

first page of the document was a summary of the document presented to the Board in July. He introduced Dr. Thomas O'Toole, director of special education, and Mrs. Margit Meissner, assistant for policy development who worked with the task force.

* Mrs. Peyser joined the meeting at this point.

Dr. Cody reported that at yesterday's administrative team meeting there was a discussion of a proposal from Dr. Fountain's staff on continuing work on objectives and problems in the special education area. Once it worked through the staff, it would be brought to the Board sometime in January. He cited the transition from school to work which was a major part of the second document.

Mr. Ewing commented that in the memo on reaffirmation of Board policy there was reference to increased in-service needs. He wondered what they were planning to do in the way of assuring that this staff training would be done in advance of the time the program changed. Dr. O'Toole replied that in regard to the mod task force report through a federal project at the University of Maryland they had been training special education staff for new roles. One of the major thrusts would be to have the community be the classroom or the educational setting. The federal project has built into it training of the teachers in Concord, Longview, and Stephen Knolls. They had already done intensive training of staff in the satellite schools. In addition, they had done some program training of staff in regular schools. They had done training of students in regular schools. They also planned to meet with ancillary staff such as speech pathologists and physical therapists. Previously they had had all their youngsters in the same building, and now they were spread out when they went to the satellite concept. This changed the delivery of services.

Dr. Fountain reported that through their in-service training unit they had mainstreaming coordinators in each of their schools. Dr. Fagen would continue to assist these people to gain skills they could use with regular education staff. For the past two and a half years they had been working with bus drivers and attendants in getting them ready for some changes. Their major concern was retrofitting the regular classroom teachers and attendants who would move the classroom from the four walls to the job site.

Mrs. Meissner commented that they had to keep in mind this was not going to be done on a mammoth scale. They had to look at the particular school environment and the type of student they were putting into that environment. Then they would do the type of training needed for this particular school at that time. Dr. Cody noted that staff development was in the other document being worked on by the staff. If they followed the general scheme, the objective and strategy would be elaborated on more in the detailed plan of action. It would include the magnitude of the training and the resources that would be needed. Mrs. Praisner assumed that this document would also have references to facilities implications and space in buildings.

Mr. Ewing thought that the report moved them in the right direction, but at the same time he knew there would be people who would have questions about this. He asked about plans to assure that the report got enough circulation so that they could get some feedback. Dr. Fountain replied that they had been working with the advisory council on dissemination and feedback. They would distribute the report to the schools and ask for feedback. He remarked that they did have a good track record now because 80 of these students were in regular schools now. He cited the example of Woodward High School where the principal had welcomed these students.

Dr. Cronin stated that in the recommendations of the advisory committee on the rights of handicapped individuals there was a recommendation for a staff person to coordinate job placement for handicapped. He asked whether they had accepted or rejected this. Dr. Fountain believed the way they were going about it was the best way. They had a responsibility to make sure that the quality of the program as well as the cost of getting it done was sensible. They felt the administrator knew the program very well and would be able to spend enough time to coordinate the program. Dr. Cronin asked whether the person would have job placement responsibility. Dr. O'Toole replied that the person would be assisting with the overall coordination. As they were preparing next year's budget, they had been thinking about restructuring one position into a job coordinator. He thought this would give them more mileage than creating a position to work only with one program. They did have people working on job coordination at Rock Terrace.

Dr. Cronin noted the proposed resolution in the package and asked whether it incorporated attachment 4. Dr. O'Toole explained that it was not meant to. Dr. Cronin stated that the only way he would vote to approve the reaffirmation was if it included a conceptual framework. Dr. Cody replied that he would have no problem including this. Mrs. Praisner thought Dr. Cronin wanted a Resolved that said the Board endorsed the charter, and Dr. Cronin agreed.

Dr. Cronin said the program focus spoke to transportation and retraining. He had raised a number of questions in pre-Board about how they would do the training. In transportation one of the problems he noted was that by using their buses for handicapped pick up, high school pick up, and elementary pick up they were picking up some profoundly handicapped children at 6 a.m. which meant parents or group home personnel had to start at 4 a.m. to prepare these students for school. He thought that this really needed to be considered and coordinated so that parents and children did not have a double burden. Dr. O'Toole replied that they were able to modify this schedule. They did point out the need for transportation and were working closely with transportation personnel. One way to help with the time problem was to transport special education and regular education students together. Another way was to have youngsters attend sites closest to their homes. Dr. Cronin hoped that they would make a commitment to having these sites in use for a long time. Dr. Fountain hoped that this would be the case, but he noted

that staff was realistic about this. Dr. Cody commented that as they dealt with facilities there had been a general tendency to put a special program in a regular school and as things changed to move that special program. He thought that facility plans should be long-range. They should make decisions based on the best locations for the students, and these decisions should be long-term. Dr. Cronin could see no reason why when they spent time planning transportation and teacher training a program would not last minimally five to ten years.

Dr. Cronin inquired about teacher/pupil ratios. Dr. O'Toole replied that with severely and profoundly handicapped they had a ratio of six students to one teacher and one aide when they moved that program out into a satellite. If the program stayed at the special school, they would have nine students to one teacher and two aides. Dr. Cronin asked whether all programs conformed to that ratio, and Dr. O'Toole replied that generally they did.

Dr. Cronin asked who was responsible for obtaining the cooperative training agreements and whether they received a progress report on those. Dr. O'Toole replied that at present the individual coordinators in the different centers were responsible for this. They wrote up an agreement with different facilities where youngsters were trained and indicated what MCPS agreed to provide. They evaluated this on the basis of the individual students placed, and then they sat down periodically with the people from the facilities and reviewed the plan. In addition, there were staff visits to these sites. Dr. Cronin asked whether they had a sufficient range of employers, and Dr. O'Toole replied that he did not think so. Dr. Cronin asked whether MCARC could assist in this endeavor, and Dr. O'Toole replied that they had already been very helpful.

Dr. Cronin was concerned about evaluation because it was defused. Progress was documented on IEPs which the Board never saw, and this was summarized in vague annual reports. Dr. Fountain commented that he had been evaluated on this point. He explained that because this was a new venture they did not want to make promises they could not keep. At a later point they would be better able to tell the Board precisely what their goals were. They had established a cooperative effort with the other associate superintendents, and next year they would be better able to have an evaluation.

Dr. Cronin stated that home/school cooperation was extremely important because it was a continuation of a training process at home and so that the parent knew what their child was doing. A parent had raised the idea of monthly progress reports; however, for some students there would be minimal progress in only a month, but it seemed to Dr. Cronin that two reports a year were too little. Dr. Fountain thought that the work they did with severely and profoundly handicapped youngsters was closely related to what happened in the home. He would not want to be tied down to a monthly report for every student, but he explained that for some students there were reports home on a daily basis.

Dr. Floyd commented that he would underscore Dr. Cronin's view that they not add additional burden on parents in these particular cases. A few weeks ago he had visited John T. Baker Intermediate School, and he would commended the principal Phil Dean and his staff for their work in interacting with handicapped students.

Mrs. Praisner stated that on a couple of occasions she had suggested that this might be an excellent story for the county newspapers. She wondered when the Board would receive the plans that were now before the Administrative Team. Dr. Cody thought that this would be available in January. He explained that this was an overall plan for all the departments and divisions. Mrs. Praisner asked if they had used the Economic Advisory Council and the Foundations to contact potential employers. Mrs. Meissner replied that they were working with a variety of groups. However, federal agencies were more interested because they were under a mandate to have handicapped workers. She emphasized that they could not do this on a large scale because of site supervision. Dr. Fountain reported that they were now employing two handicapped students in his office.

Mrs. Praisner thanked staff for an interesting report. She looked forward to receiving the staff plan and the proposed resolution of reaffirmation.

Re: Staff Plans and Response to
Nonpublic Special Education
(Jones Report)

Dr. Fountain called attention to the sentence which stated that this paper only dealt with K-12, Levels 5 and 6. He said that the number of school-aged nonresidential placements had been decreasing substantially over the past four years. Fewer students were being placed outside of MCPS, and these placements were for shorter periods of time. Students placed in private settings were the more severely handicapped students. Costs continued to escalate at a rate higher than the Jones study projected. They believed that a consistent core of students would continue to need residential placement in the foreseeable future. Dr. Fountain said that staff would not be in favor, at this time, of operating their own residential facility. He explained that their five-year facility plan would deal with many of the concerns in both reports. He introduced Ms. Judith Kenney, former student placement supervisor, and Mrs. Mary Lee Phelps, acting student placement supervisor.

Dr. Cronin said that staff had received a letter from Mr. David Williams, School for Contemporary Education, and asked that the staff provide a copy of their response to Mr. Williams. Dr. Cronin reported that recently a couple of state hearing examiners had overruled the school system, and on page 2 there was a footnote which indicated that Social Services or Juvenile Services could overrule MCPS decisions as well. Mrs. Praisner explained that it was not an issue of overruling decisions, it was who paid for the services. Dr. Cronin asked about the basis for the decision to go

to a residential placement. Mrs. Phelps replied that the issue was that the school system had determined that the child's educational needs could be met in a day placement, and other agencies might perceive other needs. Dr. Fountain added that MCPS would pick up the educational piece, and the other agencies would pay the rest.

Ms. Kenney said that at the point of decision-making, MCPS was guided by the least restrictive environment for the child. If they believed they could provide the child with an appropriate and reasonable education in a day program, this would be their decision at that point. Dr. Cronin was concerned that they be careful not to segment because the home environment could set back the daily learning environment. Ms. Kenney explained that they were required to look at what was required for the child to make reasonable educational progress. They looked at what happened to this child over the weekend or on a daily basis. Dr. Cody commented that if they came across a situation like this, it would be referred to another public agency.

Dr. Cronin asked staff to comment on facilitating the return of students. Mrs Phelps replied that the central placement office's function was to serve as a monitor and a source of information in determining program needs. They advise Dr. O'Toole's office of programming needs. Dr. O'Toole commented that his office worked very closely with Mrs. Phelps and her staff. Dr. Fountain added that Dr. O'Toole was responsible for the education of all special education students in Montgomery County. Dr. O'Toole received assistance from other units; however, if he felt the children could not be educated in the school system he would refer the students to the central placement unit.

Dr. Cronin inquired about the discretion in Level 5 and 6 placements of minority students. He said it would appear that to qualify to Levels 5 and 6 the student had to have severe physical or emotional difficulties. Therefore, if they found an imbalance, they would to address other causes rather than the school system discriminating. Mrs. Phelps felt that most of the students placed in the nonpublic programs at Levels 5 and 6 were appropriately placed. She reported that part of the plan addressed at the Administrative Team was to determine whether the identification of black students was correct. They were planning to have a study team look at that issue and make some recommendations. Dr. Fountain stated that the question in the report had to do with the large number of minority students in programs up through Level 5 public, but there was a wide difference in the percentage with the students in private placement. He thought that the gap had narrowed from the time of the study to the present.

Dr. Cronin called attention to the statement about an active list and inactive list of schools and asked whether they had guidelines for removing schools from participation. Mrs. Phelps replied that they did not. She explained that by saying active and inactive they had students placed but they did not actively refer new students to many of those programs. Ms. Kenney added that there were state

guidelines for state approval for a special education program. There were also guidelines for local agencies as well to look at compliance with state mandates.

Dr. Cronin noted that the question of therapeutic intervention for seriously emotionally disturbed students appeared to remain unsolved. Dr. Fountain replied that he would say "partially unsolved." They did have the RICA program with a therapeutic environment and had a good working relationship with the Health Department and the new health director for Mark Twain in getting more psychiatric time for that school. Dr. Cronin inquired about criteria to assess that need, and Dr. Fountain said they considered the fact that they had so many students who were emotionally disturbed. Dr. Cronin asked whether next year's budget would reflect the need, and Dr. Fountain replied that they were handling that need through private providers. If this got to be too expensive, they would talk about other options. Dr. Fountain explained that this year they budgeted \$5.8 million and used about \$5.6 million. Although costs had increased, this year they would be all right because of the reduction in numbers of students. Dr. Cronin asked if the staff plan under consideration would include this aspect. Dr. Cody replied that it would not. The plan dealt with major initiatives such as the proportion of minority students in Levels 1 through 4. Dr. Fountain added that they had never had any major difficulty with the Board or County Council on this part of the budget.

Mr. Ewing was concerned about the nature and extent of the problem with emotionally handicapped students. While it might not be a budgetary problem, he thought it was a problem of the Board's understanding of the extent of the problem. He said a student with learning disabilities might have emotional disturbances, and that might be true to a substantial extent with those who were retarded. It would be desirable for the Board to have some better sense of the scope of the problem, the trends, and how this relates to other programs. He had the sense that all of them were struggling to comprehend what they had here. He had heard from parents who were also struggling with this. He suggested that they have some sense of this problem as a separate item. Mrs. Praisner agreed that this would make a useful issue paper for the Board. The paper could show the issue as staff saw it and the kinds of questions the system would have to address for students and staff and educational decisions. After they received the paper, Board members might want to discuss the paper and raise additional questions.

Mr. Ewing commented that he was pleased to see that the staff report, while including some agreement with some recommendations of the Jones report, did not rely on the Jones report analyses and data for its judgments about what the school system needed. He did not think the Jones report was well done at all in terms of the quality of the analysis, and related to that were some of the conclusions in the report. Some conclusions supported a trend toward the return of students from private placement. He said that while this was not a bad idea, there were a substantial number of people in the community

who believed that the school system first made up its mind to withdraw students from private placements and then found data to support the conclusion. He thought this was unfair, but this was supported in part by the Jones report. He thought this was a problem they had to deal with in terms of public perception. They had to make it clear that the principles upon which they based their decisions were principles arrived at by considering what was best for children. He suggested prefacing the staff plan with a clear and precise statement about why they were doing what they were doing and how this would benefit students.

Dr. Fountain explained that they had made major changes in going from 200 plus students to 117, the residential part of the project. They had not increased day programs substantially. He said the Jones study did not deal at all with any student below kindergarten. He said they had been working very closely with their private providers because MCPS was responsible for the education of the students. He thought they had not had any disagreements with providers for the school-aged population. Ms. Kenney said that they talked about costs because that was the purpose of the Jones study. However, they did not often talk about the instructional program. Their goal was for students to receive quality education, and the Jones study supported the need to look at the instructional element. Mr. Ewing explained that he was not suggesting that he thought the critics were correct. He was suggesting that the criticisms were there and needed to be answered.

Mrs. Peyser imagined that it was easy to identify retarded youngsters at an early age; however, she believed that most learning disabled students did not start out with emotional problems. Many emotional problems started because students were not identified young enough as learning disabled students. She suggested that one way to facilitate the early identification of these students and prevent emotional disturbances from developing was to have smaller classes at the elementary grades. Teachers would be better able to know their students.

Mrs. DiFonzo noted that the number of students enrolled fluctuated depending on the time of the year. Mrs. Phelps explained that these were students approved but not placed or not yet receiving funding approval.

Dr. Cronin stated that recently there had been instances in the newspaper of abuse of persons at residential centers. He asked about the MCPS responsibility for a student placed in that environment. Mrs. Praisner asked about the review that MCPS did about the staff and programs in these schools. * Miss Duby joined the meeting at this point. Ms. Kenney replied that when students were placed in residential programs they were approved by the Maryland Department of Education. Therefore, there was joint responsibility between the state and the local educational agency to monitor and to assure that the facility is appropriate and that the environment is safe. Dr. Cronin asked whether they had placements at Great Oaks, and Dr. O'Toole replied that they did not place at

Great Oaks but were providing educational services for some 40 Montgomery County students. He said that state Department of Education did monitor and evaluate those facilities, and last year Great Oaks was evaluated. By having a number of students from Great Oaks in MCPS, they did have daily contact with the staff there. All MCPS youngsters were monitored for signs of child abuse. Dr. Fountain said that in the case of MCPS placements in private schools they did do on-site investigations. Ms. Kenney added that if an MCPS student was in private placement and they felt a need to visit that school, staff would be sent to that school immediately. Dr. Fountain reported that this year he was recommending that they involve regular school principals and area office staff to get a better understanding for students reentering MCPS and a better perception of the instructional program in private schools.

Mrs. Praisner thanked staff for their report.

Re: Executive Session

The Board met in executive session from 11:45 to 1:35 p.m. to discuss personnel matters and legal issues. *Dr. Greenblatt joined the meeting during executive session.

Re: Board/Press/Visitor
Conference

The following individuals appeared before the Board:

1. Janet Rodkey, Kensington community
2. Vincent Foo, MCCSSE

Resolution No. 561-84 Re: Award of Procurement Contracts
over \$25,000

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

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

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

	Name(s) of Vendor(s)	Dollar Value of Contract
P-MEMO-1	Staff Cars for Division of Transportation Gladding Chevrolet	\$ 49,974
12-85	Uniforms Suburban Uniform Company	\$ 84,366
28-85	Canned Fruits	

	Carroll County Foods	\$ 76,146
	Frederick Produce Co., Inc.	78,561
	Total	\$154,707
85-05	Taxicab Transportation for Handicapped	
	Barwood, Inc.	\$176,129
	Silver Spring Taxi, Inc.	46,380
	Total	\$222,509
	GRAND TOTAL	\$511,556

Resolution No. 562-84 Re: Award of Contract - Furnish and
Install Industrial Arts Modifications -
Various Schools

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

WHEREAS, Funds were approved in the FY 1985 Capital Budget for industrial arts ventilation at various schools; and

WHEREAS, Sealed bids were received on October 25 to furnish and install industrial arts modifications at Cabin John, Hoover, and Takoma Park Junior High Schools, and Churchill and Walter Johnson High Schools, as indicated below:

Proposal A	Proposal B	Proposal C	Proposal D	Proposal E	
Total					
Cabin John	Hoover	Takoma Park	Churchill	Johnson	
Bidder - W. B. Maske Sheet Metal Works, Inc.					
\$ 6,853	\$ 6,774	\$22,073	\$ 2,983	\$ 9,685	\$
48,368*					
Bidder - Arey, Inc.					
\$ 8,350	\$ 9,095	\$29,670	\$ 4,480	\$ 9,900	\$
61,495					
Bidder - American Combustion, Inc.					
\$34,465	\$34,138	\$39,530	\$ 6,962	\$25,455	
\$140,550					

* Recommended award

and

WHEREAS, The low bidder, W. B. Maske Sheet Metal Works, Inc., has performed satisfactorily similar projects for Montgomery County Public Schools; and

WHEREAS, The bid results are within the staff estimate and sufficient funds exist for contract award; now therefore be it Resolved, That a contract be awarded to W. B. Maske Sheet Metal Works, Inc., in the amount of \$48,368 to furnish and install industrial arts modifications at Cabin John, Hoover, and Takoma Park Junior High Schools, and Churchill and Walter Johnson High Schools in

accordance with plans and specifications prepared by Morton Wood, Jr., Engineer.

Resolution No. 563-84 Re: William Tyler Page Elementary
School Reroofing (Area 1)

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

WHEREAS, Sealed bids were received on November 7 for the reroofing at William Tyler Page Elementary School as indicated below:

Bidder	Base Bid
1. R. D. Bean, Inc.	\$120,562
2. J. E. Wood & Sons Co., Inc.	124,147
3. Orndorff & Spaid, Inc.	130,939
4. Y.S.K. Construction Co., Inc.	146,430

and

WHEREAS, The low bidder, R. D. Bean, 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 \$120,562 be awarded to R. D. Bean, Inc., to accomplish reroofing at William Tyler Page Elementary School in accordance with plans and specifications dated October 19, 1984, prepared by the Division of Construction and Capital Projects.

Resolution No. 564-84 Re: Purchase of Relocatable Modular
Building - County Service Park -
Transportation Work Space

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

WHEREAS, A sealed bid was received on November 5, 1984, to purchase a relocatable modular building for the County Service Park as indicated below:

Bidder	Base Bid
Commercial Modular Systems, Inc.	\$57,000

and

WHEREAS, Several prospective bidders were solicited; however, only one bid was received; and

WHEREAS, Staff has reviewed the bid and has determined it to be reasonable, within the budget, and in strict accordance with the

WHEREAS, Asbestos was discovered during demolition and steps were immediately taken to identify the work that needed to be done and the approximate cost of the asbestos removal; and

WHEREAS, A proposal dated October 12 from the general contractor, Kimmel & Kimmel, Inc., in the amount of \$63,721 was recommended for approval by the project architect, Eugene A. Delmar & Associates; and

WHEREAS, The work was authorized on an emergency basis by appropriate staff to remove the material; now therefore be it

Resolved, That a change order for \$63,721 to the contract with Kimmel & Kimmel, Inc., be approved to remove asbestos from plaster ceilings at Montgomery Blair High School.

Resolution No. 567-84 Re: Bradley Hills Elementary School -
Modernization Project Change Order
(Area 2)

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

WHEREAS, A contract for the modernization of Bradley Hills Elementary School was awarded to J. Roland Dashiell & Sons, Inc. and J. Roland Dashiell Realty Company A Named Joint Venture on November 21, 1983; and

WHEREAS, A modest contingency of 1.5 percent was identified as the uncommitted contingency at project award; and

WHEREAS, A normal contingency for a project of this type is 5 percent; and

WHEREAS, The original contingency identified at project award has been depleted; and

WHEREAS, Additional needs have been identified in the amount of \$70,000 to fund a change order proposal No. 4 for asphalt paving and to establish a small contingency for the remainder of the project; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the county executive be requested to recommend approval of a transfer of \$70,000 from the Local Unliquidated Surplus Account 997-01 (balance before transfer \$270,428.42) to the Bradley Hills Elementary School, No. 410-07; and be it further

Resolved, That a change order for paving for \$53,359 to the contract with J. Roland Dashiell & Sons, Inc. and J. Roland Dashiell Realty Company A Named Joint Venture, be approved at Bradley Hills Elementary School subject to the transfer from Local Unliquidated Surplus Account being approved.

Resolution No. 568-84

Re: Wheaton High School/Edison Career
Center Post Occupancy Review

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

WHEREAS, A post occupancy review has been completed by school facilities staff in conjunction with administration at both the Wheaton High School and the Edison Career Center; and

WHEREAS, Additional needs have been identified and prioritized that are appropriate capital activities; and

WHEREAS, The project contingency has been depleted and a transfer from the Local Unliquidated Surplus Account is necessary to fund these additional needs; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the county executive be requested to recommend approval of a transfer of \$125,000 from the Local Unliquidated Surplus Account 997-01 (balance before transfer \$200,428,42) to the Wheaton High School/Edison Career Center Project, No. 782-08.

Resolution No. 569-84

Re: John F. Kennedy High School Site -
Storm Drainage Easement (Area 1)

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

WHEREAS, Montgomery County Department of Transportation has requested a right-of-way and storm water easement across John F. Kennedy High School site for the purpose of installing storm drainage; and

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

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

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

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

Resolution No. 570-84

Re: Utilization of a Portion of the FY

1985 Provision for Future Supported
Projects for Project Reach

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

Resolved, That the superintendent of schools be authorized to receive and expend, within the FY 1985 Provision for Future Supported Projects, a \$4,500 grant award from the Maryland State Department of Education under the Education Consolidation and Improvement Act Chapter 32 in Category 01, Administration; and be it further

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

Resolution No. 571-84 Re: Utilization of a Portion of the FY
1985 Provision for Future Supported
Projects for the Vocational
Education Program

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

Resolved, That the superintendent of schools be authorized to receive and expend, within the FY 1985 Provision for Future Supported Programs, \$18,196 for a basic grant from the Maryland State Department of Education under the Vocational Education Act in the following categories to develop and/or purchase computer software:

Category	Amount
03 Instructional Other	\$ 8,196
04 Special Education	10,000
Total	\$18,196

and be it further

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

Re: FY85 Emergency Supplemental
Appropriation Request

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

WHEREAS, The projected enrollment for FY85 Head Start through Grade 12, was 90,866 students; and

WHEREAS, As of September 30, 1984, the actual enrollment was 91,697 or 831 above the projected figure; and

WHEREAS, Additional positions have been allocated to help relieve large classes; and

WHEREAS, As of October 8, 1984, there were 533 classes over the desired maximum class size guidelines established by the Board of Education; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Board of Education requests an emergency supplemental appropriation for 25 teachers, an administrative intern, and instructional materials and textbooks in the amount of \$611,505; and be it further

Resolved, That the county executive and the County Council be given a copy of this request for an emergency supplemental appropriation and that the executive be requested to recommend approval of this emergency supplemental appropriation to the County Council.

Resolution No. 572-84 Re: An Amendment to the Proposed
Resolution on
an Emergency Supplemental
Appropriation

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

Resolved, That the proposed resolution on an emergency supplemental appropriation be amended to add 10.5 secondary teaching positions in the amount of \$227,490.

Resolution No. 573-84 Re: FY85 Emergency Supplemental
Appropriation Request

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

WHEREAS, The projected enrollment for FY85 Head Start through Grade 12, was 90,866 students; and

WHEREAS, As of September 30, 1984, the actual enrollment was 91,697 or 831 above the projected figure; and

WHEREAS, Additional positions have been allocated to help relieve large classes; and

WHEREAS, As of October 8, 1984, there were 533 classes over the desired maximum class size guidelines established by the Board of Education; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Board of Education requests an emergency supplemental appropriation for 35.5 teachers, an administrative intern, and instructional materials and textbooks in the amount of \$838,995; and be it further

Resolved, That the county executive and the County Council be given a copy of this request for an emergency supplemental appropriation and that the executive be requested to recommend approval of this emergency supplemental appropriation to the County Council.

Resolution No. 574-84 Re: Monthly Personnel Report

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

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

Resolution No. 575-84 Re: Extension of Sick Leave

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

WHEREAS, The employee listed below has suffered serious illness; and

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

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

Name	Position and Location	No. of Days
McFadyean, Rebecca	Instructional Assistant Harmony Hills Elementary	30

Resolution No. 576-84 Re: Death of Mrs. Agripina Aboyme,
Instructional Assistant on
Personal Illness Leave
from Highland Elementary School

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

WHEREAS, The death on October 29, 1984, of Mrs. Agripina Aboyme, an instructional assistant on personal illness leave from Highland Elementary School, has deeply saddened the staff and members of the Board of Education; and

WHEREAS, Mrs. Aboyme had been a loyal employee of Montgomery County Public Schools for six years; and

WHEREAS, Mrs. Aboyme was a reliable and responsible employee always willing to learn new skills, and she was kind and encouraging with

students and gave freely of her time and energy to help them improve; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the members of the Board of Education express their sorrow at the death of Mrs. Agripina Aboyme and extend deepest sympathy to her family; and be it further

Resolved, That this resolution be made part of the minutes of this meeting and a copy be forwarded to Mrs. Aboyme's family.

Resolution No. 577-84 Re: Death of Mr. Joseph L. Eldred,
Classroom Teacher at Walt
Whitman High School

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

WHEREAS, The death on October 17, 1984, of Mr. Joseph L. Eldred, classroom teacher at Walt Whitman High School, has deeply saddened the staff and members of the Board of Education; and

WHEREAS, In the more than twenty-one years that Mr. Eldred had been a member of the staff of the Montgomery County Public Schools, he was a valuable and dedicated professional; and

WHEREAS, Mr. Eldred's commitment to the foreign language program added strength to the total school program; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the members of the Board of Education express their sorrow at the death of Mr. Joseph L. Eldred and extend deepest sympathy to his family; and be it further

Resolved, That this resolution be made part of the minutes of this meeting and a copy be forwarded to Mr. Eldred's family.

Resolution No. 578-84 Re: Death of Mr. Donald E. Thomas,
Building
Services Manager II, Area II
Administrative Office

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

WHEREAS, The death on October 27, 1984, of Mr. Donald E. Thomas, a building services manager in the Area II Administrative Office, has deeply saddened the staff and members of the Board of Education; and

WHEREAS, Mr. Thomas had been a loyal employee of Montgomery County Public Schools for over twenty-two years; and

WHEREAS, Mr. Thomas was a cooperative staff member giving of himself in time, energy, and services to students and staff; now therefore

be it

Resolved, That the members of the Board of Education express their sorrow at the death of Mr. Donald E. Thomas and extend deepest sympathy to his family; and be it further

Resolved, That this resolution be made part of the minutes of this meeting and a copy be forwarded to Mr. Thomas' family.

Resolution No. 579-84 Re: Personnel Appointment

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

Resolved, That the following personnel appointment be approved:

Appointment	Present Position	As
Michael R. Haney	Assistant Professor of Computer Science Towson State University Towson, Maryland	Blair H.S. Magnet Coordinator Grade M Effective January 2, 1985

Resolution No. 580-84 Re: Amendment to the Position
Classification and Pay Plan

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

WHEREAS, As part of the established procedure for reviewing and revising the position classification and pay plan, the superintendent has recommended the changes described below; and

WHEREAS, It is desirable to establish and maintain positions at an equitable and competitive pay level; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the classification and pay plan revisions proposed below be approved effective on the first day of the first pay period following approval by the Board of Education:

Department of Financial Services

- a) Change the pay grade of the Director, Division of Accounting; Director, Division of Insurance and Retirement; and Director, Division of Payroll from pay grade N (\$34,908 minimum - \$47,112 maximum) to pay grade O (\$37,592 minimum - \$51,492 maximum).
- b) Change the title of the Financial Systems Analyst position, pay grade 25, to Business Systems Specialist, pay grade 25.

Placement Unit

Change the position from Student Placement Supervisor, pay grade N (\$34,908 minimum - \$47,112 maximum) to Student Placement Supervisor, pay grade O (\$37,592 minimum - \$51,492 maximum).

Administrative Offices

Change the three positions from Supervisor of Special Services, pay grade O (\$37,592 minimum - \$51,492 maximum) to Supervisor of Special Services, pay grade P (\$40,277 minimum - \$54,230 maximum).

Division of Construction and Capital Projects

Change the position from Facilities/Operations Analyst, pay grade 24 (\$28,745 minimum - \$44,699 maximum longevity) to Utilities Management Specialist, pay grade 25, (\$30,222 minimum - \$46,758 maximum longevity).

Department of Instructional Resources

Change the position from Account Clerk II, pay grade 11 (\$15,787 minimum - \$24,169 maximum longevity) to Instructional Resources Assistant, pay grade 14 (\$17,846 minimum - \$28,017 maximum longevity).

Division of Data Processing Operations

- a) Change the position of Technical Support Supervisor from pay grade N (\$34,908 minimum - \$47,112 maximum) to pay grade O (\$37,592 minimum - \$51,492 maximum).
- b) Change the six positions of Systems Programmer from pay grade 24 (\$28,745 minimum - \$44,699 maximum longevity) to pay grade 25 (\$30,222 minimum - \$46,758 maximum longevity).

Principal, RICA

Change the position from Principal, RICA, pay grade O (\$37,592 minimum - \$51,492 maximum) to Principal, RICA, pay grade P (\$40,277 minimum - \$54,230 maximum).

Re: Proposed Amendment to Grading Policy

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

WHEREAS, A committee was appointed to review the Grading Policy; and

WHEREAS, This committee has proposed an addition to this policy; and

WHEREAS, Community support for this addition has been solicited and indicates approval; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the following statement be added to the Grading Policy:

"If, for the three grades in a semester (two report periods and a final exam), a student received two Es" the student will receive an "E" for the course regardless of the mathematical grade calculation."

and be it further

Resolved, That this change to the Grading Policy be effective starting with the second semester of the 1984-85 school year; and be it further

Resolved, That all appropriate policies and regulations be amended to reflect this change.

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

A motion by Dr. Cronin to amend the proposed resolution on the grading policy by adding another Resolved, "The teacher and the principal may agree to change the grade to accommodate extenuating circumstances" failed with Dr. Cronin, Dr. Greenblatt, and Mrs. Peyser voting in the affirmative; Dr. Floyd voting in the negative; Mr. Ewing and Mrs. Praisner abstaining (Miss Duby abstaining).

Re: A Motion by Mr. Ewing to Postpone
the Proposed Resolution on
Grading (FAILED)

A motion by Mr. Ewing to postpone the proposed resolution on grading until the all-day meeting in December failed with Mr. Ewing, Dr. Floyd, and Mrs. Praisner voting in the affirmative; Dr. Cronin, Dr. Greenblatt, and Mrs. Peyser voting in the negative (Miss Duby voting in the affirmative).

Re: A Motion by Mrs. Peyser to Adopt
the Proposed Amendment to the Grading
Policy (FAILED)

A motion by Mrs. Peyser that the Board adopt the proposed amendment to the grading policy failed with Dr. Cronin, Dr. Greenblatt, and Mrs. Peyser voting in the affirmative; Mr. Ewing, Dr. Floyd, and Mrs. Praisner voting in the negative (Miss Duby voting in the negative).

Re: Commission on Children and Youth -
Child Care Issues

Dr. Nancy Dworkin, chairperson of the Commission on Children and Youth, explained that the Commission was mandated to advise the county executive, County Council, the Board of Education, and the Department of Family Resources on issues relating to child care. They set up a task force to look at issues related to child care, and thirty-two citizens were involved in the task force which worked under the direction of three commissioners. They looked at issues from infant care to school-aged children to employer involvement. She said that 28,000 youngsters in the county were being taken care of by people other than parents, and another 23,000 were taking care

of themselves or caring for younger siblings. The county had resources for about 11,000 children. As the committee divided into three subcommittees, many more people in the public and private sectors became involved. She reported that the Interagency Committee on Child Care worked in cooperation with the Commission's Child Care Committee.

Ms. Deborah Ehrenstein, chair of the Child Care Committee, said they would highlight the parts of the report that were of particular interest to the Board of Education. She believed that MCPS had enormous interest in the kind of child care that the children in Montgomery County received. Whether or not the Board had a direct responsibility for providing child care was a debatable issue. She thought the school system had a special interest because the kind of care children received before they came to school or in the hours before and after school would have an enormous effect on how well they would do in their learning. She said that MCPS also controlled the biggest resources for child care which were school buses, school facilities, and communications with parents. They thought that MCPS did have a role to play in helping them provide good child care for the children of Montgomery County, but they really needed to see how all parts of the county government could work together to coordinate all the resources that they had.

Ms. Clea Toomey stated that most children under the age of 14 lived in households where the single parent or both parents worked. She said that while Montgomery County did have an extraordinary number of day care centers, there were not enough. She said that the cost for a child in day care was approximately \$3,100 a year for full-time day care, and for part-time before and after school it would be \$1,800. She said that the great majority of day care programs were nonprofit and working on a very low budget. Several years ago MCPS opened school buildings to private day care programs through the joint occupancy policy, and now there were about 45 centers in public school buildings. However, as schools were closed, centers were displaced or reduced in size as enrollments in elementary schools increased. She felt that an increasing number of children would need day care while the space for day care would decrease. When programs for school-aged children are not located in or near schools, transportation problems arise. In January a paper was presented which recommended the formation of a task force to plan for facilities and transportation for day care over the next few years. She reported that the task force was meeting and MCPS had a representative on it. The task force would be reporting in February, 1985 so that the plan could be implemented for the 1985-86 school year. She asked that the Board insure sufficient resources for the task force to complete its work in time and that the Board support the policy recommendations coming from the work of the task force.

Ms. Mary Ellen Savarese stated that there were about 36,000 children between the ages of six and thirteen who had some need for child care before or after school. When the child care was not located in or near a public school, transportation between school and the child

care program became a major issue for families. Parents were not available at 9 a.m. to take the children from child care to school or at 3 p.m. to take the children from the school to the child care. In the past, parents were allowed to transfer to schools with a child care program. In recent years transfers had not been approved because of high enrollment or racial balance in a particular school. Parents, because they did not want to "latch key" their child, put the child in a private school setting. Some transportation was provided, and in some cases it was free and in other cases there was a charge to the child care center. She thought that policies as to who received transportation were inconsistent. She noted that school bus transportation was expensive for MCPS to provide, but public transportation was not viable for elementary school children. She said that most child care centers could not afford to run their own buses.

Ms. Savarese said they had recommendations, and the first was that the task force would be making plans for transportation needs and the Board was urged to support this. They believed that MCPS could provide additional transportation for child care purposes if they planned for and budgeted for this. She said transportation was a student need even though it happened after 3 p.m. She indicated that the cost of transportation should not be reflected by the school budget. They felt that if MCPS could project honest costs of services for before and after school, the county government should make arrangements for payments of this cost as a separate line item. This should be financed by revenues from user fees and public supplements. Dr. Dworkin said that the Board was considering overlapping bus routes in the public sector and public schools and it might reduce school bus needs which would allow some buses to be used for day care. Mrs. Praisner explained that the county government would be reducing the amount of money needed to purchase buses rather than freeing up buses.

Ms. Ann Mustafa said that the problems of latch key children were of high priority. In 1983 they found that 23,000 children between the ages of six and thirteen were in self or sibling care. They cared for themselves or they were cared for by a sibling under the age of 14. They found that 4,000 of these children were between the ages of six and eight, 7,000 between the ages of nine and eleven, and 12,000 were between the ages of twelve and thirteen. She said that one half of the total population of children ages ten to thirteen regularly cared for themselves, and three-quarters of the total population between the ages of twelve and thirteen cared for themselves. They were concerned about the safety and supervision of these children. They worried about the lack of adult guidance and possible harm from other individuals. For the older aged group they worried about drug and alcohol abuse, truancy, vandalism, and premature sex. She explained that 12,500 school-aged children were already served by various forms of day care and 27,000 children were cared for by their parents. She explained that not all parents understood the need for age-appropriate day care for school age children or were willing and able to pay for services. She cited problems with locating additional programs and providing

transportation to these new sites. In addition, existing programs did not tend to be appropriate for older children. These children needed the flexibility to participate in other afterschool programs such as scouts, sports, special interest classes, music lessons, religious instruction, etc. They recommended that self-reliance skills training be part of the curriculum for all children. Secondly, with the county government they would like to devise methods for stimulating age-appropriate day care programs for older children. They asked the Board to consider ways to extend afterschool study and tutoring centers for Grades 4-8 throughout the county with parent fees. They would like MCPS to assure that needed facilities and transportation were provided. They encouraged the county including the Board of Education to look at and address the needs of latch key children.

Ms. Ann Goldstein stated that what was often lost was the idea that child care could be and should be good for children. They felt that parents as consumers of child care could play a role in ensuring quality programs. They wished to promote a child care community that strives for excellence. She said that working parents had more problems than other parents in terms of getting out to parenting programs. Their recommendation was to work with the county government to assure a central clearing house for parenting programs, target additional parenting programs to certain receptive groups, offer programs at work sites, offer child development education for teenagers, and assure child care services for adolescent parents.

Dr. Joan Wilson explained that their report had six major chapters, and the presentation had focused on one of those, school-aged child care. She said there were a couple of recommendations from the other chapters which were among their priorities for Board action. One, it was important for employers to become appropriately involved. They recommended the Board consider feasible methods for assisting its own employees with day care needs. Secondly, to the average citizen for whom child day care was important, public sector functions related to child care were fragmented, inconsistent, and confusing. They believed the county government had the responsibility to better coordinate child care related functions, and they urged the Board to cooperate in insuring a more cohesive and efficient structure. Their child care report made 54 recommendations. They had several priorities for the Board. The first was to expedite the implementation of the task force on day care facilities and transportation and support policies growing out of the task force. Second was to budget for transportation between schools and both child care and recreation programs for K through 8. Third was to include self reliance skills training in public school curriculum beginning no later than kindergar- ten. Four was to cooperate with the county government in stimulating develop- ment of innovative programs to service latch key children especially those in Grade 4-8. Fifth was to ensure cohesive structure for all government functions related to child care. The last was to consider feasible methods of assisting MCPS employees with their child care needs. Dr. Wilson asked that they respond to

the report within 90 days.

Mrs. Praisner explained that it would be appropriate to get staff reaction to the recommendations. An information paper would give the Board some idea of whether there were policy actions required, what actions were needed, whether they were already doing some of the things recommended, and the cost implications of the recommendations. They had also received a paper from Dr. Cronin with a list of questions, and they would appreciate a response to these questions. She said they had asked the Board to expedite implementation of the task force recommendations; however, the Board had never decided whether it agreed or disagreed with the recommendations. She hoped that once they had a response from staff they could have a follow-up discussion.

Dr. Cronin explained that most of his questions were in his memo. He said that the Board's charge was to go K-12 through a school day. The further they extended beyond that charge they would assume an obligation that they did not have. They were then at a risk of exposing themselves to budget cuts. He appreciated that there would be separate line items and user fees and that the county government would be making very clear that there was a separate issue which was day care. Therefore, the county government would be accepting its responsibility for that program and its funding. Dr. Dworkin pointed out that since 1983 in the private sector from 600 corporations to about 1500 had been getting into child care. She said that the absentee rate of the employees had dropped dramatically and people did not leave their employment.

Dr. Cronin said that when they talked about transportation to day care there was a distinction between a single person providing day care and a center. In terms of centers there was more stability through the entire year. Individuals providing day care could fluctuate wildly. He could hear their transportation staff trying to work out transportation based on a parental decision which might not even put the child in the local service area. They could end up with a tremendous increase in their transportation budget. Mrs. Zoe Lefkowitz reported that they had met with Dr. Jacqueline Rogers who made it clear that if buses were freed because of the use of Ride-on by students, the funds that were available could possibly be used for day care. In regard to Ride-on, Mrs. Praisner explained they were going into a pilot program at four schools for extracurricular activities to see whether there were cost savings involved. She said that the Board and staff were very willing to go into this pilot, but at the same time she hoped that they were not spending all of the money saved from it until they determined from the pilot that there were those funds. They had to look at implications across the county and at the cost of budgeting Ride-on buses. Ms. Savarese thought that Dr. Cronin's concern emphasized the need for the task force to develop policies.

Dr. Cronin felt that they could not take the responsibility for the recommendations without the county's agreement for 100 percent funding. Ms. Ehrenstein said that the Commission was well aware

that the Board had to have its funds for education. She explained that there were representatives on the task force from county government as well as the school system. Dr. Cronin noted that there were no MCPS people on the committee developing the report. Dr. Wilson replied that there were MCPS people on the Commission, but not on the committee. However, there were interagency groups involved.

Mr. Ewing thought the Commission and the Committee had done school system and the county a great service with the report and the recommendations. He agreed that they needed support from the county government to carry out this enterprise. They needed to work closely together with all agencies of county government having a role in this area as well as private agencies. They also needed a mechanism to bring all of these people together. They could, of course, carry out their educational mission at all kinds of levels focusing on the classroom and, therefore, they would not have any support mechanisms such as counselors, social workers, etc. However, they would not carry it out as well. Personally, he thought they would do a better job of their educational mission if they did a better job of doing some of the things the Commission was talking about. He hoped that the county executive and County Council would understand that kind of message. For example, if children came to school well cared for, they would be better able to concentrate on what they were doing in school. He asked whether they were dealing with students up through eighth grade, and Ms. Savarese explained they were talking about mostly through the sixth grade. Mr. Ewing said this raised the question of the extent to which this should be directed toward senior high school students. Dr. Wilson assumed MCPS staff would look at this in career related activities for high school youngsters. She wondered about child development courses that might enhance sibling care.

Mrs. Peyser expressed concern about the staggering numbers of children left in care of someone other than their parents. She noted that they had spoken to raising the public consciousness about higher pay for people working in child care centers. She hoped that they could encourage one parent to stay home with the children. She had read about infants being put into child care as well as preschoolers. She suggested they look into child support payments so that mothers would be able to stay home. She was also concerned about what she had read about child abuse in day care, and she said that the other problem of day care was the transmittal of diseases because parents did not keep children home when they were sick. She hoped that they could encourage people to postpone having children or working part-time or in the home.

Mrs. DiFonzo inquired about parents not being able to afford quality day care. Ms. Ehrenstein replied that about 1300 children a year were getting subsidies for day care, which meant in Montgomery County that their parents income was below \$18,000.

Dr. Greenblatt thought that the school system should be cautious about expending a lot of money in this area. They should encourage

facilities to be available on a user basis. She did not think they should be in the business of dealing with before and after care for children. These were decisions that families made when both spouses were working. On the other hand, there was plenty of room after school for activities to be going on or a play area to be supervised so that the children could be in that facility under supervision. She thought they were never going to be able to limit latch key children. As far as transportation, she reported that she grew up in a city and public bus transportation to school was provided after third or fourth grade. She thought there was nothing wrong with children at that age learning some survival skills on how to use public transportation. She did not see why transportation to the day care center should become a problem because they must transport children home if they lived beyond a certain distance. The question would then become whether they were transporting these students beyond the normal bus route. She would be very cautious as to what was the county government's role in this. She personally would not want to send her children to a day care center; however, she did send them to nursery school. However, other parents might choose day care. She felt that the option should be there, but at cost. Ms. Ehrenstein explained that the Commission was hoping that the county government would provide some of the infrastructure, but the program would be done by the private sector. Dr. Greenblatt pointed out that the state superintendent had made a recommendation that for a high school diploma students would have to provide some kind of service to the community. She said that some high school students could work in the elementary schools after school or work at a day care center.

Dr. Cronin inquired about the number of changes of day care site a student might go through from September through June. Dr. Dworkin explained that this would depend in part on what was available. She said that while they had talked a great deal about transportation, many of the recommendations were more pertinent to the school and related to the curriculum for youngsters. She asked that they consider the recommendations they might want to implement more quickly.

Mrs. Praisner explained that the Board needed to know cost and staff implications of the recommendations. She said that the next step would be for the staff to give them comments and information as to what might be a policy issue. Mr. Ewing reported that the other evening he had represented the Board at a reception of the Montgomery Child Day Care Association. At that meeting he accepted an award on behalf of an employee of the public schools. He presented the award to Dr. Robert Posilkin in appreciation of his outstanding community service.

Re: Board Member Comments

1. Mr. Ewing stated that based on a visit to Rolling Terrace Elementary School he felt this school needed attention. It was not only overcrowded, but it was an inadequate facility particularly in regard to staff bathrooms.

2. Dr. Floyd called attention to the superintendent's memo of October 29 which stated that four staff members were on a study trip to Japan, Dr. Martin Galvin, Mrs. Helen Holston, Mrs. Maria Schwab, and Dr. William Wilhoyte. Dr. Floyd said that he had served as a contact person with the U.S. Department of Education and the Embassy of Japan when Japanese business people and educators had visited the United States. He was especially pleased that some MCPS staff people were getting a reciprocal opportunity to visit Japan and look at the Japanese educational system. He hoped that these educators would share their insights with the Board of Education. Mrs. Praisner explained that this was a second year for these trips and last year staff did make a presentation before the Board.

3. Mrs. Peyser stated that a recent study stated that American youngsters were unfit physically and less fit physically than they were in the past. She said that students used to be required to take physical education every year through twelfth grade. She asked the superintendent to look into this. She had heard of a school where physical education was offered two or three times a week and another course offered in the remaining days. She asked that staff examine this proposal and come back with a recommendation.

4. Mrs. Peyser reported that in September the Board had received a letter about a bus stop situation in Gaithersburg. Mrs. Praisner replied that she had reactivated what should be the appropriate process in these situations. A request of this type which might be the basis for an appeal to the Board would be sent for staff response. If the individual was not satisfied with the staff response, the individual could appeal the superintendent's decision to the Board.

5. Dr. Cronin commented that recently they had heard about the death of the student member of the Prince George's County Board of Education, and he wanted to know whether the MC Board had expressed its sympathy. Mrs. Praisner replied that Miss Duby had attended the viewing, and Mr. Fess was in contact with the P.G. Board to determine their plans for a memorial.

6. Miss Duby reported that several days after this incident the Board had met with students from Area 2 and the issue of teaching students to cope with stress was a major topic. The Student Affairs Office would be sending to all schools cards and posters with hotline numbers and information about how students can get help. Student personnel will be strongly encouraged to distribute these cards. She said that MCR had already planned two programs in January and February on suicide prevention and the second on stress management. She indicated that she would come back to the Board with some ideas on how those programs could be expanded for other students. Dr. Greenblatt thought they should be very cautious about this issue because in Texas several students in one town decided to commit suicide.

7. Dr. Greenblatt called attention to the pictures listing Board

members going back to the nineteenth century. She would be curious to know more about these people and their accomplishments.

8. Dr. Greenblatt reported that on October 26 when Board members were attending a NFUSSD meeting Secretary Bell made awards for distinguished school boards. Seventeen Boards were honored. The Richard Montgomery High School Jazz Ensemble under the direction of Bud Caputo performed at the luncheon. Four of the 17 Boards were members of NFUSSD and were honored because of their response to the National Commission on Excellence report.

9. Mrs. Praisner had read that the College Board Panel had created a panel to study and present recommendations for improving high school guidance and counseling services. She would appreciate receiving further information about the timetable of that study.

10. Mrs. Praisner requested additional information on schools which gave credit or did not give credit to students involved in yearbook, student government, and newspapers. She asked about how that decision was made.

11. Mrs. Praisner had read that the county government had hired a consultant to evaluate the Ride-on study. She understood that staff did not know about this until they read it in the newspaper. She requested information on what the consultant was studying.

12. Mrs. Praisner commended staff, especially Dr. Orloff, for the planning that went into the high school symposium. She regretted that they had had to limit the number of the participants because of the size of the facility. Some similar themes had come out of the symposium including the need for staff training and development and flexibility at the local level to develop alternative programs to meet the needs of high school students. They also heard discussion about the need to involve the business community. She believed this discussion reflected a lack of understanding of the comprehensive nature of the involvement of the school system with the business community. Dr. Cody had assured her they would have a brochure which would highlight the business community's involvement and the way additional businesses could become involved. She thought that one way they could address this issue was to develop a school system or Board business advisory council.

*Mrs. Peyser temporarily left the meeting at this point.

Resolution No. 581-84 Re: BOE Appeal No. 84-2

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

Resolved, That the Board grant the request for the withdrawal of BOE Appeal 84-2 (employee discipline).

Resolution No. 582-84 Re: Minutes of September 11, 1984

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

Task Force

Mr. Ewing moved approval of the following resolution:

Resolved, That the Board of Education adopt the following charge to the Area 2 Task Force:

To assess/review the concerns which have been expressed by school communities in Area 2, as they related to the following topics:

- I. The demographic picture of the schools and communities in terms of current and future school populations.
- II. Student transportation as it relates to both MCPS and county systems.
- III. Attendance patterns on a school-by-school basis
- IV. Procedures for school staffing and student projections.
- V. Program opportunities including:
 - A. Equity of Program Distribution
 - B. Teacher/Pupil Ratios
 - C. ESOL
 - D. Advanced and Remedial Programs
 - E. "Regular" Program
 - F. Honors Program
 - G. Magnet Programs
 - H. Vocational/technical Programs
 - I. All-day Kindergarten
 - J. Day Care

and be it further

Resolved, That the following procedure for the selection of the members of the Task Force be approved:

- I. Cluster chairpersons will be asked to solicit representatives from their clusters, at least two oneó from each level (elementary, J/I/M, senior). The Board of Education will select from this list, one representative from each level (elementary, J/I/M, senior) from each cluster or a total of 21 representatives. delete sentenceó
- II. The area associate superintendent will solicit principal representatives from Area 2, one from each level (elementary, J/I/M, senior) and one teacher representative from each level (elementary, J/I/M, senior).
- III. Each cluster coordinator will nominate one at-large candidate. The selection of the four at-large candidates will be made by the Board of Education.
- IV. The area associate superintendent will solicit the names of

Task Force

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

Resolved, That the proposed resolution on the Area 2 Task Force be amended by substituting the following for II., III., and IV.:

- II. Equity of student transportation between and within Area 2 and Area 2 schools
- III. Equity of attendance patterns on a school-by-school basis between Area II and the other areas and within Area 2
- IV. Equity of school staffing between Area 2 and the other areas and within Area 2

For the record, Mr. Ewing assumed that under I. they were not precluding the committee from dealing with the issue of student projections.

Resolution No. 592-84 Re: Charge and Composition - Area 2
Task Force

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education adopt the following charge to the Area 2 Task Force:

To assess/review the concerns which have been expressed by school communities in Area 2, as they related to the following topics:

- I. The demographic picture of the schools and communities in terms of current and future school populations.
- II. Equity of student transportation between and within Area 2 and Area 2 schools
- III. Equity of attendance patterns on a school-by-school basis between Area 2 and the other areas and within Area 2
- IV. Equity of school staffing between Area 2 and the other areas and within Area 2
- V. The equity of programs between Area 2 and the county and within Area 2 such as the following:
 - A. Equity of Program Distribution
 - B. Teacher/Pupil Ratios
 - C. ESOL
 - D. Advanced and Remedial Programs
 - E. "Regular" Program
 - F. Honors Program
 - G. Magnet Programs
 - H. Vocational/technical Programs

Resolved, That the following individual be appointed for a two-year term to serve as community member-at-large for Area 2:

Dr. Marguerite W. Coomes

Resolution No. 594-84 Re: New Appointment to the Title IX
Advisory Committee

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Dr. Floyd 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, A vacancy now exists on the committee due to the expiration of the term of a member; and

WHEREAS, In accordance with the Board-approved recruitment and selection procedures, the nominee mentioned below was 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 Ms. Anita Goldberg as the MCEA representative to a two-year term beginning immediately, and terminating in October, 1986.

Resolution No. 595-84 Re: Impartial Hearing Officers

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

WHEREAS, The Office of the Ombudsman and Staff Assistant to the Board of Education is responsible for assigning hearing officers to the appeals of special education placements; and

WHEREAS, Amendments to Section 8-415(a) of the Public School Laws of Maryland require the Montgomery County Public Schools to maintain a list of at least ten impartial hearing officers and assign them in rotating alphabetical sequence; and

WHEREAS, The Board of Education took action on August 23, 1982, to establish a list of impartial hearing officers; and

WHEREAS, The list of impartial hearing officers needs to be expanded due to the unavailability of some of the approved hearing officers; and

WHEREAS, Letters were sent to make inquiries about the availability of additional candidates; and

WHEREAS, Three people have indicated a desire to serve as impartial hearing officers; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the following individuals have been selected to serve as impartial hearing officers for appeals of special education placements for the Montgomery County Board of Education:

Dr. Catharina Eeltink
Dr. Corinne Klein Jensema
Dr. Lois Shofer

Re: New Business

Mr. Ewing moved and Dr. Cronin seconded that the Board schedule a discussion of the recommendations of the task force on child care including also the recommendations of the Commission on Children and Youth.

Re: Process for Reviewing Transfer Requests

Mrs. Praisner explained that this was not a discussion to change the transfer process. It was a discussion on how they could improve the process for transfer requests.

Dr. Alan Dodd said he had made one recommendation that they have the area superintendent hearing an appeal on something that went on in his own staff, and he thought this could be telescoped into one action. Whatever came out of the area level would become the area's decision. Mrs. Praisner thought that the hearing examiner process with Dr. Dodd worked very well. She hoped that they would use this in the future. She thought that Dr. Dodd had done a very thorough job and had freed up other staff members.

Mrs. Peyser expressed her appreciation to Dr. Dodd for his written report. She was concerned about consistency throughout the county. She said that the system from the associate superintendents on up to the Board had to be consistent and objective. They had to let parents know what were the valid reasons for transfers. She would like to see the system compile a list of transfer reasons that could be given to parents. She said they should define what was a "program" and what was a "course."

It seemed to Mrs. Praisner they could tell people what would be the general reasons, but they could not say that would be uniformly interpreted. They had to evaluate the differences between schools and the differences between individual students. Dr. Pitt reported that they had 2500 requests for transfers, 1800 were approved, and 261 were appealed. He thought that the process had worked efficiently given the policy that they had.

Mrs. Praisner said that it seemed to her they might want to look at the involvement by the principal at the local school. She thought

they should cut out the local principal's involvement and participation. She would be interested in views about having a parent seeking a transfer going to the area office. Dr. Dodd said they he always thought that before parents sought a transfer they should seek some guidance. However, he agreed that this could go directly to the area. Dr. Robert Shekletski, area associate superintendent, explained that after the open transfer period, the parent did not have to go to the local school. They could come right to the area office.

Mr. Ewing thought that the comments they had received from various people on this subject were very helpful. He hoped they would look carefully at what they could do to speed up the process and that they would give serious consideration to Dr. Dodd's recommendations. They should consider the extent to which they were willing to say that every school should be closed and then make exceptions.

Mrs. Praisner asked whether their letters told people about the time limitations for submitting an appeal. She thought that they should be consistent here. Where people had waited a long time to appeal, they had gotten into the problem of adjudicating cases after the opening of school.

Dr. Steve Frankel, director of the Department of Educational Accountability, stated that their recommendation was the appeal to the superintendent would be automatic which could save 15 days right there. If turned down at the area, it would automatically get kicked up to the central office. He was also astounded that the areas were handling an average of 1,000 appeals within the transfer period.

Mr. Fess thought that the problem was in the parent going beyond the area to the superintendent and when they chose to exercise that right. They had to reject an appeal at the superintendent level if it was not timely filed. He said that the study showed that the Board had added at least 20 days to the Board's part of adjudicating. They had to back that up to see how they could get out of the August last minute decisions. Mrs. Praisner thought a major problem was time when the Board was dealing with these issues.

Dr. Cody asked about the basis for accepting reasons when people filed appeals later and later. He asked whether they could say that after a certain date they would say "no." Dr. Dodd said they always had to remember looking at each case. He had some cases where things actually did change. He agreed that they should take a harder line. He commented that the thing that impressed him most about Montgomery County was that people did put a lot of time into these appeals.

Dr. Pitt stated that the research did not answer whether they were consistent in time. He agreed that they should look at this and have a more consistent approach. Mrs. Praisner thought that people would understand the timeliness issue if they were consistent from

area to area. She said that the longer the process was prolonged the more they had the problem of students getting to September and not knowing what school they would attend.

Dr. Shekletski explained that the problem with cutting them off was at the area level because this was where the majority of appeals came in. If the Pupil Services staff said it was beyond the deadline, the parent appealed to the area. Dr. Cody thought it might take a number of years to help parents understand that the ball game had changed. He suggested that this matter be sent back to staff to sort through several helpful reports. Mrs. Praisner said that these were not policy decisions but rather implementation and administrative decisions. She stated that they also had the other issue of the way the transfer policy was drafted. Dr. Dodd explained that a lot of the transfers were related to school closings and "grandfathering." As they moved to more stable schools, he thought that requests for transfer would lessen. He felt that the Board should be commended for putting students first in those decisions.

Re: Items of Information

Board members received the following items of information:

1. Items in Process
2. Construction Progress Report
3. Follow-up Study of Children Referred to Developmental Evaluation Services for Children (DESC)

Resolution No. 596-84 Re: Adjournment

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education adjourn its meeting at 5:30 p.m.

President

Secretary

WSC:mlw