



reports and evaluations that had come to them from different sources. Dr. Cody stated that the interest in improving services for students with special needs came to them from the superintendent's advisory committee. One of the themes was for MCPS to deal more directly in helping students with special needs in the transition from school to work. This was of significant magnitude to include in the initiatives paper.

\* Mr. Ewing joined the meeting at this point.

Dr. Cody explained that he wanted to find out whether the Board concurred in these three initiatives. The second theme was a concern for some discomfort with the ACES process. For example, it took too long for some students to go through the process, and minority students were heavily represented in certain special education programs. They all believed that the whole ACES process needed to be revised, and they already had in place a model for dealing with a part of it differently. It had to do with a determination of whether a child was learning disabled. They were participating in a project sponsored by the Maryland State Department of Education which was fairly well implemented in Area 2. That particular process seemed to be an effective way of reviewing and evaluating students and determining whether they were handicapped or not. The process had built into it a pre-intervention step where a group meets to come up with plans to help the child overcome deficiencies prior to establishing whether the child was learning disabled. When the process was applied, ways were found to get help to the student without labeling that child as handicapped. The proportion of minority students in special education went down substantially. Dr. Cody explained that the third area identified was most complex. There was an absence of any clear linkage between their long-range facility planning and the needs of students in special programs. This year's facility update included some recommendations for the out-years without any lengthy consideration by the Board of Education as to the kind of policies and guidelines they should be following. They proposed bringing some general guidelines and following that with specific proposals.

Dr. Cody asked for Board comments, reactions, and suggestions on the three initiatives for students with special needs. When they talked about the ACES proposal and pre-referral, they were really talking about students who were not special education handicapped. When they looked at the number of students who were determined to be learning disabled and said those numbers were higher percentage-wise than across the country, they thought they were identifying too many students but these students still needed help. Some of these students would continue to be identified as special education students and some of them just needed other kinds of help. On the facilities issue, they intended to discuss policies and guidelines on facilities needs, not just for special education students but for students in other special programs. He emphasized that the proposal did not try to cover the waterfront, but it did not mean that they would not be dealing with other things that were important. It was identifying items of such magnitude that they needed special

attention.

Dr. Hiawatha Fountain, associate superintendent, did not think there was anything in the paper Board members and citizens had not had some experience with over the past several years. The public had emphasized the need to do something in these areas. Dr. Cronin said they had an identification process, a facilities notion of where these students ought to be, and an attempt to reduce the number of students given LD labels. These students were in regular schools, and there had to be a program constructed for those students from the elementary schools through the high school. They had a regular program which had to exist side by side with the special services program, and that was not addressed here. He asked they show where the regular programs and the special education programs all started to dovetail together and where the resources were that would assist these programs. Dr. Fountain replied that the most appropriate place to discuss this would probably be in the identification and assessment process and what happened to the students who were no longer eligible to receive services through special education although they still had serious educational needs. He was very impressed with the process they went through in getting here. He felt that staff saw this was not a special education problem but rather a school system problem. They wanted to make sure that all responsibilities were taken care of, and the big question was how they were going to deal with these "grey area" students.

Dr. Cronin suggested that they start with a discussion of placement.

Dr. Fountain explained that their goal talked about assuring appropriate placement. This was an assumption that some students might not be appropriately placed. Many students referred were eliminated from the definition of what was an LD child. Therefore, these students might have an educational problem, but they were no longer eligible for services from the special education program. There were three objectives under this goal. The first was the improvement of the process of ACES itself. The procedures were eight to ten years old, and they needed to take a real serious look at that process. They wanted to gather information and eliminate a lot of the unnecessary overlap. They might be able to redesign forms where they could get more information at one shot. They might be able to handle students in a SARD/ARD process and eliminate one level. Dr. Cody explained that this would get the decision made quicker. Dr. Cronin asked how they envisioned accomplishing this stage of it. Dr. Fountain hoped to redo the ACES procedures in a year. They would establish a work group to complete the process within a year. Dr. Cody stated that the state LD project was expanding in all three areas and had this pre-referral intervention activity of a group in a local school. He thought that the implementation of that program across the school system would make a big difference in overcoming the tendency to designate a child as handicapped in order for that child to receive services.

Mrs. Praisner reported that she had written a memo containing quite a few questions. She would be interested in receiving information on

the state LD program. She also requested information of the state Department of Education evaluation. She had no disagreement with all three initiatives. However, she had some concern that the time tables might not be realistic, and she was also concerned that there was not adequate attention to what might be budget and staff implications. When they talked about this kind of change in the preparation of local schools to meet the needs of students, it would mean time for that local staff to be trained and given appropriate support. She had some question about whether they were putting too much of an expectation on what the psychologists could do given their number and the demands on them. She requested more information about the role of the psychologist in this whole issue. She was familiar with the ACES procedure. It seemed to her crucial that local staff and area office were involved in the development of the procedures and had ample time to review and comment. She hoped the timetable would show ample feedback and participation with the people who were working with those forms at the local school level. She was concerned that they were changing the process so that the decision might not be made at the local school level, but at the same time they were bringing services back to the local school. She hoped that the procedures would reflect this. They were talking about having more local school programs, but if the paperwork reduced the decision-making at the local level it might be the wrong process for the programs they had in place later on. She was concerned about this impact on facility planning and the whole issue of the resource room and how they were going to be using it.

Dr. Cronin asked where the funds were coming from to revise the process. Dr. Fountain replied that they would have to have some funds for released time to ensure local participation. There had been some discussion about whether he was being too optimistic. As they looked down the road at the budget, there would be budgetary implications, but he did not see it immediately affecting the budget in a big way. He pointed out that this year the Board increased the amount of per diem time for psychologists. He did not see them hiring a tremendous number of additional psychologists, but they would need additional per diem time in order to get some of this stuff done. He thought there would be budget implications for the students no longer identified as special education, but it would not be as much as the paperwork now required for special education.

Mrs. Praisner said she could understand the paperwork, but they were talking about the local teacher and the local school meeting the needs of that child. It might not be additional money, but it was redirected time and energy. Dr. Robert Shekletski, associate superintendent, said that when they talked about cleaning up the ACES procedures they were talking about the forms and time involved, but there was a piece in there of using the EMT process to cut out a lot of the things in the ACES process. He explained that the LD project was an expansion of what they used to call the EMT incorporating the psychologists. Initially there would have to be a greater commitment on the part of the local staff because it was a more involved process than it had been before. In Area 2 when the project began, there was a psychologist partly paid by the school system and partly by the

state department who facilitated the project. Once it went in and the staff became familiar with it, it was a lot easier to manage. If they looked at objective 3, once they went through this process part of it was to say what they were going to do with the student if the student was not handicapped. In Area 2 they had a proposal now in which the speech pathologist, the reading teacher, and the resource room teacher would form a team. The team would work together along with the classroom teacher to address the needs of that particular student. The student might be a handicapped student or might not be a handicapped student.

Mr. Ewing thought that the overall approach in terms of focus on these three areas was a good one. The one they were discussing was the most crucial because it defined the nature of the program for the future. From that would follow the other issues, the transition to work and the facilities needs. With respect to what was here, he did not have a lot of objection to it because it was mostly process although there were outcomes that they were searching for. One outcome not explicitly stated, but he assumed intended, was that the process of identification, assessment, and placement ought to be made more efficient. They could reduce the time and increase the clarity to the public of the explanations. All of this had to be balanced against the need to be fair in the process and accurate in the judgments that they made. Those things tended to take more time. He hoped as they pursued this they would be very clear that they were searching for efficiency. He also hoped that there would be the opportunity for advocacy groups and advisory groups to review what they were doing at various points along the way and to comment both to the superintendent and the Board about their views of the proposals.

Mr. Ewing pointed out that if they went about this in the objective way described in the paper they would end up with some fairly substantial changes in the program in terms of whom it served. That meant they would have to change whom they served in the regular program. With the introduction of requirements both at the state level and as a result of law suits and federal law for the education of handicapped children, there was a tendency on the part of the system and other systems to classify everybody as being either a regular student or in need of special education services. It was in the grey area of students with problems that they did not want to put in special education or were not served by the regular program that they ran into some difficulties. That issue was not solved by this although it was recognized. He felt it must be addressed or they would end up with a situation where they were perceived to be pushing students out of special education without providing them with the services and support they needed. If they were going to address this issue, they had to address themselves to what they were going to do for students who needed help but were not special education students. For example, the Minority Relations Monitoring Committee was concerned about MCPS putting too many labels on students too early and too often. Students with problems needed help but not necessarily of a kind that was special education. This was an area where they really had to pay very special attention to what they did.

He knew that it was not Dr. Fountain's responsibility explicitly. He did not see anyone with the sole responsibility for that task. It was a task for the education of a child with educational problems or social problems or some combination of the two. It was the education of the child from a poverty stricken background. The assumption that school systems often made was that they could simply handle that in the regular classroom without any additional resources. Montgomery County had done better, but the DEA research on Head Start showed that the gains made in Head Start were not retained because when students moved out of that special support program into the regular classroom they did not continue to function as well. He thought they had a very big problem to address in this area, and he was worried by the possibility that they might not yet have in mind how they were going to get there.

Dr. Pitt remarked that Mr. Ewing and Mrs. Praisner had hit the critical problem. He recalled that six years ago the Board had about 120 to 130 disadvantaged teachers and about 98 of those positions became resource room positions. Once they became resource room positions, they had a special structure to them. In order to receive service, a youngster had to be identified as special education. He questioned whether they should have moved that many positions that quickly. As they looked at their resources, one of the things they would have to look at if there were less youngsters served by those resource room teachers was their ability to build some flexibility into their time to allow those trained people to work with youngsters who were not labelled as special education but had special needs. In addition, he believed they would need some more resources.

Dr. Cronin noted that on page 29 there was a statement that the activity would begin in September 1985 with full implementation as resources permit. He wanted to know whose resources, where, and why. Dr. Fountain replied that he was also looking at the thrust of Priority 2 and change in perceptions about which students could remain in the classroom and which students could not. He was not so naive to believe that every student in special education who might not be appropriately placed would immediately move back into the regular classroom. He said with Priority 2 some of these students would never leave the regular classroom now. For example, the Board would be talking about TESA which was one of the strategies they would be using. This would not solve the whole problem. As they moved students from the resource room, that would free up some of that time. Instead of moving that resource person they were thinking about leaving that position in the school.

It seemed to Dr. Cronin they were talking about a two-stage process. One was the changes in the assessments and the referrals, and the second was the transition into the school. The second would be the longer phase. Dr. Fountain agreed and stressed that on this one the area associates, building principals, and teachers would have to work with special education.

Dr. Cody offered a hypothetical situation. A school had enough students identified as LD so that one resource room teacher was

assigned to that school. When the process was implemented, the number identified as LD might go down by one half in future years. They would not pull the resources and would keep the manpower there in the school because the students still needed help but would not be formally classified as LD.

Dr. Lee Etta Powell, associate superintendent, stated that there was another resource that was crucial to this entire process. That was the psychologist who was the pivotal force enabling them to implement the LD project. At this point in time, their time was relegated to making assessments. If they were moving into the LD project phase, they would need additional psychologists. She remarked that psychologists did have a wide range of expertise, knowledge, and skills that they could share with staff that would make the LD project a viable program. Until they had these psychologists, she had grave concerns about their ability to move forward with the project.

Mrs. Slye shared those concerns. She pointed out that the Board wanted to discuss some of this during the framework of the budget discussions. She said that decisions like this could not be made in a vacuum, and she thought the document went a long way toward putting forward in a systematic fashion what the Board hoped to achieve. She said the identification and testing issue was key and almost had to be the first thing addressed. She had looked for two words and did not see them. One of these words was "flexibility." If they were going to look at the system, one of the things with which they had had most difficulty was a system that allowed a child in and out of services depending on need, growth, or development and did not lock them into retesting and reevaluation at each step of the process. She felt that if they were going to look at streamlining the process, they were going to have to look at a more flexible approach. She commented that now the change from a Level 4 placement to a Level 3 placement was an enormous leap, and she asked if they were prepared to commit the resources to support a flexible decision and try that type of a placement. She thought that the pre-referral support was important; however, she was concerned that nowhere did it point to the fact that if the pre-referral process was going to be successful it needed to be early in a student's career. She did not see an emphasis on the fact that their greatest gains were generally made when they had an opportunity to address a student's needs early in his career.

Mrs. Slye was concerned about the staffing levels that did exist when they talked about not removing existing resources when they made this project work. Dr. Fountain had referred to every school having a half-time resource teacher. Dr. Fountain explained that this was a goal of his, and this was the second year. Mrs. Slye thought they had to walk with a fair amount of caution in making sure that the resources did exist to make this plan operative.

Mrs. Slye pointed out that they had not specifically stated that testing and appropriate placement had to be early and had to be timely. Any process had to result in some type of service of one

type or another within a reasonable time frame in a school year. Mrs. Slye asked what the 50 percent identified as LD say to the staff as they worked through this issue. Dr. Fountain replied that the DEA study said that the building principal and staff were frustrated as to what they could do with a particular student with some educational needs. The teacher got frustrated, and the principal and EMT decided they had to do something with this student. Therefore, the 50 percent included part of those students. Mrs. Slye said children did have very divergent learning styles, and she felt they had to work hard to develop effective divergent teaching methods. The process had to be two ways and had to go back into the regular curriculum in terms of teaching approaches.

Mrs. DiFonzo asked how long it took a psychologist to do a work-up. Dr. Bruce Johns replied that the actual work-up was a process taking a couple of weeks, but it might be a month before the psychologist got to that case. Mrs. DiFonzo asked about actual time invested, and Dr. Johns replied that it would be 12 to 15 hours. Mrs. DiFonzo asked about the amount of additional psychologist time they would need in order to implement the plan. Dr. Fountain did not believe that they had to invest in a lot more psychologists, but he thought they would need more per diem to do this. They might need a few more psychologists, but they really needed two to three years of additional per diem time. He said they were required to have a meeting once a year about a child and a review every third year, and they needed to take a hard look at that process to see whether they could do it better without hurting anyone. He thought this was one of the places where they could recapture some of the time. Dr. Cody asked about the percentage of psychologist time going to third or later year evaluation. He thought there might be a tradeoff with the new program. Dr. Fountain reported in the last five years the psychologists had to be retained to work with babies, and it took a lot of time to do these assessments.

Mrs. DiFonzo noted that the graph on page four was a time line and looked more like a flow chart. She questioned No. 3 on page 24 on overrepresentation of minority students. She did not feel that "why" had been answered. They had talked about students being identified and this being used as a dumping ground, but this did not answer the question of "why." She said that the new ACES process by definition was almost going to be self-limiting in terms of the number of students. In an effort to try to limit this, they had to make sure they were not eliminating children who needed the services. Dr. Fountain replied that this was not the intent of this project at all. They would serve every single identified handicapped youngster as they had already. He said that part of the "why" was the different pedagogical approaches. If the majority of students were moving at a fast pace, they had to look at the kinds of interventions to accommodate those students who did not move quite as fast or who culturally had problems in adapting to the various teaching and learning styles.

Mrs. DiFonzo noted that on page 27 there was a statement that a

number of schools had developed successful instructional programs for a wide range of students with diverse educational needs without classifying them as handicapped. She said that they had talked around that paragraph, but the sentence did not tell her how those schools had done this. Dr. Fountain replied that they planned to study that this year and find out what made those schools different. Dr. Cronin suggested that they spend a few minutes on the facilities issue because they would be discussing this in August when they had a new plan for assessing school capacity. Mrs. Praisner said whatever they were doing on facilities planning they would have to have some assumptions with it as well. They had to address questions such as how much special education or special programs were the best amount as far as a mix with the local school. They had to discuss support space implications for local schools. This had to be built into facility plan discussions. They had to talk about the amount of clustering and whether they were going to be moving programs or establishing additional programs. She felt there needed to be a philosophy statement about why the system was moving this way. There needed to be a message to the broad community about the rationale behind the changes being made in the schools. They had to look at whether there were implications for the design of future school buildings.

Mrs. DiFonzo said that pages 14 and 15 talked about Level 4 and 5 students and what happened after they graduated. About 20 percent of the Level 4 students were regularly employed and 33 regularly unemployed. She asked why they had a better employment record with Level 5 students. Dr. Fountain said that they would be looking at this. He said that traditionally in Montgomery County they had worked toward sending all children to college and just recently built their first vocational center. They hoped to begin to develop a plan for youngsters at their fourteenth birthday and have some specific training for them based on their aptitude and interest. He said he was appalled at the Level 4 numbers because he thought that more were employed. However, he pointed out that Level 5 included all of the secondary learning centers, Mark Twain, and RICA. There were some students there whose ability to work might be much better. Mrs. DiFonzo said that she would like to see an expansion on what was going on here. Dr. Cody agreed that an explanation would be provided. He pointed out that they had a perception of levels as if they were part of a sequence, and it was really not. Level 5 included some students with emotional problems but were intellectually very able.

Mrs. Slye said she would be interested in seeing some of the 67 programs they reviewed. She knew that some areas had some strong track records and while their programs might not be tailored to the needs of Montgomery County, it would be helpful to look at some of the success models. She did not want anyone to assume that the transition from school to work was the future for all students in special education services. It was simply an area where they knew there was a great need to improve on what they did.

Mr. Ewing pointed out that in the section on the transition there was an activity on a steering committee which would involve a variety of people and also a transitional coordinator position. He thought that was very important in this area to have someone having full responsibility for assuring over a long period of time that this activity was both carried out and monitored. He assumed that as the steering committee worked it would have to be very much involved with employers in the community who could give their views about how effectively MCPS was mounting this effort. He was concerned that they mounted the effort too much in isolation from the community as a whole. Dr. Fountain replied that the Cody/Gilchrist task force on transition to work was working with his office. They were also looking at the fact that MCPS employed about 11,000 people, and they would be looking at employment efforts here. Mr. Ewing felt that it was important to get systematic feedback from employers not only about what they were doing but also about how well the students were doing. They would want to know what skills students lacked or what skills were needed to be successful in the work environment.

Dr. Cronin pointed out that on page 20 in the strategy of transition services there was no one talking to employers, students, parents, or advocate groups. Assurance were given that this would be done, but he would like to see those words in print. Mr. Ewing stated that despite what Vitro said about its being the largest employer in Montgomery County, the school system was. He was glad that Dr. Fountain was looking at employment opportunities internally.

Dr. Cody said that the next steps were spelled out in the report. In terms of the facilities issues, they would come back to the Board with general guidelines and examples of their application. The ACES review was a year-long process, but the LD part of that had been started. The transition from school to work was internal staff work with a community process over a period of months. As they moved along they would provide the Board with general status reports on what they were doing internally. The cost implications would be coming forward prior to the FY 87 budget. Dr. Cronin said there appeared to be general agreement from the Board that they could go ahead with these initiatives, identify the resources and staff needs, and give the Board periodic updates of success. Mrs. Praisner felt it was important to know about this before budget time, and they had to keep the community and funding agencies informed.

Re: PRESENTATION ON TESA (TEACHER EXPECTATIONS AND STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT)

Mrs. Marion Bell, director of the Department of Human Relations, introduced members of her staff who made a presentation on TESA. Dr. Huong Mai Tran described the TESA program which was an in-service training for teachers to provide them with specific motivating actions to increase student performance. She explained the research which led to the identification of 15 different interactions which were practiced more frequently with high achieving students. The program involved five workshops each three hours in length, and in each workshop three interactions were introduced. Following each

workshop there was a three-week interval in which participants observed each other in the classroom practicing each of these interactions. Mr. Ronald Feffer stated that the TESA interaction model was broken into three basic strands: response opportunities, feedback, and personal regard. Units one through five comprised the five major workshops. The first unit was equitable distribution of response opportunities. Ms. Joyce Whittier explained that the second unit was individual help. The third unit was latency, the fourth was delving, and the fifth was higher level questioning. Mr. Jack Schoendorfer stated that the observation process differentiated TESA from other training programs. The participants got an opportunity to acquire information about teacher expectations, got time to practice this, and received feedback through the observation process.

Ms. Whittier reported that in November 1982 four MCPS staff persons were trained in TESA and returned to MCPS to teach HR 20, a countywide in-service course. As the school system began to implement the priorities, many schools elected to spend some or all of their minigrant funds on TESA. In the fall of 1984 fourteen additional staff were trained as TESA leaders. Dr. Tran reported that at present there were 27 TESA instructors.

Mr. Foubert thought that TESA was a terrific program, and he felt that it should be implemented on a broad-based spectrum throughout the school system. While it was not evaluative, it did improve teacher performance. Mrs. Bell commented that there were two things important about TESA. Teachers were being observed by a peer and it was non-evaluative. Another point was that the teacher responded to all of his or her students equally and did not praise one more than the other.

Mrs. Praisner requested a list of the number of schools that had participated, the number of staff broken down by elementary and secondary, and how many had requested the program for next year. She asked whether any school systems in the country required this training. She felt that the key to success in MCPS was that people wanted to have this training. She asked how they could better meet the demands or needs. She also inquired about whether there was a national evaluation of the program.

Mr. Ewing requested a copy of the staff training materials, and Mrs. Praisner suggested that copies be placed in the Board office for review by Board members.

Re: EXECUTIVE SESSION

The Board met from 12:25 to 2 p.m. on legal and personnel matters.

Re: BOARD/PRESS/VISITOR CONFERENCE

The following individuals appeared before the Board of Education:

1. Ann Kaplan, Sherwood High School
2. Robin Wexler, North Farm
3. Steve Bradicuh, Cashell PTA

4. Judy Skolnick
5. John Weston
6. Dr. Sam Joseloff, Winding Way/English Orchard Civic Association
7. Naomi Resnick
8. Owen Katzman, Woodward Facilities Committee
9. Vicki Rafel, MCCPTA

RESOLUTION NO. 327-85 Re: TUITION FOR OUT-OF-COUNTY AND OUT-OF-STATE PUPILS FOR FY 1986

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

WHEREAS, Resolution 364-77 which established the basis for noncounty tuition charges provides that the per pupil cost shall be based on the current year's estimated cost, including debt service; and

WHEREAS, The basis for the calculation of cost per pupil for tuition purposes in FY 1986 is as follows:

	KINDERGARTEN	ELEMENTARY	MIDDLE JUNIOR/SENIOR	SPEC ED
Estimated Number of Pupils	6,682	35,722	46,528	4,232
Out-of-County Maryland Pupils				
Cost:				
Regular Program	\$18,673,331	\$140,407,279	\$204,234,824	\$34,443,110
Debt Service	520,412	5,564,245	7,247,444	659,199
Total Cost	\$19,193,743	\$145,971,524	\$211,482,268	\$35,102,309
Cost Per Pupil:				
Regular Program	\$ 2,795	\$ 3,931	\$ 4,390	\$ 8,139
Debt Service	78	156	156	156
Total Cost	\$ 2,873	\$ 4,087	\$ 4,546	\$ 8,295
Out-of-State Pupils				
Cost:				
Regular Program	\$18,673,331	\$140,407,279	\$204,234,824	\$34,443,110
Debt Service	642,301	6,867,486	8,944,920	813,593
Total Cost	\$19,315,632	\$147,274,765	\$213,179,744	\$35,256,703
Cost per Pupil:				
Regular Program	\$ 2,795	\$ 3,931	\$ 4,390	\$ 8,139
Debt Service	96	192	192	192
Total Cost	\$ 2,891	\$ 4,123	\$ 4,582	\$ 8,331

Comparisons with Previous Year

	1984-85		1985-86	
	Out-of-County	Out-of-State	Out-of-County	Out-of-State
Kindergarten	\$2,552	2,573	2,873	2,891
Elementary	3,817	3,859	4,087	4,123
Middle/Junior/Senior	4,240	4,282	4,546	4,582
Special Education	7,702	7,744	8,295	8,331

now therefore be it

Resolved, That the tuition rates for out-of-county Maryland pupils and out-of-state pupils for the 1985-86 school year shall be:

	Out-of-County	Out-of-State
Kindergarten	\$ 2,873	2,891
Elementary	4,087	4,123
Middle Junior/Senior	4,546	4,582
Special Education	8,295	8,331

RESOLUTION NO. 328-85 Re: UTILIZATION OF FY 1986 FUTURE SUPPORTED PROJECT FUNDS FOR THE SPECIAL EDUCATION TRINITY COLLEGE STUDY CENTER

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

Resolved, That the superintendent of schools be authorized to receive and expend, within the FY 1986 Provision for Future Supported Projects, an additional \$6,696 supplemental grant from Trinity College to operate a special education professional material and study center in the following categories:

	CATEGORY	AMOUNT
04	Special Education	\$6,171
10	Fixed Charges	525
		-----
	TOTAL	\$6,696

and be it further

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

RESOLUTION NO. 329-85 Re: UTILIZATION OF FY 1986 FUTURE SUPPORTED PROJECT FUNDS FOR THE INTENSIVE VOCATIONAL ENGLISH AND SKILLS PROGRAM

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

Resolved, That the superintendent of schools be authorized to receive and expend, within the FY 1986 Provision for Future Supported Projects, a \$39,807 grant award within the following categories from

the Montgomery County Department of Social Services, Division of Family Resources under the Immigration and Nationality Act Targeted Assistance for Refugees, Title IV for the FY 1986 Intensive Vocational English and Skills for Refugees:

	CATEGORY	AMOUNT
02	Instructional Salaries	\$35,078
03	Instructional Other	1,747
10	Fixed Charges	2,982
		-----
	TOTAL	\$39,807

and be it further

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

RESOLUTION NO. 330-85 Re: PROCUREMENT CONTRACTS OVER \$25,000

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

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

WHEREAS, All bids received in response to RFP 85-18, Microcomputer Equipment, should be rejected and rebid due to insufficient competition; now therefore be it

Resolved, That RFP 85-18 be rejected; and be it further

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

85-17	Financial Leasing Memorex Equipment	
	NAME OF VENDOR(S)	DOLLAR VALUE OF CONTRACTS
	Memorex Finance Company	\$ 166,286
115-85	Health Room Supplies	
	NAME OF VENDOR(S)	
	Accredited Surgical Co.	\$ 10,774
	J. Cole Associates	4,062
	Commercial Wiping Cloth, Inc.	10,400
	Foster-Murray Baumgartner	1,875
	Gamma Medical Systems, Inc.	4,472
	William V. MacGill and Co.	6,866
	Med-Electronics, Inc.	625
	Medex Products Corp.	4,588
	Monumental Paper Co.	1,575
	Owens and Minor	6,272
	School Health Supply Co.	5,515
		-----
	TOTAL	\$ 57,024

125-85	Air Conditioning and Temperature Control Service Contract	
	NAME OF VENDOR(S)	
	Carrier Building Services	\$ 27,408
	Johnson Controls, Inc.	38,196
	Mechanical Systems Maint.,Inc.	6,672
		-----
	TOTAL	\$ 72,276
131-85	Lamps	
	NAME OF VENDOR(S)	
	Maurice Electrical Supply	\$ 196,971
135-85	Custodial Supplies	
	NAME OF VENDOR(S)	
	A A Ladder and Supply Corporation	\$ 1,218
	A and B Textiles	19,690
	Airchem/Capital Supply, Inc.	30,985
	Albright Company, Inc.	40,470
	Antietam Paper Co.	970
	Avril, Inc.	6,149
	Baer Slade Corporation	18,806
	Calico Industries,Inc	72,870
	Consolidated Maintenance & Supply, Inc.	8,614
	Daycon Products Co., Inc.	41,406
	Frank W.Winne & Son, Inc.	2,586
	Leonard Paper Co.	85,500
	The Mat Works	2,730
	Metropolitan Paper & Packaging Co.	8,370
	Monumental Paper Co.	89,728
	Noland Company	4,147
	Potomac Rubber Co., Inc.	162
	Puritan/Churchill Chemical Co.	845
	Waco Ladder and Scaffolding,Inc.	2,387
		-----
	TOTAL	\$ 437,633
161-85	Processed Meats	
	NAME OF VENDOR(S)	
	Dutterer's of Manchester Corp.	\$ 2,925
	Great Lakes Food Brokers	2,642
	Manassas Frozen Foods	8,800
	Mazo-Lerch	13,230
	A.W. Schmidt	4,932
	Stanely Food and Equipment Co., Inc.	2,096
	Vienna Beef	6,560
		-----
	TOTAL	\$ 41,185
162-85	Poultry Products	
	NAME OF VENDOR(S)	
	Carroll County Foods	\$ 4,779
	Dutterer's of Manchester Corp.	3,920
	Manassas Frozen Foods	24,750
	Smelkinson Brothers Corporation	94,290
		-----

	TOTAL	\$ 127,739
163-85	Frozen Baked Items	
	NAME OF VENDOR(S)	
	RMI	\$ 47,532
165-85	Frozen Fish	
	NAME OF VENDOR(S)	
	Smelkinson Brothers Corp.	\$ 38,906
	Carroll County Foods	11,154
		-----
	TOTAL	\$ 50,060
171-85	Replacement Physical Education Equipment	
	NAME OF VENDOR(S)	
	Atlantic Fitness Products Co.	\$ 840
	BSN Corporation	628
	DVF Sports	5,243
	J.L. Hammett Company	11,876
	Delmar Harris Company, Inc.	4,840
	Mitchell Industries, Inc.	3,640
	Play Sports Activities Company	592
	Sportmaster	3,275
	U.S. Games, Inc.	444
		\$-----
	TOTAL	\$ 31,378
172-85	Bread and Rolls	
	NAME OF VENDOR(S)	
	Capital Bakers	\$ 173,190
173-85	Milk, Milk Shake Mixes, Cottage Cheese, Yogurt, and Fruit Juices	
	NAME OF VENDOR(S)	
	Shenandoah's Pride Dairy	\$1,144,874
174-85	Snack Foods, Chips, and Popcorn	
	NAME OF VENDOR(S)	
	Herr's Food Inc.	\$ 119,148
178-85	Student Insurance	
	NAME OF VENDOR(S)	
	Reliance Standard Life Insurance Company	\$ 131,053
179-85	French Fries	
	NAME OF VENDOR(S)	
	Interstate Food Processing Corp.	\$ 76,860
184-85	Continuous Form Stock Tab	
	NAME OF VENDOR(S)	
	O.E.I. Business Forms	\$ 67,002
	Origami, Inc.	331
		-----
	TOTAL	\$ 67,333
189-85	IBM Personal Computer Equipment	
	NAME OF VENDOR(S)	
	IBM Corporation	\$ 46,688
196-85	Installing Dealer for Apple Microcomputer Equipment and Acquisition of Peripherals	
	NAME OF VENDOR(S)	
	Custom Computing	\$ 110,750
	VF Associates	7,973

TOTAL	-----
	\$ 118,723
GRAND TOTAL	\$ 3,105,963

RESOLUTION NO. 331-85 Re: HEATING SYSTEM PIPING REPLACEMENT -  
CLARKSBURG ELEMENTARY SCHOOL (AREA 3)

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

WHEREAS, Sealed bids were received on July 2, for heating system piping replacement at Clarksburg Elementary School, as indicated below:

	BIDDER	BASE BID
1.	American Combustion, Inc.	\$33,400
2.	E.J Whelan & Company	34,250
3.	Arey, Inc.	44,044
4.	R.W. Warner, Inc.	45,000
5.	Darwin Construction Co.	79,000

and

WHEREAS, The low bid is reasonable and the bidder is a reputable contractor and has successfully performed similar projects; and

WHEREAS, Funds are sufficient to award the contract; now therefore be it

Resolved, That a contract be awarded to American Combustion, Inc., for \$33,400, for heating system piping replacement at Clarksburg Elementary School, in accordance with plans and specifications prepared by the Department of School Facilities in conjunction with Morton Wood, Jr. Engineer.

RESOLUTION NO. 332-85 Re: ACCESSIBILITY MODIFICATIONS FOR THE  
HANDICAPPED - VARIOUS SCHOOLS

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

WHEREAS, Sealed bids were received on June 27, 1985, for accessibility modifications for the handicapped at various schools, as indicated below:

	BIDDER	BASE BID
1.	Ernest R. Sines, Inc.	\$ 94,900
2.	Jesse Dustin & Son, Inc.	128,400
3.	MAP Maintenance & Const. Co., Inc	153,610
4.	Hanlon Construction Co., Inc.	163,305
5.	Patrick Quinn, Inc.	165,000

and

WHEREAS, The low bidder, Ernest R. Sines, Inc., has performed similar projects satisfactorily;and

WHEREAS, Recommended bid is within staff estimate and sufficient funds are available to effect award; now therefore be it

Resolved, That a contract for \$94,900 be awarded to Ernest R. Sines, Inc. to accomplish accessibility modifications for the handicapped at various schools (listed below) in accordance with plans and specifications covering this work dated June 12,1985, prepared by Arley J. Koran, Inc., architect:

1. Ashburton Elementary
2. Broad Acres Elementary
3. Brookhaven Elementary
4. Winston Churchill High
5. Highland Elementary
6. Walter Johnson High
7. Maryvale Elementary
8. Montgomery Knolls Elementary
9. Rock Creek Valley Elementary

RESOLUTION NO. 333-85 Re: MONTHLY PERSONNEL REPORT

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Mrs. DiFonzo seconded by Mrs. Praisner, 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. 334-85 Re: EXTENSION OF SICK LEAVE

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

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

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

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

NAME	POSITION AND LOCATION	NO. OF DAYS
Barnes, Elizabeth	Career Information Asst. Computer Related Instruction	19
Wyatt, Roger	Building Services Manager II	6

Fallsmead Elementary

RESOLUTION NO. 335-85 Re: DEATH OF MR. NORMAN A. BROWN, RESOURCE  
TEACHER AT TAKOMA PARK JUNIOR HIGH  
SCHOOL

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

WHEREAS, The death on June 28, 1985, of Mr. Norman A. Brown, a  
resource teacher at Takoma Park Junior High School, has deeply  
saddened the staff and members of the Board of Education; and

WHEREAS, Mr. Brown had been a loyal employee of Montgomery County  
Public Schools for nine years; and

WHEREAS, Mr. Brown was a very successful mathematics resource teacher  
who continually contributed to the improvement of all students and  
provided leadership for the school; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the members of the Board of Education express their  
sorrow at the death of Mr. Norman A. Brown 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 copies be forwarded to Mr. Brown's family and Takoma Park  
Junior High School PTA and faculty.

RESOLUTION NO. 336-85 Re: PERSONNEL APPOINTMENT AND REASSIGNMENTS

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 appointment and reassignments  
be approved:

APPOINTMENT	PRESENT POSITION	As
Judith S. Kenney	Supervisor of Placement Office of Assoc. Supt. for Special and Alternative Ed.	Principal Lakewood Elementary Effective 7/10/85

REASSIGNMENT	POSITION EFFECTIVE	POSITION EFFECTIVE
NAME	AUGUST 19, 1985	JULY 1, 1988
Darryl Laramore Supervisor of Guidance	A&S Counselor	Retirement

TEMPORARY REASSIGNMENT FOR THE 1985-86 SCHOOL YEAR

NAME AND PRESENT	POSITION EFFECTIVE	POSITION EFFECTIVE
------------------	--------------------	--------------------

POSITION  
William Bowen

JULY 10, 1985  
Assignment to be  
determined

JULY 1, 1986  
A&S position for  
which qualified

Re: PROPOSED RESOLUTION ON HONORS PROGRAM  
(FAILED)

The following proposed resolution on the honors course failed with Dr. Cronin, Mrs. DiFonzo, and Mr. Ewing voting in the affirmative; Mrs. Praisner and Mrs. Slye voting in the negative (Mr. Foubert voting in the affirmative):

WHEREAS, The Board of Education passed a resolution on October 12, 1982, which established a system-wide pilot Honors Program in Grades 9-12; and

WHEREAS, The intent of the Honors Program is to provide appropriate instructional challenges for academically talented and motivated students; and

WHEREAS, Montgomery County Public Schools has piloted the Honors Program consisting of advanced placement courses, advanced level courses, and honors work in designated courses for two years; now therefore be it

Resolved, That students in Grades 9-12 may participate in the Honors Program based upon a review of specified criteria by a school selection committee; and be it further

Resolved, That students enrolled in "honors level work in designated courses" will pursue the MCPS instructional objectives in greater depth and/or breath and with greater use of higher level intellectual skills; and be it further

Resolved, That teachers of honors program courses will receive in-service training as needed; and be it further

Resolved, That the following courses be added to the MCPS Honors Program that has been piloted:

- o Oral Communications - Honors, Grade 10 (1459)
- o Magnet Geometry (3038, 3039)\*
- o Fundamentals of Computer Science (2952, 2951)\*
- o Interdisciplinary Seminar (2971, 2970)\*
- o Advanced Science 1 (3531) and Advanced Science 2 (3532)\*
- o Advanced Placement Computer Science (DP) (2965, 2966)\*
- o Advanced Placement Studio Art (6482, 6483)
- o Advanced Placement Studio Art (6484, 6485);

\* These courses have pilot status

and be it further

Resolved, That the Honors Program that was pilot tested for two years be given final approval for inclusion in the Program of Studies and for continuing implementation in grades 9-12.

RESOLUTION NO. 337-85 Re: ADDITIONS TO HONORS COURSES BEING  
PILOT TESTED

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

Resolved, That the following courses be included in the Honors courses being piloted tested:

- o Oral Communications - Honors, Grade 10 (1459)
- o Magnet Geometry (3038, 3039)
- o Fundamentals of Computer Science (2952, 2951)
- o Interdisciplinary Seminar (2971, 2970)
- o Advanced Science 1 (3531) and Advanced Science 2 (3532)
- o Advanced Placement Computer Science (DP) (2965, 2966)
- o Advanced Placement Studio Art (6482, 6483)
- o Advanced Placement Studio Art (6484, 6485)

RESOLUTION NO. 338-85 Re: APPROVAL OF PROGRAM OF STUDIES  
REVISIONS OF COURSES MEETING THE FINE  
ARTS GRADUATION REQUIREMENT - PART 1

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

WHEREAS, The Board of Education on October 11, 1984, approved the addition of one credit in the fine arts for graduation from high school (Resolution 546-84), effective for incoming ninth graders in September, 1985; and

WHEREAS, The State Board of Education subsequently voted tentative approval of the addition of one fine arts credit requirement (November 28, 1984, and March 27, 1985); and

WHEREAS, The Maryland State Department of Education simultaneously issued guidelines for course content and curricular goals for all courses meeting this requirement; and

WHEREAS, The Board of Education on April 9, 1985, approved a list of courses which graduating students in 1989 and thereafter may take to meet the fine arts requirement provided that revision to those courses be made as soon as possible to meet MSDE content and curricular goal guidelines; and

WHEREAS, Staff has prepared the first section of such revisions applicable to those courses generally available for incoming ninth

graders, and the Council of Instruction has approved these revisions (May 22, 1985); and

WHEREAS, The remaining course revisions will be forthcoming in the fall of 1985; now therefore be it

Resolved, That Part 1 of the Board-mandated revision to fine arts courses submitted as an information item to the Board on June 12, 1985, be approved; and be it further

Resolved, That these revisions become effective for the 1985-86 school year and thereafter.

RESOLUTION NO. 339-85 Re: CERTIFICATE OF MERIT

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

WHEREAS, The Montgomery County Board of Education would like to encourage as many high school students as possible to pursue more challenging programs and to reward students who successfully pursue more challenging programs; and

WHEREAS, The State Board of Education gave final approval on June 26 to the Maryland High School Certificate of Merit for students who successfully complete 17 specified core credits, earn at least 12 credits in advanced courses, and obtain at least a 2.6 cumulative grade-point average of a 4.0 scale; and

WHEREAS, The Certificate of Merit will be awarded beginning with the graduating class of 1989; and

WHEREAS, The High School Certificate of Merit is to be awarded in addition to the High School Diploma; and

WHEREAS, Guidelines concerning the identification of advanced courses have been provided by the State Department of Education; and

WHEREAS, The Montgomery County Board of Education with the advice of the superintendent has the responsibility to effect the requirements for earning the Certificate of Merit; now therefore be it

Resolved, That students in the graduating class of 1989 and beyond may earn the Certificate of Merit upon satisfaction of specified requirements in addition to the High School Diploma; and be it further

Resolved, That the approved courses to meet the requirement for earning at least 12 credits in advanced courses for the Certificate of Merit be as follows (an asterisk indicates that the course is offered in the MCPS Pilot Honors Program):

ART

Studio Art 1A 6105  
Studio Art 1B 6106  
Studio Art 2A 6205  
Studio Art 2B 6206  
Studio Art 3A 6305  
Studio Art 3B 6306  
Advanced Studio A 6313  
Advanced Studio B 6314  
Commercial Art 3A 6403  
Commercial Art 2B 6413  
Ceramics/Sculpture 2A 6383

Ceramics/Sculpture 2B 6393  
Ceramics/Sculpture 3A 6385  
Ceramics/Sculpture 3B 6388  
Visual Art Center (TP) A 6490  
Visual Art Center (DP) A 6492  
Visual Art Center (TP) B 6491  
Visual Art Center (DP) B 6493  
\*Studio Art AP A 6482  
\*Studio Art AP B 6483  
\*Studio Art AP (DP) 6484  
\*Studio Art AP (DP) 6485

#### BUSINESS EDUCATION

Data Processing (TP) A 4115  
Data Processing (TP) B 4116

#### CAREER EDUCATION

Executive High School  
Internship Program 2325

#### COMPUTER SCIENCE

Computer Programming for  
Problem Solving 2962  
Pascal 2964

Computer Science AP (DP) A 2965  
Computer Science AP (DP) B 2966

#### DANCE

Summer School for the Performing  
Arts: Advanced Dance 6917

#### DRAMA/THEATRE

Theatre 2 6911  
Advanced Acting 6912  
Stage Design 6913

Play Directing 6914  
Summer School for the Performing  
Arts: Advanced Acting 6916

#### ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS

\*Intro. to High School Eng.  
Honors 1471  
\*Language/Writing Workshop 1  
Honors 1470  
\*Narrative/Drama as Lit. 1  
Honors 1472  
\*Language/Writing Workshop 2  
Honors 1477  
Essay/Lyric 1, 1454  
\*Essay/Lyric 1 Honors 1474  
Narrative/Drama as Lit. 2, 1453  
\*Narrative/Drama as Lit. 2,  
Honors 1473  
Essay/Lyric 2, 1455  
\*Essay/Lyric 2 Honors 1475

Narrative/Drama as Lit. 3, 1457  
\*Narrative/Drama as Lit. 3  
Honors 1476  
\*English AP A 1017  
\*English AP B 1018  
Informative & Argumentative  
Speaking 1461  
Oral Interpretation and  
Media Study 1462  
Techniques of Adv. Journalism 1152  
Publications Editing, Layout &  
Business Management 1153  
Advanced Composition A 1130  
Advanced Composition B 1135  
\*Oral Communications, 1459

#### FOREIGN LANGUAGES

Chinese 2A 1873  
French 2A 1612

German 4A 1964  
\*German 4A Honors 1978

German 2A 1962  
Hebrew 2A 1893  
Italian 2A 1983  
Japanese 2A 1833  
Russian 2A 1853  
Spanish 2A 1712  
Chinese 2B 1874  
French 2B 1622  
German 2B 1972

Hebrew 4A 1897  
\*Hebrew 4A Honors 1937  
Italian 4A 1987  
\*Italian 4A Honors 1991  
Japanese 4A 1837  
\*Japanese 4A Honors 1841  
Russian 4A 1857  
\*Russian 4A Honors 1848