

adopted unanimously:

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education oppose HB 1198/SB 635 - State Aid for School Construction - Approved Costs.

RESOLUTION NO. 144-86 Re: HB 1200/SB 637 - PUBLIC EDUCATION - KINDERGARTEN AND PREKINDERGARTEN STATE FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE (BALTIMORE CITY ADMINISTRATION)

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

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education support HB 1200/SB 637 - Public Education - Kindergarten and Prekindergarten State Financial Assistance (Baltimore City Administration).

RESOLUTION NO. 145-86 Re: HB 1201/SB 638 - SPECIAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS - REQUIRED STATE FUNDING (BALTIMORE CITY ADMINISTRATION)

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

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education support HB 1201/SB 638 - Special Education Programs - Required State Funding (Baltimore City Administration).

RESOLUTION NO. 146-86 Re: HB 1253 - EDUCATION - TRANSPORTATION OF PUBLIC SCHOOL STUDENTS

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Dr. Floyd seconded by Mr. Ewing, 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:

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education support HB 1253 Education - Transportation of Public School Students.

RESOLUTION NO. 147-86 Re: HB 1324 - EDUCATION - FUNDING FOR CHILDREN IN OUT-OF-COUNTY LIVING ARRANGEMENTS

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Mr. Ewing seconded by Mrs. Praisner, the following resolution was adopted with Dr. Cronin, Mrs. DiFonzo, Mr. Ewing, (Mr. Foubert), Mrs. Praisner,

Dr. Shoenberg, and Mrs. Slye voting in the affirmative; Dr. Floyd abstaining:

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education takes no position on HB 1324 - Education - Funding for Children in Out-of-county Living Arrangements, but that the Board of Education indicate that a more reasonable proposal is that of the governor.

RESOLUTION NO. 148-86 Re: HB 1083 - SPECIAL EDUCATION - GRADUATION REQUIREMENTS

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

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education oppose HB 1083 - Special Education - Graduation Requirements.

RESOLUTION NO. 149-86 Re: SJR/HJR 47 - GUBERNATORIAL TASK FORCE - TEENAGE SUICIDE AND OTHER MENTAL HEALTH PROBLEMS AND HB 1221 - YOUTH SUICIDE PREVENTION SCHOOL PROGRAM

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

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education support SJR/HJR 47 with a recommendation that students be included on the task force and oppose HB 1221.

RESOLUTION NO. 150-86 Re: HB 1443 - HOME EDUCATION

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Mrs. Praisner seconded by Mr. Ewing, 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 abstaining:

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education oppose HB 1443 - Home Education.

RESOLUTION NO. 151-86 Re: HB 1319 - PUBLIC SCHOOLS - ALTERNATIVE PROVISIONAL CERTIFICATION TRAINING PROGRAM

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

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education support HB 1319 - Public Schools - Alternative Provisional Certification Training Program.

Re: ANNOUNCEMENT

Dr. Cronin noted that Mr. Thomas S. Israel, former president of the Board of Education, was in the audience. Mr. Foubert introduced Mr. Andy Herscowitz, another candidate for the student Board member seat.

RESOLUTION NO. 152-86 Re: RESCISSION OF OCTOBER 8, 1985 RESOLUTION DECLARING MSA TO HAVE BREACHED CONTRACT UNDER REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL 84-01, INTEGRATED FINANCIAL INFORMATION SYSTEMS SOFTWARE

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

WHEREAS, It has been determined that the disputes existing between the Board of Education of Montgomery County and Management Science America, Inc. (MSA) would best be resolved on an amicable basis; and

WHEREAS, A mutually acceptable confidential settlement arrangement has been concluded between the Board of Education and MSA providing for cancellation of the Board of Education's right to use certain of the licensed software systems and refund to the Board of Education of an appropriate portion of the license fees paid to MSA by the Board of Education; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education of Montgomery County hereby rescinds the October 8, 1985, Resolution, together with the "Explanatory Information" made a part thereof, declaring MSA to have breached its contract under RFP 84-01, and the Board acknowledges that the assertions contained in the rescinded resolution and accompanying materials are vigorously disputed by MSA and that the settlement effectuated by the Board of Education shall not infer or in any way be deemed an admission of fault by either party in the performance of its obligations under the subject contract; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education authorizes the superintendent of schools to execute the Software Cancellation Agreement with MSA to effect the settlement; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the license fees refunded to the Board of Education be received and placed in the Category 1 Administration, Contractual Services Account for the use in the development of the new Financial Information System.

RESOLUTION NO. 153-86 Re: ROCK CREEK FOREST ELEMENTARY SCHOOL - PARTIAL REROOFING (AREA 2)

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Mrs. DiFonzo

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

WHEREAS, Sealed bids were received on February 13, for the partial reroofing of Rock Creek Forest Elementary School, as indicated below:

BIDDER	LUMP SUM
1. Orndorff & Spaid, Inc.	\$28,456
2. J. E. Wood & Sons Co., Inc.	28,661
3. Colbert Roofing Corporation	35,481
4. R. D. Bean, Inc.	35,850

and

WHEREAS, The low bidder, Orndorff & Spaid, 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 \$28,456 be awarded to Orndorff & Spaid, Inc., to accomplish a reroofing project at Rock Creek Forest Elementary School, in accordance with plans and specifications dated January 30, 1986, prepared by the Department of School Facilities, Division of Construction and Capital Projects.

RESOLUTION NO. 154-86 Re: REJECTION OF CONSTRUCTION BIDS FOR THE SPRINKLER SYSTEM IN THE CONSTRUCTION MALL AT EDISON CAREER CENTER

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

WHEREAS, Bids were received February 13, 1986, for revisions to the sprinkler system in the Construction Mall at the Edison Career Center, as indicated below:

BIDDER	LUMP SUM
Hub City Sprinkler, Inc.	\$49,880

and

WHEREAS, The only bid exceeds the staff estimate and is not cost effective; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That this bid from Hub City Sprinklers, Inc., be rejected and that the project be readvertised at the earliest possible convenience.

RESOLUTION NO. 155-86 Re: FY 1986 SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION FOR

A SPECIAL K-8 MATHEMATICS PROJECT

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

RESOLVED, That the superintendent of schools be authorized, subject to County Council approval, to receive and expend a \$71,418 grant award in the following categories from MSDE under the Education for Economic Security Act, Title II for the mathematics training of selected K-8 teachers:

CATEGORY	SUPPLEMENTAL
01 Administration	\$66,521
10 Fixed Charges	4,897

TOTAL	\$71,418

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.

Re: BOARD/PRESS/VISITOR CONFERENCE

The following individuals appeared before the Board of Education:

1. William Ott, Area 3 Coalition for the Highly Gifted
2. Elliot Chabot, Aspen Hill Civic Association
3. Myron Fliegel, Area 3 Coalition for the Highly Gifted
4. Mark Allen, Farmland PTA
5. Lila Scott, Seven Locks PTA
6. Vicki Rafel, MCCPTA

Re: PRINCIPAL RECRUITMENT AND SELECTION
PROCESS

Dr. Cody indicated that since they had last discussed this subject they had received a report from their consultant. Dr. Shaffner had chaired a meeting on this subject and had provided some reactions of the principals which the Board would be receiving. As he reviewed the process of recruiting, screening, and appointing principals, he found that one of the possible weaknesses in the process was the lack of congruence between the criteria used in the early screening of individuals to the criteria used to serve as a framework for the objectives of the training program to the criteria serving as the basis for the assessment center to the criteria used for the selection of principals and to the criteria used for the evaluation of principals. They had a whole set of professional judgments they were making, but they were not sure these judgments were congruent. During the next couple of months they would be looking at all of that. This might have implications for the final evaluation of the

principals, or they might decide to fit other things to this final evaluation. This might have implications for the type of assessment centers they used. The MCPS center was related to the performance of the principalship in Montgomery County while another type of assessment center identified the candidate's strengths. They might need two versions of the assessment center.

Dr. Cody said it was important for the school system, the Board, and the administrative staff with the continuing consultation of the principals to look at this and see whether as a whole unit it made sense. In the meantime they were tightening up and improving the decision steps in the process that they now had. While they might end up changing the content of the decision steps, he thought the basic framework was a sound one.

Dr. Cody reported that they had discovered they were not doing an in-depth evaluation of credentials of candidates and were not reaching out to identify prospective leaders who had not identified themselves. In addition, in their recommendations to the Board they were trying to reflect the logic and rationale for the choices made. They were not there yet in terms of tying the criteria to the specific job to the information about the person nominated.

Dr. Cody called attention to the consideration of two types of assessment centers. From Dr. Shaffner's meeting with principals, it was suggested that they consider the issue of whether principals and assistant principals should automatically change assignments after a period of time. For example, after five or six years they would be considered for transfer to another principalship vacancy and after seven or eight years they would be transferred.

Dr. Cronin asked if the new process would be in place when they appointed principals to the new high schools and new elementary schools. Dr. Cody replied that major portions of the process were already in place. He said that he was not quite satisfied with the documentation going to the Board with his nominations. He indicated that they would continue the framework for the interview when candidates were being considered for promotion, but they would add another step with the superintendent, deputy, and a member of the executive staff interviewing one or more of the finalists.

Dr. Cronin asked if committee members had comments. Mrs. Joan Israel, principal of Wyngate Elementary, pointed out that if they looked at the committee membership they would see that these participants had a lot to say. They had given their comments to the superintendent because they felt there were a lot of issues beyond the mechanical processes.

Mrs. DiFonzo commented that the entire issue of principal selection was one that lent itself very easily to cynicism on the part of people that the process was not fair and not open. There had been aspersions made about the trainees assigned to the various principals and the criteria for their selection. She hoped that the process would lead people to believe that the process was fair, that there

were criteria, and that the process would be followed. In regard to the rotation of principals, she recalled that this issue had been discussed for years. She suggested that if they were going to do this, they should explain why, and if they were not going to do it, they should explain why.

Mrs. Praisner asked about the timetable for the DEA study. She remarked that the paper before the Board clarified and improved the process and explained for the public what MCPS was about when it selected trainees. However, she was concerned about the other piece of the pie, that piece which was what expectation they had in Montgomery County for the principalship. These pieces were only good if they supported and reflected those expectations and job descriptions they had defined. Dr. Cody believed that what should drive the study should be what they wanted and expected from principals at the local level. The DEA study would be practical study of what principals did but eventually it would be a philosophical choice of what they thought principals should do.

Mrs. Israel commented that their group did not think the cart should be put before the horse. They could not decide what they were going to assess in the assessment center unless they knew what principals did do now and what they wanted them to do. The study was supposed to be completed in May, and the report would go to the Board in early fall. It seemed to Mrs. Praisner that they had to have some lengthy and serious discussions with principals about the major expectations issues and how job descriptions, selection processes, and training procedures reflect this. Dr. Cody thought they could start on this issue while the other study was going on. Mrs. Praisner noted that MCPS already had some very strong job descriptions for elementary and secondary principals. Dr. Cody indicated that in the next month or so they would look at job descriptions and criteria and put them in one report to see whether they fit together.

Mrs. Praisner reported that she was serving on the state subcommittee on evaluation. They would have a retreat in March, and they hoped to have some recommendations available for public hearings in the spring. She said she had questions about how long people would stay on lists, the issue of the intern at the secondary level, and the assistant principal position.

Mr. Foubert asked why parents and students were not on the screening panel. Dr. Cody explained that this was a confidential process because it involved the personnel folders of the individuals. He said that the consultant encouraged them to increase the knowledge and capability of the individuals doing the screening. He thought it was fine to involve students and parents in interviews, particularly at the high school level.

Dr. Shoenberg commented that the main advantage of this exercise was to tidy up a drawer that had gotten messy over the years and to make sure there was some consistency in the process and criteria at each step of the process were kept together. He did not think they should expect any magic from this. He was not sure that a new process would

produce any better results than they now had other than improving perceptions that the process was done more fairly. They would find that the process had certain kinds of inequities. It would solve certain kinds of problems and create other problems. It was his experience in selecting people over the years that a group of people knowing what it was they were looking for, operating each with his or her own criteria, would come to a remarkably consistent decision. He asked the principals to speak to what they saw as the most glaring problems with the current system.

Dr. James Shinn, director of personnel, explained that when the Board saw the report of the committee, many of those issues would be identified. Dr. Shoenberg hoped the report would explain why people were concerned about certain areas and why they were concerned about them in terms of the result that they produced.

Mr. Ewing recalled that this effort was not generated by the principals but rather by the Board. The Board did not know what the process entailed. They saw a process that produced good people, but it did so in ways that seemed each time to be different from the last time. Secondly, the Board kept hearing from both the larger public and from those interested in becoming principals that they did not understand how that process worked either. While it was important to ask the principals about problems, it was the Board who sought this. He complimented Dr. Cody for taking this up. Mr. Ewing said that like Dr. Shoenberg he did not believe a new process would solve all their personnel problems, but increments of clarity and fairness were always desirable in large bureaucracies. He did think it was important for them to be clear about expectations, but on the other hand some of the reforms in the process did not depend very strongly on expectations. Those reforms could be pursued now.

Dr. Cronin suggested that later they had to look at the fine line between their own trainees and the small pool of qualified outside applicants. Dr. Cody replied that they had an increased number of positions to fill because of opening new schools and because of retirements. He believed they ought to have available a small number of individuals they had identified as qualified and consider them as vacancies come up. If they were interviewing five people, four of them might be from the inside and one from the outside depending on the vacancy. They did get letters of inquiry from the outside, but when the time came to make appointments these people were ignored. They might encourage a few outside candidates, prescreen them, and determine them to be eligible and qualified. He agreed with the principals that most appointments should come from the inside.

Ms. Bonnie Fox, principal of Redland Middle, reported that the principals had spent a lot of time on this committee because they thought it was a very important issue. They did not like going into the committee thinking there was a problem; however, they did feel there were areas of improvement. They did make some recommendations for further study and discussion. The committee was not against outside infusion. They were in favor of it, but they did recommend that for the most part this infusion be at a level other than the principalship. They should recruit for assistant principals or trainees.

Re: COMMITTEE REPORT ON ACADEMIC ELIGIBILITY
FOR COCURRICULAR ACTIVITIES

Dr. Pitt introduced Anitsa Cordon, chair of the committee. He said that the committee did a good deal of research. The recommendations were reviewed at the administrative team level. They felt this report should go before the Board without a policy recommendation. If after discussion, the Board felt there should be a major change in this area they recommended it be a policy rather than a regulation. On behalf of the Board, Dr. Cronin thanked the committee for an extremely impressive report.

Ms. Cordon stated that they were asked to review available literature, determine current trends nationally and locally, and consider the impact a policy would have on the quality of cocurricular programs and participation by students, especially minority students and students with special needs. They identified their concerns and had listed their findings and recommendations. Dr. Shoenberg commented that the administrative team was somewhat in disagreement over an issue he did not quite understand. It was not clear to him why it was the coach or advisor who decided the student was eligible to resume the activity. It seemed to him the eligibility was determined academically by the principal. Dr. Cronin asked why this would not be "admitted by the principal after consultation with the coach."

Ms. Cordon explained that the student would indicate an interest in establishing re-eligibility, the coach/advisor would be the first person, than it would go to the principal or a committee. Dr. Shoenberg said that if a student failed and was ineligible, this determination was not made by the coach. The determination that the student was now eligible had to do with a review of his academic performance.

Dr. Cody explained that in the administrative team the process of reconsideration at midpoint in a grading period was a process that secondary principals had reservations about. It could be worked out for Grades 7 and 8. Dr. Pitt said that this spoke to reinstating someone at the mid point of a grading period. They saw this as a major problem in athletics. They were concerned that this would put major pressure on a lot of people, and decisions could be made in one school that were not being made in another school.

Mr. Mike Michaelson, administrative assistant for student affairs, reported that when they looked at the calendar it would affect very few, if any, students in athletics. If they were ineligible at the beginning of the grading period, they probably would not be permitted to try out for the team. This was perceived as a vehicle for year-long activities such as cheerleaders, poms, band, student government, etc. Mrs. Slye thought there would be a problem with baseball. In most schools baseball try-out eligibility was determined by the report card, but tryouts were not complete prior to the midpoint in the next marking period. She thought that this would

have to be an achieved and maintained type of thing. She said the process had some possibilities and should be given close consideration.

Mr. Edward Masood said he spoke out against this because of the impact of ineligible people participating on teams, especially where the teams were in competition at state-level playoffs. If a student got back on a team and failed at the end of the term, they would have to deal with the state playoff system. They also had the problem of who was going to monitor this in the school. He explained that they had problems finding out who was ineligible at the end of nine weeks, and it would be even more difficult at the midpoint.

Mrs. Praisner assumed that the committee felt the need for uniformity was such they were not interested in making an exception. Mr. Michaelson explained that one of the most consistent messages they had received from students was the issue of equity. The students seemed to lean toward a more conservative standard.

Mrs. Praisner pointed out that this dealt only with Class 3 activities and not ad hoc activities such as chess clubs. She noted a reference that many schools had implemented academic eligibility standards for a variety of other cocurricular activities. She asked whether they were suggesting this would not be possible in the future. Dr. Cronin asked for examples of other activities other than Class 3. Ms. Cordon replied that at Poolesville only athletic activities were governed by academic eligibility requirements. At Woodward they applied this only to athletics, but if they found students were participating in other activities and were failing, they were counseled. At Damascus, a student with two E's could not participate in club activities.

Dr. Shoenberg said that the studies they summarized suggested there wasn't very much of a relationship between grades and participation in cocurricular activities. If one were to take that uniform conclusion to its logical conclusion, one would say that to impose any kind of academic eligibility standard on participation was inappropriate. Yet the committee had decided it would go with the athletic eligibility standard for all Class 3 activities. Ms. Cordon replied that they had a regulation working well in athletics. Not to have any kind of requirement did not seem consistent with the county goals in education. They felt the need for consistency in activities.

It seemed to Dr. Shoenberg they were going to take a local standard for athletics and put every student who participated in a Class 3 activity in the same bag even though the evidence they had suggested it was an irrelevant bag to be in. He thought they were making a recommendation because the public relations consequences of moving in another direction would be unfortunate despite the fact that they knew that this was the wrong direction to be moving in.

Dr. Cronin asked if staff was saying that the minimum eligibility requirement was a motivational factor, and Mr. Masood replied that it

was. Mr. Ewing pointed out that the report said they were not jeopardized by this requirement. The report said that if students spent a lot of time watching television, their grades did suffer. Ms. Pat Foster, assistant principal at Redland Middle, added that it was setting expectations for students to want to be successful in school. By having some standard, they were saying they did expect students to study.

Dr. Cody commented that the evidence had to do with statistical averages, and they were talking about individual students. In a California school district they instituted such a requirement amidst the fear that a lot of students would drop out of school, and they found that students were seeking help and getting higher grades.

Mr. Ewing was not sure a 1983 survey ought to be the sole source for this, and the statement that student grades are not jeopardized by participation in activities was not the way the evidence should be summarized. He suggested that next time they discussed this issue the Board be provided with examples in a couple of high schools of what was not included in the way of activities under the Class 3 listing. With regard to Recommendation 5, he was not sure whether the committee was saying that every school should do all six of those things or whether that list was a list from which schools would choose. He assumed it was the latter. He was not clear about the content of what an active outreach program might be in Recommendation 6. In regard to these recommendations, he said the findings were not surprising but they were dismaying with respect to minority student participation. The recommendation seemed to be consistent with the Board's priorities but did need a lot of fleshing out.

Dr. Cronin pointed out that the dominantly minority school system in the area had a higher standard of a C average. Mrs. Slye wondered why the C average was not recommended, and Mr. Masood replied that this brought a whole series of problems dealing with the C average of the learning center student versus the honors program and whether it is academic courses only.

Mr. Foubert stated that when the Board acted on this subject he would have more extensive comments. He found the committee's findings extremely interesting and very helpful. He did agree with the notion that students were in school for the purpose of learning; however, he found it notable that the committee said activities were an integral part of the educational program and that grades were not jeopardized. This suggested to him that they should have no eligibility rules as Dr. Shoenberg had suggested. It did not make sense to him to take away an integral part of a student's educational program because the student was not doing well in other areas. Despite this feeling, he did intend to support the committee's recommendations. He commented that if the appeal process had no criteria he would not support it. However, it was based on grades, and student improvement in performance could be seen clearly.

Dr. Cody felt that the purpose of the exercise was that a student making poor grades would seek help if the student were threatened

with exclusion. The consequence would not be exclusion. If a lot of students were excluded, they would have failed.

Dr. Floyd commended the committee for its work and the informative data they presented. He remarked that they did a lot of things in the school system that they did not subject to a cause and effect judgment. A lot of decisions had to do with common sense. If they could not prove that something helped but could prove it did not hurt, it might be common sense to do it until they came up with something better.

Mrs. DiFonzo was concerned that this was limited to Category 3 activities which still maintained a double standard. She did not think they could limit it to youngsters enrolled in one type of extracurricular activity. Ms. Cordom commented that the committee had fought long and hard about that. They looked at the time factor that a youngster put into an activity, and the stipended activities were the ones that did take the time. Mrs. DiFonzo noted that the addendum reports talked about youngsters who did well going out for activities. These reports never look at the issue of whether extracurricular activities helped youngsters keep up their grades. With regard to establishing a minimum standard, she believed in incentives and felt that students wanting to participate in an activity would do what they needed to do. The school system had the obligation to provide the support to that youngster. She was concerned about the possibility of this getting into the appeal process because the staff was overloaded now.

Dr. Cronin asked that the superintendent develop a policy for Board consideration.

Re: CONCEPTS FOR A LONG-RANGE FACILITY
PLANNING POLICY/PROCESS

Dr. Phil Rohr, director of facilities planning, explained that the proposal before the Board was a modification of an earlier proposal. They were attempting to provide for more positive staff/community involvement in developing mutually agreeable solutions to facility problems. They would do that in place of the superintendent's preliminary recommendations that originally were to come out in May. At the staff level they would be using this time to work with communities. He pointed out that they were in an era of providing facilities where they were required, and there would few, if any, school closings in the next few years. They were trying to maximize the time available to work with people and to bring their proposals in line with legal requirements. They were required to produce a capital budget and a six-year capital improvements program. By state law the superintendent had to submit that by November 1, and the Board had to act in November. He noted that many of their solutions would involve capital projects, and the CIP should serve more as a planning and solution document.

Dr. Rohr said there was a possibility of a two-step process. They had originally proposed that the CIP would include all the capital related projects and solutions which did not involve a capital

project would occur later in February or March. There was a feeling, where they had reached agreement with communities, that they include in the CIP all these items, and that action would occur at this time rather than later. Only the items that were particularly difficult or where there was strong disagreement would be deferred until February or March. In November they would have an expanded six-year capital improvements program with far more back-up and documentation. They were thinking about including data on building permits and resident live births.

Dr. Cody explained that after the Council acted on May 15 they would publish the long-range master facilities plan, and they would do that annually. It would include decisions that had been made and tentatively approved by the Council about school construction and identify areas that had yet to be resolved. This document would be discussed by staff and citizens. In fall they would have recommendations to modify that document. It would not be a 15-year plan with annual updates, but it would be an annual plan.

Mrs. Cordie Goldstein, MCCPTA facilities chair, stated that they had concerns about the September 10 date from the community point of view. It was infeasible to work with communities over the summer. She pointed out that they were working with a cluster concept rather than a PTA president concept. Mrs. Mary Ann Bowen, MCCPTA facilities chair, noted that this had not gone by the MCCPTA executive board.

Dr. Cody said that the biggest difference would be Dr. Rohr working with the community to reach agreement on differences of opinion rather than having the community worry over the superintendent's preliminary recommendations. It would constitute a different style of working with communities. Mrs. Bowen said that they were recommending making the process more flexible for staff, community, and Board. She said they would be in agreement on the elimination of the preliminary recommendation step. Mrs. Rafel stated that their main concern was the protection of the communities because the facilities decision process over the last ten years had been more destructive of parent involvement than any other activity. She hoped that they could get appropriate community input before the community was burned out.

Dr. Floyd pointed out that at the Board/Press/Visitor Conference Mrs. Scott from the Seven Locks PTA had stated that the Board had made a decision about Avenel Farms. If the new process cured that problem, he would vote for it. He said that people had to understand there were stages involved and the die was not cast until four people around the table agreed.

Mr. Ewing said he was looking forward to receiving MCCPTA's comments. He thought the issue of September 10 was important because if they asked citizens to work in the summer the effort to persuade them that MCPS was not engaged in devious efforts would be itself undermined. He said that the suggestion of working with the community without the superintendent's recommendations was a good one. He remarked that there was somewhat of a danger in the process because the staff and

the community might come to an agreement which boxed the Board in and eliminated options. He asked when they would deal with the issue of options, and Dr. Muir replied that this meeting would be held in October when they could review enrollments and projections. Mr. Ewing suggested that the policy should address this potential danger.

Mrs. Praisner agreed and noted that earlier they were concerned that if the Board discussed these issues too early it would be perceived as being the Board's recommendation. She thought the September issue was a significant one. However, once they looked at the magnitude of what had to be addressed, she wondered whether there were ways to address the "on or before June" issue. She said they might be meeting with every school and community unless it was going to be by cluster. She asked whether they thought there were not that many and, therefore, the whole thing could be done in September. She was also concerned about how neatly they could define solutions that did not involve capital projects. Dr. Rohr explained that where there seemed to be a consensus on a non-capital solution such as a boundary change, it was to be presented and decided in November rather than February or March. In February they would consider serious questions that had been raised.

Mrs. Praisner was concerned that a lot of these issues were not neat and simple. For example, a boundary change was an alternative to a capital project. Dr. Rohr explained that the staff might be proposing a boundary change rather than construction of an addition. Up until the February/March time frame they would be working with the community on a solution. If the Board should decide that an addition were necessary, the capital budget could still be amended.

Dr. Cody remarked that when construction and boundary changes were the alternative, he would prefer this be done in the fall. He said they were moving toward getting more and more of this done in the fall if they could. He explained that it had to do with spreading out workload during the year. Mrs. Praisner said she had a strong desire to move toward this kind of a process, but she was concerned that they did not in the process of streamlining perpetuate problems that they could eliminate at the same time.

Dr. Shoenberg thought that the proposal was moving in the right direction. However, he was bothered that although it was streamlined it also seemed to lock in an extended period of time during which the Board would be bombarded with community concerns about school facilities. Dr. Muir replied that the Board should be better off under this proposal. The earlier plan had the superintendent's recommendations in May with a decision in November. Under the new plan they would not have a possible solution until the beginning of November. Dr. Shoenberg pointed out that the more controverted issues would be dealt with in November and then in February or March. Dr. Muir said that he sensed the concept paper was moving in the right direction. He would try to meld the concept paper and the existing facilities policy. It would be scheduled for discussion on March 11, and Dr. Cronin indicated that the Board could act on the policy on March 24.

Re: MONTHLY FINANCIAL REPORT

Dr. Pitt stated that they were close to being able to handle the \$300,000 problem related to driver education. He explained that the reduction in oil prices had been a big help in this regard. He said that they were not filling the oil tanks with the idea that prices would keep going down.

Mr. Ewing observed that if they used lawyers less or paid lawyers less or budgeted adequately for lawyers, they would not have a deficit now.

Re: BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS

1. Mrs. Praisner said they had received a proposal from MCR for a three-day study period prior to final exams. She had received a response to her questions on this, and now she would like to see a response from the staff as to the feasibility of the MCR proposal. She hoped the Board would hear from principals.

2. Mr. Ewing reported that he had attended the Open House Construction Clinic held on February 22 and saw two houses that students had built. He said that as usual they had done an outstanding job.

3. Mr. Foubert said that he had visited Burning Tree Elementary School to observe their gifted and talented program. He was impressed by the program and the instruction the students were receiving. He remarked that the level of discussion and student vocabulary was nearly equivalent to that which he would expect from a high school class. He had spoken with Joseph Goldberg, a fifth grade student. The student had written a composition because he felt that students should be exercising in physical education, and square dancing, which was what they were doing, did not qualify.

RESOLUTION NO. 156-86 Re: EXECUTIVE SESSION - MARCH 11, 1986

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

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

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education of Montgomery County hereby conduct its meeting in executive closed session beginning on March 11, 1986, at 9 a.m. to discuss, consider, deliberate, and/or otherwise decide the employment, assignment, appointment, promotion, demotion, compensation, discipline, removal, or resignation of employees, appointees, or officials over whom it has jurisdiction, or any other personnel matter affecting one or more particular

individuals and to comply with a specific constitutional, statutory or judicially imposed requirement protecting particular proceedings or matters from public disclosure as permitted under Article 76A, Section 11(a) and that such meeting shall continue in executive closed session until the completion of business; and be it further

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

RESOLUTION NO. 157-86 Re: MINUTES OF OCTOBER 21 and NOVEMBER 5,
1985

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

RESOLVED, That the minutes of October 21 and November 5, 1985, be approved.

RESOLUTION NO. 158-86 Re: DEATH OF BRADY STRAUB, PHYSICAL
EDUCATION TEACHER AND COACH, JOHN F.
KENNEDY HIGH SCHOOL

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

WHEREAS, The recent death of Brady Straub, physical education teacher and coach, has deeply saddened the staff and members of the Board of Education; and

WHEREAS, In his fourteen years with the Montgomery County Public Schools, Mr. Straub was responsible for developing outstanding football and baseball teams at Northwood High School and, more recently, an outstanding football team at John F. Kennedy High School; and

WHEREAS, Mr. Straub touched the lives of many students through his philosophy of honor and respect, scholarship, and sportsmanship; and
WHEREAS, Mr. Straub served as an outstanding role model for students, both as an inspired teacher and coach as well as a devoted husband and father; and

WHEREAS, Mr. Straub's courage and never-ending faith in combatting his illness will long be remembered by students and staff and will serve as an inspiration for all; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That on behalf of the students and staff of the Montgomery County Public Schools, the members of the Board of Education express their sincere sorrow at the untimely death of Mr. Brady Straub and extend deepest sympathy to his family; and be it further

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

RESOLUTION NO. 159-86 Re: SCHEDULING OF A DISCUSSION ON THE POLICY ON RETURN OF TESTS

On motion of Dr. Cronin seconded by Mr. Ewing, 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:

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education revisit the policy on the return of tests in light of comments made at the State Board of Education relating to recent appeals.

Re: PROPOSED RESOLUTION TO SCHEDULE DISCUSSION ON J/I/M SCHOOL NEEDS

On February 11, 1986, Dr. Cronin moved and Mr. Ewing seconded the following resolution:

RESOLVED, That the curriculum and other needs of the J/I/M schools be addressed by the Board in the near future.

RESOLUTION NO. 160-86 Re: A SUBSTITUTE MOTION ON J/I/M SCHOOLS

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

RESOLVED, That the superintendent be requested to come forward with a proposed method for discussing J/I/M schools which would include discussion of policies, curriculum, and other needs as proposed by the superintendent.

Re: PROPOSED RESOLUTION TO SCHEDULE DISCUSSION ON A SPECIAL PROGRAM FOR UP-COUNTY SECONDARY SCHOOLS

On February 11, 1986, Mr. Ewing moved and Mrs. Slye seconded the following resolution:

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education schedule a discussion and action item on the establishment in the up-county area of a special secondary school program which would be developed, if approved by the Board, in accordance with the program policy of the Board and which would take account of the results of the survey of citizen interests and would involve consideration by the Board of several possible alternatives in the way of program and location including but not limited to the program involving math, science and computers to be located at Gaithersburg High School or some other up-county high school.

Re: A MOTION BY DR. SHOENBERG TO AMEND THE PROPOSED RESOLUTION ON UP-COUNTY

SECONDARY SCHOOLS (FAILED)

A motion by Dr. Shoenberg to amend the proposed resolution on up-county secondary schools by deleting "to be located at Gaithersburg High School or some other up-county high school" failed with Dr. Cronin, Mrs. DiFonzo, (Mr. Foubert), and Dr. Shoenberg voting in the affirmative; Mr. Ewing, Dr. Floyd, and Mrs. Slye voting in the negative; Mrs. Praisner abstaining.

RESOLUTION NO. 161-86 Re: AN AMENDMENT TO THE PROPOSED RESOLUTION ON UP-COUNTY SECONDARY SCHOOLS

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

RESOLVED, That the proposed resolution be amended to substitute "at an up-county high school" for "at Gaithersburg High School or some other up-county high school."

RESOLUTION NO. 162-86 Re: SCHEDULING A DISCUSSION ON A SPECIAL PROGRAM FOR UP-COUNTY SECONDARY SCHOOLS

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

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education schedule a discussion and action item on the establishment in the up-county area of a special secondary school program which would be developed, if approved by the Board, in accordance with the program policy of the Board and which would take account of the results of the survey of citizen interests and would involve consideration by the Board of several possible alternatives in the way of program and location including but not limited to the program involving math, science and computers to be located at an up-county high school.

Re: A MOTION BY MR. EWING TO SCHEDULE AN AMENDMENT TO THE CAPITAL BUDGET FOR GAITHERSBURG HIGH SCHOOL (FAILED)

The following motion by Mr. Ewing failed with Mr. Ewing, Dr. Floyd, (Mr. Foubert), and Mrs. Slye voting in the affirmative; Dr. Cronin voting in the negative; Mrs. DiFonzo, Mrs. Praisner, and Dr. Shoenberg abstaining:

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education schedule at the earliest possible time discussion and action on an amendment to the FY 87 capital budget which would provide for fully adequate core facilities for Gaithersburg High School including but not limited to kitchen facilities built to a standard like that used for new schools serving the same number of students as Gaithersburg High School and including as well media center facilities which would provide adequate space to house collections which meet MCPS standards which are otherwise

adequate for student use, and which would consider the suitability of the space in the high school for a future special program. For the record, Mrs. Praisner made the following statement:

"I am more than eager to discuss all of those issues, but I find the word 'suitability' still confusing for me and difficult for staff to respond to by the March meeting to the extent that it will be needed. I think the other issues need to be addressed and are critical at this point. The other issue obviously will be addressed soon as well."

For the record, Dr. Shoenberg made the following statement:

"I would like to make clear that my abstention is based on two things having to do with two parts of the motion. We have already been told as to the part involving the facilities that we are going to get that information. I see no point in passing a resolution that would ask for what we have already been promised. I agree with Dr. Cronin about the creation of a presumption."

For the record, Mrs. DiFonzo made the following statement:

"I wish to point out that I have abstained for two reasons. No. 1 that which Bob just talked about in that to me it is redundant in terms of what is coming to us, and secondly I was out of the room on personal business during the major portion of the discussion and rather than vote on that part that I did hear I chose to abstain."

Re: NEW BUSINESS

Mr. Ewing stated that there was an urgent need for the Board to discuss the implications of the annual report of the California Achievement Test results particularly with regard to the performance of Hispanic students. He urged the Board officers to schedule this topic.

Re: ITEMS OF INFORMATION

Board members received the following items of information:

1. Annual Report of the California Achievement Test Results, 1984-85
2. Preliminary Evaluation of Mobile Educational Teams Program
3. Survey of Graduating Seniors - Class of 1984

Re: ADJOURNMENT

The president adjourned the meeting at midnight.

President

Secretary

WSC:mlw