to whether staff had enough training and enough preparation before school began. There was a special concern about teachers working with lower achieving students. They regarded questions raised about materials, guides, and forms as growing pains which would be worked out. However, the management system for monitoring was not uniform and implementation itself was uneven. The biggest problem was implementation of the program for low achievers. Dr. Frechtling said that as they examined the data for the subsequent years they would keep these problems in mind.

Dr. Steve Frankel noted that on the last page of the executive summary they were calling for an end to the "dribble" approach to program implementation. He said that they put 90 to 95 percent of their efforts into program development and relied on faith for implementation. He thought that even if it meant slowing down implementation they should focus on a set of schools and provide 20 to 40 hours of training rather than the few hours they were now providing.

Dr. Shoenberg remarked that he had asked that this topic be put on an agenda for discussion because they put a lot of time into the development and implementation of these programs. There was also a

very heavy expectation about the implementation of curriculum by the people who designed it, by the people in the building, and by the Board. Then they got to the situation of what was happening in the individual school. He commented that he was the last person to expect uniformity from school to school, but he would have expected a better picture than that painted by the report. He was concerned about training both in this report and the gifted and talented report. He said that these reports suggested that the Board's determination to stay with its priorities and with implementation of the present curriculum was the right move.

Dr. Shoenberg asked about Project Basic tests interfering time-wise with what they were trying to do here. He was especially concerned about low achieving students. He called attention to the statement in the executive summary "since the curriculum was mandated for all students, a greater effort needs to be made to provide adaptations which better meet these students' needs, to convince teachers of the efficacy of the program in its present form with low achievers...." He said that they might need to see whether this was the right program for all students. Mrs. Praisner wondered whether the problem was with staff preparation or with the curriculum. Mrs. Peyser thought it might be the curriculum because the new curriculum had less emphasis on phonics, and perhaps teachers felt low achievers needed more practice on phonics. She suggested that perhaps they had to go back to the more traditional teaching of reading.

Mr. Ted Schuder, coordinator of reading/language arts, reported that they had something like 20 years of research and had designed the program for all students. They did have an instructional program in decoding and had telescoped this to make room for the comprehension program. He said that the evaluation of the curriculum had involved 50 staff members across the county, and he thought it would be a mistake to condemn students to a basic skills program.

Mr. Ewing stated that the report gave them insights as to how they did their work as a school system. He said they still did not have a plan or theory on how to develop and deliver program. He noted that the previous Board had cut into resources available in the area office to assist schools in the implementation of program, and he thought this was a mistake. The previous Board cut training funds, and he thought that was a mistake, too. They needed the resources to implement program, and they could not make it work with the existing number of people in the area offices or with the existing training. He remarked that if they wanted the school system to function for every child they had to have the resources, development, assessment, and testing to do the job. People called this overhead which was a mistake because they did have to train people and follow through on programs on an on-going basis which did take funds. If they did not want excellence, they should not invest funds. They could not just hire teachers, principals, and a superintendent and be done with the job. They had to support the school system if they wanted a system to develop good curriculum and to make sure it was in place for every child.

Dr. Cody commented that while he rarely made comparisons he would point out that in 1978 his previous school system spent more than MCPS did last year on staff development. He said that they were going to hire two or three hundred elementary teachers, have them come in two or three days prior to the opening of school, and ask them to implement MCPS curriculum.

Dr. Cronin hoped that when they got to the budget they would remember this discussion when it came time for voting on those dollar items including the present Board's textbook and materials funding. In regard to record-keeping, he wondered when they would see a process adequate to the needs of MCPS. He had the impression that much of the record keeping was done by hand in the schools, and he wondered about getting terminals in the schools to feed into a central system. Mr. Schuder replied that the only thing of that sort now related to performance on the criterion-referenced test.

Dr. Cronin wondered whether they would ever have a record on every child based on all of their performances. Mr. Schuder replied that in the Program of Studies they listed seven major sources of information regarding a child's achievement in reading and listening. They had places on a checklist for a teacher to enter on-going practices and summary judgments. However, this was still being done by hand.

Dr. Cronin commented that teachers understood the effect of programs and suggested that the superintendent could meet with resource teachers or MCEA and discuss an evaluation of the system. Dr. Floyd observed that the report said two out of five of their teachers did not believe something about this system. However, they were told that there was 20 years of evidence that this was effective. He thought it was important that they have good record-keeping, but they needed to concern themselves about priorities. He said it was important for them to invest time and money into the future, and he would emphasize the training aspect to get people better informed.

Mrs. Peyser cited an article on controlled studies of Latin being taught in the elementary schools. The results showed students studying Latin jumped up to a year ahead of the control group in vocabulary and reading skills.

Dr. Cody felt they needed to do more and different things than they had been doing in implementation of all programs. He noted that the program had been approved in the summer of 1981, and it was amazing that so much had been accomplished by the area staff. He said they would be coming up with specific plans and budget requests. Dr. Shoenberg asked whether they were going to address the administration organization and relationship between curriculum development and implementation. Dr. Cody said he had not thought about this specifically. It seemed to Mrs. Praisner that there were two issues. One was relationship between the developer and the process for implementation. The other question was the issue on criterion-referenced testing and issues as to whether they were

meeting the needs or whether there were significant problems. She thought this kind of discussion was very important both from understanding what they were doing with curriculum and efforts to make expectations a reality. She said that it was obvious that everyone was working hard, but there were issues they had to face as a school system. She said she would appreciate hearing from principals, staff, and citizens if they had reactions to the study. She also thought it was important to remember the confidence staff had in the validity of the reading curriculum.

Re: Progress Report on Blair and B-CC  
Clusters

Dr. Cody thanked Dr. Cheryl Wilhoyte, Dr. Paul Vance, Dr. Robert Shekletski, Mr. Richard Fazakerley, and staff for the fine work going on in the clusters. As problems came up, they were straightened out. He thought that some very exciting things were taking place in the magnet schools from the people serving on the design team for the Blair curriculum to the large number of students transferring in to Takoma Park to the large number of kindergarten students in Rosemary Hills.

Dr. Vance felt that they had made remarkable progress in the Blair cluster. He reported that the ninth graders from Blair had been moved into Takoma Park and Eastern, and they were continuing with planning for the magnet at Blair. Work at Takoma Park had exceed expectations, and they had over 120 youngsters enrolled from all over the county. They had the magnet at Rolling Terrace with an emphasis on Latin, and the communications magnet was at Forest Knolls. In the other schools they were continuing to fine tune and improve programs. They had a plan for preliminary program review of magnet changes, and some schools were already suggesting changes in their magnet programs. Dr. Vance felt that in the area of staffing, procurement, facilities, and transportation everyone was to be commended for their efforts.

Dr. Vance explained that he could not single out a person or persons for their contributions; however, 90 percent of the success was due to the leadership of Dr. Wilhoyte. He praised her efforts in the Blair cluster because things were upbeat again in the cluster.

Dr. Shekletski commented that the school system had made a commitment in the B-CC cluster, and he thought they were seeing excellent results. Racial balance, numbers of students, and participation in the programs were all positive. They were up 33 students at North Chevy Chase, and the majority percentage in the kindergarten at Rosemary Hills was 53 percent. The Spanish immersion program at Rock Creek Forest had gone from 48 to 77 students. He felt that it was extremely positive in the cluster. In regard to transportation, Dr. Cody explained that they had started out providing pickup points to the clusters, had gone to two pickups, and had evolved a transportation program. He thought it was working well because of Mr. Fazakerley and his transportation people.

Dr. Cronin inquired about the involvement of the community in assessing program effectiveness. Dr. Shekletski replied that the cluster groups had representatives from every elementary school and met once a month. The same group met annually with the associate superintendent and staff members. Dr. Vance said that his staff worked very closely with parents and parent representatives on curriculum committees.

Dr. Cronin asked about responsibility for magnet cluster long-range planning. Dr. Wilhoite replied that they were trying to bring together many aspects of the school system. They were making an effort to bring together different departments in a planning process. For example, facilities and magnet programs were working together. Magnet programs did have different space requirements, and they were trying to take a look at the impact of that. They were also looking at long-range budget planning in terms of the positions and resources. Dr. Cody added that she had been working on a framework for future budgets to make sure there was equity and fairness among programs. However, they were not sure that all programs could be fit in such a framework, but it would help them with multiple year planning.

Mr. Ewing observed that this was an example of where the Board made a commitment and put the resources behind implementation. The Board had made it clear that it wanted this process to succeed and to succeed fast. He said that this was a case where they had seen how magnificently the school system could perform when it was given the opportunity and the resources. He said that public attitude was important, and he was seeing and hearing people saying that integration was really working. He thought this meant they were doing a good job of communicating with the public. In addition, they were seeing that success itself was generating more ideas about how to do more and to do it better.

Mr. Ewing remarked that some people had anxieties about success in a next-door school and their assumption was that it was a zero sum gain. If they win, I lose. He thought they had proceeded with the assumption that everyone could win in this process and should. He had heard those anxieties from some parents in the Eastern community. He would like to know whether they were making sufficient progress in improving the program at Eastern. Dr. Vance replied that the high anxiety still existed at Eastern. Most of the parents were pleased with the opening of school and the quality of staff and the program. The parents had formed a group interested in developing a communication arts magnet which would also include French, Spanish, Latin, and perhaps a non-Western language. He said there were concerns with school sharing space with magnet programs, because parents felt that youngsters not in a magnet program were not getting the attention. He explained that they did try to reassure parents that the quality of programs was superb. He thanked Mrs. Heck and Dr. Poore for the support they were giving principals.

Miss Duby agreed that they had not moved as quickly with Eastern as they had with Takoma Park. She said that part of the reason was they had not shown the same enthusiasm for programs outside of the math/science type program. She thought they needed to communicate with everyone in Montgomery County that other programs were in keeping with their priorities. She had a concern about what happened to Eastern students once they finished the immersion program, and she wondered whether parents were voicing the same concern. Dr. Vance replied that their planning had not progressed that far. Dr. Wilhoyte added they had met with the resource team at Blair to make sure that the history or government courses would be the type that they could teach in a foreign language. She said that at the ninth grade level in national, state, and local government given the vocabulary, the class would be taught bilingually as opposed to immersion.

Dr. Shoenberg said it was not clear to him as they talked about the programs in the Blair area whether they continue to talk about them as magnets intended to draw whites in or as a series of elementary schools, each of which had its special program in order to be equal to the others. He was interested in getting information on the extent to which the magnets were serving as magnets. He would like to know the degree to which they have crossover within the cluster and the number of students they were busing in from outside the cluster. He also asked for information about the schools these students were attending.

Dr. Floyd observed that in the report there were statements about efforts at publicity. He commended staff for that because often they had a tendency not to promote something because they thought it was good. He said that in Gallup Polls parents tended to rate schools higher than nonparents. He noted in one of the reports that the publicity had been distributed to day care centers, real estate offices, and libraries.

Re: Executive Session

The Board met in executive session from 12:20 to 2 p.m. on personnel matters and negotiations. Mrs. Peyser temporarily left the meeting during executive session.

Re: Board/Press/Visitor Conference

Mrs. Nancy Dacek, MCCPTA president, appeared before the Board.

Resolution No. 515-84

Re: Award of Procurement Contracts  
over \$25,000

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Dr. Shoenberg seconded by Dr. Cody, 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 for the bids as follows:

189-84	Motor Vehicles, Step Van Trucks	
	Name of Vendor(s)	Dollar Value of Contracts
	Chevy Chase Chevrolet	\$ 55,600
5-85	Typewriters and Calculators	
	Docutel/Olivetti Corp.	\$ 7,500
	Maryland Typewriter and Equipment Co.	1,900
	MPI Business Systems	5,575
	Rockville Office Machines, Inc.	94,617
	Total	\$109,592
6-85	Power Mowers and Lawn and Garden Tractors	
	Conaway, Inc.	\$ 5,005
	Gaithersburg Ford Tractor Co.	48,155
	Total	\$ 53,160
10-85	Telephone Equipment and Parts	
	Executive/Atlantic Telephone Company	\$ 3,678
	Graybar Electric Company	5,922
	North Supply, Inc.	55,585
	Terminal Data Corporation	4,071
	Total	\$ 69,256
17-85	Carpeting	
	American Excelsior Company	\$ 29,400
	GRAND TOTAL	\$317,008

Resolution No. 516-84                      Re: Springbrook High School Partial Reroof (Area 1)

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

WHEREAS, Sealed bids were received on September 14 for roof modification and partial reroofing of Springbrook High School as indicated below:

Bidder	Base Bid
1. Y.S.K. Construction Co., Inc.	\$218,498
2. R. D. Bean, Inc.	239,920
3. J. E. Wood & Sons Co., Inc.	240,130
4. Orndorff & Spaid, Inc.	267,255
5. Colbert Roofing Corporation	289,444

and

WHEREAS, The low bidder, Y.S.K. Construction Co., 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 \$218,498 be awarded to Y.S.K. Construction Co., Inc., to accomplish roof modification and partial reroof at Springbrook High School in accordance with plans and specifications dated August 31, 1984, prepared by the Division of Construction and Capital Projects.

Resolution No. 517-84                      Re: Acceptance of Donated Site - Lake Seneca Future Junior High School Site (Area 3)

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

WHEREAS, Land use planning studies have shown the need for a future junior high school to serve part of the area north of Germantown and west of I-270; and

WHEREAS, The developer of the subdivision has presented a deed making a junior high school site available to the Board of Education under the town sector provisions of the zoning ordinance; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Board of Education authorize acceptance from the Prudential Insurance Company of America a parcel of land in its subdivision containing 16.7809 acres, said land to be conveyed at no cost to the Board of Education for use as the site for a future Lake Seneca Junior High School; and be it further

Resolved, That the Board of Education agrees to hold the donor harmless for an amount not to exceed one-half of the abutting street improvement costs; and be it further

Resolved, That the superintendent be authorized to express the appreciation of the Board of Education to the developer for the conveyance of this parcel of land.

Resolution No. 518-84                      Re: Acceptance of Woodlin Elementary School Modernization and Addition Project (Area 1)

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

Resolved, That having been duly inspected on September 21, 1984, the Woodlin Elementary School Modernization and Addition project now be

formally accepted, and that the official date of completion be established as that date upon which formal notices is received from the architect that the building has been completed in accordance with the plans and specifications, and all contract requirements have been met.

Resolution No. 519-84                      Re: Utilization of a Portion of the FY  
1985 Appropriation for Projected  
Supported Projects for the  
Maryland State Functional Math  
Workshop

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

Resolved, That the superintendent of schools be authorized to receive and expend, within the FY 1985 Appropriation for Projected Supported Projects, a \$5,000 grant award in Category 1, Administration, from the Maryland State Department of Education to complete and distribute the compiled material from the FY 1984 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. 520-84                      Re: FY 1985 Supplemental Appropriation  
for Project Basic/School  
Improvement Through Instructional  
Process (SITIP) Program

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

Resolved, That the superintendent of schools be authorized, subject to County Council approval, to receive and expend \$3,900 from the Maryland State Department of Education with the provision of matching \$3,900 of that amount from budgeted Department of Staff Development accounts for the FY 1985 Project Basic/School Improvement Through Instructional Process program, in the following categories:

Category	Supplemental
01 Administration	\$3,815
10 Fixed Charges	85
Total	\$3,900

and be it further

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

Resolution No. 521-84

Re: FY 1985 Supplemental Appropriation  
for the Maryland Competency-based  
Instructional Program

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

Resolved, That the superintendent of schools be authorized, subject to County Council approval, to receive and expend \$47,417 from the Maryland State Department of Education under the Adult Education Act for the FY 1985 Competency Based Instructional Program for Adult Basic Education in the following categories:

Category	Supplemental
02 Instructional Salaries	\$31,410
03 Instructional Other	12,430
08 Operation of Plant & Equipment	750
10 Fixed Charges	2,827
Total	\$47,417

and be it further

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

Resolution No. 522-84

Re: Monthly Personnel Report

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Dr. Cronin seconded by Mr. Ewing, 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. 523-84

Re: Death of Dr. Melvin B. Davis,  
Classroom Teacher at Richard  
Montgomery High School

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

WHEREAS, The death on September 20, 1984, of Dr. Melvin B. Davis, classroom teacher at Richard Montgomery High School, has deeply saddened the staff and members of the Board of Education; and

WHEREAS, In the seven years that Dr. Davis had been a member of the staff of Montgomery County Public Schools, he provided a rewarding learning experience for his students; and



Mary K. Lacy	Principal Fallsmead Elementary	Supervisor of Elem. Instruc. Area Administrative Office Grade 0 Effective March 1, 1985, or sooner
Marie L. Petrenko	Acting Supervisor of Instruction Area Admin. Office	Supervisor of Elem. Instruc. Area Administrative Office Grade 0 Effective March 1, 1985, or sooner

Re: FY 1985 Capital Improvements  
Program Submission to State IAC

Dr. Cody explained that this was a preliminary discussion of the capital request to the state. Mr. William Wilder, director of the Department of School Facilities, added that by state law the superintendent had to submit a preliminary budget request in priority order to the state. There were two categories: projects for funding and projects for planning approval. The memo also showed a time line for public hearing and action. In addition, he said they would be monitoring a number of areas of concern which included New Hampshire Estates, Rolling Terrace, Rosemary Hills, and the Darnestown/ Travilah areas.

\* Dr. Greenblatt joined the meeting at this point.

Dr. Floyd inquired about the rationale behind monitoring these schools. Dr. George Fisher, director of planning, replied that New Hampshire Estates and Rolling Terrace were part of the middle school study, and in the alternatives they had suggested adding to New Hampshire Estates and Rolling Terrace. Rosemary Hills was over projection, and there were larger numbers of students in kindergarten and Grade 1. They also had an overcrowded situation at Darnestown, and the community had requested either a new school or an addition to Darnestown.

Mrs. Praisner inquired about the timetable for New Hampshire Estates and Rolling Terrace. Dr. Cody replied that a decision would be made in the next six to eight weeks on whether to include these schools in the 1987 update.

Mr. Ewing noted that he had visited Fox Chapel this week, and the school was enrolling sixteen new students each week. He wondered whether they were planning the new school large enough to handle the growth in that area. Dr. Fisher replied that they were trying to get South Germantown built a year sooner to open in September 1986

and provide relief. Among the new schools being considered was one in east Germantown which could be opened in September 1987. Mr. Wilder remarked that they had also asked the state about obtaining additional portable classrooms.

Dr. Shoenberg said that on the second list there was mention of a new school for an upcounty vocational/technical center. However, he recalled that at budget they had decided to postpone a decision on this until they could decide how best to approach this program. The Board had not yet held this discussion, and he wondered why this was on the list as a "new school." Dr. Cody explained that there was a committee considering all alternatives including placing this center in an existing building. Mrs. Praisner suggested that the wording be changed to reflect the fact that the Board had not yet reached a decision on whether this would be a separate building. Dr. Shoenberg said that, in addition, they should look at the enrollment at Edison this year in order to use their experiences at Edison as a basis for making decisions about the upcounty. He also inquired about an addition to Paint Branch which raised a similar set of questions. He said that it was not clear that an addition was the way to go because they might need a new school. Dr. Fisher replied that they did not see the need for a new school in the 29 corridor yet. They were looking at the problem of Paint Branch and the relief needed by Banneker as part of the 1984 update.

Dr. Shoenberg suggested that they present information to the public as "tentative" rather than raising expectations that this was exactly what the Board would be doing. Dr. Cody explained that they had a \$41 million request going to the state and would probably receive \$3.5 million. They considered paring down the list but decided to present to the state the full needs of Montgomery County. Mrs. Praisner commented that the Council was also asking the Board to identify long-term needs. It was appropriate for them to identify where they needed capital expenditures. She said it would be helpful to have the tentative budget for next year accompanied by the actual appropriation for last year. Mr. Wilder replied that they were gathering this information and would be providing it to the Board.

Re: Policy on Naming Schools

Dr. Greenblatt moved and Dr. Shoenberg seconded the following:

WHEREAS, The Board of Education has the responsibility for adopting names for county public school facilities; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Board adopt the following policy on naming schools:

I. Purpose

The purpose of this policy is to establish an equitable process by which the Board of Education can assume its responsibility for naming schools.

## II. Process and Content

- A. It is the responsibility of the Board of Education to adopt official names for county public school facilities. In fulfilling this responsibility, the Board will make every effort to respect community preferences.
- B. When a new school site is purchased, or a planning project for a new school is initiated, the superintendent will establish a temporary, geographical name to designate the site or building for planning purposes. As a new school nears completion, the superintendent shall establish a process through which interested groups in the community which the school will serve may choose to retain the school's planning name or may recommend in priority order as many as three preferences for a new name.
- C. Geographic names are preferred for new schools, especially elementary schools. These names should be clearly identifying, widely known and recognized.
- D. If a geographic name is not appropriate, schools may be named for distinguished persons, no longer active in their careers, who have made an outstanding contribution to the community, county, state or nation. The Board will give preference to names of women and minorities so that these are equitably represented among county school names.
- E. Although the Board will consider carefully community recommendations for school names, the final responsibility for officially naming a school building rests with the Board of Education.

## III. Feedback Indicators

The superintendent will publish a regulation to implement this policy. Biennially the superintendent will review this policy and its implementing regulation to determine if policy modifications should be recommended to the Board of Education.

Re: A Motion by Dr. Cronin to Amend  
the Proposed Policy on Naming  
Schools (FAILED)

A motion by Dr. Cronin to amend the proposed policy on naming schools by adding "secondary" before "schools" in II. D. failed with Dr. Cronin and Dr. Greenblatt voting in the affirmative; Mr. Ewing, Dr. Floyd, Mrs. Praisner, and Dr. Shoenberg voting in the negative (Miss DUBY voting in the negative).

Re: A Motion by Dr. Greenblatt to  
Amend the Proposed Policy on  
Naming Schools (FAILED)

A motion by Dr. Greenblatt to delete "the Board will give preference to names of women and minorities so that these are equitably represented among county school names" failed for lack of a second.

Resolution No. 526-84

Re: Policy on Naming Schools

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

WHEREAS, The Board of Education has the responsibility for adopting names for county public school facilities; now therefore be it Resolved, That the Board adopt the following policy on naming schools:

I. Purpose

The purpose of this policy is to establish an equitable process by which the Board of Education can assume its responsibility for naming schools.

II. Process and Content

- A. It is the responsibility of the Board of Education to adopt official names for county public school facilities. In fulfilling this responsibility, the Board will make every effort to respect community preferences.
- B. When a new school site is purchased, or a planning project for a new school is initiated, the superintendent will establish a temporary, geographical name to designate the site or building for planning purposes. As a new school nears completion, the superintendent shall establish a process through which interested groups in the community which the school will serve may choose to retain the school's planning name or may recommend in priority order as many as three preferences for a new name.
- C. Geographic names are preferred for new schools, especially elementary schools. These names should be clearly identifying, widely known and recognized.
- D. If a geographic name is not appropriate, schools may be named for distinguished persons, no longer active in their careers, who have made an outstanding contribution to the community, county, state or nation. The Board will give preference to names of women and minorities so that these are equitably represented among county school names.
- E. Although the Board will consider carefully community recommendations for school names, the final responsibility for officially naming a school building rests with the Board

of Education.

### III. Feedback Indicators

The superintendent will publish a regulation to implement this policy. Biennially the superintendent will review this policy and its implementing regulation to determine if policy modifications should be recommended to the Board of Education.

\* Mrs. Peyser rejoined the meeting at this point.

Re: A Motion by Mr. Ewing Regarding  
State Graduation Requirements

Mr. Ewing moved and Dr. Cronin seconded the following:

Resolved, That the Board of Education as appropriate and where its prior testimony or positions have not been taken account of fully by the state Board in its revisions repeat in a written statement to the state Board those positions and in addition ask for clarification of the issue under C (3).

Resolution No. 527-84                      Re: An Amendment to the Proposed  
Resolution on State Graduation  
Requirements

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

Resolved, That the proposed resolution on state graduation requirements be amended to add: "seeing the latest edition to this policy which would include the appeal procedure for those exceptions to the five credits per year that Board oppose the statement that all appeals would have to go to the state superintendent and request that that right be reserved for the local jurisdiction."

Resolution No. 528-84                      Re: State Board of Education  
Graduation Requirements

On motion of Mr. Ewing 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; Dr. Floyd abstaining (Miss Duby voting in the affirmative):

Resolved, That the Board of Education, as appropriate and where its prior testimony or positions have not been taken account of fully by the state Board in its revisions, repeat in a written statement to the state Board those positions and in addition ask for clarification of the issue under C (3); and be it further

Resolved, That seeing the latest edition to this policy which would include the appeal procedure for those exceptions to the five credits per year that Board oppose the statement that all appeals would have to go to the state superintendent and request that that right be reserved for the local jurisdiction.

Re: Board Member Comments

1. Mr. Ewing felt uneasy about where the Board was going in terms of their policy and their program of objectives in the area of JIM schools and he wondered if they shouldn't soon be addressing themselves to their objectives in that area, not in terms of what they want in a particular set of grades, but what they want in the way of program for students and how they pursue that. He stated they had come up against the flexibility of their facilities that pushed them toward focusing on program needs in that area, and he thought a starting place might be to ask the JIM principals to focus on that issue and to let the Board, at the convenience of that group, know whatever it is they are thinking about.

2. Mr. Ewing suggested that the Board create some kind of group or commission or panel of distinguished citizens who would address themselves to advising what kinds of things the Board might need to do in Montgomery County to assure that excellence in teaching would continue to be the hallmark of Montgomery County Public Schools in the future. He said there was a whole range of issues which were dealt with typically almost exclusively in negotiations, and he was not suggesting removing any of those from that forum but putting them in a time frame when the contract had been renewed for three years and they could think about what was needed to be done about recruitment, training, salaries, pay approach, benefits, training of teachers, what the public would like to see in the long term. He believed the public had a big stake in that but that they tended to be excluded from those kinds of considerations. He felt they didn't really focus on the long-term needs of the community and what long-term strategies should be. He added the superintendent said the Board would be facing a time in the very near future when they would have a shortage of very good teachers and Mr. Ewing asked what in Montgomery County they were going to do about it. He realized there were limitations but that there were things that could be done and, while the Board by virtue of being busy with a whole range of things didn't have time itself to look at all of the issues in depth, it would benefit from the work of a group of citizens. He would want to include representatives of MCEA, and perhaps other employee organizations, and a wide range of citizens who could help to define what the problem was and develop recommendations about how to address it. Mr. Ewing added he would be making such a proposal formally in the near future.

3. Dr. Cronin stated he had long felt that by having a curriculum K to 8 they were losing the 6th-7th-8th age group who had a transition from 6th or 7th grade to 7th and 8th and then to senior high, and he believed that experience needed to be reexamined to see whether teaching strategies were adequate to the needs of the students,

whether they really even understood the stage of development they were in intellectually, and whether they were meeting those educational needs. Under new business he planned to ask for a symposium, similar to the one the Board would be doing on high schools, for the spring on JIM schools.

4. Dr. Cronin asked the superintendent to go into some idea of day care needs in Montgomery County. As the Board saw day care pressures on it, day cares trying to take over closed schools, and the task force of the executive's office on day care needs, he believed that a task force between the school system, the executive, major businesses in Montgomery County and the day care providers could give the Board a comprehensive view of the day care needs of Montgomery County so that all of them could share, first, an examination of the problem and then the solution, including funding costs. He thought that since private providers, the school system and private corporations all dealt with the problem separately, perhaps the superintendent might take the lead in asking for a joint effort to deal with the issue.

5. Dr. Cronin commented that one of the offices at Montgomery College was working with the gifted and talented program in the school system, and he kept hearing that cooperation was proceeding very well and he wanted to pass that on to the superintendent.

6. Dr. Cronin stated he had originally asked for information on how many MCPS students qualified for the President's Academic Fitness Awards and had noted in that that to qualify a student had to have a B+ average as defined on a 4.0 scale, so if the Board went to a 5.0 scale it would be affecting MCPS students.

7. Mrs. Peyser thought that during discussion of the Walter Johnson Yearbook one of the decisions made by the Board had been some revision in the journalism curriculum to improve the situation, and she had not seen anything about this. She asked if the curriculum would be revised and if any course would be required for the editing positions on the yearbooks. Mrs. Praisner remembered the Board directing the superintendent and staff to review the journalism curriculum to see if it needed modifications. She didn't recall the Board saying modifications were required. Dr. Cody said the Board would be given the results of that review.

8. Miss Duby was all in favor of the Recognition Night and thought the turn in that direction was very positive, but said she had been made aware of a concern that, in light of focusing on awarding student achievement, private companies were jumping on the bandwagon swamping schools and students with offers to gain distinction as outstanding scholars by paying \$10.00 and sending a list of their qualifications. Then the parents were asked to buy a very pretty but very costly book. She said it was confusing to college counselors and guidance counselors and she was wondering what could be done about it. She added she knew Mike Michaelson had received some of the complaints and would be disseminating the NASSP list of approved programs.

9. Dr. Greenblatt, in response to Dr. Cronin's comments on weighted grading, stated that in the President's Academic Fitness Awards program the minimum grade needed to qualify was based on the equivalent of B+ regardless of the scale and that it was done that way across the country.

10. Dr. Greenblatt asked what efforts the Board and school system were taking in support of the Board's resolution on TV-watching.

11. Mrs. Praisner noted that the administrative offices were now named the Carver Educational Services Center, and the Board had determined to hold an appropriate ceremony to mark that occasion. The Board had decided to establish a small committee to plan the program, and she and Mr. Ewing would represent the Board on this committee. They anticipated having community and staff representation on that committee as well.

12. Mrs. Praisner noted that the Board had adopted a resolution calling for letters of commendation to students who had received a 4 or better on advanced placement tests. She and Dr. Cody had responded to that motion. She thanked the individuals in the office of the deputy superintendent who had to fulfill that requirement. One secretary had taken 25 to 30 hours to do this, typing a shell letter, typing addresses for students, checking the spelling, calling the schools to make sure the addresses were correct, and pulling out duplicates where students had taken more than one test. The secretary had labelled, folded, and stuffed the envelopes. This activity had tied up a printer for about 15 hours. She and Dr. Cody had signed over 700 letters each. Mrs. Praisner said she was bringing this to the Board's attention not to be critical of the Board or the resolution, but to inform the Board of the staff work involved when it takes an action.

13. Mrs. Praisner also commented that the Board would be holding its fall recognition program on October 15, at 7:30 p.m. at Eastern Intermediate School. On behalf of the Board, she thanked Ms. Ann Ginsburg and Mr. David Fischer of the Board Office for their work.

14. Dr. Floyd commented that he had visited Gaithersburg High School, Fox Chapel Elementary, Baker Junior High, and Cedar Grove Elementary. At Gaithersburg High School he had witnessed some significant administrative efforts to streamline programs and boost student morale. He was pleased to see the effort that was going forward. At Fox Chapel, he saw outstanding staff adjustment to a very difficult overcrowded situation. He recalled that staff was thinking about requesting some additional portables; however, there were already 900 students in a facility built for 500. He said that the multipurpose room was already overtaxed. He commented that at Baker and Cedar Grove the instruction was well organized, teacher morale was high, and there were high expectations for students.

Re: Proposed Changes in Grading  
Policy

Dr. Edward Shirley, administrative assistant, explained that the original purpose of the committee was to look through the regulations associated with the grading policy. In dealing with the regulation, it became apparent that they had to look at the policy. They were proposing that if, in the course of the nine-week grading period, two of the grades were E's then the student would receive a failing grade. At this time if a student were to receive a minimum of a C in one of the marking periods and receive failing grades, this came out to be a D. In terms of the regulations, the majority of the changes did deal with language changes. They had tried to define the latitude a teacher would have in forcing a final grade. They had tried to make sure the regulation was in line with the Board's loss of credit policy. They had made a statement in terms of the expectation that the student would make an effort to complete all aspects of the course including the exam regardless of what the grades were going into the exam. Finally, they confirmed that all schools would be on a nine-week grading cycle. At present there were four schools on six-week cycles.

Dr. Cronin said he had language relating to grade inflation. He asked the committee to react to a mathematical average above 2.5 which automatically went up to the higher grade. His proposal would be that the student would be graded on the exact mathematical average. He asked for a reaction that a grade would be a C unless the teacher took into effect the trend. Dr. Shirley explained that in determining a final grade, anything at .5 and above goes to the higher grade. In other words, 2.5 would be a B, and 1.5 to 2.4 is a C.

Mrs. Praisner understood that there were a lot of changes Dr. Cronin might be proposing, but the only proposal before the Board dealt with the two marking periods and the final exam. She said that the final exam counted 20 percent, and a student going into the final exam could know that no matter what they did they were not going to fail. The proposal before them indicated that as long as two of the three grades were an E, the student would receive an E. Dr. Shirley noted that this was a policy question because in doing so, they were changing the value of the exam.

Mrs. Peyser asked whether they were to discuss regulation issues. Mrs. Praisner said that the question was how the superintendent intended to proceed with changes in the regulations which were not Board changes. Dr. Cody commented that they had created a problem by not providing Board a copy of the actual policy. Dr. Cronin asked how the Board would raise issues about something in regulations. Mrs. Praisner suggested that next time the Board discussed this they have copies of both the policy and the regulation. Dr. Shirley explained that the regulation was being provided as information to the Board. The most significant changes dealt with the question of the latitude of the forced final grade. The other was the question of the expectation that the student would make an effort to complete the final exam. The other parts were wording changes.

Mrs. Peyser indicated that she did submit some questions in writing. She wondered why they did not say students were expected to participate in the "final exam or activity" rather than "final activity." At the top of page 12 in the regulation, she suggested it read "...and failure to do so will result in a grade of I or incomplete." She would add, "if the absence from the final exam is unexcused, the grade will be E." She said they had to emphasize the importance to students of attending school on the day of their exam. Mrs. Nancy Powell commented that Mrs. Peyser's amendment was in line with committee discussions. Mrs. Peyser said she would add at the end of the first paragraph under F, "in order to pass the course, the student must satisfactorily complete all of the objectives of the course." Mrs. Praisner asked whether she meant all the objectives had to be mastered, and Mrs. Peyser replied that she meant "completed." She would hope that for a grade of B or A, this would mean mastery.

Dr. Shoenberg said Mrs. Peyser was getting at making a distinction between a student making an effort and failing and a student who did not make the effort at all. The grade in both cases is an E. It seemed to him they had lost an opportunity to distinguish between not doing anything at all and trying and failing. He wondered whether there was any discussion about this. Dr. Pat Sweeney, area director of educational services, replied they did discuss this in terms of loss of credit. They talked about giving a zero for not taking the exam at all. Dr. Shoenberg thought there should be a difference between a zero and a 59. Mrs. Powell added that in a real classroom situation where a student was making a lot of effort, the teacher would provide other opportunities for the student to increase the grade.

Miss Duby said she had concerns about the discussion because they were confused about the differences in regulation and policy. As they talked about changing the regulations, she saw some policy implications. She hoped they would make very clear exactly what was being revised and how people can give input to regulation revisions. In reference to the two E's, she said that when she first read this she had no problems. The Board adopted a policy giving a certain weight to final exams, and she had a real concern with saying this was going to be worth 20 percent and then finding an exception. She suggested that perhaps they should look at the whole issue again.

Mr. Ewing commented that this did open up the possibility of setting aside the 20 percent rule for this purpose. For example, if all of the grades were numerical, the final exam would count 20 percent and the rest of the grades 80 percent. If the 80 percent were done at the level of .3, you would multiple that by four. If the final exam were a 2.0, that would give them a .64 for the course. He said the student was pulling the grade up above the level of D, and he wondered why they shouldn't do that. Mrs. Powell said the student would receive an E. Mr. Ewing wondered why they wanted to penalize a student for pulling up a grade. Mrs. Praisner said he appeared to

be saying they were telling students it didn't matter if they look the exam because if they have two E's they are going to fail. She wondered whether there was another way of addressing this.

Dr. Floyd remarked he had a problem with trying to resolve a policy issue on one hand and then trying to tell someone how to do it. Policy meant you told people what it was you wanted done and to some extent, why. How it was to be done was a professional responsibility. In grading they were concerned about arriving at a certain standard, and they were concerned about assessment and measures of growth. Unless they kept those things in front of them, they would be forever in the morass of where they cut off a C. He did not see this as a policy decision. They should set a policy which would allow professionals to make those judgments and hold them accountable.

Dr. Cronin remarked that they had started from the viewpoint of students cruising into the end of a course. He said there was another issue. The teacher was not the only person giving the grade. There were factors written into the regulations which were not in the policy where the prior approval of a principal was necessary for a teacher to assign a grade in unusual cases. In other ones, there must be the concurrence of the principal in another type of grading. He was concerned that in some instances they removed the right to grade from the teacher.

Dr. Greenblatt asked why couldn't this be by regulation as clarification of the policy. It seemed to her the problem came up because teachers felt these students did not deserve to pass. She felt that this was an administrative decision. Mrs. Praisner noted that the 20 percent for the final examination was a Board policy. She said that the options for forcing grades were not there for teachers. Dr. Shirley explained that when the committee first started they thought they were dealing with a regulation, but they were really altering the value of the marking period or the exam. The Board action had set the 20 percent.

Dr. Greenblatt asked that this be written out because she did not understand the proposal. The other issue was students going into the final knowing that there was very little they could do on that final to affect their grade unless they were two letter grades above or below what they had been doing. Dr. Cody explained that this problem came out of the issue of choosing the 20 percent. Mrs. Powell commented that if they gave the final exam more than 20 percent, two hours were awfully significant in relation to 90 class periods and all of the work involved in class.

Mrs. Praisner asked that the staff respond to where they were with the regulation. If they were going to put the regulation changes out for response, the Board needed to know that, too. She suggested that the next time Board receive a copy of the policy when it looked at the pros and cons of the proposal. If they had other options they considered, these should be shared with the Board.

Resolution No. 529-84

Re: Executive Session - Negotiations

On recommendation of the superintendent, and on motion of Dr. Shoenberg seconded by Miss Duby, the following resolution was adopted with Dr. Cronin, Mr. Ewing, Dr. Floyd, Dr. Greenblatt, Mrs. Praisner, and Dr. Shoenberg voting in the affirmative; Mrs. Peyser voting in the negative (Miss Duby 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 meetings in executive closed session at times to be determined to conduct collective bargaining negotiations or consider matters and issues in connection therewith; and be it further

Resolved, That the president of the Board of Education will announce at public business meetings when the Board of Education has held these executive sessions.

Resolution No. 530-84

Re: Minutes of August 27, 1984

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

Resolved, That the minutes of August 27, 1984, be approved.

Resolution No. 531-84

Re: BOE Appeal 1984-24

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

Resolved, That the Board affirm the superintendent's decision in BOE Appeal 1984-24, student transfer.

Resolution No. 532-84

Re: BOE Appeal 1984-31

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education reverse the superintendent's decision in BOE Appeal 84-31.

Resolution No. 533-84

Re: BOE Appeal 1984-32

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education affirm the withdrawal of BOE Appeal 1984-32.

Resolution No. 534-84                      Re: Citizens Advisory Committee on  
Family Life and Human Development

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

WHEREAS, COMAR 13A.04.01 requires that each local education agency have a Citizens Advisory Committee on Family Life and Human Development; and

WHEREAS, Montgomery County has had such a committee since 1970, consisting of representatives of various civic associations and religious groups, community members at large, and student representatives; and

WHEREAS, Membership on the committee is for a two-year term; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the following individual be appointed to represent the respective organization for a two-year term:

Ms. Patricia Kramer - Suburban Area Study Group

and be it further

Resolved, That the following students be appointed for a one-year term:

Tammy Weiner (Thomas S. Wootton HS)  
2325 Glenmore Terrace  
Rockville, Maryland 20850

Sima Ali (Wheaton HS)  
12903 Moray Road  
Wheaton, Maryland 20906

Martin Videaus (Winston Churchill HS)  
7605 Heatherton Lane  
Potomac, Maryland 20085

and be it further

Resolved, That these individuals be notified of their appointments to the Citizens Advisory Committee on Family Life and Human Development.

Resolution No. 535-84

Re: New Appointments to the Title IX  
Advisory Committee

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

WHEREAS, The Title IX Advisory Committee has been active since its establishment in 1977; and

WHEREAS, Vacancies now exist on the committee due to resignations or the expiration of the terms of several members; and

WHEREAS, The vacancies for the committee have been advertised as directed by the Board of Education; and

WHEREAS, In accordance with the Board-approved recruitment and selection procedures, the nominees listed below were recommended by the committee to the superintendent; and

WHEREAS, Members are appointed by the Board of Education through the superintendent; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Board of Education appoint the following persons to a two-year term beginning immediately, and terminating in September, 1986:

Betty Montgomery, MCCSSE  
Mariana Doores, MCAASP  
Zelma Sheppard, Gray Panthers  
Bertha Lubin, Older Women's League  
Lorena Guidry, Young Women's Christian Association  
Elizabeth Harp, MCCPTA  
Elvira Crocker, Montgomery County Commission for Women  
Irma Dobkin, Women in Education

and be it further

Resolved, That the Board of Education appoint the following students to a one-year term beginning immediately, and terminating in September, 1985:

Elisa Weiss, Rockville High School  
Paul Ideglia, Walter Johnson High School  
Cathy Atwell, Churchill High School

Resolution No. 536-84

Re: Policies BLB and BLC

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

WHEREAS, Policy BLB, Rules of Procedure in Appeals and Hearings (Other than Special and Alternative Education) was adopted by the

Board on April 10, 1984; and

WHEREAS, The Board asked that Policy BLC be republished to include Resolution 429-80; and

WHEREAS, The title of Policy BLB was changed from "Other than Continuum Education" to "Other than Special and Alternative Education"; and

WHEREAS, Policy BLB would be the appeal procedure for students in alternative programs; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the titles of Policies BLB and BLC be changed to read as follows:

- BLB - Rules of Procedure in Appeals and Hearings (Other than Special Education)
- BLC - Rules of Procedure for Impartial Due Process Hearings (Special Education Only)

Resolution No. 537-84                      Re: Recognizing MCPS Staff and Student Achievements

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

WHEREAS, Many MCPS employees and students accomplished outstanding achievements, and thereby deserve recognition and praise from their peers, the superintendent and the Board of Education, and the public; and

WHEREAS, On February 8, 1983, the Board of Education unanimously adopted a policy establishing the practice of recognizing students' and employees' outstanding achievements; and

WHEREAS, Two of the groups of students to be recognized include National Merit Scholarship Semifinalists and Semifinalists in the National Achievement Scholarship Program for Outstanding Negro Students; now therefore be it

Resolved, That Recognition Evening be held on October 15, 1984, 7:30 p.m. at Eastern Intermediate School; and be it further

Resolved, That the following list of students and employees be so recognized and honored that evening:

HONOREES

STUDENTS

Melanie Lynn Bogushefsky, of Seneca Valley High School, was elected Youth Lieutenant Governor of the State of Maryland in the Y.M.C.A. Youth and Government program. In addition, she served as an

advocate for the governor on the Governor's Youth Advisory Council. The U.S. Department of Education and the Commission on Presidential Scholars announced that Mary Cavender of Churchill High School was one of Maryland's two Presidential Scholars for 1984.

French students from Herbert Hoover Junior High School were winners in the national French Contest, Le Grand Concours. The national winners were Nadine Ekrek, Albert Hsia, Mark Katz, Lorena Levy, and Pearl Tsai. Stephanie Dea, Ben Lang, and Kenny Young, were state winners.

Karen Jarrard, of Montgomery Village Junior High School, was among 10 students nationally whose scientific proposals have been selected for testing aboard a future space shuttle flight. Jarrard was one of 20 regional finalists who presented project proposals in a symposium sponsored by NASA and the National Science Teachers Association. Greg Letterman was Jarrard's teacher.

Kimberly Ann Montgomery, a Magruder High School junior, received the Achievement in Youth Endeavors Award at the National Association of Blacks Within Government's "Salute to Black Women." The award honors achievement, inspiration and service to the community. Lisa Olson, of Walter Johnson High School, won the National Scholastic/Kodak National Medallion of Excellence in Photography in addition to an honor award for her photographic work. Her teacher was Bonnie Collier.

Magruder High School student Susan Ryman earned All-American distinction in gymnastics, an award given to fewer than 40 high school gymnasts nationally each year.

Daniel Silber, a student at Bethesda-Chevy Chase High School, spent last summer studying in Germany. He qualified for the all-expense paid four-week trip by scoring in the 90th percentile of the American Association of Teachers of German National Standardized Test.

Winners in the visual arts/middle school division of the National PTA Reflections project, "I Have a Dream," were Julius West Middle School students Hee Soonglee, first and Janet Gilchrist, second. They were students of Kusum Ohri.

Wendy Wright of Blair High School, received a third place environmental science award at the International Science and Engineering Fair in Columbus, Ohio. For her research on acid rain's effect on bean plants, she also received a special Department of Energy award. The second MCPS winner, Kimberly Searce of Wootton High School, also participated in the international fair with her project, "Does Word Significance, Grouping and Serial Position Affect the Brain's Ability in Word Memory?"

Joey Yaffe, from Wood Junior High School, was the male winner of the Maryland Outstanding Teens of America pageant. Two of Yaffe's classmates, Elyssa Diamond and Suzanne Diamond, were state finalists

in the female competition.

#### STAFF

Donald Barron, Wheaton High School physics teacher, was one of 12 teachers selected for a National Science Foundation grant to produce a media presentation on physics teaching.

Three MCPS staff were among 10 who were recognized as Outstanding Science Educators by the Washington Academy of Sciences and Joint Board on Science and Engineering Education. They are Ronald Bombick, Bethesda-Chevy Chase High School science resource teacher, Charles LaRue, elementary and middle school science coordinator and Gloria Seelman, Woodward High School biology teacher. Wayne Bussard, a teacher at Magruder High School, has been selected as National Gymnastic Coach of the Year.

Kevin P. Dwyer, MCPS psychologist and coordinator of the Learning Disabilities Project, received an Outstanding Chairperson Award from the National Association of School Psychologists for his ability to represent the diverse needs of children and the professionals who serve them. The award honored Dwyer's work with Congress and the Department of Education.

Bernice Easter, 2nd grade teacher at Weller Road Elementary School, won a first place ribbon and gold medal for her photograph "Rainbow," in the Council of Maryland Camera Club All-Maryland Contest.

Richard Fazio, instrumental teacher at Woodward High School was among 15 conductors selected from the U.S. and Canada to participate in the Northern Bay Music Festival Orchestral Conducting Symposium. Yolanda Fernandez, foreign language resource teacher at Richard Montgomery High School, received the Distinguished Cuban American Teacher's Award, sponsored by The Cuban Educational Crusade.

Joy Frechtling, director of instructional evaluation and testing, won the "best presentation award" at an American Educational Research Association conference.

Donald M. Graham, principal at Candlewood Elementary School, has been selected as one of 54 outstanding principals in the first annual National Distinguished Principals Awards program.

Magruder High School math teacher Margaret Marcou, Springbrook High School math teacher Elizabeth Offutt, Wootton High School science resource teacher Ronald Smetanick, and Gateway Alternative School science teacher Daisy Withers were finalists for the 1984 Presidential Awards for Excellence in Teaching Science and Mathematics.

Joe Marosy, Montgomery Blair High School physical education resource teacher, has received the certificate of merit, the highest award given by the American Red Cross. Last December, Marosy applied

mouth-to-mouth resuscitation to a student who had been struck by a private school bus. After about one minute, the victim began breathing on her own. The certificate of merit, presented Sept. 19, was signed by President Ronald Reagan and Jerome Holland, Red Cross national chairman.

Sandra Metcalfe, of Wheaton High School, was a finalist and Jonetta Russell, of Gaithersburg High School, and Mary Thomson, formerly of Peary High School, were semifinalists for the 1984 National Association of Biology Teachers Outstanding Biology Teacher Award for Maryland.

James Myerberg, Testing Coordinator, Division of Instruction Evaluation and Testing in the Department of Educational Accountability, competed in the United States Masters Swimming National Championships at Raleigh, North Carolina. He competed in seven events and placed in all seven events.

Three MCPS science teachers, Andrew Pogan of Poolesville High School, George Smeller of Wootton High School and Bruce Snyder of Redland Middle School, were judged national finalists for the Student Space Shuttle Involvement Program, sponsored by the National Science Teachers Association and NASA. Finalists' proposals will be considered for a future shuttle flight.

Jan Redinger, home economics resource teacher at Wheaton High School, was selected as the Maryland Home Economics Teacher of the Year for 1984. She was also named a National Merit Winner for Family Life Education in a competition sponsored by the American Home Economics Association and Cheseborough-Pond's Inc.

Laura Steele, kindergarten teacher at Harmony Hills Elementary School, was named Outstanding Volunteer in Special Events by YWCA of the National Capital Area.

Robert Turnbull, industrial arts teacher at Seneca Valley High School, won a Maryland conservation district award for an extracurricular project. Turnbull advanced to the regional competition of the awards program sponsored by Allis Chalmers Corporation and the National Association of Conservation Districts.

#### GROUPS AND PROGRAMS

Jeff Bruner, editor of the Gaithersburg Junior High School Sword and Shield, was named top junior high journalist, and Molly Gross, editor of the Blair High School Silverlogue, was selected top yearbook staffer for 1983-84 by the Maryland-Delaware-District of Columbia Press Association. In the senior high competition for journalist of the year, Marcia Hack, editor of the Churchill Observer, won third place, and John Heyde, editor of Walt Whitman High School's Black and White, won honorable mention. Tania Hahn and Steve Gamboa of Einstein High School received Bealor Memorial Scholarships to participate in a newspaper workshop and Kendra Franconi, Gaithersburg Junior High School, received the Regis Boyle

Scholarship to participate in the yearbook design workshop at the University of Maryland.

The Churchill High School Observer was named best all-around newspaper of 57 represented at a convention at Temple University in Philadelphia.

Ninety-three MCPS students won awards at the 1984 Maryland School Film Festival. Earlier at the local level, there were 1,800 MCPS students who competed before the state level. Heavily involved in this activity was Harry Swope, TV program specialist. Sponsors included: Robert Berry, technical services assistant from Woodward High School; Linda Crump, media specialist from Gaithersburg High School; Brian Filano, media specialist and Barbara Walker, fifth grade teacher from Washington Grove Elementary School; Rusty Flint, technical services assistant from Bethesda-Chevy Chase High School; Jane Hsu, instructional materials aide from Seven Locks Elementary School; Ann Padelford, media specialist from Darnestown Elementary School; Rachel Rankin, media specialist from Chevy Chase Elementary School; Kathleen Secker, media specialist from Sherwood Elementary School; and Jerry Ward, vocational department aide from Damascus High School.

The Air Force ROTC program at Northwood High School was named recipient of an Air Force Meritorious Award. About 15 percent of the 61 northeastern high schools with AFROTC programs receive the award annually. Col. John Langford and Sgt. Marvin Morris administer Northwood's three-year-old program.

Gaithersburg High School has won the 1984 Mae Graham School Library Media Program of the Year Award, which is given to Maryland's most outstanding elementary, junior and senior high school media centers on a rotating basis. Linda Crump is the media specialist.

Magruder High School's team placed second in the "Moby Dick" competition at the state Olympics of the Mind finals. Robert Hines, of the social studies department, was the team sponsor.

Thirteen MCPS junior and senior high school students won awards in the 57th annual National Scholastic Art competition. Students were selected regionally in a screening sponsored by the Corcoran School of Art. They are: Hugo Silberberg of Walt Whitman High School, who received a scholarship. Medals were presented to Michelle Kwong, Michael Wessler and Michelle Kelner of Hoover Junior High School; Michael Shiller of Walter Johnson High School; Christina Ford, Walt Whitman High School; and Rebecca Abernethy and Rina Yang of the Visual Arts Center.

The Ridgeview Junior High School Advanced Band, under the direction of Robert Isle, received superior ratings in all categories at the State Band Festival at Charles County Community College. Because judging was based on stringent requirements, the all-superior rating ranks Ridgeview Junior High School among the best junior high bands in the state. Other MCPS bands receiving recognition for

achievement were Martin Luther King Junior High School, directed by Brian Hartle; Gaithersburg Junior High School, directed by Jim Jacobsen; Churchill High School, directed by Richard Swope; and Bethesda-Chevy Chase High School, directed by David Levin.

The National Association of Jazz Educators has named the following to its 1984-85 All-Star Jazz Ensemble: Tenor Sax - Susan Schantz, of Walt Whitman High School; Warren Gibbons, also from Walt Whitman High School; and Wiley Hodges of Richard Montgomery High School. Trumpet - John Sanchez of Rockville High School, Derrick Farmer of Walt Whitman High School, and Mike Lowenthal of Bethesda-Chevy Chase High School. Trombone - Phillip Wolfle and Marcel Belanger of Richard Montgomery High School. Drums - Kevin Jurin of Walt Whitman High School and Mark Haugen of Richard Montgomery High School.

Five students of Blair High School health occupations teacher Helen Ryan won awards at the Health Occupations Students of America spring convention. They were Mary Ann Darling, second place extemporaneous speaking; Lynne Montrose of Springbrook High School, third place medical spelling; and Caroline Clementson, Pamela Fields and Ky Lim, second place for a team community awareness project.

In the recent Folger Shakespeare High School Festival, Springbrook High School's Shakespearean Troupe presented a collection of scenes entitled "Partners of Greatness." Brynell Bennett and Ben Barnett won Best Actress and Actor respectively, and Karen Meyer was Best Ensemble Player. Awarded the honor of Best Performance by a Drama Club, Springbrook was one of five schools performing at the Folger's Festival Highlights Night. Troupe director was Lee Viccellio.

Northwood High School students won 11 of 23 awards presented from more than 200 entries in the Western Maryland High School Poetry Contest. Kristina Yee won third prize; Margaret Mary Wilson, Seth Riebman, Lisa Pelletier and Helen Shueh won fourth prizes, and Lisa Pelletier, Jo'el Brenner, Rosa Hwang, Wendy Katzman and Caroline Russell won honorable mentions. Kate Hammer of Wootton High School also received an honorable mention.

Montgomery County schools were at the top of elementary, intermediate and senior divisions in this year's Maryland Mathematics League competition. In the high school division, Wootton High School and Churchill High School were two of three schools tied for first place. In separate seventh and eighth grade competitions, Pyle Intermediate School teams scored first in both competitions. Burning Tree Elementary School was first among elementary schools participating. The person largely responsible for this superb effort was Eric Walstein, Bethesda-Chevy Chase High School mathematics resource teacher, who coaches and trains students for competition at this event as well as for others, such as the Northeastern competition at Penn State.

MCPS had four winners in the national Scholastic Writing Contest. From Springbrook High School, Kenneth Cohen won first place and Nayan Shah won honorable mention in essay. Seth Riebman of

Northwood High School won third place and Jo'el Brenner, also from Northwood, won honorable mention in essay. Teachers Carol Reinsburg of Springbrook High School and Mary Lee Ruddle of Northwood High School were among 20 nationwide with two or more winners.

Springbrook High School's math team was over-all statewide winner at the second annual competition of the Maryland School-College Math Association. Springbrook also won first place in the county competition. Team members were Mark Ahrens, Lloyd Cha, Thanh Cong, Mustafa Haque, Kenneth Hartman, Paul Kapp, Lucy Pao, David Romano, Peter Shawhan and David Wade. Team sponsor is Barbara Jaques. Of the forty-three regional high school teams competing in the 1984 Physics Olympics at the University of Maryland, four of the top five teams were from MCPS: Wootton High School came in first, Seneca Valley High School came in second, Walter Johnson High School came in third and Poolesville Junior-Senior High School came in fifth. In the crowd-pleasing bridge-building event, Poolesville placed first. Using no more than 2.2 pounds of popsicle sticks and Elmer's glue, Poolesville student Leslie Marshall built a bridge that held 3,360 pounds before breaking.

The Rockville High School "It's Academic" team won the Washington area WRC-TV competition. The Ramademics, Linda Liu, Marc Intrater, and Joseph Hsu, were coached by English and journalism teacher Kevin Keegan.

MCPS won three of five awards given in the poster contest that was part of the Maryland Foreign Language Association's "Internationalizing Your Classroom" conference in Baltimore. Whitman High School entries won first and second place, and Ridgeview Junior High School won fourth. Tilden Intermediate School was runner-up.

The Springbrook High School Naval Junior ROTC unit has been selected to receive the Chief of Naval Education and Training Award given to eight units nationwide. Springbrook was designated as the No. 1 unit in five states and the District of Columbia.

The Damascus High School Band, directed by Matt Kuhn, was invited to play in France and England as part of "Operation Friendly Invasion" which commemorated the June 6, 1944, landing of Allied forces on Normandy Beach.

The Rampage, Rockville High School, ranked among the top thirty high school newspapers nationwide for the 1981-85 period by the Columbia Scholastic Press Association. Lane Thomasson is the current editor and Kevin Keegan is the faculty advisor.

NATIONAL ACHIEVEMENT SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAM FOR OUTSTANDING NEGRO STUDENTS SEMIFINALISTS

BETHESDA-CHEVY CHASE HIGH SCHOOL  
Phala E. Kimbrough  
Michael T. Risher

PAINT BRANCH HIGH SCHOOL  
Anthony J. Johnson

BLAIR HIGH SCHOOL

Erika L. Boyer  
Thomas Broadwater

CHURCHILL HIGH SCHOOL  
SCHOOL

Amy E. Blunt  
Jonathan S. Holloway

KENNEDY HIGH SCHOOL

Claire E. Cherry  
Dianthe R. Eiland

RICHARD MONTGOMERY HIGH SCHOOL

Michelle A. Hall

SEMIFINALISTS IN THE 1985 NATIONAL MERIT SCHOLARSHIP QUALIFYING  
EXAMINATION

BETHESDA CHEVY-CHASE HIGH SCHOOL  
SCHOOL

Jeremy B. Bergsman  
Arthur L. Burris  
Elizabeth K. Esty  
Benjamin R. Foster  
Daniel S. Gaylin  
Laurie J. Goldberg  
Leila O. Hudson  
Maura M. Kearns  
Karen E. Lasko  
James T. Lawrence  
Louisa C. Lund  
Claire G. Manwell  
Laura H. Porter  
Michael T. Risher  
SCHOOL  
Juliet I. Weiss  
Matthew J. Zapruder

MONTGOMERY BLAIR HIGH SCHOOL

Kevin D. Diamant  
Omar A. Manuar  
Michelle L. Stewart

WINSTON CHURCHILL HIGH SCHOOL

Catherine V. Atwell  
Laura J. Chanchien

ROCKVILLE HIGH SCHOOL

Patricia Gill

SENECA VALLEY HIGH

Tresa D. Pinkney

SPRINGBROOK HIGH SCHOOL

Lisa M. Nicholls  
Christopher L. Tynes

WALT WHITMAN HIGH SCHOOL

Peter A. James

ALBERT EINSTEIN HIGH

Josh Heller

GAITHERSBURG HIGH SCHOOL

Jeffrey Cohen  
Inna M. Feyns  
Tejal K. Gandhi  
Christopher Lee Garner  
Erik R. May  
Iyu Tai  
Kathleen A. Whalen  
Douglas A. Wolf

WALTER JOHNSON HIGH

Daniela Amzel  
Anand S. Dighe  
Jordan A. Drachman  
John R. Frantz  
John C. Hovendon  
Sharon F. Lean  
James D. Lewin  
Kathleen T. McCoskrie  
Thomas L. Nissley  
Renee A. Oatway  
Brenda L. Shapiro  
Jean A. Shapiro

David M. Chao  
Loretta Y. Chen  
Jason A. Dickstein  
SCHOOL  
Susan Gorman  
Kelvin B. Hao  
Rea A. Inglesis  
Julian Y. Kim  
Adam E. Kulakow  
Steven S. McWilliams  
Marielle S. Palombo  
Deborah J. Satinsky  
Erica N. Schulman  
Andrew F. Shorr  
Lynn M. Sprott  
SCHOOL  
Deborah L. Weltz

DAMASCUS HIGH SCHOOL

Michael A. Bell  
David M. Cohen  
Jeffrey A. Regner

PAINT BRANCH HIGH SCHOOL

Chenteh K. Fan  
Beth Friedman  
Erika Gaffney  
Karen B. Manheimer

POOLESVILLE HIGH SCHOOL

Sayan Chakraborty

ROCKVILLE HIGH SCHOOL

Stanley W. Brown  
Ann L. Codori  
Kenneth W. Dahl  
Barbara M. Fried  
Joshua D. Gezelter  
Patricia Gill  
Laura L. Pierce  
Nicholas G. Rigopoulos  
Susan R. Stolovy

SENECA VALLEY HIGH SCHOOL

Laurice H. Chow  
Courtney A. Clements  
Jonathan S. Kay  
Ilkyoon S. Kim  
Amy F. Rabb  
Randy S. Swit

Joanne Wu

JOHN F. KENNEDY HIGH

Karen V. Chenausky  
Joshua A. Gordon  
David L. Kaminsky  
Dana L. Shoenberg

MAGRUDER HIGH SCHOOL

Susan L. Parker

RICHARD MONTGOMERY HIGH

Marcel B. J. Belanger  
Ronald A. Broadhurst  
Regina Marie Kreger

NORTHWOOD HIGH SCHOOL

Kichul J. Nam  
WALT WHITMAN HIGH SCHOOL  
Eva H. Baker  
Palma E. Catravas  
Dean C. Chang  
Michael B. Eisen  
Douglas C. Elliott  
Adam T. Feild  
Laura R. Gaffney  
Elizabeth G. Hendricks  
David G. Jarvis  
John W. Kelly  
Sara R. Levine  
David A. Manzano  
Alice S. Mendelsohn  
David A. Morris  
Franklin H. Myhr  
David E. Nassau  
Mary F. Palomba  
Steven C. Papkin  
Jeremy N. Rich  
Clifford J. Rogers  
Laura M. Romberg  
Joshua V. Rosenberg  
Gerald S. Rourke  
William R. Schief  
Deborah S. Sobeloff  
Beth A. Stekler  
Kimberly S. Stopak  
Johnna B. Tipton  
Daniel J. Vanderryn

SHERWOOD HIGH SCHOOL  
Wayne W. Finnegar  
SCHOOL  
SPRINGBROOK HIGH SCHOOL

Suneel Bhagat  
John T. Birmingham  
Jacqueline L. Duby  
Lorin M. Hitt  
Caleb Kleppner  
Susan M. Krizek  
SCHOOL  
David Y. Ting

WHEATON HIGH SCHOOL

Lynn M. Cherny  
Brian L. Klock  
James P. Ledwell  
Leland J. Tankersley

Christine C. Waldmann  
David E. Williams  
CHARLES WOODWARD HIGH

David M. Avery  
Dorit S. Brenner  
Chris J. Conlon  
Anne E. Messitte  
Jonathan S. Snyder  
Richard L. Sohn

THOMAS WOOTTON HIGH

Lewis S. Bruck  
Eric B. Fretz  
Mark A. Goodin  
Imi E. Hwangbo  
Dan Reiter  
Linus T. Wang

Re: New Business

1. Dr. Cronin moved and Mr. Ewing seconded the following:

Resolved, That in the spring the school system conduct a symposium to discuss the educational effectiveness of the JIM (junior/intermediate/middle) schools.

2. Miss Duby moved and Mrs. Praisner seconded the following:

Resolved, That the Board of Education schedule a discussion of peer counseling.

3. Mr. Ewing moved and Dr. Floyd seconded the following:

WHEREAS, The Board of Education and the school system, as well as all students in Area 3, have benefited from the wise advice and excellent recommendations from the Area 3 Task Force, established by the Board in 1983 to advise the Board on Area 3 program and facility needs; and

WHEREAS, The Board has recognized that these area program and facility needs in Area 2 must be addressed, on which the Board needs the advice and recommendations of parents and other citizens; and

WHEREAS, The Board wishes to make certain that the advice it receives takes account of its five priorities, adopted in 1983 and reaffirmed in 1984; and

WHEREAS, The Board would like to be able to take account of Area 2 needs identified by the task force in the 1985-86 school year budget; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Board of Education establish an Area 2 Task Force, the purpose of which shall be to identify program and facility needs in Area 2 schools which should be addressed by the school system; and be it further

Resolved, That the task force shall give advice on how its recommendations support and strengthen the school system's efforts to achieve the objectives set forth in the Board of Education's five priorities; and be it further

Resolved, That the task force shall be comprised of representatives from each school in Area 2, and in addition shall include one principal from each level (elementary, JIM and high school) and one teacher from each level, and four other citizens chosen for their areawide and/or countywide perspective, but residing in Area 2; and be it further

Resolved, That the task force shall have a liaison person designated by the superintendent to work with the task force and shall operate under the regulations the Board has established for its advisory committees, including election by the task force of its own chairperson; and be it further

Resolved, That the task force shall convene as soon as possible, so that at least a preliminary report may be available before the Board adopts its budget for the 1985-86 school year.

Re: Items of Information

Board members received the following items of information:

1. Items in Process
2. Construction Progress Report
3. School Facilities Change Order/Bid Activity Quarterly Report
4. Annual Report - QIE
5. Annual Report - Information
6. Annual Report - Association Relations

Resolution No. 538-84                      Re: Adjournment

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education adjourn its meeting at 5:15 p.m.

President

Secretary

WSC:mlw