

APPROVED
48-1985

Rockville, Maryland
November 5, 1985

The Board of Education of Montgomery County met in regular session at the Carver Educational Services Center, Rockville, Maryland, on Tuesday, November 5, 1985, at 10:05 a.m.

ROLL CALL Present: Dr. Robert E. Shoenberg, President
in the Chair
Dr. James E. Cronin
Mrs. Sharon DiFonzo
Mr. Blair G. Ewing
Dr. Jeremiah Floyd*
Mr. John D. Foubert
Mrs. Marilyn J. Praisner
Mrs. Mary Margaret Slye

Absent: None

Others Present: Dr. Wilmer S. Cody, Superintendent of Schools
Dr. Harry Pitt, Deputy Superintendent
Mr. Thomas S. Fess, Parliamentarian

Re: ANNOUNCEMENT

Dr. Shoenberg explained that Dr. Floyd would join the Board in the afternoon.

RESOLUTION NO. 502-85 Re: BOARD AGENDA - NOVEMBER 5, 1985

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education approve its agenda for November 5, 1985.

Re: PRESENTATION BY MRS. KEELER

Mrs. Sally Keeler explained that Montgomery County, in cooperation with the other 13 school districts in the Washington metropolitan area, had been working on publicizing American Education Week. The local Chesapeake Chapter of the National School Public Relations Association won the gold medallion award for these efforts. She said that they could not reproduce the award but had had it printed on coasters which she presented to Dr. Cody and Dr. Shoenberg.

Re: PRELIMINARY REPORT ON PRINCIPAL
RECRUITMENT, TRAINING AND SELECTION
PROCESS

Dr. Cody stated that they had talked about this general topic on a number of prior occasions. They had a document identifying four basic procedures they followed: elementary principal trainee,

selection of elementary principal, secondary assistant principal selection, and secondary principal selection. The process was outlined in terms of decision making and described who was involved in the decision, the process followed, and those items under consideration for modification. In addition to staff study, they had hired a consultant, Dr. Dale Bolton, who would be looking at MCPS processes and making suggestions. In addition, a committee would be examining procedures, and in February he would present the Board with proposed changes and modifications. After that, a brochure would be developed on the selection of principals in MCPS. He also pointed out that the State Department of Education had a task force looking at the principalship and might have some constructive ideas. Dr. Cody commented that in addition to what was before the Board they had to deal with a fundamental examination of the role of the principal and a definition of the duties and responsibilities of the principal, although he was reluctant to add this major activity to the agenda. If that examination changed their description of the principalship, this would have implications for their assessment center. At present he was waiting for the results of the state task force before dealing with this. He understood that it had been some time since the school system had engaged in this examination of the basic skills, knowledge, attitude, and characteristics of the principal.

Mrs. Slye asked whether the modifications listed for change that were under consideration would be more or less immediate or things that needed to be placed into operation. Dr. Cody replied that these would be immediate or within the next couple of months. He did see these things in place by the time they were into the spring session of filling vacancies. Mrs. Slye asked whether he would communicate these changes as soon as they were in final form so that anyone who was a potential candidate would be aware of the changes. Dr. Cody explained that this was not a change in criteria but rather a change in the amount of information and the method used to screen people as well as who was involved in making decisions.

Mr. Ewing thought that the proposals made a lot of sense, but he thought it was important to learn from what the state task force was doing and examine what they wanted the principalship to be and what they wanted principals to do. An early draft of the state report indicated that they wanted the principal to do and be everything. The report started out with a neat set of categories about things that principals might do and the kinds of things that might be required of them. The report then went to a set of conclusions, and he thought the report was a little disingenuous in not saying that that was what they were doing. He said there were matters of greater and lesser importance that they might want to place on what was important which would change the characteristics that people ought to have. He felt that they had to look at how the area offices supported and assisted principals in getting their jobs done. He did think it was important for them to look at the issue of what it was they wanted in principals.

Mr. Foubert questioned whether an interview panel would include

representatives of Areas 1 and 2 if they were going to appoint a principal for Area 3. Dr. Cody replied that at the present time the appointments were almost exclusively area based. The proposal was to return to an earlier practice of having representatives from across the system in the belief that the appointment of someone was to a principalship in Montgomery County and not just in a particular area. Dr. Pitt added that while it was important to appoint a principal who would do what was needed for a particular school, it had to be someone who was flexible enough to move to other schools and be successful there.

Mrs. Praisner commented that she would understand this process in the selection of a new principal, but she was not sure the rationale held for the transfer of a principal. Dr. Cody explained that they had tried to narrow this down to the promotion issue. The transfer issue was another whole set of procedures, and they felt if they could be clear on the promotion procedures they could go back and see whether the transfer procedure had to be modified.

Mrs. Praisner stated that she had a problem with the timing for advertising outside the school system for vacancies. It seemed to her it would have to be done earlier, and she suggested keeping a list of people who were interested in coming to Montgomery County.

Dr. Cody explained that basically they would be operating from a pool of people inside who are eligible for promotion and a pool of serious candidates from the outside. He said that in the past when they had advertised outside the process had taken so long they felt they needed a general ad once or twice a year inviting people to apply so that the prescreening could be done before there was a vacancy. In regard to the state task force, Mrs. Praisner reported that the committee was focusing on both the principal and vice principal and was looking for information on the issues of preparation, certification, selection, evaluation, and professional development. Their recommendations were to go to the state superintendent in June. At the same time, there were plans for assessment centers to be set up around the state. The first one involved Prince George's, St. Mary's, Charles, and Talbot. There were plans for Baltimore City itself to be an assessment center using the NAASSP model. She suggested it would be useful to have some discussion of how the MCPS model differed from the NAASSP model. Dr. Cody explained that the NAASSP had to be under their jurisdiction with NAASSP handling the training of the assessors. The major difference was in the set of characteristics they used for the principalship.

Mrs. Praisner said that Mr. Ewing had referred to the task force paper, but that paper was prepared for the task force and was not developed by the task force. It was a review of the literature and a discussion of the role of the principal. She was concerned about improving the process in MCPS as well as the issue of how many principals they might need in the future. She assumed that the reduction of the numbers was caused by characteristics and qualifications, but she asked if it were also based on finances as to

how many they could afford to assess. Dr. Pitt replied that it was. He explained that in the elementary model this was an additional person, and in the past they had not budgeted for his. He thought that if they were going to continue with this model it should be brought to the Board as a budget item. At the secondary level they did have one or two interns in the budget. Primarily these people were put into vacant assistant principals slots, but there were pros and cons in doing that. This placed the trainee where there was a vacancy and might not give the person an all around view of the principalship. He suggested they needed to budget some additional positions at the secondary level so that there could be more flexibility in training these people.

Mrs. Praisner commented that given the anticipated turnover in principalships, they needed to identify the needs of the system in order to prepare for training and the costs of running the assessment centers. She said they had to discuss the improvement of the process as well as the need to meet anticipated long-range needs. Dr. Cronin asked that the Board be given an updated list of those principals eligible for retirement.

Dr. Cronin saw a three-level process. They had the assessment of the individual in both their interviews and performance ratings in schools and the training process. There was the process of selection through which the candidate had to move, and there was the locus of power relating to the entire process. He asked that the consultant address the power points because he saw certain titles appearing on every committee. Therefore, it would appear that a small group of people could either make or break a person's career. He asked that Dr. Bolton address this in terms of expanding that locus of control.

In regard to outside applicants, Mrs. DiFonzo asked whether they kept these people in mind or plugged them into other positions. Dr. Cody replied that both of these options might happen. Basically they would look at the supply/demand problem and also the desirability of having some of their administrative appointments coming from outside the school system. They would send out notices that MCPS would be filling a number of elementary and secondary vacancies within the next six months. They would do a prescreening and evaluation of those outside applications and put them on a list of persons eligible for employment. He would assume that generally these were already experienced administrators. Generally promotions from assistant principals to principals would be from the inside. They would arbitrarily limit this to those who were already experienced. They would end up with a short list of elementary and secondary principals who would like to come to MCPS, contact them when there was a vacancy, and ask them if they would like to be considered. If they said yes they would be interviewed, but if they said no several times they probably would be dropped from the list.

Mrs. DiFonzo commented that the assessment center might be a very valid first cut screening process, but she wanted to know whether a one-year internship was really adequate training for someone to move

into that situation literally all by themselves next year. She asked if they had any baseline data on how people who had been on an internship did. Dr. Cody replied that once they were appointed the first-year principals got considerably more backup support, help, and supervision from the area office than the other principals. He emphasized that they were not placed and then left to their own devices. Dr. Pitt explained that for the first time this year they established a continual training program for the recently appointed elementary people. They had a regular meeting with a trainer who helped them in terms of the things they needed to know.

Mrs. DiFonzo questioned whether they were doing an adequate job of informing community members on the interview team exactly what their role was and what their "vote" was worth. This confusion about their role had been going on for ten years, and she thought they needed to do a better job of explaining how the process worked, what their input was, and how it was going to be weighed. Dr. Cody thought that this was a perception problem because as the staff and Board knew in the interview process everyone's rating had equal weight. They added up the numbers, and the top choice was recommended unless there was some specific reason that the interview process was not privy to.

Dr. Cronin asked whether they had ever considered trying to develop consensus on the committee behind a particular candidate. Dr. Cody explained that the process was really based on independent evaluations so that everyone's opinion had equal weight. For example, the screening committee rated individuals to be considered for training, but this was done individually and the scores were totalled. It was the whole notion of individuals rather than a committee. He agreed that it was important that individuals taking part in the process to know that their recommendations were advisory. The interview was an assessment of how the individual reacted in an hour's time and responded to questions. That group did not have all the other background material which was extremely important. While they leaned heavily on committee scores, there was also this other pool of information.

Dr. Cronin pointed out that the assessors might be listening for their own bias and might misunderstand something. He asked if there was an opportunity for them to discuss their perceptions. Dr. Cody replied there was, but it was before the fact. The group discussed the characteristics they were looking for before the start of the interview. The questions were prepared ahead of time. Dr. Forrest Shearin added that after the sheets were collected, the committee was given an opportunity to discuss the process and the applicants. Dr. Cody explained that the interview was a structured one with a structured rating for specific characteristics. Dr. Cronin asked if other committees did this as well. Dr. Shearin explained that the paper screening committee might not even meet in the same room. Dr. Cody commented that one of the reasons for the independent rating was to maintain some degree of objectivity in the process.

Dr. Shoenberg remarked that in the process of maintaining objectivity, however, some of the people involved might not be

sensitive to the full range of considerations that need to be made. He asked whether there was a meeting with the committee before interviewing candidates to talk about the full range of considerations. Dr. Shearin replied that at the meeting before the interviews and information sheet was distributed which explained the process, their role, and the confidentiality of the process, the person chairing the committee usually explained in more detail what the questions represented. Dr. Cody added that the characteristics of the position came out of a survey of teachers, high school students, and community. The interviewers evaluated the individual's response to specific questions. Dr. Shearin added that one of the items proposed was more training rather than just a general orientation.

Dr. Pitt explained that the committee had a great deal of influence, but the superintendent after looking at all the information might make a decision which was not the first choice of everyone. If they had a discussion where they reached consensus, it would make it very difficult for anyone not to pick that candidate.

Mr. Ewing thought it was important as they moved into this to be clear about how they forecasted their needs at various levels in the schools. As part of the process they had to be as specific as is reasonable about the size of the pool of candidates and the life of the pool. For example, they might forecast they had a need for 50 elementary school principals in the next ten years, and they might decide that they needed a pool of five times or three times the number they were going to fill. If people were not considered within a certain timeframe, they needed to go back to them and find out whether they were still interested, get additional information from them, or tell them their eligibility had expired. He thought something like this was important to build into this process.

In regard to decision-making, Mr. Ewing believed people had trouble with the role of participating in decisions when they did not make the final choice and that they did not get feedback on what was done with the information they supplied. He said that this was very difficult in personnel selection because there was confidential information in files which might make a difference sometimes as to who got chosen. He thought it would help if people were told in advance and subsequently about the process and how it worked. He suggested that this had to be repeated every time. In terms of decision-making, he felt it was important that they recognized that while there were some collegial aspects to it, in the end the decision had to be made by the person in authority and responsible for it and accountable for the selection. However, they could build a process which emphasized the importance of a variety of kinds of contributions to that decision. He thought that people somehow either misled themselves or were misled into believing that they were doing to make the choice. He did think they needed a better way to provide feedback to people who participated in the process. He

suggested some message go back about the consideration that was given and repeated the whole statement about the process.

Mr. Ewing thought it was important for them not to stop here but to move on in the direction of considering evaluation as a next step and the evaluation processes. He knew that these were a concern of the employee organization representing the principals, but he did not think they ought to avoid the issue for that reason. This got them into the business of performance assessment and, therefore, performance requirements. Dr. Cody agreed that as soon as the technical parts were worked out, they needed to turn to evaluation and to the assessment center.

Mrs. Praisner said that in reacting to Dr. Cronin's suggestion about development of a consensus, she would share the concerns raised by Dr. Pitt. This might be even more intimidating or cause more problems for the community member involved because they would be only a small segment. The perception of the role of the interview would be even more focused incorrectly from the standpoint of what that recommendation would be. However, she did agree that it was important for them to have more feedback to the panels and the individuals who participated, the applicants, and earlier in the process to individuals who had indicated they would like to move into a principal or intern process. She wanted to make sure they were talking to these candidates and giving them the kinds of feedback they needed. She agreed that they needed assurances that the pool had the kinds of people they wanted. She hoped that when the consultant came they talked about the whole issue of the role of the interview in the selection process and if they were going to use an interview process how could they be assured they were getting what they wanted.

Dr. Cody was troubled by the perception that the interview process assumed that if one was screened through and was interviewed that everything was equal and the only difference was the interview. Dr. Cronin added that there was an assumption on the interview panel that the persons they were seeing were viable candidates and there was nothing in the confidential file that would make them a noncandidate. Dr. Cody said that everyone being interviewed was capable and qualified, but they were not all the same.

Dr. Shoenberg stated that they needed to maintain in the pool of people eligible for appointment a sufficient number of minorities and women. This had been a matter of some concern and needed to be said in this context. Mrs. DiFonzo asked if 92 people applied or if these were 92 assistant principals who were considered to have applied.

Dr. Shearin explained that each year they automatically collected references on all assistant principals. These people did not actively fill out an application. Dr. Cody explained that right now they gave notice and people applied to be considered for an elementary school trainee. In order to get minorities and women into the pipeline, they wanted to change this and have more outreach into the school system.

Dr. Shoenberg knew that in their principal appointment process they

were particularly sensitive to the kind of person that was needed and the particular strengths they were looking for. He thought there was danger that the state commission would forget that, and he thought it was also true that the community would forget that two weeks after the principal was appointed. He said there needed to be continuing sensitivity on the part of the community to the reasons why they appointed particular people. There also had to be some sensitivity that circumstances change, and a person would not forever be the best person to deal with that situation because those strengths might not be needed. They had to think about the process for moving that person to a situation where those strengths were needed without embarrassing the person. While they were thinking about appointments, they needed to be thinking about transfers.

Dr. Pitt said that based on his own experience one of the points of extreme frustration was feedback to staff who were not selected. They did try to give feedback, but he thought this was an area where they needed to do some work.

Re: LOCAL LEGISLATION - PROPOSED MCCSSE
RIGHT TO STRIKE BILL

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education support the proposed MCCSSE right to strike bill.

Re: A SUBSTITUTE MOTION BY DR. CRONIN ON
THE MCCSSE RIGHT TO STRIKE BILL

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education take no position on the proposed MCCSSE right to strike bill.

RESOLUTION NO. 503-85 Re: A SUBSTITUTE MOTION ON THE MCCSSE
RIGHT TO STRIKE BILL

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

Resolved, That the Board's position is that it has no position on the MCCSSE right to strike bill but that Board members will have individual positions which they should convey to the staff to the Delegation.

Re: STATUS REPORT AND NEXT STEPS ON
BOE/MCPS PRIORITIES - PART I

Dr. Cody explained that this was an overview of the general approach they had been taking in the school system with regard to Priorities 1 and 2, the principal activities that had taken place up to this time, and to identify next steps. These reflected discussions with members of the senior staff about on-going activities and the ideas that came

out of the Board/senior staff retreat. After each plan, they had a one page work plan of next steps which indicated where the activities were, who was responsible, and when things would be happening. They intended to continue to move toward a multiyear plan of action with major milestones on it, but they were not there yet. They viewed this not as a closed ended document, but an open ended document which needed to be continually modified. In Priority 2 they had a basic strategy and they had added an approach for the central office similar to that used in the schools.

Dr. Shoenberg was interested in the fact that they were thinking about and considering some kind of integrated testing. He asked how far thinking was on that. Dr. Lois Martin, associate superintendent, replied that this was discussed last year by the steering committee and there was some interest in that. Sizer had proposed this to the Educational Testing Service. They were about to set up a committee to look at the possibility of other measures of achievement than norm-referenced and criterion-referenced tests. Dr. Shoenberg said he would like to encourage this because for students to do an adequate job of this kind of thing would require some preparation. This would require school personnel to think about ways in which there were connections within the program. He commented that one of the major indictments of the secondary curriculum was that lack of a sense of integratedness which they did have in a number of cases in elementary schools and in middle schools.

Dr. Shoenberg called attention to the analysis of elementary mathematics and science and some comment about conducting a study to see what kind of science and math preparation elementary school teachers received in their college curriculum. It seemed to him that those two things must be related to each other in people's thinking. He was not sure they needed to conduct a study. It could take the form of telephone calls to those responsible for elementary teacher education at the schools from which they most frequently got teachers. He thought they would find that the preparation was quite minimal. Dr. Cody explained that it was not just what the colleges required but what students were taking. They intended to find out this by transcript analysis. Dr. Shoenberg assumed that they were not talking about abandoning ISM but would be looking at teaching those subjects particularly through the use of specialists. Dr. Cody thought they might, on a sampling basis, get an assessment of the substantial knowledge in science and math relating to the curriculum that teachers actually had. He emphasized that he did not want to evaluate individual teachers.

Dr. Shoenberg called attention to the statement about focusing on writing as a tool for teaching and learning higher order intellectual skills. He asked about the extent to which they had activities of this sort going on. Dr. Martin reported that this month they had held three all-day conferences for elementary and secondary staff dealing with higher order intellectual skills. One conference for secondary teachers was on writing across the curriculum. They had belonged to the Maryland Writing Project and now the National Capital Area Writing Project for a number of years and had trained staff in

that model. They had also offered an in-service course for a number of years and enrollments had gone up in that. She considered them to be at the beginning stage of that effort. They would be offering some workshops using stipends as part of their Priority 1 training.

Dr. Shoenberg wondered whether there was any usefulness in working within organizations in the various teacher specialities in the county. For example, he did not know how active the social studies teachers were or the science teachers were. He wondered whether they would enlist their cooperation, support, and ideas.

Dr. Cronin inquired about their final goal in writing across the curriculum and how they would know that they had achieved the objective. Dr. Martin replied that they had not described a final goal because it was a huge project. They would like to see writing used increasingly in classrooms. She pointed out that there was as much writing anxiety among adults as there was math anxiety. They saw this as a very long-term project, at least five years. She thought this represented a fundamental change in American education just as increasing overall competence in math was a change in education.

Dr. Cody reported that they would be working on assessment measures for progress in writing. Until they identified the form they were talking about, he did not know how long this would take. He guessed it would take a year or two to do this. Dr. Cronin said that he would like to see the timeframe for developing the assessment measures.

Mrs. Slye asked if they were to the point where they could suggest how many fewer they would like to not pass the Maryland functional tests. They tended to use objective benchmarks with regard to Priority 2, and she wondered whether they could have these benchmarks with Priority 1. Dr. Martin replied that she saw them as the same thing. She explained that they had not brought out a separate Priority 1 report on measures. The reports had dealt with minority achievement and achievement as a whole. Dr. Cody added that at this point in time the instruments were the same. In regard to the Project Basic tests, their objective in Priority 2 was that 90 percent pass these by the ninth grade. They were accomplishing this in reading. If they accomplished Priority 2, they were accomplishing Priority 1.

Mrs. Slye suggested they consider a clear statement of how the two priorities were, in fact, the same and how the two sets of measures were applied. She was pleased to see they were going to concentrate on writing performance in the K-8 area. She asked for a brief review of some of the difficulties that students had encountered with the Maryland Functional Writing Test. Dr. Martin replied that within a week or so they would have a report on short-term measures as well as long-term measures. They were beginning another cycle of training sessions for teachers on how the test was constructed, how to help students to prepare for it, and how the test was scored. The latest results indicated that a significant number of students were missing

by half a point. They believed that students needed practice in analyzing the problem the student was to write about. Secondly, the students were falling down on not providing enough supporting detail. In addition, they were concerned about grammar, usage, and spelling.

Mrs. Slye said she had heard that with this text they were getting very mixed results in the sense that the very able student sometimes had great difficulty with this test. However, a student who put in a mediocre performance could sometimes sail through the test. Dr. Martin remarked that they were getting more examples of this drawn to their attention, but she would not say that it was wholesale at all. She felt it was related to the difficulty of assessing writing.

Mr. Ewing remarked that he did not find anything in the report that he disagreed with, and he thought they were making many of the right steps. His concern was more a matter of some unanswered questions. Basically the strategy in Priorities 1 and 2 was to rely on the training of teachers and the implementation of curriculum. However, they did not have a way of determining how those things were going to affect outcomes. He was concerned about how they would know at some future juncture that what they did was related to what they got. He wanted to know whether the strategies they were employing were going to be effective. He noted that they had trouble trying to specify what the substantive outcomes ought to be. They had talked about skills which were important. On the other hand, the accumulation of a certain amount of facts was an essential outcome. They really had not spoken to that much at all. He said that he had a final worry. In a busy, big school system there was a tendency to respond to new priorities by rearranging what one was currently doing to fit it into the new category of activities. In effect, this made relatively little change. He was not suggesting that that was what they were doing because he was seeing some very substantial changes. However, a stranger to this process might conclude that this was at least in part what they were doing because they had done teacher training and curriculum implementation in the past. He had mixed feelings because he believed they were making substantial new departures. He was concerned about how they presented what it was that they were doing. He thought the paper before the Board was better than some of the earlier papers, but he thought they should say where they were now, where they would like to be, and what the things were that they were doing to get there. The paper could point out the new departures as well.

Dr. Cody noted that the specific measures were not in the paper. He felt that they needed additional measures of some kind. At present they had the California Achievement Test which was not correlated to the curriculum. They had the SAT's which were taken by 60 percent of their students. They were still in the developmental stage of trying to come up with criterion-referenced tests that were keyed to the curriculum. If they could work out the technical problems, the criterion-referenced tests would be a direct link between Priority 1 in terms of achievement related to the objectives of the curriculum. They needed some way to measure improvement in writing assessment in the school system. They would set up a group to think beyond that

about other measures of progress in the school system. They would end up with a array so that they would be able to say with some reasonableness that by having teachers more effectively implement the curriculum the indicators showed they were making progress.

Mrs. DiFonzo stated that they had had a great deal of discussion about parent participation. She saw that as being an overarching consideration of both Priorities 1 and 2, and she asked whether they had considered including that here. Dr. Cody pointed out that this was item 7 under Priority 2 which was parent outreach. Mrs. DiFonzo said she had some problems with the way #7 was written because it was too exclusive or not inclusionary enough. It specified minority parents, and she thought they needed to include all parents because all students were not achieving. Dr. Cody agreed and noted that in the school system outreach was a problem primarily with parents of minority students and some small number of low-income whites. Dr. Hiawatha Fountain, associate superintendent, added that there was another concern because at the present time a little over 50 percent of the parents worked. This suggested to them they would have to do some creative things for the so-called regular parents as well.

Dr. Cronin saw Priority 1 as the average white male priority. What they had done was zero in on a number of target specific groups and lost in there was the other student who just went through the system. Therefore, how did they serve that student? If they used Priority 2 as the standard of measurement, they did not reach that student. He wanted to add another measure of determining whether a child in a course could have learned more. They could come in with an entry-level and an exit-level test and find out that perhaps that student was never stretched. Dr. Cody didn't think anyone knew how far they could go with individual students. He thought they needed to expand their array of measures. They had to instruct in a way that challenged students at all levels of performance.

Mrs. Praisner asked how the surveys referred to on page 6 would function. She thought that assessing comments by teachers, principals, and specialists was important, but she was not sure they meant a formal survey. Dr. Martin replied that DEA had done two major studies, one on math several years ago which produced a lot of information. This year they expected to complete a three-year study of the reading part of the Reading Language Arts curriculum. DEA thought they could construct a questionnaire which would be given to a sample to see how widespread those concerns were. Dr. Cody added that they had not decided whether it would be a DEA survey. If this were the decision, they would set up an ad hoc committee to frame the questions for the study. He was not sure the survey was the best way, and he suggested getting a group of five or six teachers to talk about this and identify issues before a survey instrument was

constructed. He thought they needed to find out the nature and types of difficulty that teachers were having in implementing curriculum.

Mrs. Praisner was concerned that they might create an instrument without defining what they wanted out of it first. She thought that

on-going communication with the local school level was important. They had to look at appropriate budgetary support and time to support whatever they did.

Dr. Shoenberg indicated that the Priority 2 discussion would be scheduled at a later date.

Re: EXECUTIVE SESSION

The Board of Education met in executive session from 12:20 p.m. to 1:45 p.m. to discuss legal issues and appeals. *Dr. Floyd joined the meeting during executive session.

Re: ANNOUNCEMENT

Dr. Shoenberg reported that during executive session the Board of Education had discussed an amendment to a state Board of Education bylaw requiring that there be advertising in two local newspapers two weeks prior to a public hearing involving school closure. MCPS had not published the legal notice; therefore, the hearings scheduled for Cabin John, Woodward, and Luxmanor would have to be postponed. The hearings for other Area 2 issues would be held on November 13. The closure hearings would be held on Saturday, November 23. Decisions on Area 2 schools would be made on the evening of November 26. All schools would be contacted regarding the changed hearing and decision schedule.

Re: BOARD/PRESS/VISITOR CONFERENCE

The following individuals appeared before the Board:

1. Sheila Lockshin, Horizon Hill
2. Louise Allentuck, Wootton High School PTSA
3. Joseph Simpson, Montgomery County Taxpayers League
4. Carol Fanconi, Gaithersburg High School PTSA
5. Mark Simon, MCEA

RESOLUTION NO. 504-85 Re: MONTHLY PERSONNEL REPORT

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Dr. Cronin 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. 505-85 Re: EXTENSION OF SICK LEAVE

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Dr. Cronin 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
Davis, Gloria	Bus Operator Area III	30
Parker, Kevin	Programmer Trainee Division of Systems Development	30
Clarke, Dorothy H.	Instructional Assistant Einstein High School	9

RESOLUTION NO. 506-85 Re: DEATH OF MS. NORA E. TWYMAN, BUS
OPERATOR IN AREA 2, DIVISION OF
TRANSPORTATION

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

WHEREAS, The death on October 6, 1985, of Ms. Nora E. Twyman, a bus
operator in Area 2, Division of Transportation, has deeply saddened
the staff and members of the Board of Education; and

WHEREAS, Ms. Twyman was an excellent employee of Montgomery County
Public Schools for over sixteen years; and

WHEREAS, Her pleasant personality and friendly manner in dealing with
the children made her a valued employee of the school system; now
therefore be it

Resolved, That the members of the Board of Education express their
sorrow at the death of Ms. Nora E. Twyman and extend deepest sympathy
to her family; and be it further

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

RESOLUTION NO. 507-85 Re: PERSONNEL APPOINTMENTS

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

Resolved, That the following personnel appointments be approved:

APPOINTMENT	PRESENT POSITION	AS
Marylee Phelps	Teacher Specialist Placement Unit	Supervisor of Placement Placement Unit Grade O Effective 11-6-85
Alberto Reluzco	Pupil Personnel Worker Area Administrative Office	Supervisor, International Students Admin. Office Dept. of Interagency, Alternative, and Supplementary Programs Grade N Effective 11-6-85

RESOLUTION NO. 508-85 Re: AMENDMENT TO THE POSITION
CLASSIFICATION AND PAY PLAN

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

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

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

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

OFFICE OF THE DEPUTY SUPERINTENDENT

Change the position from Office Assistant II, pay grade 10 (\$15,766-\$23,940) to Correspondence Assistant, Office of the Deputy Superintendent, pay grade 11 (\$16,432 minimum - \$25,147 maximum).

OFFICE OF THE ASSOCIATE SUPERINTENDENT FOR INSTRUCTION AND PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT

Change the pay grade of the Director, Department of Academic Skills and the Director, Department of Career and Vocational Education from pay grade P (\$49,924 minimum - \$57,430 maximum) to pay grade Q (\$53,327 minimum - \$61,817 maximum).

CHILD FIND/CEDS/EARLY CHILDHOOD HANDICAPPED UNIT

Change the position from Data Systems Technician, pay grade 18 (\$22,443 minimum - \$35,318 maximum) to Special/Alternative Education Data Systems Assistant, pay grade 20 (\$24,648 minimum - \$38,708 maximum).

DIVISION OF TRANSPORTATION

Change the position from Vehicle Operator Instructor, pay grade 18 (\$22,443 minimum - \$35,318 maximum) to Transportation Training and Safety Assistant, pay grade 20 (\$24,648 minimum - \$38,708 maximum).

DIVISION OF HEAD START

Some of the social service aide positions are 10 month and some are 12 month positions. Change the 13 social service aide positions, pay grade 10 (\$12,067 minimum - \$18,323 maximum for 10 month and \$15,766 minimum - \$23,940 maximum for 12 month) to Social Services Assistant, pay grade 12 (\$13,086 minimum - \$20,250 maximum for 10 month and \$17,097 minimum - \$26,457 maximum for 12 month).

BLAIR MAGNET PROGRAM

Establish a new classification of Instructional Computer Systems Assistant, pay grade 16 (\$20,300 minimum - \$32,073 maximum).

SERVICES FOR PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED CHILDREN UNIT

Establish a new classification of Occupational Therapy Assistant, pay grade 12 (\$13,086 minimum - \$20,250 maximum for 10 month).

MARK TWAIN SCHOOL

Change the pay grade of the position of principal, Mark Twain School, to pay grade Q, effective July 1, 1983.

RESOLUTION NO. 509-85 Re: PROCUREMENT CONTRACTS OVER \$25,000

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

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

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

	NAME OF VENDOR(S)	DOLLAR VALUE OF CONTRACTS
86-07	Chapter I Services to Nonpublic School Students Learning Alternatives	\$ 89,815

4-86	Trucks, 1/2 Ton thru 2 1/2 ton	
	Chesapeake Truck Sales, Inc.	\$ 34,017
	Lanham Ford, Inc.	233,595
	Sport Chevrolet Co.	9,584
	Dick Stevens	73,600

	Total	\$350,796
16-86	Motor Vehicles, Step Van & Cargo Van	
	International Harvester Co.	\$ 26,034
18-86	Laser Printer	
	Xerox Corporation - installment	\$ 24,966
	purchase cost (6 months)	
46-86	Woodwind and Brass Instrument Repairs	
	Washington Music Sales Center, Inc.	\$ 25,000
	(three year contract)	
57-86	Assorted Canned Fruits and Vegetables	
	Chaimson Brokerage Co., Inc.	\$ 17,332
	Frederick Produce Co., Inc.	83,637
	Mazo-Lerch Co., Inc.	34,124

	Total	\$135,093
	GRAND TOTAL	\$651,704

RESOLUTION NO. 510-85 Re: GAITHERSBURG HIGH SCHOOL - PARTIAL
REROOFING (AREA 3)

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 October 24 for reroofing Gaithersburg High School, as indicated below:

BIDDER	LUMP SUM
1. R. D. Bean, Inc.	\$189,433
2. The Hartford Roofing Company, Inc.	229,465
3. Orndorff & Spaid, Inc.	241,803

and

WHEREAS, The low bidder, R. D. Bean, Inc., has performed satisfactorily on other MCPS projects; and

WHEREAS, Low bid is within staff estimate and sufficient funds are available in account 999-42 to effect award; now therefore be it

Resolved, That a contract for \$189,433 be awarded to R. D. Bean,

Inc., to accomplish a reroofing project at Gaithersburg High School, in accordance with plans and specifications dated October 10, 1985, prepared by the Division of Construction and Capital Projects.

RESOLUTION NO. 511-85 Re: SUBMISSION OF AN FY 1986 GRANT
PROPOSAL TO INSTITUTE A CHILD ABUSE AND
NEGLECT PREVENTION PROGRAM

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

Resolved, That the superintendent of schools be authorized to submit an FY 1986 grant proposal for \$15,000 to Montgomery County Government to institute a child abuse and neglect prevention project; and be it further

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

RESOLUTION NO. 512-85 Re: UTILIZATION OF FY 1986 FUTURE SUPPORTED
PROJECT FUNDS FOR THE PROJECT BASIC
MAINTENANCE PROGRAM

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

Resolved, That the superintendent of schools be authorized to receive and expend the \$3,000 grant award in the following categories within the FY 1986 Provision of Future Supported Projects from MSDE for Project Basic Maintenance programs:

CATEGORY	AMOUNT
01 Administration	\$2,830
10 Fixed Charges	170

TOTAL	\$3,000

and be it further

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

RESOLUTION NO. 513-85 Re: FY 1986 SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION TO
PROVIDE A HANDICAPPED YOUTH WORK
EXPERIENCE PROGRAM

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

Resolved, That the superintendent of schools be authorized, subject to County Council approval, to receive and expend the \$54,659 grant award in the following categories from the Montgomery College Job Training Partnership Unit to provide an FY 1986 Youth Work Experience Program:

CATEGORY	SUPPLEMENTAL
04 Special Education	\$50,259
10 Fixed Charges	4,400

TOTAL	\$54,659

and be it further

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

RESOLUTION NO. 514-85 Re: FY 1986 SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION TO PROVIDE TRANSITION PROGRAMS FOR REFUGEE CHILDREN

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

Resolved, That the superintendent of schools be authorized to establish 1.0 teacher specialist (A-D) position and an .8 instructional assistant position; and be it further

Resolved, That the superintendent of schools be authorized, subject to County Council approval, to receive and expend the \$58,001 grant award in the following categories from MSDE under the Refugee Act of 1980, P. L. 96-212, for the FY 1986 Transition Program for Refugee Children:

CATEGORY	SUPPLEMENTAL
02 Instructional Salaries	\$42,947
03 Instructional Other	3,750
10 Fixed Charges	11,304

TOTAL	\$58,001

and be it further

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

RESOLUTION NO. 515-85 Re: SUBMISSION OF AN FY 1986 GRANT PROPOSAL
FOR A K-6 FOREIGN LANGUAGE IMMERSION
PROGRAM

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

Resolved, That the superintendent of schools be authorized to submit an FY 1986 grant proposal for approximately \$150,000 to the Department of Education under the Secretary's Discretionary Program for Mathematics, Science, Computer Learning, and Critical Foreign Languages for the purpose of training immersion teachers and for the purpose of developing a K-6 immersion curriculum; and be it further

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

Re: ANNUAL REPORT ON NONRESIDENT TUITION,
1984-85

Dr. Hiawatha Fountain, associate superintendent, reported that there were three levels of appeal on nonresident tuition. He described the process and noted that the last appeal went into the Board of Education appeal procedures.

Dr. Cody noted the increase in the number of applicants last year.

Mr. William Myer, supervisor of the Division of Interagency and Alternative Programs, reported that last year there were 500 but these students had to reapply every year and 300 did so. Dr. Cody thought there had been a gradual increase for three years. Dr. Shoenberg assumed that those 500 students represented all appeals for waiver of tuition not those coming just from foreign students. Dr. Richard Towers, director of the Department of Interagency, Alternative, and Supplementary Programs, reported that only 194 of the 500 were international students.

Mr. Ewing said he was struck by the statement on page 2 of the report that the policy provided little guidance to decision makers. He asked staff to tell the Board what kind of policy was needed which would provide adequate guidance. With respect to numbers, he noted that in 1977 when they had 110,000 students, or 20,000 more than they had now, they had a request for 236 waivers. Today they had 500, and they were approving virtually all of them. He said they could explain this based on increased numbers of refugees, but he wondered if the approval rate was in any way related to the absence of clear policy. Mr. Myer replied that in 1977 they could have a child where the parents had died and the child had come here to live with a relative. The guardian would have to reapply every year. It was not 500 new people every year. Mr. Ewing pointed out that the total number had doubled. Dr. Towers thought that of the 500 number, only

about 200 were new this year. Dr. Cody asked staff to provide information on students new to the process this year.

Dr. Shoenberg noted that if they denied 84 people who applied, they were not 84 out of 500 because once granting the waiver they were not then going to deny it. The denials had to be related to the number of new applicants.

Mrs. Praisner asked if there had been cases where a student reapplying had been denied, and Dr. Fountain replied that there had been cases where this had happened. Mrs. Praisner thought that the information presented to the Board did not reflect everything that was going on to get a handle on what was really occurring. They needed more information on the numbers who were new and the repeats. Dr. Shoenberg also requested information on students who had been granted waivers the year before but had left the system.

Dr. Cronin pointed out that one paragraph said that there was little guidance for decision, but the last sentence stated that the current policy was an appropriate one. Dr. Towers felt this alluded to a number of cases where it was difficult to obtain documentation about the students. A great deal of discretion and judgment came into play. They did ask for tax returns and proof of residence and required legal guardianship. He said that they had turned down 84 of the 110 appeal cases this year, and in a number of those it was virtually impossible to get the kind of documentation they would like to have.

Dr. Cronin asked how they reconciled the statement about students living in the county for the sole purpose of attending school here and the statement saying that parents had moved from the county but had children attending school here. Dr. Towers replied that this was not a case where they would necessarily approve the waiver. If a child was living with a guardian, they had to prove they did not have a guardian for the sole purpose of attending a Montgomery County school. If the parents moved and the youngster wanted to continue to attend MCPS and the youngster was living with the parents, this was not a case they would readily approve.

Mrs. DiFonzo asked about the numbers of youngsters who did not apply for a waiver and were paying tuition. They knew the number of exceptions which were listed in the paper. Dr. Tower replied that 86 paid tuition, but they would have to check the number not applying for a waiver. Mrs. DiFonzo said that if they had 1,000 youngsters and 500 applied for waiver, the number changed its significance. She asked whether a ward of the court or a ward of Social Services would have to apply for a waiver. Mr. Myer explained that all the children at the Baptist Home placed in that facility by the Department of Juvenile Services or the Department of Social Services had to apply, but it was an automatic approval because the agency was acting as the parent for that child. Mrs. DiFonzo inquired about the number of categories they had to approve. Dr. Towers called attention to Table III which listed those the policy said would be approved. He cited Protective Services, Social Services, and emancipation.

Mrs. DiFonzo asked if the youngsters receiving waivers were concentrated in any particular area of the county. Mr. Myer replied that they were not. Dr. Pitt commented that this was a fairly restrictive policy. The student was not automatically allowed to attend school in Montgomery County even if their legal guardian was in the county. The category of political asylum was one they could debate. Dr. Fountain added that the family crisis issue was another very difficult area.

Mr. Foubert asked why a student whose parents had died and who had a Montgomery County guardian had to apply. Dr. Pitt explained that the policy required this, and he pointed out that at an earlier time they had had a much more liberal approach. He explained that he was not arguing for the policy but wanted to make it clear that it was not a very liberal policy.

Dr. Floyd asked what happened if a student was a resident of the County, his parents died, and he went to live somewhere else in Montgomery County. Mr. Myer replied that some of these students applied and some did not. Dr. Towers explained that at the school level when there was uncertainty these students were asked to apply. In some cases because of language problems, the students applied when they did not have to. He said that what was unclear in the policy was the part about the "crisis." The policy said an exception could be made if there were a crisis, but it did not define crisis. In addition, the policy did not deal with hardship and nothing in the policy spoke to the ability of the student to pay the tuition.

It seemed to Mr. Ewing that staff had to define the areas where they had problems. He saw them as being of three sorts. The first was the family crisis issue which accounted for one third of applicants. This was poorly defined, and in particular there was the issue of economic capacity and alternatives. The second was the political crisis and asylum which was a big issue for the Immigration and Naturalization Service. Again, the policy did not give much guidance, and 95 students were involved here. The third was the students living outside of the county but wanting to attend school here. There were a number paying tuition, approximately 80. He did not know whether they had a big problem there or not. He thought the policy was aimed at students who wanted to attend MCPS but were not living here. He suggested that they needed to know if what they were told in the paper record was correct. He thought as part of the policy there should be a statement that some effort was to be made to inquire into the paper record. He also asked staff to respond to the questions raised by Mr. Simpson.

Dr. Pitt reported that they spent a lot of time having principals and counselors check student residences. This was especially difficult in schools located near the borders of the county. If the principal had a question about the residence, they would not accept the person without a legal residence. He thought they could improve this process although it did require a lot of time. He agreed that political and family crises were not well defined. The policy had

been changed to be more restrictive.

Dr. Cronin noted that there were federal programs to assist in the relocation of immigrants, and he asked whether MCPS applied to those programs for funds. Dr. Fountain replied that they did through ESOL and the refugee assistance programs. Dr. Towers added that they routinely received a per capita grant for instruction from the refugee assistance program. However, most of those students were here with their parents. He said that they did not turn anyone down if they were here with their parents. He said that while B-2 was a tourist visa, they did have students from Iran on these visas which was the only way they could get out of the country. Dr. Shoenberg noted that they had approved 45 students with B-2 visas. He said it was clear that they were not turning down many students. He did not know whether they were just approving everyone who appealed or whether a large percentage of those applying had a good chance of getting the appeal granted and those thinking they did not have a good chance did not appeal. He said there were 86 students paying tuition. He said that Mr. Simpson had said there were 572 students with B-1 and B-2 visas in the system, if 50 were granted waivers that would mean that 477 were supposed to pay tuition, but they only showed 86. Dr. Fountain explained that Mr. Simpson was associating the total number with foreign students and that was not the case.

Dr. Shoenberg said that Mr. Simpson had used the report on the International Students Admissions as the source of this information. He asked that staff compare the information in the two reports. Mrs. Quy Tran, teacher specialist, explained that they had 600 in this category, but they were not tourists. Most were children of diplomats who had temporary B-2 visas but were going to receive change of visas.

Mr. Ewing recalled that when they had reviewed this policy before they had tried to figure out what to do with the children of diplomats. It seemed to him that they had two sets of decision making going on for several different kinds of purposes. This all added up to a fair amount of money if they calculated what it was they were waiving. He asked for a report on where they were on all of those. Dr. Pitt suggested it would be helpful to have someone write a brief paper explaining the process as it occurred in both offices. Dr. Shoenberg agreed that it would be helpful to have a paper including clarification of the data, the recommendations for modifications to the policy, and the response to Mr. Simpson's questions.

Mrs. Praisner called attention to the first part of the memo and the fact that three tuitions for last year had not been collected in full to date. She requested information on the process used for collecting tuition. Mr. Charles Stine, director of financial services, explained that the school collected the tuition for the first semester and then Accounting put the student on a billing system. In regard to the three, they had a promise for payment on two and the other one was going to court. Mrs. Praisner asked if they told people that the student could no longer continue if the

tuition was not paid, and Mr. Stine said they did and they also withheld records.

Mrs. Slye asked that staff check into the visa status of employees of embassies, international organizations, and the World Bank. Mr. Ewing asked that they contact the State Department and INS. Dr. Cronin asked if they ever tried to negotiate a fee that was less than tuition based on an ability to pay. Dr. Fountain said that they did not other than the policy for employees living out of the county. Dr. Pitt recalled two cases in the past five years for partial payment.

Re: PROPOSED SEX EQUITY POLICY

Dr. Cody proposed several changes to the policy, and Board members made several suggestions including renaming the policy from sex equity to "women's equity." Dr. Shoenberg reported that this policy would be on the December 10 agenda for action.

RESOLUTION NO. 516-85 Re: AN AMENDMENT TO THE PROPOSED POLICY ON WOMEN'S EQUITY

On motion of Mr. Ewing seconded by Mrs. Praisner, the following resolution was adopted unanimously (Mr. Foubert being temporarily absent):

Resolved, That the proposed policy on women's equity be amended by adding the following Resolved clause:

Resolved, That copy of this resolution and policy should be made available to principals, staff members, PTAs, government agencies, and interested local organizations.

RESOLUTION NO. 517-85 Re: REORGANIZATION OF THE DEPARTMENT OF INSTRUCTIONAL RESOURCES

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

WHEREAS, The Department of Instructional Resources has been given significant new responsibilities with the advent of cable television in Montgomery County; and

WHEREAS, The existing structure of the Department, with no divisional breakdowns, puts an excessive burden directly on the Department director; and

WHEREAS, Dividing the Department into divisions would focus responsibilities in a more efficient manner; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Department of Instructional Resources be organized

with the creation of two new divisions, the Division of School Library Media Programs and the Division of Media Technology and Production; and be it further

Resolved, That the Department of Personnel Services is hereby directed to analyze the affected positions in view of their increased responsibilities and recommend any reclassification that might be justified.

RESOLUTION NO. 518-85 Re: POLICY ON LONG-RANGE PLANNING

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

WHEREAS, In an April 22, 1985 memorandum transmitting the Budget Alternatives Task Force recommendations to the Board of Education, the superintendent noted that those recommendations may necessitate modifications to several Board policies; and

WHEREAS, The two policies now identified as requiring modification are: 1) Long-range Educational Facilities Planning (FAA), for which changes will be proposed in April 1986; and 2) Comprehensive Planning (AEB); and

WHEREAS, The current Comprehensive Planning policy adopted in October 1975, shows it to be considerably different from the planning concept under which the superintendent and staff are now working; and

WHEREAS, The Board discussed on October 21 a new Policy on Long-range Planning proposed by the superintendent, and it recommended some changes in that proposed policy which have now been made; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Board of Education hereby rescinds Resolution 744-75, Comprehensive Planning Policy (AEB), adopted October 27, 1975; and be it further

Resolved, That the Board adopts the following Long-range Planning policy to become effective immediately, to replace the former Comprehensive Planning policy:

LONG-RANGE PLANNING

A. Purposes

The Board of Education intends to ensure that the Montgomery County Public Schools and its students will be better able to meet the demands of the future by instituting an ongoing, comprehensive long-range planning process that has as its goals:

1. Identifying, analyzing and planning to cope successfully with the major internal and external forces that will affect what

and how students learn and how the public schools function as a vital element of society over a 10- to 15-year period

2. Establishing a limited number of program improvement goals, to be achieved through sustained effort by all MCPS staff over three- to five-year periods
3. Developing written, multiyear plans for all major priorities and initiatives, including major activities, expected outcomes, timelines, responsible persons and required resources.
4. Basing major budget decisions on long-range plans.

B. Process and content

1. BOARD PARTICIPATION

The Board will participate in long-range planning through an annual conference or retreat with the superintendent and senior staff to review progress on the implementation of priorities, initiatives and long-range plans, to determine which goals have been achieved, whether any new efforts are needed, and to review major issues that may affect the future. It will also consider and act upon objectives and major activities proposed by the superintendent to achieve long-range goals.

2. PLANNING PROCEDURES

The superintendent will develop necessary procedures, forms or other measures to implement the goals of this policy using simple, logical and collegial processes.

3. COORDINATION

The Department of Long-range Planning Coordination is established to help the superintendent coordinate system-wide planning efforts, establish and coordinate an issues management process, aid MCPS staff in developing specific plans, and monitor implementation schedules.

4. CALENDAR OF PLANNING ACTIVITIES

A calendar of annual planning activities should permit the Board of Education to discuss and to endorse specific major activities that are planned for a fiscal year before it considers the operating and capital budgets for that fiscal year.

It will take several years to phase-in a comprehensive long-range planning process, but it should be fully in place not later than the 1988-89 school year.

5. STAFF INVOLVEMENT

The Board encourages maximum staff participation in the long-range planning process. Staff from all units that are to be involved in implementing activities should have a role in planning them, and to the extent possible, there should be opportunities for interested staff to participate in long-range planning.

6. COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT

The superintendent will provide opportunities for interested citizens to become knowledgeable about the MCPS long-range planning process, and to review and to make recommendations concerning specific MCPS long-range plans.

7. PROGRESS REPORTS

The superintendent will give the Board periodic reports each year on the progress and success of various plans, and will ensure that similar progress reports are available to the news media and directly to county citizens.

C. Feedback Indicators

The most appropriate measures of the effectiveness of long-range planning are qualitative indicators, which would be included among other assessments, positive responses to questions such as:

- o Are we defining our goals and how we expect to achieve them with greater precision?
- o Are Board/superintendent long-range goals recognized, understood and supported by staff and community?
- o Are long-range plans being successfully implemented and in a timely fashion?
- o Are there improvements in school system services and programs that are attributable to better long-range planning?

Re: ATTENDANCE POLICY

Mr. Foubert moved and Dr. Floyd seconded the following:

WHEREAS, There is current dissatisfaction with the current class attendance policy (E2); and

WHEREAS, Article XII, Section D of the "Student Rights and Responsibilities" handbook states, "Reduction of grades shall not be used as a punitive or disciplinary measure;" and

WHEREAS, Montgomery County Public Schools' grading policy (IKA-RA)

states that "Teachers are to grade on mastery of objectives;" and

WHEREAS, The aforementioned policy states further that "letter grades are not to be adjusted by personality factors, social achievement, or deportment;" and

WHEREAS, Current class attendance policy is not consistent with the three aforementioned policies; and

WHEREAS, The Board of Education of Montgomery County disapproves of and believes there should be some sanctions for class cutting; and

WHEREAS, A student's most valuable asset is his/her time; and

WHEREAS, Col. Zadok Magruder High School is currently using a school work program which has proven to be effective for dealing with class cutting; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the automatic failure and loss of credit due to lack of attendance (E2) be rescinded; and be it further

Resolved, That the old policy (E2) be replaced with the following:

1. With the first unexcused absence the student will be counseled by the teacher and there will be parental notification.
2. With the second unexcused absence the student shall serve one hour of administrative detention.
3. With the third unexcused absence the student shall serve two (nonconsecutive) hours of administrative detention.
4. With the fourth unexcused absence the student shall serve five (nonconsecutive) hours of administrative detention.
5. With the fifth unexcused absence the student shall have the option of serving ten school service hours, or receiving the grade of E2.
6. With further unexcused absences within the semester, Step 5 will be repeated.

and be it further

Resolved, That if a student chooses to serve school service hours and does not do so, the student will receive the grade of E2; and be it further

Resolved, That the student shall be counseled by the teacher, and parent notification shall occur at each of these steps; and be it further

Resolved, That this program shall be a one-semester pilot from January 28, 1986, through June 19, 1985; and be it further

Resolved, That at the end of the semester the superintendent will review the status of the program and bring recommended modifications, if any, to the Board of Education; and be it further

Resolved, That class tardies shall not be accumulated toward an unexcused absence and therefore may not be linked to a loss of credit or a reduction in grades.

Mr. Foubert stated that as a school system they faced an important issue which was how to combat the problem of class cutting. He agreed that class cutting should not occur, and the issue was how to deal with that problem. Since he had been on the Board, he had sensed a great deal of dissatisfaction among most Board members with the present E2 policy, and he had also sensed a great deal of opposition to the thought of mixing discipline and grades. It was his view that grades were to measure the degree to which the student had mastered the objectives in a given course and not be manipulated as a negative incentive for students to go to class. He had heard the argument that attendance should be the objective of every course, and if the objective were not met, the student should automatically fail. However, if they followed that same theory, it would seem logical that if the student met the objective of attendance they should receive an automatic A. He believed both of these were unsound educational policy.

Mr. Foubert had serious problems with the way the current E2 policy conflicted with the Student Rights policy and with the grading policy. Each policy set a clear definition between the separation of grades and discipline. He also had problems with the way the current policy negated every measure of achievement a student had earned in a course because of one discipline factor. Poor class attendance was a discipline problem and should be treated as such. He believed that the system was giving up when a student received a grade of E2. When a student received an E2 the student had absolutely nothing to do except sit in a class and cause trouble or go elsewhere and waste time. Some might say that the E2 policy had succeeded in its goal of reducing unexcused absences, but he believed it was the wrong way of going about the problem.

Mr. Foubert thanked staff members who had provided him with a great deal of material on the subject of truancy. He had discovered that encouraging class attendance through withholding credit might have legal implications. There had been cases where policies such as MCPS's had been overturned by the courts.

Mr. Foubert stated that he was not overly thrilled with his proposed resolution, and he hoped that someone would introduce a better option. He thought that in the long run it was vital that they come to an agreement to improve the present system. At Magruder they had a school service program to deal with the problem of class cutting, and he believed they should have a countywide pilot for one semester. He said that a concern had been raised that students would be missing a class because of this proposal, but he pointed out that this work

would be done afterschool or on weekends. He explained that the policy operated on a class by class basis, and the penalty for the second absence was one hour administrative detention. School service would only come with the fifth unexcused absence. In regard to parental notification, he said that notifying parents wasn't only done by a teacher/parent phone call. At his school, they had a computer that called home or they could send a letter to the parent's business address.

Mr. Foubert stated that he had given thought to the contractual difficulties of the proposal. One idea would be to make the plan voluntary on the part of employees. Often at Magruder, employees appreciated the extra cleaning help. If these employees were not willing to participate, he would propose that other staff members such as librarians or department heads might use these students. If these people were unwilling, he would propose that the students be assigned to the principal.

Mr. Foubert asked for comments on the proposed resolution and a possible broadening of excused absences. He has discussed his proposal with student leaders at Blair, and they favored the proposal. He stated that they were facing a problem which did not have easy answers, and it was his hope that a majority of the Board could come to an agreement on what penalty to use to combat the problem.

Mrs. DiFonzo reported that when the senior high school policy was up for discussion in the fall of 1979, she spoke against this portion of that policy. She believed that the senior high policy made a grave mistake of confusing discipline and academics. The thinking of the Board at that time was that class cutting was a discipline problem, and she would agree with that. Their solution to that problem was through academics which struck her as being a conflict of MCPS policy. She believed that students belonged in school, and as much as she opposed the policy in 1979, it had the desired effect of cutting down on class cutting. When asked about the number of unexcused absences she would permit, her response was none. She had yet to receive a cogent argument that said youngsters should be allowed any unexcused absence. She agreed that they were caught with a state bylaw about excused absences. This put parents in the position of lying when students had to be taken out of school.

Mrs. DiFonzo was surprised that no one had challenged the present policy in court. She called attention to one of Mr. Foubert's clauses in the proposal dealing with a student's time as an asset. If they had youngsters who were creating infractions of the attendance policy, they needed to address this with some kind of sanction. A school services hour would be a viable alternative, but the problem they ran into was contractual with supporting services employees and teachers. She said that the E2 policy was created to close a loophole in LC. She did not love the proposal in front of them because she recognized that had problems, difficulties, and contradictions, but she had helped Mr. Foubert develop it because it was something she felt strongly about. She did not know if this was

the ideal solution, but she felt they had to draw attention to a policy that was unfair.

Dr. Cronin did not believe that if a student cut that student should be able to do something on his or her time on a Saturday. He believed that course requirements included attendance. If they had a problem with the state law defining absences they ought to be lobbying the state in order to change this to give them some leeway. To him class attendance was a requirement of the course and should not be treated in a disciplinary fashion as graffiti. If a student did not attend class, he did not see a benefit in having that student clean the school. He commented that if he were a member of the union he would be very careful before he would have any of his members volunteer to change their job descriptions. For example, if you could volunteer for one thing, you could volunteer for something else and by the time you had finished you would have extended your work day and your responsibilities. He did not want to put the requirement of supervising students on those persons who were not hired or trained for those responsibilities. If they had problems with students not attending classes and if the leverage of E2 was not available, there should be other leverages. They had progress reports, parent conferences, contracts with students, discipline measures, and counseling with students afterschool. If a student was going to E2, they had to address where the student would be placed during that period. This could be a study hall or an assignment to the principal.

Mr. Ewing reported that he was the only Board member who had been on the Board when the original high school policy had been adopted, and he had voted against that. The issue had to do with whether or not the punishment fit the crime and whether or not the proposed substitute punishment was appropriate. He did not think coupling discipline measures with academic outcomes was appropriate, but he was not sure that the proposed solution was appropriate either. This left him uncertain about next steps.

Mr. Ewing thought they should define lawful absences somewhat differently. He believed there was sufficient flexibility in the state bylaw to permit that. He suggested that they could permit activities approved by the principal, except that principals felt the guidance they had received limited them to little flexibility. He thought that if they did provide this guidance they could consider moving in the direction proposed by Mrs. DiFonzo of not having unexcused absences. He did not know how feasible this was. It was his view that they ought to have some mechanism for imposing a penalty for missing class which was a genuine deterrent for the future. The deterrent there now had had some impact, but there was the possibility that they could come up with another deterrent. They might be able to come up with a device of requiring a student to be in school, perhaps in a supervised study hall afterschool. He would rather have a penalty which deprived the student of some of the student's time and focused on an academic remedy than a loss of credit.

Dr. Cody stated that in reviewing the policy he was uncomfortable with it, and he had talked with John about it. Since then he had spent more time considering the proposed revision and the purposes of the policy. The issue was mixing discipline with academics, but he was not really persuaded that this was really the issue. He did not think the requirement to attend class and the failure to do so fell in the same category of discipline for some violation of a rule. Generally they disciplined students for the violation of a rule which in most cases was an infringement upon the rights of other individuals. This was of a different order because it derived from an obligation to attend class which was an academic requirement. He did not think that the educational requirements for courses were simply satisfied by the mastery of those things called course objectives. They also had the requirements that people get work in on time, and there were academic consequences for not doing so. He felt that being present to participate in class was an academic requirement. The parallel was not discipline and misbehavior and punishment, it was going to work and fulfilling the obligation of a contract one had. The contract meant that you might have personal leave days or sick leave, but if you didn't go to work you didn't get paid. This was a basic principle of their society. This was not meeting an academic requirement, and therefore you did not get credit.

Mrs. Nancy Powell, principal of Magruder High School, reported that at her school they had used some afterschool service projects as a consequence for discipline. It had been used sometimes for class cutting or truancy as well as a variety of other things along the lines suggested by Dr. Cody. The bulk of them were for those rather than class cutting. However, they had had situations where they had students who had been repeatedly truant. Suspension just gave the student what the student wanted. For example, they had used students to rake leaves. She said that some of the students in these difficulties had trouble sitting there and studying at the end of the school day because this was one of the options. They would accept the service jobs for the opportunity to be physically active. She did not see what they had done would work readily as a policy. They had looked carefully at who the youngster was, what the infraction was, what needed to be done around school, and who was interested and would be a good match-up. It had been an individual judgment. She agreed with Dr. Cronin that they could really be changing job descriptions. They were pleased that some students had taken some ownership about the school as a result of helping. Other schools must be interested in trying these things, but she did not think it would work if it were mandated.

Mrs. Powell shared some discomfort at the idea of the E2 policy especially until they got the appeal process working; however, the appeal process had helped. At her school they had a designated person who would work with the student on preparing his appeal. She said that there were circumstances where a youngster would get into the loss of credit situation and the teacher might hold the form in a desk. She thought they had worked out some things to help them with some behavioral things, but she did not see this as being a total

success. She explained that the other area of discomfort was with students missing six or seven classes and still passing the course. There had to be something wrong with what was going on in the classroom. On balance, she would urge them to leave the E2 policy in place until they came up with something better. She said that they had a responsibility as administrators to work with their teachers to see to it that that instruction in the classroom was so meaningful they would hope most students would want to be there.

In regard to excused and unexcused absences, Mrs. Powell explained that her major concern was that young people were where their parents thought they were. She said that anytime a parent sent a letter in advance requesting permission for a student's absence, she would excuse the student. She was against putting parents in a position where they felt they had to lie to the school authorities.

Dr. Joseph Dalton, principal of Wheaton High School, stated that he generally approved requests from parents that were submitted in advance. However, if he had questions, he did call the parents. He applauded John for his efforts, but he had some practical and logistical problems with the proposal because of union reasons. He had used school service in handling problems but he had used this primarily when the school had been defaced. He was not wild about the E2 policy, but it seemed to be the best thing going right now. It had helped to keep students in class. At Wheaton in addition to the E2 policy, when a student received the third unexcused absence the student received a full day in the in-school suspension room along with the warning. He believed that had done more than anything else to keep kids where they belonged. In regard to discipline and grading, he felt the students had responsibilities to be where they belonged and that was in the classroom.

Dr. Thomas Warren, principal of Sherwood High School, did not see the E2 policy as mixing discipline and grades at all. He thought that one of the requirements for satisfactory completion of a course was attendance. A student could not skip more than four classes and still get credit. The parallel was that to graduate from a Maryland high school you had to attend four years, not just meet the graduation requirements in terms of the courses.

At Sherwood Dr. Warren only knew of two cases where the appeal about E2 was denied. In one of those the student had been absent 45 consecutive days, and in another one the student came in on the day of the final exam and wanted to pick up an appeal procedure to get credit and had missed the entire semester. In every other appeal, an agreement had been signed with the teacher that the student was to attend class and get there on time. However, he would appreciate receiving some interpretations of what was or what wasn't an excused absence.

Mrs. Praisner explained that the policy before them came to them in two stages, one as part of the senior high policy with the loss of credit for five absences and then secondly with the failure. She had

been on the Board for the second stage and opposed the E2 policy. She recalled that when staff had presented this to the Board it was because they had identified a loophole. Students were manipulating the loss of credit and rather than failing they were taking the five absences because they preferred to have a loss of credit rather than affect their grade point average and their class rank with a failure in that course. At that point her concerns were not with the effect on those students, but she was concerned about the loophole as she was now starting to be concerned about the loophole and manipulation of honors classes and class rank. At the same time her concern was with the average student or that individual for whom attention and work was necessary. This would allow no opportunity to work with those students and to encourage them to stay in school. It would be

the wrong kind of message; however, she was pleased to hear that the appeals process seemed to be working.

Mrs. Praisner asked for statistical information. She asked how many students were involved and if they could talk about what kinds of students they were, and how many courses they were involved with. She asked about the success rate of the appeals process. She was not convinced that she had made a mistake in 1982 in opposing the policy, but she was not convinced that this proposal was any better. She thought that students should be in school, and she did think that attendance was part of the academic experience. She thought both the state and the Board made that clear. She did not think the recommendation before the Board was any less disciplinary in its suggestion. Working after school and the consequences of not doing it were disciplinary more so than the recommendation of losing credit. She did not think this kind of recommendation was appropriate for every student or for every school or for every situation. On the other hand, she did think they had to look at the excused absences granted by principals in different schools. She would like to know more about creative ways that principals were using in-school suspension to deal with this issue.

Mrs. Slye stated that she was one of the most severe critics of this policy as it was written because she did not think it instilled in students the importance of those habits that went along with successful learning. It appeared that they ended up punishing students for not doing these things as opposed to giving them an opportunity to learn how to do them successfully. However, she was reassured to hear that principals had the same mixed feelings about the situation. The policy was not perfect but it did appear to be addressing the problem that they initially set out to address. She would like to hear from principals some suggestions to address how they could get the student to improve the behavior. Given the fact that this was reducing absences and presence in the classroom was critical to the learning process, she thought they must leave it in place. She was unwilling to modify it as proposed because once again they substituted service which was not an answer to what the problem really was. She was pleased that the principals were comfortable with and familiar with the appeals process which they felt satisfied individual student needs. She was not certain that the community and

students shared that view. She thought that the communication issue with regard to the appeals process was critical as well as counseling at the local school level, particularly beginning at the third absence from class. She hoped that they would work on better alternatives and address the communications issue with regard to the appeals procedure.

Dr. Floyd stated that for 11 years he had taught mathematics to secondary school students. He said that the facts, principles, and generalizations which it was his privilege to teach when added in the right proportions added up to skills for those students he hoped he was able to influence. He thought that what he had to offer was the best thing that had come along since sliced bread. When students cut his classes, he confronted them with the "Floyd reality." He remarked that for any teacher genuinely concerned about his professional practice of teaching when someone decided to cut your class one's vanity was challenged. Dr. Cody had made the observation that students needed to learn that if you did not go to work, you did not get paid. However, you could go to work, but it was the quality of the work that you did while you were there which accounted for your success on the job. He thought that the whole question revolved around the role that teachers played in deciding the progress of students and where credit was deserved and earned. From his experience, most teachers did establish some kind of proportional basis for a grade. He said there was a distinct difference between achievement as reflected in one's grade and attendance. The former had to do with growth which was demonstrated in the degree of mastery of the subject matter, and attendance and deportment might affect achievement results. If a portion of the grade were based on interaction, you could not do much interaction if you were not there. However, he was not prepared to say it was equally as important as other things in that equation.

Dr. Floyd stated that in the end they should say to students that the general principle was that they attended school to learn and then the question was how did one demonstrate that one had learned. He did not think they did this just by attending class. He would be prepared to vote to rescind the current policy, but he was not prepared to do that because in discussions with principals he had been told that the attendance problem had improved. He felt they probably needed to have something better than what they had, and he thought they should be able to come up with something that made logical sense so that they did not get caught up in this illogical conundrum that they were in now.

Dr. Shoenberg said that Mrs. DiFonzo had talked about the zeros that her classmates received when they cut class. He would suggest that the policy they now had was analogous to that. They were saying if you were absent five times, that was too many zeros. He did not see this policy as being any more punitive for reasons other than academic than other policies with which some people felt comfortable. He recalled that they had this policy because some students failing the course chose to have a loss of credit by cutting the class. Students by doing this made the policy an academic policy. While the

policy did involve two different kinds of situations, on the whole, especially given the appeals process that seemed to be working well, it seemed to make good sense. He was not willing to vote for the proposal that was before the Board. In the past he had made another suggestion, and he would like some reaction to the idea of going back to giving an LC for an excessive number of absences from class and that the report card indicate in addition to the LC whether the student was failing or passing the course. He would not change the appeal process because it provided a good deal of flexibility.

Mr. Ewing stated that it was important to note that when they had the senior high report in front of them it did not identify this as a major problem that needed the solution that was proposed. In the course of discussion of that issue, the question was raised by a number of people as to the nature and extent of the problem to be solved. There really wasn't any data. However, that Board of Education wanted rigid regulations uniformly applied in every school in exactly the same way. It wanted a rigid and automatic punishment schedule. He thought it was that spirit that disturbed a lot of people in the community. He did not know how to deal with the problem of what an appropriate reprisal might be for students missing classes too often. He did think there was something that could be done about the matter of rigid regulations, and principals had already undermined that original intent in their application of this policy. He thought they needed to express what the principals practiced in approving parental requests for excused student absences. He said that the problem was that some principals still operated in accordance with the original intent of the policy while others were reasonable and sensible. In his opinion, they should develop some reasonable guidelines that would incorporate the kinds of judgments that principals were now making. He thought that the other part was very tough and very hard to fix.

Dr. Cronin said that this was one of the opportunities for principals to have more authority. He thought they had to assess why students were cutting, how they could monitor their activities better, and how they could deal with boredom, pressures, and the games played by students. He pointed out that they assumed responsibility for students under 18, and they had to make that clear and prepare students for the adult world. For the most part students went on to college, and there was an agreement in college that you received one cut per credit. He felt that five cuts was not unreasonable.

Dr. Shoenberg suggested that the Board receive some data and some information about the degree to which they could institutionalize what principals were already doing. He would like some reaction to his suggestion as well. When they had this data and information, they should be prepared to schedule this matter for some kind of closure.

Re: ANNUAL DRUG/ALCOHOL REPORT

Dr. Richard Towers, director of the Department of Interagency,

Alternative, and Supplementary Programs, reported that once again they had seen a decline in the amount of drug and alcohol usage among youngsters in the past two years in Montgomery County. This had followed a similar statewide and nationwide decline. The reduction in Montgomery County was the biggest reduction of any of the local jurisdictions in the State of Maryland. They continued to work very closely with county government, police, health, and family resources on a variety of projects. They continued to subscribe to the philosophy that the problem could only be dealt with if they all worked together including parents and students. He emphasized the work that youngsters were doing in their schools to try to change what the norm was.

Dr. Shoenberg expressed the Board's appreciation for the work being done by students. It seemed to him that these programs were creative and positive approaches to a problem that frightened most of them. They were anxious to support this work.

Mrs. DiFonzo reported that she had been on the police/student task force on alcohol and drug abuse in the late 1970's. Many recommendations came out of that task force and most of these had been implemented. She thought that SADD was a student grass roots tack-on to those kinds of things. She was delighted to see students taking a proactive and positive role. From what she had heard at national conferences, Montgomery County was leading the way in terms of programs in schools and alcohol and drug prevention programs. However, they still had drug and alcohol problems in the schools, and she did not know whether the day would ever arrive when they had eliminated drug and alcohol problems.

Mrs. DiFonzo thought it was commendable that Montgomery County was below state levels in alcohol consumption and frequency of use of alcohol. She was concerned about the usage of PCP and cocaine which was still markedly high. She wanted to focus on the conclusions and recommendations. She agreed that they needed to do more to recognize student leaders and staff members providing assistance to them. She asked for feedback and reactions from student peers in regard to student involvement in the various programs.

Miss Carrie Conney from Paint Branch High School reported that she and other students had attended a training program at New Windsor. They had named their program "Choice" and felt people were positive about their program. They did not start off saying "no drugs and alcohol," but rather they worked into it and said they were there if students needed them. Students liked the idea that there was something besides SADD which was focused on drunk driving. Their school had peer counseling, SADD, and Choice, and students went to one of these groups. Mrs. DiFonzo asked if she felt her efforts were making a difference, and Miss Conney replied that she did.

Mrs. DiFonzo asked whether they believed it was becoming more acceptable to say no. Miss Sima Blackmon replied that SADD used positive peer pressure to try to change student views about drinking and driving. She remarked that there would always be people opposed

to their opinions, but at the same time she felt when there was a community effort, students did realize that there was a problem. Students were saying no.

Mrs. DiFonzo said that one comment was they did this training and got something on line and worked at it for a year or two, and then they forgot what they were all about. There was a comment about revitalizing staff and administrators on a biannual basis, and she thought this was an excellent idea to keep the momentum going. She pointed out that they had hundreds of new teachers they did not have five years ago when many of these programs had started. She thought it would be worth their while to make that kind of commitment as a system. She suggested they give serious consideration to looking at recognizing students and staff.

Dr. Cronin stated that this was a great report in terms of the numbers of things they were doing. He inquired about kinds of recognition and support they needed to do a better job. Dr. John Schneider, principal of White Oak Intermediate School, replied that one of the things was the opportunity to provide leadership training needed by students to develop their groups. He said that he saw a strong correlation between school failure and alcohol and drug involvement. Their approach was to work through Priorities 1 and 2 and to focus on student achievement. Last year they took 20 or 30 students who developed a positive peer partners program. This year they took another group away and these students were working on four different programs focusing on school success. He felt that the students were branching out into nontraditional ideas and a variety of other efforts to reduce drug and alcohol involvement. He saw more projects as a way to get more people involved.

Dr. Cronin stated that one of the concerns he had was with large parties on the weekends where large numbers of students drank. He asked if they had the support of the police to have a significant number of parents arrested and charged with contributing to the delinquency of minors. Dr. Frank Masci, principal of Gaithersburg High School, reported that he had met with the police and community and that very question was asked. They were assured that if they were to inform the police of a field party that they would show up and make arrests if necessary. Another thing was the ease with which students bought alcohol. They had the names of a number of stores in the Gaithersburg area and turned these over to the police. He felt that the police were very willing and would be very helpful. Dr. Cronin felt that if they could see more of that publicly it might assist them in stopping those kinds of parties. Dr. Masci added that a lot of parents did not realize that they could be personally liable if they served liquor at their homes and a student was involved in an accident. A lot of PTAs were planning educational programs for parents.

Ms. Barbara Jaquette, Einstein High School, stated that she was the family life and drug educator at her school. She said that one of the major commitments in terms of support and recognition was time. One of the major problems in a high school was that everyone had

conflicting activities after school. She suggested exploring the idea of doing a curriculum so that they could give credit and set aside a period at schools. In this way it would be easier to have an enthusiastic group of students if they could be working at it full time. She would also support the idea of parent education. In doing parent education last fall, she reported that most parents did not realize it was illegal to serve alcohol to students under 21. She felt that one of the most important things they had done in the last several years was awareness because awareness and prevention efforts were much more important than treatment efforts.

Mrs. Joanne Fiscina said that as a parent advisor to a SHOP group at B-CC they did not have enough parents involved. They now had a liaison with PTA, and they were trying to do parent networking. She agreed that they had to educate parents as to what their involvement might contribute. She said that when these parties occurred, parents were seldom home. If neighboring parents would report these parties, the police could become involved.

Mr. Ewing thought the report was a useful one and informative about the areas of education, prevention, training, and treatment. He believed that the school system had to be continuously attentive doing everything in its power to keep the grounds and buildings free of drugs. The police would not do that. They would come if there was a specific report, but they would not patrol the halls or the grounds. If they wanted the schools free of drugs, they had to do this themselves. He was not saying that this should replace in any way all of the other things they did. He thought that the other things they did had a stronger and more lasting effect and were much more likely to reduce real incidents. They had a major responsibility to the public to make sure that was so. He was not saying they were not doing that, but there was nothing in the report about this specifically. He knew that there were a great many people in the community who believed they were falling down on the job in that regard. He wanted to know what it was going to take for them to do a better job, and he inquired about the need for more security assistants. He asked that the Board be informed about this because they were coming up to budget time.

Dr. Masci stated that prevention was one thing, but enforcement was equally important. If incidents occurred at a school, they must be dealt with appropriately and according to county policy. He believed that the secondary school principals were following Board policy. Personally, he felt the need for more security assistants. This was based on the nature of his school which was very large and rambling and had a lot of students. He suggested that they look at individual cases and decide on the number of monitors needed. He also suggested that they look at the Student Rights and Responsibilities Policy because the minimum penalty for the possession of drugs was a one day suspension. He felt that this was inadequate and that they needed a strong statement that this was unacceptable and a more lengthy suspension.

Mr. Foubert asked about mandatory drug counseling along with the

suspension. Miss Blackmon reported that at her school some students were caught with alcohol. In addition to being suspended, the students were required to read a book on drinking, write a report, attend several SADD meetings, and meet with the principal.

Mrs. Slye stated that she was delighted with the indications that they were moving in the right direction in this important area. She felt that the report demonstrated less clear cut progress with regard to the use of alcohol among students than it did in regard to drug usage. This concerned her because as a parent she continued to hear that alcohol usage was beginning at earlier and earlier ages. She asked about efforts to take the awareness effort to JIM or elementary schools. Mrs. Fiscina reported that her group had spoken at one of their feeder schools. Their CODA group had approached all their feeder PTAs, but they only had one response. She felt that parents did not want to hear about this until they thought it was a problem for them. Mrs. Slye agreed and noted that the education directed at much younger children about tobacco usage was very successful. This education was directed at the children. She asked about the situation with regard to alcohol usage. Dr. Towers replied that they did do some of that with regard to the health education curriculum as early as fourth grade. Additionally, there were programs like Coping with Alcohol which was in the JIM schools as well as Project Smart. The drug survey was done every two years, and four years ago showed an increase at eighth grade. At that time they tried to zero in on intermediate grade students. As a result of that, a number of instructional efforts had been instituted. A great number of elementary school teachers received training through a grant in connection with the CARE center.

Dr. Cronin stated that he had always had a problem with the drug report the Board received from schools. He would see one school with one reported incident for the entire year, but he knew that did not reflect reality. He was seeing the one student who got caught in school. For example, if he looked at the numbers, in eighth grade in a class of 32 students, two of them were on their way to being confirmed alcoholics. At tenth grade, three of those students were on their way, and at twelfth grade, five of a class of 25 were on their way. It simply meant those students had not gotten caught. He asked what they were doing in terms of the entire county, not just the School Board. He had heard a report that the County was going to spend \$3 million on beautification of the downtown areas, and he would like to see that \$3 million spent on activities for youth afterschool and on weekends. He felt that students had figured out how to beat the system and hide usage.

Dr. Shoenberg stated that three things had emerged from this discussion. One was the Board's gratitude and admiration for the work done by students and staff. The second was an awareness that much more needed to be done. There was concern on the Board for doing its part. The third was that the Board was looking for suggestions of ways in which they could be useful. The Board was looking for guidance, and he trusted that all would continue to work with the staff to see that they got the appropriate guidance.

Dr. Floyd asked about MCPS involvement with the "Just Say No" clubs program which was a national effort. He had attended a meeting at NBC at which the program was discussed. Ms. Jaquette replied that the county was doing some important things and there was a lot of networking. She had received information from the CARE center on the "Just Say No" program. Dr. Towers added that schools could start clubs, but in Montgomery County he had seen an incorporation of the positive peer pressure and the "Just Say No" strategies into some of their existing activities.

Mrs. Praisner said she would be interested in knowing how much involvement and overlap they had with students in the peer counseling program and the extent to which they were the same individuals involved. She asked about opportunities for students to have other places to go than fields or shopping centers. She would be interested about whether students thought these organized activities worked. She was not sure of the extent to which the county government was involved in providing alternatives on weekends for students. Dr. Shoenberg suggested that staff respond in writing at a later time. He thanked the participants for their presentation.

Re: BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS

1. Mr. Ewing noted that they had information items on educational specifications for Rolling Terrace, New Hampshire Estates, and Oak View. He said that there were no parents on the Oak View committee, and he thought that was an oversight. With regard to Rolling Terrace specifications, they had had a number of communications from parents about alternatives. He would like to see what the alternatives might do to the specifications and asked that the Board have these for consideration before they agreed to those. Dr. Cody replied that he would check into the Oak View committee and find out what transpired. Dr. Shoenberg asked about costs for the additional three rooms at Rolling Terrace, and Dr. Cody agreed to provide a report.
2. Mr. Ewing reported that he had written a memo to the superintendent in which he raised three issues about magnet school operations. Two of them had to do with the Blair area, and one had to do with the B-CC area. He worried that things that the Board had promised the community did not always happen at least from the point of view of the community. A second worry was that things that seemed to be solvable were not solved or should be solved by asking for whatever resources were necessary to solve did not get addressed. He commented that those efforts were fragile. He cited the buses to the Blair magnet, the net effect issue at Oak View, and the extent to which the magnet school at North Chevy Chase was operating in accordance with Board guidelines. Dr. Cody agreed to provide a report to the Board and emphasized that he did not think they were letting the magnet schools erode.
3. Mrs. Praisner noted that the Board had an information item on the next steps on alternate budgets. She recalled that this was an evolving process. They had indicated that a statement should be made

in the budget that this was an evolving process so that in subsequent years when the information was not the same the community would understand. She hoped that this comment would be included in the budget format. Secondly, the process included at one point some information on each individual school. She did not know whether they were going to have such a sheet, and if they were going to include such a sheet, she would like to like to see what the fact sheet would be. She assumed that over the years Board members would have an opportunity to comment on the documents.

4. Mrs. Praisner congratulated Stan Day of Wheaton High School who won the National Forensics Diamond Key Award.

RESOLUTION NO. 519-85 Re: MINUTES OF AUGUST 13 AND SEPTEMBER 18,
1985

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

Resolved, That the minutes of August 13, 1985 and September 18, 1985, be approved.

RESOLUTION NO. 520-85 Re: EXECUTIVE SESSION - NOVEMBER 18, 1985

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Dr. Cronin seconded by Mrs. Praisner, 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 November 18, 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.

Re: PROPOSED TASK FORCE ON TEENAGE SUICIDE

Mr. Ewing asked why this task could not be given to the Mental Health Subcommittee of the Medical Advisory Committee. Mrs. DiFonzo explained that the task force might have a broader base of input, but she would have no objections to doing that if it were the pleasure of

the Board. Dr. Cody noted that the subcommittee had been working on this particular topic.

Mr. Ewing suggested that the Board postpone action on this task force until they could find out whether the subcommittee might be prepared to take on this task. Dr. Cronin said that he and Mrs. DiFonzo could draft a series of questions or issues for the subcommittee to see if they could handle this issue or would like to have a task force. Dr. Shoenberg said that he would also like to have some indication as to the experiences over the last several years with suicide rate in the county. Mrs. Praisner pointed out that the SCHOOL BOARD NEWS had indicated there were some bills before the House of Representatives on suicide prevention, and NSBA had some interesting material on the youth suicide epidemic. She suggested that this material be made available to Board members.

Re: PROPOSED RESOLUTION ON OAK VIEW
ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

Dr. Shoenberg suggested that this proposed resolution be rescheduled as a regular agenda item. Mrs. Praisner asked that the superintendent respond to the proposed resolution, and Mr. Ewing suggested that the community be asked to comment.

RESOLUTION NO. 521-85 Re: CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR FAMILY
LIFE AND HUMAN DEVELOPMENT

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

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

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

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

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

Kenneth Bloom
John F.Kennedy High School
Garland Days
Winston Churchill High School
Kerry diGrazia
Gaithersburg High School

RESOLUTION NO. 522-85 Re: GOVERNOR BLAIR LEE, III

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

WHEREAS, The death on October 26, 1985, of Blair Lee, III, former lieutenant governor and acting governor of the State of Maryland, has deeply saddened the staff and members of the Board of Education; and

WHEREAS, Governor Lee spent over 25 years in public service in the State of Maryland and served in both chambers of the General Assembly, as secretary of state, and as the state's first lieutenant governor; and

WHEREAS, Governor Lee's sincere and honest endeavors for the betterment of the State of Maryland and Montgomery County will long be remembered; and

WHEREAS, Governor Lee was an outstanding friend of public education, who had served as a member of the Board of Regents of the State of Maryland and who with Delegate Maurer was the author of the Lee-Maurer formula for public school funding; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the members of the Board of Education express their sorrow at the death of Governor Lee and extend deepest sympathy to his family; and be it further

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

RESOLUTION NO. 523-85 Re: APPOINTMENT OF A MEMBER TO THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON COUNSELING AND GUIDANCE

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

WHEREAS, In accordance with the Policy Statement on Counseling and Guidance adopted by the Board of Education on October 22, 1973, revised and adopted on June 12, 1978, the members of the Advisory Committee on Counseling and Guidance are appointed by the Board; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the following person be appointed to the Advisory Committee on Counseling and Guidance:

Bea Barrientos, Magruder High School (one year)

RESOLUTION NO. 524-85 Re: BOE APPEAL 1985-19 (PERSONNEL MATTER)

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

Resolved, That BOE Appeal 1985-19 be assigned to a hearing examiner.

RESOLUTION NO. 525-85 Re: BOE APPEAL 1985-20 (TRANSPORTATION)

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education grant withdrawal of BOE Appeal 1985-20.

RESOLUTION NO. 526-85 Re: BOE APPEAL 1985-21 (TRANSFER)

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education adopt its decision and order in BOE Appeal 1985-21.

RESOLUTION NO. 527-85 Re: BOE APPEAL 1985-27 (PERSONNEL)

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

Resolved, That BOE Appeal 1985-27 be assigned to a hearing examiner.

RESOLUTION NO. 528-85 Re: CHAIR FOR NOVEMBER 23 PUBLIC HEARING

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education appoint Mrs. Marilyn Praisner as the temporary chair for the November 23 public hearing.

Re: ITEMS OF INFORMATION

Board members received the following items of information:

1. Items in Process
2. Construction Progress Report
3. Next Steps on Alternate Budget Formats
4. Rolling Terrace Educational Specifications
5. New Hampshire Estates Educational Specifications
6. Oak View Educational Specifications
7. Follow-up to Area 2 Task Force Report
8. Follow-up Study of Special Education Graduates, Class of 1984
9. Wootton High School Gymnasium Specifications

Re: DINNER RECESS

The Board recessed for dinner from 6:05 p.m. to 7:15 p.m.

Re: DISCUSSION BETWEEN THE BOARD OF
EDUCATION AND MEDICAL EXPERTS ON
AIDS

Dr. Shoenberg introduced Dr. B. Frank Polk, associate professor of epidemiology and medicine at Johns Hopkins University; Ms. Debbie LaCamera, registered nurse with the NIE epidemiology service; Dr. Donald Swetter, chief health officer of the Montgomery County Health Department; Dr. Ebenezer Israel, chief of the Office of Disease Control and Epidemiology of the State of Maryland, and Mr. Ed Masood, who had been working with the Board on the AIDS policy.

Mr. Masood stated that when the panel made reference to AIDS they would also include references to AIDS-related complex (ARC) and HTLV-III. The Board had authorized the superintendent to begin gathering information as a basis for making a series of recommendations in August and for consideration of a policy statement. Shortly thereafter the Board received a packet of materials on this topic including the United States Public Health Centers for Disease Control guidelines for children as well as policy statements of boards of education from various jurisdictions. Several discussions were conducted on additional considerations for the policy, and the Board had been provided with a variety of updated information.

Mr. Masood reported that the Board's Medical Advisory Committee had presented its recommendations on October 8. During this time they were confronted with the situation that resulted in the identification of a staff member who had died of AIDS. Review of other employee death certificates resulted in the identification of a second staff member who also had AIDS listed as one of the causes of death. Given this, the superintendent implemented procedures which were still in effect and directed that students be placed on home instruction and staff reassigned to other duties until such time as the Board adopted a policy statement on this issue.

Mr. Masood said that MCPS had also provided responses to the Maryland Health Department and the State Department of Education on proposed guidelines for dealing with staff and student AIDS victims. Information previously presented revealed that the modes of transmission were primarily restricted to one or more of the following groups: homosexual males, intravenous drug users, infants who had contracted the disease through gestation or birth, intimate sexual contact between infected and non-infected persons and those who received whole blood, blood products, or transfusions.

Mr. Masood explained that while there had been reported cases of the virus appearing in tears and in the saliva of individuals, there had been no reported cases which verified the transmission of the virus other than those which he had previously mentioned. Further there had been no reported cases of transmission of the virus through casual contact such as that which occurred in normal classroom settings.

Dr. Polk made a slide presentation and explained that AIDS was the endstage of a virus infection. The virus was called HTLV-III, and AIDS was the endstage of the lymphocytes viral infection. AIDS

occurred when the virus had so depleted the immune system that a person became susceptible to a number of unusual kinds of cancer.

Dr. Polk stated that some 14,200 cases had been reported to the Centers for Disease Control which was an extraordinary epidemic by any standard. It was estimated that some 500,000 and possibly as many as two million individuals had been infected and would be HTLV-III antibody positive. He said that one of the key questions was what proportion of those would go on to develop the disease. This was a central issue they would be addressing in their large study. It was critically important because once persons developed AIDS, 100 percent were dead within five years. The median length of survival was more like 18 months.

Dr. Polk pointed out that AIDS had been reported on five continents and in 60 countries. It was rapidly becoming a pandemic, that was reaching epidemic proportions throughout the world. It was not randomly distributed within the United States because New York and California accounted for 60 percent of the cases. However, this was changing and the cases were now being more widely distributed throughout the United States. He thought that the epidemic might be beginning to peak a bit or slow now. However, nationwide the number of cases was doubling every 13 months, while in Maryland it was doubling every nine to ten months.

Dr. Polk noted that 73 percent of reported cases in the United States had been male sexual partners, 17 percent drug users, one percent hemophiliacs, and one percent among heterosexual contacts. He pointed out that of the 133 individuals in this last category, 118 were women and only 15 were men. This began to suggest that the efficiency of the bidirectional heterosexual spread might be asymmetric. There was increasing evidence that it was far easier for an infected man to transmit the virus to a woman than the other way around. He reported that the number of new cases generated through transfusions ought to be over now because of the new blood screening program. The last category was six percent other or unknown. Half of that category were Haitians, and they were no longer a separate category. This left 3 percent that had no known risk identified. Some of these died before they could be investigated.

Dr. Polk reported that the age distribution was much older than it would be for other sexual diseases such as gonorrhea. There was an excess of cases among blacks, especially in the Maryland area, and it was not clear why this was so.

Dr. Polk said that there were 209 cases of pediatric AIDS (children under 13). He felt that the criteria used by the CDC were far too strict for pediatric AIDS, and he thought it was likely that there were 500 to 600 cases. He said that three quarters of those cases were accounted for by being born into a family in which one or both parents was in a high risk group. It was strongly suggested that there was maternal fetal transmission. A small proportion of these children were hemophiliacs, and perhaps 15 percent were associated with transfusions in the neonatal period. He commented that the

incubation period made projections very difficult. The transfusion associated cases gave them two or three years, but a more recent study suggested it might be four to five years.

Dr. Polk thought they needed to know more about the specifics of sexual transmission in order to better educate the population so as to prevent transmission. They needed to know more about the probability of AIDS, given the presence of infection. He said it might be possible to interrupt the disease process in the middle and perhaps stop the development of disease after infection. More importantly, they needed to reduce the risk of transmission among those who were uninfected. He suggested that they had to initiate much more aggressive sex and drug education than they had done in the past. One possible spinoff of the epidemic might be a reduction in teenage pregnancies and a reduction in drug abuse.

Dr. Polk explained the difference between infection and disease. For example, if 100 children were infected with polio virus, perhaps only one would get paralytic polio. At the other end of the spectrum, measles and rabies were probably very close to 100 percent. They now believed that HTLV-III was in the range of 5 to 20 percent within the first five years of infection. The problem was that they had but a five-year snap shot of the epidemic. He said there were only three ways to deal with epidemics. They could get rid of the reservoir, but they had to be able to identify the reservoir and have an effective intervention. This was not possible with AIDS. They could immunize the susceptibles, but at present they did not have a vaccine. In the meantime all they had to work with was interruption of transmission, and in order to do so they needed to understand the modes of transmission. Sexual transmission was the most common mode, and they were beginning to see a change in life styles among gay and bisexual men. He was not so sanguine about their ability to educate drug abusers to change their behavior to reduce the risk of transmission. Blood and blood products were now being screened with very efficient tests, and the blood supply was now safe. Maternal fetal transmission was a difficult issue because they did not know the probability of a baby getting infection.

Dr. Polk stated that the bad news was that the virus affected brains and brain cells. For any anti-viral agent to work, it was going to have to be able to get into the brain.

As to the risk of transmission, Dr. Polk reported that Ms. LaCamera and her colleagues at NIH, the investigators of the CDC, and others at Massachusetts General together had now followed over 500 health care workers who had stuck themselves with a needle or otherwise had a high risk exposure. These workers had been followed for a year, and not a single seroconversion had been observed. While the incubation period was long, the period of time between infection and the appearance of antibodies was relatively brief. It was their estimate that it was two to eight weeks.

Dr. Polk showed a slide about household transmission. A hospital in New York investigated 88 household non-sexual contacts of 35 patients

with AIDS. Fifty-three were children, nine were siblings of the AIDS patient, 11 were parents, and 15 were other relatives. They followed these people for several months during which they had been exposed to the AIDS patients. Of those 88 people, only one was seropositive, and that was a two-year old infant born to one of the patients. These household contacts were much closer kinds of contact than that seen in schools. There was a larger study from Georgia which also demonstrated that the virus was not transmitted efficiently through casual contact. In addition, the Department of Defense had just issue a statement that that environmental contacts in military operation settings such as tanks, submarines, and aircraft were not regarded as significant risks for infection by HTLV-III.

Ms. LaCamera stated that they now had compelling scientific information that illustrated the difficulty of spreading this virus through casual contact. They had done a study of 700 health care workers, and about 150 of those had sustained the needle stick injuries or other contacts. Two of these were significant enough to give the health care worker hepatitis. However, the HTLV-III was not transmitted. All the health care workers remained seronegative. In the United States there were now over 1700 health care workers who had had these exposures, and there were no conversions from the negative antibody status.

Dr. Israel reported that someone had put all the household studies together and had information on 316 household members. None of them showed that casual contact was a factor in terms of AIDS transmission. In addition, almost all of the 14,000 victims were asked how they acquired the disease, and they had yet to come across a case that they could attribute to casual contact. He felt that the guidelines from the State Health Department were extremely conservative. They did not allow any child who did not have control of secretions into the classroom or any child with behavioral problems like biting. They used the team approach and evaluated the children on a case-by-case basis.

Dr. Swetter said that from the public health point of view, AIDS was infectious although its transmission was through very selective routes. AIDS was preventable through basic public health measures. Education was key to this and must be widespread to all groups, especially to high risk groups. Policies should be set with the best information available, using CDC, NIH, and the universities.

Dr. Shoenberg stated that all they had to go on was basically statistical evidence. All of the guidelines related to the CDC guidelines were based on what they knew so far. Experience was limited. In order to feel totally comfortable with those guidelines, he would like to have information about the biochemistry of the virus itself. He would like to know that the evidence they had was in line with what they knew of the biochemistry of the virus itself and the modes of transmission that were possible given the nature of the virus.

Dr. Polk replied that he knew what cells did and what cells did not

have receptors for the virus. The cells that had receptors for the virus were subsets of T-lymphocytes. There might be cells within the brain that had receptors for the virus, but other than those two it was not at all clear that any other cells in or on the body had receptors. The virus had to be able to get inside the host and infect the host. As it turned out there were not many cells exposed on the outside of their bodies that had receptors that were T-lymphocytes. This was probably why men infected women, but not the other way around. As to whether the virus would remain stable over time, there was little reason to believe it was going to change in a way that would alter its transmissibility.

Dr. Cronin inquired about the press conference called by the French doctors. Dr. Polk thought it was a bit premature to treat six patients for a week and then hold a press conference. However, in the long run he did not see how their treatment could possibly work because it was not antiviral. Dr. Cronin thought it might have an effect on diminishing the number of T-cell lymphocytes which might starve the disease itself. Dr. Polk replied that the sicker the patient, the fewer the lymphocytes. He did not think this would do it. Ms. LaCamera added that the patients who were very sick had the fewest number of lymphocytes left, and it was the hardest to culture the virus from those patients. Dr. Cronin asked whether there was a more contagious time period. Dr. Polk replied that the only data they had had to do with the ease of isolating the virus from patients. It did appear that the asymptomatic carriers had the highest rates, followed by the ARC patients, but the least infectious patients were those with AIDS. The virus lived in the lymphocytes, and the fewer lymphocytes you had the fewer viruses you could have.

In regard to the virus mutating, Dr. Israel said they did not think the virus would change its behavior. However, if it did and started spreading by the respiratory route, they should not have to worry in the school setting because it would affect the entire community in such a rapid manner that having a child in a school setting would not make a difference. He pointed out that the virus had not changed in six years and there was no reason to think it was going to change. Dr. Floyd asked if this was a new disease or a newly diagnosed disease. Dr. Polk replied that it was a new disease, perhaps developing 10 or 12 years ago. The virus might have originated in subhuman primates in central Africa, underwent mutation, and adapted itself to the human host. They were guessing that it went from central Africa to Haiti and from Haiti to the United States.

Dr. Cronin asked about levels of the virus in a variety of fluids from sweat, to tears, to saliva, and to blood. Dr. Polk said that any body fluid containing lymphocytes was probably infectious. Semen was probably the most highly infectious bodily specimen they could produce. He would be skeptical of any report about sweat and the presence in tears was only reported in one patient.

Dr. Cronin inquired about precautions taken when dealing with an AIDS patient. Dr. Polk replied that he was careful in handling their

secretions especially when he was drawing blood or using needles. He washed his hands frequently. Ms. LaCamera said that when drawing blood the nurse would use gloves and dispose of the needle. In taking blood pressure or serving food trays, no precautions would be taken. Dr. Polk added that everything was wiped down with a one to nine bleach solution. Ms. LaCamera explained that the use of bleach came when they did not know what the virus was and thought it was similar to hepatitis which disinfected well with bleach.

Dr. Cronin assumed that most of the infants born with AIDS would not survive to attend school. If they had a hemophiliac child with AIDS who attended school, he wondered whether they would have to sterilize the child's desk or other objects in the classroom. Dr. Polk replied that he did not think there would be special precautions, but he questioned Dr. Cronin's first statement because they were now suggesting that maybe one third of the infants might live to attend first grade.

Mrs. Praisner asked about the jeopardy the AIDS child might be in because of diseases carried by other children that might pose a threat to the AIDS child. Dr. Israel replied that this was a very genuine concern. Their guideline suggested precautions such as the principal excluding the AIDS child when there was an outbreak. For this reason they were talking of the team approach with the child's physician and parents considering the benefit of the classroom versus the risk involved.

Mrs. Praisner asked about evaluations once the AIDS child was placed in the classroom. It seemed to her that the guidelines were not specific on this point. Dr. Israel agreed that it was their omission in terms of talking about medical monitoring. The final guidelines would incorporate this. The responsibility would be placed on the child's physician to inform the school and the Health Department of any change in the status of the child.

Mrs. DiFonzo inquired about the time between the onset of the disease from the contracting of the virus to visible symptoms. Dr. Polk replied that their best estimate was that the median was probably around four years. In an infant it might be three or four months, and the shortest timeframe for an adult had been six months. They were predicting that some individuals might go 12 to 15 years before they got ill.

Mrs. DiFonzo asked whether they knew that AIDS could be transmitted only through sexual contact, blood, needles, etc., and Dr. Polk replied no. Mrs. DiFonzo noted that there had been a mutation between the primate host and the infection of humans. She asked why they should not expect yet another mutation along the line. Dr. Polk replied that it might happen but it seemed unlikely because a virus changing species was an extraordinary event.

Mrs. DiFonzo had heard that children with AIDS lived longer than adults. Dr. Polk replied that two-thirds of them died relatively quickly but another third might live for up to five years. Mrs.

DiFonzo said that there was a possibility that in 1990 the school system could be dealing with children entering the public schools with AIDS. Dr. Polk thought that this was a possibility.

Mrs. DiFonzo asked about their legal liability with regard to allowing the AIDS youngsters in the schools. She pointed out that they might be exposed to chicken pox which did not show signs until after the two-week period. Dr. Polk replied that interestingly enough patients with AIDS were not especially susceptible to other infections. For example, their patients didn't seem to have any more upper respiratory infections than other people did. Dr. Israel added that the risks of a classroom setting would be explained to the parents and the child. The liability for the school board would be even more if the child was excluded for no given reason. Dr. Schwartz felt that the children might have more trouble with chicken pox than other infections. However, although the incubation period was 10 to 21 days, it was truly only communicable a day or two before the pox appeared. There was a preventative measure available for people who were susceptible and exposed. Dr. Israel said there was a chance of a child with AIDS going to the school system and catching an infection.

Mrs. DiFonzo said she was hearing two doctors saying different things. Could she or could she not assume that the person with AIDS was more likely to catch a virus? Dr. Shoenberg said she had asked if they knew that the disease could not be transmitted casually, and the answer was they did not know that. If Dr. Polk had been asked if people died as a direct cause of the common cold and if they knew that they couldn't die as a result of it, the answer would have been "no." Dr. Shoenberg said that the difference was one of length of experience with the disease. It was a statistical answer. People were answering the questions honestly, but the answer had to be understood within the context of epidemiological evidence.

Ms. LaCamera commented that a year ago Dr. Shoenberg's argument would be well taken, but she thought that now in addition to the epidemiologic information they had a reasonably large body of scientific information based on almost 15,000 cases. Dr. Shoenberg did not think they were differing. He said they now had more evidence and were starting to get a fix on it, but it was still statistical evidence. The conclusion they were likely to come to rested entirely on statistical evidence. It was his inclination to accept the statistical evidence they had.

Dr. Cody remarked that this was the basis of knowing anything in science backed up by some theoretical or reasonable explanation of how it worked. The biochemical explanation at this point seemed to be a reasonable explanation of why AIDS could not be transmitted except under very, very limited circumstances. In a few years they might say they did not know of any other way because they had not seen any other example. He pointed out that they now knew more than they did six months ago.

Mrs. Slye asked if the distribution of the affected groups in relative portion to one another change at all. Dr. Polk replied that it did. For example, in New York the proportion of cases attributable to drug abuse was increasingly steadily, but the proportion among gay and bisexual men was decreasing. Mrs. Slye inquired about changes among the heterosexual population as the numbers increased generally. Dr. Polk replied that as they saw more and more cases among drug abusers, more heterosexual men were going to be infected, and they would see an increase in infected women. Along with that they would see an increase in infected children.

Mrs. Slye thought that ultimately a disproportionate number of victims of this disease might be children, and Dr. Polk agreed. Dr. Israel thought they were going to have to worry about teenage sexual contact and drug abuse. He suggested that they had to address this and if they didn't they were going to pay a heavy price. Dr. Shoenberg commented that this was very good advice for them and very appropriate coming on the heels of today's discussion about alcohol and drug abuse.

In response to a question from the audience, Dr. Polk said they did not know why the virus went to the brain or at what stage it did. They had not seen anyone become notably demented prior to the diagnosis of AIDS although the British had reported this. He thought that the central nervous system and brain involvement did appear to be late. In response to another question, Dr. Polk stated that the more advanced the patient was in the disease, the less infective that person was. Dr. Cronin commented that as people reacted to individuals with AIDS, the horse was already out of the barn. Dr. Polk agreed and noted that they were focusing their concerns on the least infectious individuals. Another question was raised about early dementia, and Dr. Polk replied that early on it was apathy and finally disordered thinking process and ultimately coma.

In response to a question about the susceptibility of handicapped children, Dr. Polk replied that there was no evidence that handicapped individuals were more susceptible to infection. He stated that there was a very important difference between susceptibility and risk. As far as they knew everyone was equally at risk if they inoculated everyone in the room with the same number of viruses. But they were not all at risk. The minority in the population at risk were the risk takers because of their behaviors. In response to another question, Dr. Israel replied that AIDS did have to be reported but HTLV-III infections did not have to be. They were studying this issue and had not made a decision one way or the other.

Dr. Shoenberg thanked the members of the panel for their presentation and responses to questions.

Re: ADJOURNMENT

The president adjourned the meeting at 8:50 p.m.

President

Secretary

WSC:mlw

