

169-85	Trucks, Refrigerated	
	NAME OF VENDOR(S)	
	International Harvester Co.	134,674
	Lehnert Transportation Equipment	76,848
	TOTAL	-----
		\$211,522
191-85	Cafeteria Disposable Supplies	
	NAME OF VENDOR(S)	
	Monumental Paper Co.	\$ 88,640
405-5	Automotive Radiator Repair	
	NAME OF VENDOR(S)	
	Discount Radiator Repair	\$108,000
	Rockville Radiator Shop	12,000
	TOTAL	-----
		\$120,000
	GRAND TOTAL	\$455,127

Mr. Foubert temporarily left the meeting at this point.

RESOLUTION NO. 346-85 Re: PARTIAL REROOF - SOMERSET AND WOOD
ACRES ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS (AREA 2)

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

WHEREAS, Sealed bids were received on July 11 for the partial reroofing at Somerset and Wood Acres Elementary Schools, as indicated below:

BIDDER	PROPOSAL A WOOD ACRES	PROPOSAL B SOMERSET
1. R.D. Bean, Inc.	\$ 21,218*	\$21,545
2. J.E. Wood, Inc.	21,287	20,998*
3. Orndorff & Spaid, Inc.	21,842	21,803

*Recommended award

and

WHEREAS, The low bidders, R. D. Bean, Inc., and J. E. Wood, Inc., have performed similar projects satisfactorily and both bids are within staff estimates and sufficient funds are available to effect award; now therefore be it:

RESOLVED, That a contract be awarded to R. D. Bean, Inc., for \$21,218 for the partial reroofing at Wood Acres (Proposal A) in accordance with plans and specifications covering this work dated June 27, 1985, prepared by the Division of Construction and Capital Projects; and be it further

RESOLVED, That a contract be awarded to J. E. Wood, Inc., for \$20,998 for the partial reroofing at Somerset Elementary School (Proposal B) in accordance with plans and specifications covering this work dated June 27, 1985, prepared by the Division of Construction and Capital Projects.

RESOLUTION NO. 347-85 Re: MECHANICAL MODIFICATIONS - KENNEDY HIGH SCHOOL (AREA 1)

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

WHEREAS, A sealed bid, as indicated below, was received on July 11 for mechanical modifications to Areas 109 and 213 at John F. Kennedy High School:

BIDDER	BASE BID
American Combustion, Inc	\$39,236

and

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

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

WHEREAS, Sufficient funds are available to award this contract; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That a contract for \$39,236 be awarded to American Combustion, Inc., in accordance with plans and specifications entitled, "Mechanical Modifications to Areas 109 and 213 - John F. Kennedy High School," dated June 27, 1985, prepared by the Division of Construction and Capital Projects in conjunction with Morton Wood, Jr., Engineer.

RESOLUTION NO. 348-85 Re: WORKS OF ART FOR MONTGOMERY BLAIR HIGH SCHOOL

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

WHEREAS, Authorization for the selection of artists to receive commissions to produce works of art is delineated in Article V, Section 1, Chapter 8, "Buildings," of the Montgomery County Code; 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 in the FY 1985 Capital Improvements Program; and

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

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education enter into a contractual agreement, as indicated, subject to County Council approval:

ARTIST	WORK	COMMISSION
Ms. Tove Johansen	Mosaics	\$34,000

and be it further

RESOLVED, That the County Council be requested to expeditiously approve the above commission to the indicated artist.

RESOLUTION NO. 349-85 Re: WORKS OF ART FOR WOODFIELD ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

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

WHEREAS, Authorization for the selection of artists to receive 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, The law also requires County Council approval 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, as indicated, subject to County Council approval:

ARTIST	WORK	COMMISSION
Jean Paul Courbois	Mural	\$10,000
Steven Weitzman	Sculpture	14,000

and be it further

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

RESOLUTION NO. 350-85 Re: ARCHITECTURAL APPOINTMENT - PAINT
BRANCH HIGH SCHOOL ADDITION AND
ALTERATIONS (AREA 1)

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

WHEREAS, It is necessary to appoint an architect to provide required design services and administration of the construction contract for the Paint Branch High School addition and alterations project; and

WHEREAS, Staff has employed the Architect/Engineer Selection Procedures approved by the Board of Education in November, 1975; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education enter into a contractual agreement with the firm of Duane, Elliott, Cahill, Mullineaux & Mullineaux, P.A. to provide required design services and administration of the construction contract for the lump sum of \$285,900.00 for the Paint Branch High School project; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the State Interagency Committee for Public School Construction be informed of this appointment.

RESOLUTION NO. 351-85 Re: FY 1986 CAPITAL BUDGET SUPPLEMENTAL
APPROPRIATION

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

WHEREAS, On June 26, 1985, the State Board of Public Works approved construction funds reimbursement for the Woodfield Elementary School addition and modernization project of \$1,581,000 and for the Washington Grove Elementary School modernization project of \$1,298,000; and

WHEREAS, On the recommendation of the county executive, the County Council must approve receipt and expenditure of these funds; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the county executive be requested to recommend approval of FY 1986 Capital Budget supplemental appropriations of \$1,581,000 for the Woodfield Elementary School addition and modernization project and \$1,298,000 for the Washington Grove Elementary School modernization project, and that the FY 1986 Capital Improvements Program be amended accordingly.

RESOLUTION NO. 352-85 Re: REDUCTION OF RETAINAGE - GAITHERSBURG
HIGH SCHOOL (AREA 3)

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

WHEREAS, The Jesse Dustin & Son, Inc. general contractor for the Gaithersburg High School has completed 88 percent of all specified requirements as of June 30, 1985, and has requested that the 10 percent retainage amount, which is based on the completed work to date, be reduced to 5 percent retainage; and

WHEREAS, The project bonding company, Insurance Company of North America, by letter dated April 9, 1985, consented to this reduction; and

WHEREAS, The project architect, Thomas Clark Associates Architects, by letter dated July 15, 1985, recommended that this request for reduction in retainage be approved; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the contract's specified 10 percent retainage withheld from periodic construction contract payments to Jesse Dustin & Son, Inc., general contractor for Gaithersburg High School, currently amounting to 10 percent of the contractor's request for payment to date, now be reduced to 5 percent with remaining 5 percent to become due and payable after formal acceptance of the completed project and total completion of all remaining contract requirements.

RESOLUTION NO. 353-85 Re: REDUCTION OF RETAINAGE - LAKE SENECA
ELEMENTARY SCHOOL (AREA 3)

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

WHEREAS, The Jesse Dustin & Son, Inc., general contractor for the Lake Seneca Elementary School, has completed 92 percent of all specified requirements as of June 30, 1985, and has requested that the 10 percent retainage amount, which is based on the completed work to date, be reduced to 5 percent retainage; and

WHEREAS, The project bonding company, Insurance Company of North America, by letter dated April 9, 1985, consented to this reduction; and

WHEREAS, The project architect, Grimm & Parker Architects, by letter dated July 11, 1985, recommended that this request for reduction in retainage be approved; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the contract's specified 10 percent retainage withheld from periodic construction contract payments to Jesse Dustin & Son, Inc., general contractor for Lake Seneca Elementary School, currently amounting to 10 percent of the contractor's request for payment to date, now be reduced to 5 percent with remaining 5 percent to become due and payable after formal acceptance of the completed project and

total completion of all remaining contract requirements.

RESOLUTION NO. 354-85 Re: REDUCTION OF RETAINAGE - FLOWER HILL
ELEMENTARY SCHOOL (AREA 3)

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

WHEREAS, The Jesse Dustin & Son, Inc., general contractor for the Flower Hill Elementary School has completed 93 percent of all specified requirements as of June 30, 1985, and has requested that the 10 percent retainage amount, which is based on the completed work to date, be reduced to 5 percent retainage; and

WHEREAS, The project bonding company, Insurance Company of North America, by letter dated April 9, 1985, consented to this reduction; and

WHEREAS, The project architect, Grimm & Parker Architects, by letter dated July 11, 1985, recommended that this request for reduction in retainage be approved; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the contract's specified 10 percent retainage withheld from periodic construction contract payments to Jesse Dustin & Son, Inc., general contractor for Flower Hill Elementary School, currently amounting to 10 percent of the contractor's request for payment to date, now be reduced to 5 percent with remaining 5 percent to become due and payable after formal acceptance of the completed project and total completion of all remaining contract requirements.

RESOLUTION NO. 355-85 Re: CATEGORICAL TRANSFER WITHIN THE FY
1985 FUTURE SUPPORTED PROJECTS
APPROPRIATION

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

RESOLVED, That the superintendent of schools be authorized to effect the following transfer which does not require action of the County Council under Part V: Miscellaneous Provisions, section N, of the County's Fiscal 1985 Appropriation Resolution:

CATEGORY	DESCRIPTION	FROM	TO
1	Administration	\$ -	\$3,811
2	Instructional Salaries	2,550	-
3	Other Instructional Costs	1,261	-
	TOTAL	-----	-----
	Total	\$3,811	\$3,811

and be it further

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

RESOLUTION NO. 356-85 Re: UTILIZATION OF FY 1986 FUTURE SUPPORTED PROJECT FUNDS FOR THE COMPUTERIZED ADAPTIVE TESTING SYSTEM PROGRAM

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Dr. Cronin seconded by Mrs. Praisner, 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 \$10,000 grant award in Category 01, Administration, from MSDE to expand development to a prototype computerized adaptive testing program; and be it further

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

Re: BOARD/PRESS/VISITOR CONFERENCE

Sandra Brecker of the North Farm Citizens Association appeared before the Board of Education.

Mr. Foubert rejoined the meeting at this point.

RESOLUTION NO. 357-85 Re: PERSONNEL APPOINTMENT AND 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 appointment and reassignment be approved:

APPOINTMENT	PRESENT POSITION	AS
Rosalva Rosas	Resource Teacher Zadok Magruder H. S.	Administrative Asst. to the Assoc. Supt. for Instruc. & Program Dev. Grade M Effective 7/23/85

TEMPORARY ASSIGNMENT FOR THE 1985-86 SCHOOL YEAR

NAME AND PRESENT POSITION	POSITION EFFECTIVE JULY 23, 1985	POSITION EFFECTIVE July 1, 1986
Evelyn Scales Principal Montgomery Knolls	A&S Principal to be determined	A&S Position to be determined

Elementary

Re: PRACTICAL ARTS GRADUATION REQUIREMENT

Mrs. Praisner moved and Mr. Ewing seconded the following:

WHEREAS, The State Board of Education gave final approval on June 26 to new high school graduation requirements; and

WHEREAS, One credit must be earned in "Industrial arts/technology education, home economics, vocational education, or computer studies"; and

WHEREAS, The Montgomery County Board of Education with the advice of the superintendent has the responsibility to effect this requirement; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the students in the graduating class of 1989 and beyond may fulfill this requirement upon satisfactory completion of one credit in any course offered in Career and Vocational Education (1985-86 COURSE BULLETIN, pp. 3, 5-9, and 14-20 or Computer Science pp. 7, 8, and 21).

For the record, Mr. Foubert stated he did not support the addition of a practical arts graduation requirement. He would vote in favor of the resolution because of the broad-based spectrum of courses which were being allowed to meet the requirement.

Dr. Cronin assumed the chair.

Re: A MOTION TO AMEND THE PROPOSED RESOLUTION ON PRACTICAL ARTS (FAILED)

A motion by Dr. Shoenberg that the Board amend the proposed resolution on practical arts by adding a second Resolved clause "Resolved, That the superintendent bring to the Board in time for possible action to meet the date for the course Bulletin a list of viable options for meeting the spirit of this requirement in ways that reflect a defined and consistent purpose for it" failed with Mr. Ewing and Dr. Shoenberg voting in the affirmative; Dr. Cronin, Mrs. DiFonzo, Mrs. Praisner, and Mrs. Slye voting in the negative (Mr. Foubert voting in the affirmative).

Dr. Shoenberg assumed the chair.

RESOLUTION NO. 358-85 Re: AN AMENDMENT TO THE PROPOSED RESOLUTION ON PRACTICAL ARTS GRADUATION REQUIREMENT

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

RESOLVED, That the proposed resolution on practical arts graduation requirement be amended by the addition of the following Resolved

clause:

RESOLVED, That the Board directs the superintendent to develop for Board consideration a proposed statement of educational purpose for this state requirement as it applies to Montgomery County.

RESOLUTION NO. 359-85 Re: PRACTICAL ARTS GRADUATION REQUIREMENTS

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

WHEREAS, The State Board of Education gave final approval on June 26 to new high school graduation requirements; and

WHEREAS, One credit must be earned in "Industrial arts/technology education, home economics, vocational education, or computer studies"; and

WHEREAS, The Montgomery County Board of Education with the advice of the superintendent has the responsibility to effect this requirement; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the students in the graduating class of 1989 and beyond may fulfill this requirement upon satisfactory completion of one credit in any course offered in Career and Vocational Education (1985-86 COURSE BULLETIN, pp. 3, 5-9, and 14-20 or Computer Science pp. 7, 8, and 21); and be it further

RESOLVED, That the Board directs the superintendent to develop for Board consideration a proposed statement of educational purpose for this state requirement as it applies to Montgomery County.

Re: NEW FORMULA FOR SCHOOL CAPACITY

Dr. Cody explained that the formula evolved out of the frustration of trying to do long-range facilities planning on the basis of a utilization capacity formula which had its origin in preparing requests for state funding. The state guidelines called for 30 students per regular classroom. He noted that they were not likely to be very dependent upon the state for capital funding. This did not mean MCPS did not need to provide the type of information needed by the state. They needed a statement based on the way they operated programs in Montgomery County. They were presently taking some actions to change the way schools were staffed and programs were operated such as reducing average class size in elementary schools and increasing the number of all-day kindergartens. They needed to be dealing with building capacity numbers and planning buildings on how they operated programs today and how they expected to operate in the future. The paper before the Board had different types of numbers. For example, at the elementary grades they would consider a school more than 75 percent of the state-rated capacity to be overcrowded. Therefore, it did not make sense to use the notion of 70 to 90 percent of capacity. They should be planning at the

elementary grades at 75 percent of state-rated capacity.

Dr. Cody stated that their objectives for the future should be reflected in future facilities planning. If they pursued all-day kindergarten programs on a parent-option basis, they needed to make a five, six, and seven year facility plan with that in mind. There should be a formula applied to all schools but recognizing that some schools had more special classes and special programs than others. In addition, a school might change the number of special programs from year to year or a school might have a different average class size because it was a magnet school. This school would have a different maximum capacity. This would avoid getting into the difficulty they were in regarding the Blair cluster. He explained that the new formula was not all that complicated. At the next Board meeting they hoped to come forward with a formula for secondary schools.

Mr. Richard Fazakerley, associate superintendent, stated that in the past ten years they had been absorbing requirements that had developed as a result of social and program changes because space was available. They now needed to reflect needs for programs as seen by teachers and communities. They had to formalize this and bring it forward into the planning process.

Mrs. Slye commented that as they planned long-range they needed to develop some sort of a factor for anticipating needs before they changed. They needed statistics to indicate what program demands might reasonably be expected so they were not in a reactive posture when program needs appeared. She asked whether the 75 percent of state-rated capacity seemed to apply equally to small schools. If it did, she wanted to know what this did to their ability to meet certain standards such as desirable number of classes per grade. Dr. George Fisher, director of planning, replied that the 75 percent was a good general number. He cited Monocacy which only had 11 classrooms. If they provided a classroom for art and music and a classroom for the other support services, then they were down to providing one classroom per grade for the regular program. When they looked at schools with 12 or fewer classrooms, they were looking at one classroom per grade for the regular program.

Dr. Cody explained they were proposing a formula which assumed 21.4 which was the three-year goal for kindergarten and 23.66 for the upper grades which was an average of 22.5 which was 75 percent of the 30 figure. Dr. Pitt explained that they would have the same problem no matter what formula they used. A school such as Monocacy would have a lower capacity and smaller classes.

Mrs. Praisner thought this was a good starting point to talk about the issues; however, some of the issues were missing from here. She could see where the secondary formula might be more difficult to develop. There was an assumption that the formula was better for the school system and was a better reflection of how Montgomery County staffed its schools and the programs available within the schools. There was also the reality of the state having a role in this

process. She inquired about steps in the process that needed to take place to identify what other counties were doing other than the 30 students per classroom as far as the way they plan and how they planned to develop County Council, county executive, and state understanding of what MCPS was going to do.

Dr. Cody agreed that they had to touch base with the people on the state level and involve the Council and county executive. He hoped to persuade them that this was a more realistic way to build data about long-range planning in the county. He said they would still need to provide information in some form the way the state wanted it. Mrs. Praisner said they still prepared information requested by the state with the assumption the state would provide the funding. She said that they might generate some confusion unless they laid some groundwork. At the local level, they had to have an educational rationale for why they were developing this new formula which was to some extent missing from this paper. She suggested that the background of what this meant as far as the delivery of education should be the focus of why they were going through this process. Dr. Shoenberg commented that to some degree what she was asking for was contained in the planning paper they dealt with in January. He agreed that this paper needed to be repeated here and expanded upon.

Dr. Cronin stated that there was a second process which was the cooperation with Park and Planning. They did need a firm data base from which they then could talk about utilization and capacity. If they were to deal with subdivisions, they had to show the county there was a consistent data base in which they then applied the rationale of should the subdivision be approved. In the APFO process, they had heard that if there were no capacity there would be a three-year time frame in which they had an opportunity to adjust. He noted that the attachment on Brown Station took the state-rated versus the new formula. If they reduced the utilization of the school by 178 students, they might see a capital budget asking for a considerable amount of money in order to build schools to house the very same students they were housing right now. He asked how they explained dropping the size of a school and, therefore, asking for more capital funding from the county. Dr. Cody thought there would be some differences in terms of facilities they would need in the future; however, he did not think it would be as dramatic. There were quite a few schools where the new capacity figures would not change anything. If the analysis led to a description of more facilities problems than the current analysis, it would be a fair definition of how they actually operated programs. That did not mean they were going to get all the money they thought they needed as a result of that process. He explained that the Blair cluster area was a good example of a place where the situation got so serious they had to deal with it.

Dr. Pitt did not think the new formula was a great departure. It was really an effort to be practical and get away from the 70-90 percent which was confusing. The new formula assumed all-day kindergarten in every school because they believed this was a goal of the Board. If they looked at the new formula and today's half-day kindergartens,

they would add two classes of 23 youngsters. They would have about 47-48 more youngsters in a school which was not tremendously different.

Mr. Ewing thought that this was a good start, but there was some risk in thinking that the requirements they perceived today would be the requirements 30 years from now. This suggested to him that while this provided them with a very good argument if it were fleshed out and appropriately described in educational program terms, it did not build in flexibility into instruction. He hoped that they would tie this notion to the increasing use of modular construction and internal flexibility in core construction. A school might change character over time, and they might want to change locations of programs. If the central core was constructed in a flexible way, they could argue they were building flexibly for the future. He was concerned that their three-year goal for class size might not be a goal that was adequate. Some future Board might wish to produce even better numbers; however, he did not know how this could be built in. He was also concerned that they hadn't said anything about community uses such as day care. He thought they might want to have the concept of a residual space in the core which could be used for a variety of purposes such as day care, community services, and special education.

Dr. Cody suggested that staff track the average class size in secondary and elementary in the county for the last 15 years. They might discover that 15 years ago the numbers were the same which would make them less concerned about the long-term future. If they discovered they were considerably less today than they were 15 years ago, they would have to look at the need for some kind of flexibility in the formula.

Mrs. DiFonzo inquired about the size of an average classroom. Dr. Fisher replied that a classroom was supposed to be 950 square feet, 800 student space and 150 teacher space. Mrs. DiFonzo commented that the one thing that was not addressed were the all-purpose rooms. The Board had received a letter from Cedar Grove that talked about doubling student capacity without touching the size of the all-purpose room. She suggested that they needed to put in the capacity for looking at larger all-purpose rooms to address community need and the size of the school. Dr. Cody explained that all-purpose rooms and gymnasiums were not viewed as classrooms. He said that these were not the design criteria for building new schools. Mrs. DiFonzo felt that the size of all-purpose rooms should be sufficiently large to address the needs of the community and the children in the school and should be part of the capital appropriations request.

Dr. Shoenberg thought that this was a good start. He was concerned not so much about what they had here but how they used it once they had it and how they brought the public to understand the process. They had to be very careful on how the changes were built into the facilities policy. They had been used to talking about 70 to 90 percent capacity, and now 100 percent capacity became an ideal thing. In certain circumstances 105 or 110 percent of capacity might be perfectly acceptable. He said what they did with the facilities

policy and the adequacy with which they explained to the public what a new way of calculating capacity meant was going to be terribly important. He stated that to deal with a change of this magnitude did require a considerable sensitivity to the politics of getting people to understand what they were doing and why it was important.

Dr. Cronin asked about reality in this situation because once they said this was their formula there were 100 schools where people would expect to see these kinds of services in their schools. He asked about the amount of construction they were looking at if they approved this formula. Mr. William Wilder, director of school facilities, replied that they were doing a lot of this now because space was available. He thought they would phase in some of the major components much as they were doing with the elementary school physical education program. They were providing gyms in elementary schools when those schools were modernized or when they built new facilities. The smaller spaces would occur as space was available in a given school, much as they were doing now in dividing larger rooms into smaller spaces to accommodate reading and resource functions.

Dr. Cronin asked about a time frame as to when the new formula would apply. Dr. Cody replied that before the formula was approved they needed a dry run on how the formula would affect schools. Dr. Cronin indicated that he would not vote for this without seeing a dollar cost and a time line. Dr. Pitt pointed out that the present formula was a goal and the new formula would also be a goal. Dr. Cody observed that their average class size in elementary schools was 22.5 which was 75 percent of a class of 30. If they were to try to stick with the state figure, if a school went over 75 percent it was overcrowded. When they had an elementary school now of 85 to 90 percent of state capacity, they considered it all right, but he was almost certain the art room was being used as a classroom in that school.

It seemed to Mrs. Praisner that whatever they did they needed to know how the change fits into all of the other planning procedures the Board was involved in such as capital budget. For example, Area 2 facility information was already in front of the community now. They had to know the implications of changing this as far as changing time tables or modifying things, and she suggested that the community would need to know this as well.

Mr. Ewing inquired about the time table for Board action. Dr. Cody replied that the secondary formula would be before the Board at the next meeting. He thought that the Board would have final action by the fall.

Re: FACILITIES - BLAIR AREA ELEMENTARY
SCHOOLS

Dr. Cody felt that further study was required before tentative action could be taken here. He thought that the proposal now before the Board avoided some problems and dealt with the educational needs of the English students at Oak View.

Dr. Shoenberg pointed out the need to go back to the County Council and say that they needed funds for 23 more classrooms plus facilities at Oak View than they were funded for now. He granted that this was an attractive proposal, but he had considerable reluctance in this particular fiscal environment that the funds for 23 classrooms plus core facilities would be forthcoming. Dr. Cody explained that staff needed to go back over and identify exactly how much more would be needed. They had concluded that with the amount of money appropriated they could build several more classrooms than they had originally intended. He noted that reopening Key would cost approximately \$300,000 to \$500,000 a year and at that rate they would pay for a lot of classroom space. He realized the difference between operating and capital funds, but he thought economically the new plan was more attractive.

Dr. Shoenberg pointed out that an assumption had been made that the money for reopening Key was forthcoming which might not be a valid assumption. He felt that this solution might not be available because of the political and fiscal reality. He asked about relief for the overcrowding at Highland View under this plan. Mrs. Ann Briggs replied that this plan was essentially the same as the original and provided relief beginning in 1987.

Mr. Ewing agreed with Dr. Cody that it would be premature for the Board to take tentative action on this proposal. He suggested that the Board needed a second legal opinion on the new proposal. He noted that the new proposal showed New Hampshire Estates reducing its minority proportion by 24 percent by 1990. It showed Rolling Terrace reducing its minority population by 5 percent and Oak View increasing by 2 percent. It did not show an impact on Highland View, and it seemed to him the Board should have that figure as well. He said that the concern at Oak View/Highland View could be stated as follows: if Oak View increased its minority proportion even in this small way, the ability of Oak View students not in the French immersion program to transfer to other cluster schools would be reduced if they were majority students. This, then, impacted Highland View. He explained that they were talking at any particular grade level about a very small number of Highland View majority students. In a sense they had to make sure they were "rationing" them appropriately, and they also had to make sure they were providing enough space at all of the renovated schools to attract majority students from outside the cluster. He was concerned about the Oak View figures which showed an increase in minority proportions. He thought that if they did not have a strategy to increase majority student enrollment they might find the 2 percent increase a larger figure. He asked for suggestions with respect to that.

Dr. Cody stated that the objective was to have an English magnet program which was attractive and which would lead to majority students wanting to stay in the school and even coming into the school. Mr. Ewing asked about the effect on Highland View with its structured academic program if they had an academic program at Oak

View. Dr. Cody replied that they intended for the programs to be different; however, this still left the question of whether they would compete for the same students. Dr. Cheryl Wilhoyte commented that the academy magnet at Highland View focused on all the academic subject areas with a special emphasis on interdisciplinary instruction across the content areas, research skills, and study skills. The plan for Oak View was a focus on reading/language arts with writing and storytelling enhanced with wordprocessing K-6.

Mr. Ewing was worried that they were not going to be able to deal with the needs of both schools satisfactorily unless they had a strong strategy for doing that. It was his perception that the programs at Oak View and Highland View had been undermined by the absence of adequate staffing to deal with the increasing diversity of the student body in both schools. He said that both communities had changed over the past five years. People from foreign countries had moved in and there were students with serious educational deficiencies. People had moved out of the community because they perceived that the promise of the Highland View program or the Oak View English program had not been delivered. He said that this view could only be changed by the way they delivered educational program and by the way they staffed those schools. He hoped they did not consider these issues in the absence of staffing requirements to meet the educational needs of those schools.

Dr. Cronin raised a question about the numbers on pages 2 and 3 for Oak View and Rolling Terrace. Mrs. Briggs explained that lines were transposed. Dr. Cronin asked what would happen if the Spanish program were retained and paralleled the French program in Oak View K-6. It seemed to him that the Oak View/Rolling Terrace pairing was also predicated on taking the students back from Highland View and Piney Branch at 200 students balanced off by 156 students going out in Spanish. He asked if they were moving the Spanish program to accommodate the restructuring of New Hampshire Estates. He asked how many parents were in the Spanish program from the indigenous population of Oak View and, in which case, how many of those people would go with that program to Rolling Terrace. He asked if they were taking the home base people, moving them out of the home base program into another school, and taking a chance they would go with it.

Dr. Cody reported that the discussion about Spanish Immersion started with the issue of the French Immersion program. They had been talking about the size of it, the ability to provide two teachers per classroom, having a higher cap, and keeping it at Oak View. Someone had asked about a cap on the Spanish program. They thought that as a minimum the Spanish program should operate at one class per grade. When that was added to Oak View, the size got to be one of the problems. The Oak View campus could handle additional construction. There was also some recognition that the immersion program, although it could be articulated with the English program, to some extent was separate. The Spanish program was three teachers now and was expected to go K-6 next year. Eventually they would have seven classrooms which could be handled within the Rolling Terrace expansion. In addition, there were a fairly substantial number of

Hispanics within that community. Otherwise they would have three fairly big programs at Oak View.

Dr. Cronin asked whether the Spanish program was a program generated by community support. Dr. Wilhoite replied that it was. Dr. Cronin asked what would happen to it if it moved. Dr. Wilhoite agreed that parents would have to make a choice. They would choose to be grandfathered in if they chose to go with the program or stay in their home school community. She explained that the Spanish program, at the request of the Oak View community, was but a two-period a day program. It was not an immersion program as was the program at Rock Creek Forest. The youngsters took science and social studies in Spanish. She recalled that at one time Rolling Terrace was paired with Oak View for fifth and sixth grade. To allow the children and parents to work with the Spanish program at Rolling Terrace would put the Spanish focus in the Blair cluster in one place.

Dr. Cronin said they were talking a K-6 immersion in French with a separate set of numbers. Then they were seeing a home base English program K-6 as its own numbers as it exists presently. He asked if they were considering the Spanish program to be another separate entity. Dr. Wilhoite explained that this was a separate program because the students worked with a bilingual staff in a more self-contained setting. Dr. Cody explained this new plan needed community input from families in Oak View and Rolling Terrace. It was Mrs. DiFonzo's understanding that the Spanish program at Oak View was a modified immersion and for two periods it was straight Spanish versus the bilingual, bicultural program at Rolling Terrace. She wondered what would happen if the Oak View program went to the Rolling Terrace building. Dr. Wilhoite replied that it was important to involve the two communities to see the kinds of needs and interests that they had.

Mrs. DiFonzo inquired about the difficulty in finding certified Spanish-speaking teachers. Mrs. Marks, acting principal of Oak View, thought it was easy to find qualified Spanish speaking teachers, but they had to be informed about MCPS programs. She felt that the newer teachers needed training in terms of the MCPS curriculum, but these bilingual people were coming out of the universities. Mrs. Praisner stated that she had a series of specific questions. She asked for a clarification about additional rooms and the cost implications, because she was not sure what these were additional to because they had so many options before them. She wanted a chart for Oak View, Rolling Terrace, and New Hampshire Estates showing the current capacity in numbers of classrooms, the number of rooms under each proposal (capital budget recommendations, superintendent's June recommendations, the Board-requested option, and the superintendent's final recommendation), the number of classrooms for classes and for other services, the grades that would be housed in the schools, the capacity of the schools, the program or magnets that would be at that school, whether or not community services were in the proposal, and the size of the addition and the cost of that addition for each of those options. She wanted to know the maximum number of classrooms that could be accommodated on the New Hampshire Estates campus, a

clarification of whether it was a 10-classroom or 13-classroom addition at Oak View, what they were talking about in the expansion of core facilities, and the implications on the renovation just completed. She requested information on the impact of the Spanish magnet at Rolling Terrace on the International School and a paper on the need for community services for the entire Blair community. She asked where they were in discussing these issues with county agencies. She inquired about whether they were rejecting the idea of an extended day as a magnet and what schools could participate. She also asked about the impact on the ability of Oak View students to transfer in the Blair cluster and whether that opportunity would be any different from any other school in the Blair cluster. She asked whether they had a greater opportunity now. Mrs. Praisner asked how they proposed to get reactions from the community to this option and what the revised timetable would be.

Dr. Shoenberg inquired about how many Oak View students living in the Oak View attendance area and attending other MCPS schools were in other schools as compared with some of the other schools in the area. Mr. Ewing asked where the children would go when the schools were being renovated and whether they would give earlier relief to Highland View by placing all the New Hampshire Estates students together at an earlier point. Dr. Cody replied that they were assuming that Key would be used.

Dr. Shoenberg suggested that the Board review the data before putting the proposal out to the community. He asked that the superintendent suggest a date for a meeting time depending upon how quickly staff could respond. Mr. Ewing asked whether the Board would make a decision by the all-day meeting in September. Dr. Cody thought they could have a special meeting just prior to the all-day meeting in August. Mr. Ewing asked for a statement about the impact on the timetable of decision-making on the construction of new facilities.

RESOLUTION NO. 360-85 Re: EXECUTIVE SESSION - JULY 24, 1985

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Mrs. Praisner seconded by Mrs. DiFonzo, 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 July 24, 1985, at 7:30 p.m. to discuss, consider, deliberate, and/or otherwise decide the employment, assignment, appointment, promotion, demotion, compensation, discipline, removal, or resignation of employees, appointees, or officials over whom it has jurisdiction, or any other personnel matter affecting one or more particular individuals and to comply with a specific constitutional, statutory or judicially imposed requirement protecting particular proceedings or matters from

public disclosure as permitted under Article 76A, Section 11(a) and that such meeting shall continue in executive closed session until the completion of business.

RESOLUTION NO. 361-85 Re: EXECUTIVE SESSION - AUGUST 13, 1985

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Mrs. Praisner seconded by Mrs. DiFonzo, 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 August 13, 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. 362-85 Re: COMMISSION ON THE FUTURE

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

WHEREAS, The Board of Education of Montgomery County is committed to quality education of its students; and

WHEREAS, This commitment is predicated upon a number of factors, including planning for the future; and

WHEREAS, The Board of Education realizes that MCPS does not exist in a vacuum but is an integral part of all activities and actions in the county; and

WHEREAS, The Board of Education is concerned about a rational approach to long-range planning; and

WHEREAS, The members of the Board received a paper by Councilman Scott Fosler entitled "Commission on the Future;" and

WHEREAS, This concept of long-range planning will be useful for planning for the needs of the citizens of Montgomery County including its most important assets, the children of its citizens; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education endorses the concept of a commission on the future and expresses its willingness to participate in such a commission; and be it further

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

RESOLUTION NO. 363-85 Re: BOE APPEAL 85-4

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

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education affirm the decision of the superintendent in BOE Appeal No. 85-4, return of tests.

Re: ITEMS OF INFORMATION

Board members received an item of information on a Plan for the Study of the Area Offices.

Re: ADJOURNMENT

The president adjourned the meeting at 11:15 p.m.

President

Secretary

WSC:mlw