

WHEREAS, Delegate Maurer has been the author of or a major contributor to revisions in state aid to education formulas that have helped to strengthen and improve the quality of public education in Maryland; and

WHEREAS, Delegate Maurer's contributions to public education have been recognized by numerous organizations, including the Maryland Association of Boards of Education, which honored her with the 1984 Charles W. Willis Award for Outstanding School Board Service; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Montgomery County Board of Education hereby expresses its sincere congratulations and appreciation to the Honorable Lucille Maurer for her 25 years of public service to the citizens and young people of Montgomery County and the State of Maryland; and be it further

Resolved, That to commemorate these 25 years of public service on behalf of public education, the Board of Education of Montgomery County hereby adopts this resolution and makes this presentation to the Honorable Lucille Maurer.

On behalf of the Board, Dr. Shoenberg presented a certificate to Mrs. Maurer. Mrs. Maurer thanked the Board for its generous statement and warm recognition. She explained that her experience at the Board table had led to her work in Annapolis. She would cherish the Board's remembrance and continue her efforts on behalf of young people. On behalf of NSBA, Dr. Floyd presented Mrs. Maurer with two mementos.

Resolution No. 221-85 Re: Montgomery County Teacher Appreciation Day

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

WHEREAS, America's greatest strength has always been an educated citizenry; and

WHEREAS, That educated citizenry is directly attributable to our system of free and universal public education that provides an educational opportunity for all students; and

WHEREAS, The foundation upon which that system of public schooling rests is the teacher; and

WHEREAS, The teacher is challenged daily to reach out to every student -- regardless of ability, interest in learning, social or economic background, physical, mental or emotional handicap, race, religion, creed, or ethnic origin -- to provide the assistance and guidance necessary for full intellectual development; and

WHEREAS, The teacher is a key to the intellectual and occupational

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Mrs. DiFonzo seconded by Miss Duby, the following resolution was adopted unanimously:

WHEREAS, The Board of Education continues to close capital projects in a timely manner and to transfer the unencumbered balance to the appropriate account; and

WHEREAS, The Department of School Facilities has reviewed capital projects that may be closed effective May 1, 1985, providing the net capitalization of \$6,841,007.29; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the superintendent be authorized to close, effective May 1, 1985, capital construction projects listed below and to transfer the local unencumbered balance totaling \$0.84, subject to final audit, to the Local Unliquidated Surplus Account, project 997 (balance before transfer \$75,428.42):

Project No.	School	Balan
* 101-09	Clarksburg Elementary	\$ - 0-
* 104-07	Seneca Valley High	- 0-
105-03	Ridgeview Junior High	.26
* 105-08	Ridgeview Junior High	- 0-
* 106-02	Fox Chapel Elementary	- 0-
107-03	Martin Luther King Junior High	- 0-
* 152-09	Poolesville High	- 0-
* 204-06	Garrett Park Elementary	- 0-
* 204-08	Garrett Park Elementary	- 0-
* 215-03	Carl Sandburg	- 0-
* 219-03	Farmland Elementary	- 0-
* 226-06	Beverly Farms Elementary	- 0-
* 230-08	Rockville High	- 0-
* 235-03	Wayside Elementary	.20
* 237-06	Robert Frost Intermediate	- 0-
* 241-03	DuFief Elementary	- 0-
* 333-04	Benjamin Banneker Junior High	- 0-
* 409-05	Lynnbrook Center	- 0-
* 415-06	North Chevy Chase Elementary	- 0-
* 417-05	Wood Acres Elementary	- 0-
424-12	Walter Johnson High	- 0-
* 424-13	Walter Johnson High	- 0-
* 425-05	Ashburton Elementary	- 0-
* 427-17	Walt Whitman High	- 0-
* 515-16	Gaithersburg High	- 0-
553-06	Gaithersburg Elementary	- 0-
* 554-12	Gaithersburg Junior High	- 0-
557-03	Montgomery Village Junior High	- 0-
* 561-04	Watkins Mill Elementary	- 0-
* 568-03	Stedwick Elementary	- 0-
* 602-12	Winston Churchill High	- 0-
701-09	Damascus High	- 0-
701-11	Damascus High	- 0-
* 705-03	John T. Baker Intermediate	- 0-

* 749-04	Piney Branch Elementary	- 0-
* 756-06	East Silver Spring Elementary	- 0-
* 757-25	Montgomery Blair High	- 0-
764-10	Woodlin Portable	- 0-
769-12	Oakland Terrace Elementary	- 0-
* 772-08	Viers Mill Elementary	- 0-
* 779-08	Connecticut Park Center	- 0-
* 780-03	Bel Pre Elementary	- 0-
* 789-10	Albert Einstein High	- 0-
* 794-05	Rosemary Hills Elementary	- 0-
* 803-07	Forest Knolls Elementary	- 0-
* 808-05	Cresthaven Elementary	- 0-
* 812-08	T. V. Studio Parkland Junior High	- 0-
* 815-12	John F. Kennedy High	- 0-
* 815-14	John F. Kennedy High	- 0-
* 819-06	Rock Creek Valley Elementary	- 0-
* 822-03	Strathmore Elementary	- 0-
* 911-08	Edward U. Taylor Center	- 0-
* 916-09	Rock Terrace High	- 0-
* 916-10	Rock Terrace High	- 0-
* 917-10	Lincoln Center	- 0-
* 919-12	Carver Educational Services Center	- 0-
* 919-20	Carver Educational Services Center	- 0-
* 919-21	Carver Educational Services Center	- 0-
* 919-22	Carver Educational Services Center	- 0-
* 919-23	Carver Educational Services Center	- 0-
968-01	Portable Classrooms	- 0-
* 968-02	Portable Classrooms	.38
968-03	Portable Classrooms	- 0-
* 970-02	Kingsley Wilderness	- 0-
* 972-03	Hadley Complex - Phoenix II Program	- 0-
* 996-05	Randolph Bus Facility	- 0-
* 996-06	Randolph Bus Facility	- 0-
* 999-01	Ventilations	- 0-
* 999-02	Therapy Tank	- 0-
* 999-04	Electric Motor Line	- 0-
* 999-14	Secondary Schools Communications	- 0-
* 999-20	Installation of Walls	- 0-
* 999-24	Maintenance Equipment	- 0-
999-25	Library Security	- 0-
999-27	P. E. Equipment Safety Improvement	- 0-
* 999-31	Communications System Rehab	- 0-
* 999-47	Bleacher Overhaul	- 0-
* 999-71	Various Schools - Roof Top Air Cond.	- 0-
* 999-72	Refrigeration Unit Relocation	- 0-
* 999-81	Install Molding	- 0-
* 999-90	Kingsley Wilderness Plumb/Heat	- 0-
* 999-91	Light Covers	- 0-
* 999-92	Carpet Replacements	- 0-
* 999-93	Install Mechanical Equipment	- 0-
* 999-94	Reserve Parking Lot Lighting	- 0-
* 999-95	Renovation - Resodding	- 0-
* 999-99	Portable Walkways	- 0-

commissions to produce works of art is delineated in Article V, Section 1, Chapter 8, "Buildings," of the Montgomery County Code; and

WHEREAS, Staff has employed selection procedures submitted by the superintendent to the Board of Education on February 10, 1984; and

WHEREAS, The Montgomery County Arts Council has participated in the selection process as required by law; and

WHEREAS, Funds have been appropriated for this purpose for Gaithersburg High School in the FY 1985 Capital Improvements Program; and

WHEREAS, The law also requires County Council approval of selection of the artists before the Board of Education can enter into contracts with said artists; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Board of Education enter into contractual agreements with the following artists, as indicated, subject to County Council approval:

Artist	Work	Commi
Mr. Julio Teichberg	Assemblages	\$19,000
Mr. Guy S. Fairlamb	Mural	10,000
Students of Gaithersburg High School	(to be determined during year-long competition)	1,500

and be it further

Resolved, That the County Council be requested to expeditiously approve the above commissions to the indicated artists.

Resolution No. 228-85 Re: Amendment to the FY 1986 Capital Budget -
Proposed Quince Orchard High School
Site Acquisition (Area 3)

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Mrs. DiFonzo seconded by Miss Duby, the following resolution was adopted unanimously:

WHEREAS, Architectural planning funds are available to plan the proposed high school west of Interstate 270 (Quince Orchard); and

WHEREAS, No suitable site is available in the future school site inventory necessitating the acquisition of a non-MCPS owned parcel; and

WHEREAS, Staff from the Park and Planning Commission and county executive's office assisted MCPS staff in the site selection process; and

WHEREAS, The owner of the Quince Orchard site has agreed to exchange it for the surplus Centerway Future High School site along with a

executive and the County Council.

Resolution No. 231-85 Re: Utilization of FY 1985 Future Supported
Project Funds for a Research Project on
Probability and Statistics

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

Resolved, That the superintendent of schools be authorized to receive
and expend \$4,000 in Category 01, Administration, within the FY 1985
Provision for Future Supported Projects, from MSDE under the ECIA
Chapter 2 for a Research Project on Probability and Statistics K-12;
and be it further

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

Resolution No. 232-85 Re: Utilization of FY 1985 Future Supported
Project Funds for the Teenage Alcohol Abuse
Prevention Initiative, Project SMART

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Mrs.
Praisner seconded by Mrs. DiFonzo, 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 \$9,100 grant award from the Maryland State Department of
Health and Mental Hygiene Alcohol Control Administration, for the
Teenage Alcohol Abuse Prevention Initiative, Project SMART, in the
following categories:

Category	Amount
02 Instructional Salaries	\$2,928
03 Instructional Other	5,900
10 Fixed Charges	272
Total	\$9,100

and be it further

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

Resolution No. 233-85 Re: Utilization of FY 1985 Future Supported
Project Funds to Develop an Instructional
Guide for Dance, Grades 7-12

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

and

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

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

Name	Position and Location	No. of Days
Dixon, Marcia	Classroom Teacher Rock Creek Forest Elementary	30
Hensley, Willa D.	Bus Operator Area III	10
Kemp, Margaret	Classroom Teacher Walt Whitman High School	4
Levy, Alayne J.	Special Education Instructional Asst. Mark Twain	20

Resolution No. 237-85 Re: Personnel Reassignment

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

Resolved, That the following personnel reassignment be approved:

Name	From	To
James Jenets	Classroom Teacher On Pers. Illness Lv. M+30, L2	Instructional Assistant Beall Elementary Effective March 25, 1985 Will maintain present salary status & retire July 1, 1986

Resolution No. 238-85 Re: Death of Mr. Edward D. Carter, Classroom/
Kindergarten Teacher at Rolling Terrace
Elementary School

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

WHEREAS, The death on March 21, 1985, of Mr. Edward D. Carter, a classroom/ kindergarten teacher at Rolling Terrace Elementary School, has deeply saddened the staff and members of the Board of Education; and

WHEREAS, Mr. Carter had been a dedicated teacher in Montgomery County for over twelve years; and

WHEREAS, Mr. Carter provided educational programs which were individualized and motivating for students, and he was sensitive to the needs of the whole range of students and made many contributions to the total life of the school; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the members of the Board of Education express their sorrow at the death of Mr. Edward D. Carter 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. Carter's family.

Re: Report and Recommendations of the

Superintendent's Task Force on Alternative
Budget Formats

Dr. Shoenberg explained that the Board was being asked to react to the report so that the superintendent could move toward a Board policy on budget format and timing. Dr. Cody said that this activity had emerged out of a lot of requests from different sources. There had been emphasis from the county government and some citizens that they consider some form of school-based budgeting while others had urged that they not do that. There was also an interest in analyzing the way funds were expended in the school to determine whether funds were allocated on a reasonable basis. He believed that the most of the decisions made were straightforward formula allocations and some were allocations of resources dealing with specific problems existing in some schools. However, the numbers showing what was done and why it was done were in the documents in the school system but not in the budget. The committee had looked at this and determined that this was not a budget form issue but rather an issue of displaying data about individual schools including the amount of funds, staffing, and other resources. The committee recommended they revise the statistical report.

Dr. Kenneth Muir, director of long-range planning, reported that the committee looked at budget formats used by school systems all over the country, and they were just as difficult to understand as the MCPS format. However, the committee believed they could present information in terms of charts and graphs to give people a sense of what was in the budget and what it was doing for children. They then listened to the users of the budget and incorporated those recommendations into the eight made by the committee. Basically, people were saying that they wanted more information, and the committee concluded there was a simpler way to present that than the budget format they had been using in recent years. They had presented the report to the Board in February, and they now had recommendations from the superintendent for six work groups to flesh out the recommendations and provide a detailed plan and timeline. Dr. Cody noted that the primary interest had come from the county executive's budget office, but they had yet to receive reactions from that office.

Mr. Ewing thought they had a good set of recommendations, but there

were a couple of things they should recognize. He believed that at the federal, state, and local government levels, no matter how the budget was presented, people making decisions went for the line items in the budget. He said that the summary budget and the management budget might help here. He said that when they were explaining to the public what they were doing, they should make use of those segments of the budget which spoke to the mission of the school system and the resources associated with those particular missions. It occurred to him that the users of the budget were always changing, and he suggested it might be useful to have an annual workshop on how to read and understand the school system budget. If the Board took the time to look at the mission statements, he believed the public would read them.

Miss Duby found the report clear and interesting but thought that the graph putting it all together was confusing. However, she did not find text relating the capital budget to the operating budget and wondered whether the task force addressed this. Dr. Muir replied that the task force had devoted attention to the operating budget but felt the need to have a long-range plan out of which would come, as annual segments, an operating and capital budget. He thought this would be one of the tasks for the work group. He hoped that the long-range planning process would tie the two budgets and the facilities plan as well. Miss Duby noted that the time schedule was not in line with state requirements and asked whether this was a problem. Dr. Muir replied that it not a problem now that they were not receiving significant funds from the state for the capital budget. He hoped that they had a process with the facilities plan and the capital budget wherein they were looking at more than just a single segment. Councilman Hanna, for example, had proposed a two-year capital budgeting process for the county.

Miss Duby noted that the principals were concerned about a specific procedure for their own requests. The recommendations included more involvement of principals in setting priorities, but they did not address any specific type of procedure. Related to that was a concern about any move to report school by school expenditures in the statistical profiles. She hoped that any changes in the statistical profiles would show the need for the requests and why a school had more resources than another school.

Dr. Cronin had several concerns. He noted that the first recommendation called for the development of the long-range planning cycle by July 1; however, they were often out of step with information generated by Park and Planning. He asked how they envisioned better phasing. Dr. Muir explained that the Sherer committee had looked at a proposed facility process which started in March and ended the following December. He felt that this would be the key in the long run because they could not jam all of these processes into a relatively short period of time in the winter. They needed to be able to see enrollment data in mid-October in order to make final decisions about facilities. They were constrained by a March 1 budget presentation date to the County Council, particularly in years when the Board negotiates with the employee organizations.

The committee was going to look at whether there was a preliminary process they could go through a year in advance with final decisions being made a year later.

Dr. Cronin remarked that it was important for groups such as the PTA to know why the Board could not adopt a particular suggestion. In terms of priorities, he asked how they would see that priorities for individual departments were being met and it was simply not a five percent increase in the department across the board. He also asked for comments about zero-based budgeting. Dr. Muir explained that most of the funds allocated to schools was on a formula basis driven by enrollment. Central office functions had relation to size of the school system but were more driven by certain functions that the unit was providing. He did not think the task force was recommending zero-based budgeting. They had talked about providing the bottom priority listing to show what program managers would give up easiest. Dr. Cronin asked how the Board would know that in terms of approving the budget. Dr. Cody explained that the budget was the superintendent's recommendation; however, the Board could ask staff what they wanted and did not get.

Dr. Cronin noted there was a hope to get input from principals but teachers were not mentioned. He asked about the role of teachers in the preparation of the school budget. Dr. Muir replied that teachers could participate if they wanted to because a public invitation had been issued for advice. He explained that through the collective bargaining process teachers had input into the budget in terms of wages, salaries, and working conditions. They also had an input into the budget through the principal in the school and the area office. In the third recommendation they were suggesting a planning group which would be largely area staff by principals. Dr. Cronin hoped that teacher leadership would take an active role.

It seemed to Mrs. Praisner the whole question was how much information was needed by the people who reviewed the budget, by those who acted on the budget, and by the citizens who had an interest in the budget. It was also a question of budget presentation to facilitate understanding. She was not sure that more information was the question; however, she would like to see more pie charts and graphs with perhaps a "typical school" kind of chart. She did not think a school-based budget process would be productive for the county or the community. She also suggested they needed a visual presentation of a sample year and all the budget dates. She pointed out that unique things happened each year such as elections of Board members and negotiations which contributed to the way they dealt with budget. She was not sure citizens were going to be able to have input during the summer. She was worried about making facilities decisions without up-to-date information. She agreed that Mr. Ewing's suggestion for a workshop was important, and she also asked whether principals needed training in this area as well and what time commitments there would be on principals. She pointed out that a lot of the budget was not tied to Board priorities because of on-going activities, and she was not sure of the role of Board priorities in a yearly budget. She said that if they were thinking about including

more information in the statistical profile, she would like a sample page of what it would look like.

Mr. Ewing thought it was a bad idea for them to accede to the notion propounded by the County OMB that they have school-based budgeting, building the budget from schools up. However, he also thought it was important for them to be able to respond to the concerns behind that because some people had difficulty in understanding why there was so much variation from school to school. He said they had to be clear about what it was they expected to be present in every school at each level and what it was that caused them to depart from that. They could show how they staffed a school and the reasons why they departed from this staffing. Mrs. Slye added that Mr. Ewing was describing what NSBA called "putting your commentary where your dollars are." She felt that the calendar discussion was going to be a key element in all of this process.

Dr. Floyd remarked that the guiding principle for him was that any budget ought to reveal more than it conceals. He asked the superintendent to raise that question as he was developing his recommendations. Mrs. DiFonzo said that people looking at the budget wanted simplicity because they did not want to take the time to dig or wade through the document. They wanted a ready index to direct them to a specific page for a specific item. People were particularly interested in what was new in the budget, the cost of the new program, and where the program was located. People wanted to look at an item and find out what percentage of the whole budget or improvements the item was.

Dr. Shoenberg thanked the committee for for a very clear statement.

Re: Return of Tests Policy - JFB

Dr. Cody explained that the policy was a compromise between the valid need for students to know what it was they got right or wrong on a test as an educational benefit and the long-range interest teachers had in keeping test items valid for future tests. The first obligation was to assure that students were apprised of their efforts on various examinations by showing them the copies. The second was the right of the teacher to collect the tests after review and keep them on file. He did not see any problem with the current policy.

Mr. Ewing did not see any problem with the statement in the regulation and with the resolution adopted by the Board in February 1982. He said that the issue was the extent to which there was sufficient understanding in the schools on the part of principals and teachers of the intent here. He said that students should have the benefit of seeing what the questions were and which answers they got right or wrong. If this did not happen, students could not grasp their mistakes. Unless they thought the primary purpose of administering tests was something other than helping students to learn, it was incredible that this issue should be raised each year. Miss Duby pointed out that seeing a scantron test for half an hour was not sufficient to really understand what a student did wrong.

She thought that was the issue, not just seeing the question but having access to it to study from throughout the semester. She thought that most teachers were flexible about this.

Mrs. DiFonzo commented that the thrust should be an opportunity for students to learn from their mistakes. Dr. Cronin asked about the Resolved which stated that all teachers be strongly encouraged to return to students all tests and quizzes and whether it was required. Mr. Ewing pointed out that the language in the regulation was stronger. He recalled that the Board did not require this, and he had thought it was a mistake at the time. Dr. Cronin called attention to the section which gave the teacher the right to recall the examination material but one sentence seemed to leave it to teacher choice. Dr. Cody thought the first part might have referred to the issue of giving the tests back permanently. He thought the intent was not to give the discretion not to share, but rather the discretion was whether the students kept the test or not. Mr. Ewing recalled that Jon Lipson's original resolution made this much stronger.

Mrs. Praisner felt they had a strong regulation and a strong policy, and they should talk about what they could do to improve the situation. That discussion should take place with principals, students, and teachers. She felt they would never eliminate the problem, but they could probably do a better job of communicating the policy. They could work with the teachers association to ask for their help in communicating the policy and the regulations. They could make sure that students understood their rights, and they could keep a constant discussion of the issue.

Miss Duby said that students also had concerns about having access to the tests when they were studying for their final exams. She assumed it would be the intent of the Board that teachers allow class time or time after school under supervision for students to have access to the tests on file. Dr. Pitt agreed that teachers were responsible for having a file of tests and for providing time for students to have access to the file. He reported that the intent of the Board was clear that youngsters were to have access to the tests, but the Board did give teachers some discretion.

Dr. Shoenberg stated that it was clear that tests would be used as a learning tool to the utmost degree possible. This demanded a good deal of flexibility on the part of teachers about allowing students to have access to the tests and access with enough time to look at the questions and see the relationships between the questions and their answers. It was almost incumbent upon students to handle the materials they were given in a responsible way. He hoped that the clear intent of the Board could be shared with staff and students in appropriate ways.

Resolution No. 239-85

Re: Early Retirement Incentive Program
Proposal

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Mrs.

Praisner seconded by Mrs. DiFonzo, the following resolution was adopted unanimously:

WHEREAS, The concept of an MCEA/MCPS Early Retirement Incentive Program has been considered by MCPS since 1977; and

WHEREAS, The Board of Education approved an MCEA/MCPS Early Retirement Incentive Program on April 12, 1983, to assist with reductions-in-force needs for FY 1984; and

WHEREAS, The 1985-87 negotiated Agreement Between the Board of Education and the Montgomery County Education Association contains a section indicating that the MCEA/MCPS Joint Committee will reconsider and resubmit its proposal and that the Board of Education will make every effort to implement the plan of the joint committee; and

WHEREAS, The joint committee has met and developed a proposal for consideration by the Board of Education; and

WHEREAS, Discussion has been held with MCEA, MCCSSE, and MCAASP regarding the early retirement incentive programs; and

WHEREAS, An early retirement incentive program would be cost effective, reducing the number of employees at higher salary levels, thereby lowering the cost to MCPS for salary and fringe benefit payments; and

WHEREAS, An early retirement incentive program could assist with necessary reassignment and staffing needs, providing greater flexibility in staffing by allowing senior employees to retire early; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the early retirement incentive program formulated by the joint committee and presented herewith be approved by the Board of Education as a pilot project from May 1, 1985, to June 30, 1987; and be it further

Resolved, That this program will be effective for MCPS employees retiring during FY 1986 and 1987; and be it further

Resolved, That any early retirement incentive program that is adopted shall cover all MCPS employees equitably; and be it further

Resolved, That the status of the early retirement incentive program will be reviewed and evaluated by the Board of Education in coordination with the parties concerned, and a determination will be made regarding continuation of the program beyond FY 1987.

Re: New Hampshire Estates/Rolling Terrace
Project Proposal Process

Dr. Shoenberg said the Board had been asked by the County Council education committee to develop a plan to address the uneven enrollment situation in the Blair cluster. The Board had received an

earlier memorandum but had no time to consider it. There had been no Board discussion or opportunity for community input. The superintendent had presented a proposal to ask the County Council for planning funds in the FY 1986 capital budget, and the specific direction in which they would move would depend on the Board's decision following appropriate consultation with the community. He noted that the Board had a proposed calendar.

Board members raised objections to the calendar and suggesting building in time for Board alternatives. In addition, Board members suggested that legal advice should be obtained and that any information sent to the communities should include an explanation of how they had come to this process. Dr. Cronin asked staff to check into any commitment from the county government to use school system space. Dr. Shoenberg asked that the superintendent provide another calendar, and Mr. Ewing suggested that a letter go to the County Council about the process.

Resolution No. 240-85 Re: Amendment to the FY 1986 Operating Budget

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

WHEREAS, The Board of Education FY 1986 Operating Budget was adopted on February 12, 1985, in the amount of \$438,953,893 and later amended on February 25, 1985, in the amount of \$438,596,377; and

WHEREAS, The Council's Committee on Government Structure, Automation, and Regulations has deleted an energy management position and \$30,000 from the Board's Capital Budget and recommended that it be included in the Operating Budget; and

WHEREAS, The same committee has recommended rate changes to be used for developing energy, gasoline, and diesel fuel costs which will require an additional \$145,725; and

WHEREAS, The county requires an increased contribution of \$619,929 for the Joint Self-insurance Fund amount of \$53,164 in Category 7, \$559,858 in Category 10, and \$6,907 in Category 61 as provided for in the executive's recommended budget for the Board of Education; and

WHEREAS, The adoption of this amendment will change state categories as indicated below:

	BOARD AMENDED	BOARD AMENDMENT	BOARD AMENDED
STATE CATEGORY	Feb. 25, 1985		Apr. 22, 1985
01 Administration	\$ 26,763,671	\$ -	\$ 26,763,671
02 Instructional Salaries	224,670,020	-	224,670,020
03 Other Instructional Costs	12,254,352	-	12,254,352
04 Special Education	44,794,512	-	44,794,512
05 Student Personnel Services	1,331,653	-	1,331,653

06 Health Services	34,173	-	34,173
07 Student Transportation	21,427,015	191,265	21,618,280
08 Operation of Plant	34,321,721	37,624	34,359,345
09 Maintenance of Plant	12,437,029	-	12,437,029
10 Fixed Charges	46,093,367	559,858	46,653,225
11 Food Services	600,268	-	600,268
14 Community Services	233,404	-	233,404
61 Food Service Fund	13,635,192	6,907	13,642,099
Total	\$438,596,377	\$795,654	\$439,392,031

now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Board-adopted FY 1986 Operating Budget be amended to increase Category 7, Transportation, by \$191,265, and Category 8, Operation of Plant, by \$37,624, Category 10, Fixed Charges, by \$559,858, and Category 61, Food Service Fund, by \$6,907 for an amended total of \$439,392,031; and be it further

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

Re: Board Member Comments

1. Mrs. Praisner reported that the Board had received comments from Mr. Scull about the adequate public facilities revision. The memo requested the superintendent's comments by May 1, and she was concerned about the words listed under "schools" as alternatives. They were modular schools, busing, redistricting, and recapture of closed schools. She wondered where they were with that committee, and Dr. Cody indicated that staff was working on a proposed reply. Mrs. Praisner commented that they did transport students, they did periodic redistricting to satisfy needs when growth develops, they were recapturing a closed school, and they were looking at modular construction. However, this did not solve the adequate public facilities ordinance or the problems they had with the lack of understanding of what was possible or not possible for the school system to do. Dr. Cody explained that MCPS staff members were working with Park and Planning staff to come up with a decision model that could be applied to schools. Mrs. Praisner inquired about a date for the Board's meeting with Park and Planning. Mr. David Fischer, staff assistant, replied that the meeting would be after May 15. Mr. Ewing noted that the Board had adopted a position on why they thought it was important to build new schools rather than transport students long distances. He thought that this should be shared with Mr. Scull and that the Board should have a meeting with the Park and Planning Commission.

2. Mr. Ewing hoped that as, they discussed the Rolling Terrace/New Hampshire Estates issues, the community did not become convinced that the Board lacked enthusiasm for moving ahead. He noted that, on its own initiative, the Board had added those renovations to the budget and would continue to push for them.

3. Dr. Cronin commented that he was moved by the discussion the Board had had with representatives of the Montgomery County junior council members and seeing the pressures faced by these seventh and eighth graders. He cited an article in Education Week which stated that the middle school was a waste land in educational research and suggested that they had to pay attention to this intermediate group of students. He was going to meet with principals and their staffs to get information on what was going on in the middle school and what was needed to help these programs. He would inform the Board of these meetings. Dr. Cody reported that some JIM school principals were interested in looking at middle school programs, and Dr. Martin and her staff had been working with some principals.

4. Miss Duby reported that the Board's meeting with MCJC was the last in a series of meetings with students. She found the meeting interesting because they had discussed different pressures on seventh, eighth, and ninth graders. The next morning she had attended a meeting with several of the students who had been at the MCJC meeting, and some of these students were concerned because they had never been in a situation where they had expressed such concerns to adults. MCJC would have its final assembly on May 2, and she would attend and report to the group.

5. Miss Duby thanked those Board members who attended the Student Leadership Recognition Breakfast on Friday.

6. Mrs. Slye reported that she had talked with an Area 3 bus driver and was surprised to learn that MCPS buses had something called "universal seat belts." She requested more information from staff on how many drivers used these belts.

7. Mrs. Slye expressed wishes for a speedy recovery to Ellie Struck, a good friend of education, who was ill.

8. Mrs. DiFonzo stated that she had been concerned for some time about pressures that students seem to be functioning under. This was reinforced at the Elementary Principals Association conference because more and more elementary school children seemed to be talking about suicide. Last week in the Journal a second grade child wrote an entry about killing himself, and the school counselor had been working with that child. When the Board met with MCJC, she had asked questions about pressures put on students to succeed. She planned to write up a proposal to present to the Board at the May all-day meeting. She was going to suggest a study group, task force, or commission to try to get some recommendations as to what they could do to assure that while seeking excellence they were not asking students to do more than their best and not put students in that high pressure situation. She asked for Board member input.

9. Dr. Shoenberg reported that he and Mrs. Praisner had attended a conference sponsored by the state Board of Education involving school board members and superintendents from all of the counties and the City of Baltimore. The object of the meeting was to talk about future directions and, in particular, directions for the state

Board. At one point those in attendance were asked to rank certain major issues that had been identified as possible issues by the state Board. These included single-parent families, the intermediate schools and their purposes, the future of the teaching profession, and the problems of maintaining quality in teachers. In addition, they had a presentation on changing demographics in Maryland and would be obtaining a copy of that speech and the graphics. Mrs. Praisner commented that every time she had attended a function with other Maryland boards she had taken the opportunity to point out that Montgomery County was not that much different from the rest of the state. Dr. Cody remarked that he had added an item to the list of issues. He was reminded that research continued to demonstrate the direct linkage between the number of children borne to teenagers and the high frequency of retardation among that group. He was struck by the option to consider whether they should start schooling for four-year olds rather than five-year olds. The problem was identified as something that happened to children who had children. He wanted to think about not only identifying problems, but solutions that were outside the boundary of their function as public school systems. He thought that it was an appropriate function for them to comment on as a school system and also address what they thought other agencies should be doing. He felt that in this area it was important for them to work together with other county agencies.

Resolution No. 241-85

Re: Executive Session - May 14, 1985

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

WHEREAS, The Board of Education of Montgomery County is authorized by Article 76A, Section 11(a) of the Annotated Code of Maryland to conduct certain of its meetings in executive closed session; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Board of Education of Montgomery County hereby conduct its meeting in executive closed session beginning on May 14, 1985, at 9 a.m. to discuss, consider, deliberate, and/or otherwise decide the employment, assignment, appointment, promotion, demotion, compensation, discipline, removal, or resignation of employees, appointees, or officials over whom it has jurisdiction, or any other personnel matter affecting one or more particular individuals and to comply with a specific constitutional, statutory or judicially imposed requirement protecting particular proceedings or matters from public disclosure as permitted under Article 76A, Section 11(a) and that such meeting shall continue in executive closed session until the completion of business; and be it further

Resolved, That such meeting continue in executive closed session at noon to discuss the matters listed above as permitted under Article 76A, Section 11(a) and that such meeting shall continue in executive closed session until the completion of business.

Resolution No. 242-85

Re: Minutes of February 12, 1985

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

Resolved, That the minutes of February 12, 1985, be approved.

Resolution No. 243-85 Re: Minutes of February 25, 1985

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

Resolved, That the minutes of February 25, 1985, be approved as corrected.

Resolution No. 244-85 Re: Appointment to the Area 2 Task Force

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

WHEREAS, On October 22, 1985, the Board of Education established an Area 2 Task Force to identify program and facility needs in Area 2 schools which should be addressed by the school system; and

WHEREAS, On December 5, 1984, the Board of Education appointed the members to serve on the Area 2 Task Force; and

WHEREAS, Betty Chiang was appointed as one of the four at-large representatives; and

WHEREAS, The Board of Education has been notified that she is unable to serve; now therefore be it

Resolved, That Willard J. Adams be appointed to serve as one of the representatives on the Area 2 Task Force.

Re: Item of Information

Board members received the Monthly Financial Report as an item of information.

Re: Adjournment

The president adjourned the meeting at 11:05 p.m.

President

Secretary

WSC:mlw