

WHEREAS, The Board of Education has reaffirmed, through the adoption of Priority 1, the improvement of academic achievement of all students, with a special focus in science, technology, and computer literacy; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the Montgomery County Public Schools' Board of Education declares the week of May 11-17, 1986, as Science Week in the Montgomery County Public Schools.

RESOLUTION NO. 247-86 Re: PROCUREMENT CONTRACTS OVER \$25,000

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

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

WHEREAS, The manufacturer has announced a substantial reduction in prices for personal computers, and there will be an advantage in rebidding for Bid 108-86; IBM Personal Computers and Peripheral Equipment; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That Bid 108-86 be rejected; and be it further

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

		DOLLAR VALUE OF CONTRACT
92-96	Office and School Supplies	
	Alling and Cory	\$ 70,388
	Alperstein Bros., Inc.	23,800
	Antietam Paper Co.	48,310
	Baltimore Stationery	140
	Barton, Duer and Koch Paper Co.	9,642
	Boise Cascade Office Products	2,032
	Chaselle, Inc.	95,426
	M. S. Ginn Co.	30,336
	Globe Office Supply Co., Inc.	58,729
	Interstate Office Supply Co.	40,454
	Kurtz Bros.	3,840
	John G. Kyles, Inc.	18,967
	Lefranc Inc.	194
	Nationwide Papers	2,824
	Repeat-O-Type Mfg. Corp.	840
	Visual Systems Co., Inc.	2,328
	Westvaco/U S Envelope	23,243
	TOTAL	\$ 431,493

94-86 Art Supplies

	Brodhead-Garrett Co.	\$	528
	Chaselle, Inc.		128,559
	Dick Blick East		1,377
	Interstate Office Supply Co.		11,515

	TOTAL	\$	141,979
106-86	Art and School Papers		
	Barton, Duer and Koch Paper Co.	\$	47,481
	Chaselle, Inc.		84,629
	Garrett-Bechanan Co.		57,984
	J. L. Hammett		7,580

	TOTAL	\$	197,674
118-86	Duplicating Supplies		
	Advance Business System	\$	25,403
	Chaselle, Inc.		19,843
	Commonwealth Copy Products, Inc.		3,966
	Globe Office Supply Co., Inc.		12,797
	Jack L. Hartman & Co., Inc.		3,805
	I.E.S.S., Inc.		11,828
	Interstate Office Supply Co.		591
	Kleen-Strike, Inc.		3,702
	Magnaplan Corp.		2,003
	Nashua Corporation		104,338
	Repeat-O-Type Mfg. Corp.		6,318
	Visual Systems Co., Inc.		330

	TOTAL	\$	184,924
125-86	Office Furniture		
	Baltimore Stationery Co.	\$	6,928
	Douron, Inc.		32,122
	GSI Interiors, Ltd.		1,215
	The Office Furniture Mart		4,574
	State Use Furniture		3,744

	TOTAL	\$	48,583
127-86	Classroom Furniture		
	Baltimore Stationery Co.	\$	7,857
	Douron, Inc.		296,067
	M. S. Ginn Co.		8,526
	Glover School & Office Equipment Co.		30,978

	TOTAL	\$	343,428
178-86	Sod		
	White's Turf Farm, Inc.	\$	36,000
	GRAND TOTAL		\$1,384,081

SUMMIT HALL ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

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

WHEREAS, Legal counsel and staff have negotiated an \$18,480 settlement with GAF Corporation, roofing materials supplier, for the roof failure at Summit Hall Elementary School; and

WHEREAS, The \$18,480 settlement is an equitable share of the estimated replacement cost based on the roof's age and increased reroofing specifications which include more and stronger plies of roof membrane and increased insulation for energy conservation; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education accepts the negotiated settlement with GAF Corporation for \$18,480 as their share of responsibility for the roof failure at the Summit Hall Elementary School; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the superintendent be authorized to negotiate and execute a mutually acceptable release agreement with GAF Corporation; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the county executive is requested to recommend approval of the receipt and expenditure of these funds through the FY 1987 CIP project titled Roof Replacement, 766995.

RESOLUTION NO. 249-86 Re: CAPITAL PROJECTS TO BE CLOSED
EFFECTIVE MAY 1, 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 closes capital projects in a timely manner and desires to transfer the unencumbered balances to the appropriate account; and

WHEREAS, The Department of School Facilities has reviewed capital projects that may be closed effective May 1, 1986, providing the net capitalization of \$7,896,163.00; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the superintendent be authorized to close, effective May 1, 1986, capital construction projects listed below and to transfer the local unencumbered balances totaling \$10,599.63, subject to final audit, to the Local Unliquidated Surplus Account, project 997 (balance before transfer \$16,322.21):

PROJECT NO.	SCHOOL	BALANCE
* 104-08	Seneca Valley High	\$ -0-
* 104-09	Seneca Valley High	-0-

* 107-04	Martin Luther King Junior High	-0-
* 152-11	Poolesville High	-0-
* 152-12	Poolesville High	-0-
* 216-04	Travilah Elementary	-0-
222-02	Charles W. Woodward High	-0-
* 230-09	Rockville High	-0-
* 232-06	Tilden Intermediate	-0-
* 238-03	Cold Spring Elementary	-0-
* 303-11	Fairland Elementary	-0-
* 305-10	Jackson Road Elementary	-0-
* 311-05	Francis Scott Key Junior High	-0-
* 312-04	William Tyler Page Elementary	-0-
* 316-03	Stonegate Elementary	-0-
* 333-06	Benjamin Banneker Junior High	-0-
* 351-07	Darnestown Elementary	-0-
406-19	Bethesda-Chevy Chase High	-0-
* 406-20	Bethesda-Chevy Chase High	-0-
* 408-05	Westbrook Elementary	-0-
410-07	Bradley Hills Elementary	4,868.23
* 425-06	Ashburton Elementary	-0-
* 428-05	Thomas W. Pyle Intermediate	-0-
* 503-18	Sherwood High	-0-
* 508-07	Candlewood Elementary	-0-
* 510-11	Col. Zadok Magruder High	-0-
552-08	Washington Grove Elementary	3,560.76
* 553-07	Gaithersburg Elementary	-0-
* 556-06	Mill Creek Towne Elementary	-0-
* 558-07	Whetstone Elementary	-0-
* 559-03	Brown Station Elementary	-0-
* 562-06	Redland Middle	-0-
* 564-04	South Lake Elementary	-0-
* 602-13	Winston Churchill High	-0-
704-04	Woodfield Elementary (Port. Classrooms)	-0-
* 749-07	Piney Branch Elementary	-0-
* 755-08	Takoma Park Junior High	-0-
* 757-27	Montgomery Blair High	-0-
* 757-28	Montgomery Blair High	-0-
764-09	Woodlin Elementary	1,274.64
782-08	Wheaton Vocational/technical	-0-
* 798-13	Springbrook High	-0-
* 798-14	Springbrook High	-0-
* 812-09	Parkland Junior High	-0-
* 911-09	Edward U. Taylor Center	-0-
* 917-14	Lincoln Center	-0-
* 917-15	Lincoln Center	-0-
* 919-24	Carver Educational Services Center	-0-
* 979-03	Food Services Warehouse	-0-
* 990-03	Lathrop E. Smith Environ. Ed. Center	-0-
* 996-07	Instructional Portable Office Space	-0-
999-07	Athletic Field Watering	895.57
* 999-08	Lane House	-0-
* 999-12	Safety Glazing	-0-
* 999-37	Trash Storage	-0-
999-64	Track Resurfacing	.43

* Locally-funded Capital Improvements

and be it further

RESOLVED, That the county executive be requested to recommend approval to the County Council of these transfers.

RESOLUTION NO. 250-86 Re: REPAIRS TO BOILERS - VARIOUS SCHOOLS
REJECTION OF BIDS

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 April 10, 1986, for repairs to boilers at Herbert Hoover Junior High, Montgomery Village Junior High, Thomas S. Wootton High and Walter Johnson High Schools, as follows:

Proposal A = Hoover Junior
Proposal B = Montgomery Village Junior
Proposal C = Wootton High School
Proposal D = Walter Johnson High

Bidder

1. M & M Welding and Fabricators, Inc. \$10,631.28 (A), \$10,635.00 (B); \$11,300.000 (C); \$5,782.63 (D); \$38,348.91 Total
2. J. E. Hurley Machine & Boiler Works, Inc. \$12,382.00 (A); \$13,360.000 (B), \$11,952.00 (C); \$6,644.00 (D); \$44,338.00 Total
3. Holman Boiler Repair \$13,060.00 (A); \$13,060.00 (B); \$12,059.00 (C); \$9,000.00 (D); \$47,179.00 Total
4. Capital Boiler Works, Inc. \$22,380.00 (A); \$22,380.00 (B); \$18,900.000 (C); \$8,565.00 (D); \$72,225.00 Total
5. American Combustion, Inc. \$29,975.00 (A); \$31,350.00 (B); \$27,627.00 (C); \$7,898.00 (D): \$96,850.00 Total

and

WHEREAS, The low bidder, M & M Welding and Fabricators, Inc., made a significant error in their interpretation of the plans and specifications and cannot perform the required services for the bid price; and

WHEREAS, School Facilities' staff in conjunction with Morton Wood, Jr., consulting engineer, have clarified the plans and specifications and are in a position to rebid the project immediately; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That all bids received on April 10 for boiler repairs at Herbert Hoover Junior High, Montgomery Village Junior High, Thomas S. Wootton High and Walter Johnson High schools be rejected and

readvertised at the earliest possible date.

RESOLUTION NO. 251-86 Re: FY 1986 SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION,
CATEGORICAL AND OBJECT TRANSFER WITHIN
THE VOCATIONAL EDUCATION PROGRAM

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

RESOLVED, That the superintendent of schools be authorized, subject to County Council approval, to receive and expend an additional grant award of \$4,586 in the following category from the MSDE under the Carl D. Perkins Vocational Education Act for vocational education programs:

CATEGORY	SUPPLEMENTAL
03 Instructional Other	\$4,586

and be it further

RESOLVED, That the superintendent of schools be authorized, subject to County Council approval, to effect within the FY 1986 vocational education programs, the following categorical transfers:

CATEGORY	FROM	TO
02 Instructional Salaries	\$19,412	
03 Instructional Other		\$59,095
04 Special Education	21,088	
07 Student Transportation		2,655
08 Operation of Plant & Equip.	1,255	
10 Fixed Charges	19,995	
	-----	-----
	\$61,750	\$61,750

and be it further

RESOLVED, That the superintendent of schools be authorized to effect the following object transfer within Category 03, Instructional Other:

OBJECT	FROM	TO
02 Contractual Services	\$18,210	
03 Supplies and Materials	18,147	
04 Other	3,701	
05 Furniture and Equipment		\$40,058
	-----	-----
	\$40,058	\$40,058

and be it further

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

RESOLUTION NO. 252-86 Re: AMENDMENT TO THE FISCAL 1987
OPERATING BUDGET

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

WHEREAS, The Board of Education FY 1987 Operating Budget was adopted on February 11, 1986, in the amount of \$476,510,120; and

WHEREAS, The county executive has recommended that Capital Budget projects for instructional furniture replacement and maintenance equipment, totaling \$410,000, be deleted from that budget and be included in the Operating Budget; and

WHEREAS, The adoption of this amendment will increase several Operating Budget state categories as indicated below:

STATE CATEGORY	BOARD APPROVED FEB. 11, 1986	BOARD AMENDMENT	BOARD AMENDED APR. 28, 1986
01 Administration	\$ 29,971,500	-	\$ 29,971,500
02 Instructional Salaries	244,153,721	-	244,153,721
03 Other Inst. Costs	13,785,794	\$150,000	13,935,794
04 Special Education	47,652,601	-	47,652,601
05 Student Personnel Svcs	1,373,610	-	1,373,610
06 Health Services	36,201	-	36,201
07 Student Transportation	25,101,275	-	25,101,275
08 Operation of Plant	36,160,963	-	36,160,963
09 Maintenance of Plant	13,397,449	260,000	13,657,449
10 Fixed Charges	49,474,230	-	49,474,230
11 Food Services	581,120	-	581,120
14 Community Services	487,057	-	487,057
61 Food Service Fund	14,334,599	-	14,334,599
	-----	-----	-----
TOTAL	\$476,510,120	\$410,000	\$476,920,120

now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the Board-adopted Fiscal 1987 Operating Budget be amended to increase Category 3, Other Instructional Costs by \$150,000, and Category 9, Maintenance of Plant by \$260,000 for an amended total of \$476,920,120; and be it further

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

Re: BOARD/PRESS/VISITOR CONFERENCE

The following individuals appeared before the Board of Education:

1. Vicki Rafel, MCCPTA
2. Barbara Hill, United Black Cultural Center
3. George Sealey, Jr.
4. Susan Dominia, MDC Child Development Center
5. Deborah Linzer, MDC Child Development Center
6. Judy Koenick
7. Robert Hopkins

Re: EDUCATION TASK FORCE REPORT OF THE
COMMUNITY ACTION BOARD

Ms. Carolyn Snowden, chairperson of the Community Action Board, reported that the Education Task Force was formed as a result of a meeting between the Community Action Board and Dr. Cody in which they requested that MCPS examine the problems facing socioeconomically disadvantaged students. The CAB met with Dr. Cody in August 1984, and it was recommended at that time that MCPS institute a unit within the school system that would plan and monitor an outreach program to target parents in the low-income communities. The Educational Subcommittee then met with MCPS staff and reached an agreement to establish a task force to examine those concerns. They then testified at a Board of Education budget hearing and received the Board's support for the project. The project started in May 1985, and they were hoping that the Board would adopt the recommendations coming out of the project.

Mr. Thomas Countee, chairperson of the Education Task Force, explained that the report was originally intended to obtain statistical data based on low socioeconomic status of students in Montgomery County. It was their belief that it was their low socioeconomic status that was responsible for their lack of performance and not the fact that they were a racial minority. Originally they wanted to answer how socioeconomically disadvantaged students compared to their middle and upper class counterparts in standardized test results, how did they compare to others in honors and gifted and talented programs, how did they compare to others in terms of disciplinary problems, how did they compare in terms of nonathletic extracurricular activities, how did they compare in numbers and percentages of high school dropouts, and how did they compare to others in their participation in special education programs. They felt that the results would be similar to those found in previous studies. Unfortunately they were unable to obtain the data because the school system said the data was confidential. They were forced to reprioritize their goals and objectives and make general suggestions and recommendations.

Mr. Countee reported that there were 13 recommendations in all, and he wanted to share the first five and the eighth recommendation. The first was to identify data collection methods that would allow the MCPS to monitor the progress of low-income students through their academic careers in a number of areas. The second was to increase the number and skills of counselors particularly in schools with

large minority and low-income population. The third was to improve staff education and training regarding the expectations, attitudes, and sensitivity to the needs of low income students. The fourth was to expand existing programs and institute new programs for pupils who had fallen behind. The fifth was to establish advocacy programs for low-income students and their families. The eighth was to establish special counseling, education, and training programs for adolescent expectant mothers.

Mr. Countee stated that they had hoped to make this a more quantitative type report by identifying the population that they were dealing with. In Dr. Cody's February 24 letter he stated that there was also a problem of confidentiality concerning income and education information that would need to be resolved before such data collection was initiated. Over the next few months Dr. Cody would try to determine if these data could be collected without violating the confidentiality of these children and their families. Dr. Cronin commented that the problem the Board was trying to come to grips with is that the issue of socioeconomics was very often confused with the issue of minority students, and they were not synonymous. He asked Dr. Cody to describe how the Board would attempt to come to grips with the issue of how they would identify the socioeconomic level. He felt that if they could arrive at that point, many of the suggestions made by the task force would fall into line.

Dr. Cody stated that there were two related factors. One was not simply a matter of whether they could get the information. It was not a legal issue although it had a legal implication for what they did with the information. The question was whether or not people would voluntarily give them this information because income information was personal and private. The purposes for which they would want to use that information would have to be worked out ahead of time. In the last couple of months, they had looked at other ways of trying to get a handle on some of the broad questions of educational program and services needed, and achievement and income not by collecting information on individual students in terms of family income but gathering information on the average incomes of various neighborhoods. They thought they had found a way to do that with census data. Beyond census data there was another source of statistics from a private company. Until they had thought through this, he did not think they could start asking for voluntary information from parents.

Dr. Shoenberg inquired about the fifth recommendation having to do with an advocacy program. Regardless of whether they collected aggregate data on low-income students, a large number of individual low-income students were not difficult to identify. They had parents who were not as able to be vocal on the children's behalf as some other parents might be. He asked if by advocate they meant someone who was going to speak for those students as a group or some group of people who were going to be alert and sensitive to the particular problems those parents had in looking out for the welfare of their own children and seeing those children get the help and support they

needed. In some school systems, pupil personnel workers did that kind of work, but Montgomery County had reduced the cadre of pupil personnel workers that they had. He asked if this was the kind of person who could do the sort of thing they were talking about or if they needed to establish a separate and new group of people. The superintendent had said that the entire system should feel responsible.

Mr. Countee said they were looking for someone in the school system to advocate for low-income students and their families. This would be someone sensitive to the problems and needs of this population and able to communicate with the school system. It was well and good for the entire school system to be sensitive to the problems of low-income children, but they needed someone at a high administrative level and someone in the role of an in-school social worker to advocate on their behalf.

Ms. Snowden explained that this was the basis of their original recommendation when they met with the Board of Education. It was obvious that the low-income and the poor parents could not speak for themselves. Sometimes they had difficulty in even getting a parent to come to the school to talk with officials. They needed someone to speak for these people. Until parents could learn to communicate and trust, teachers would not be able to work with parents. Dr. Cronin commented that if the parents would not come to the school system, maybe it was time for the school system to come to them. Ms. Snowden remarked that she was elated that Mrs. Bell was going out to the community because this hadn't happened in many years.

Dr. Floyd stated that while he knew that income information was a sensitive matter he thought they might try to be as creative with that as they did in business and industry. For example, he had recently purchased a small appliance and attached to it was a marketing survey which asked him the range of his income and other questions and which took very little time to complete. He thought MCPS could come up with some creative ways to get this information. It seemed to Mr. Ewing that the task force had brought the Board a very important set of recommendations. The recommendations were in two large categories, the first was recommendation one and the others were categorized a different way. They were suggesting MCPS needed to do a much better job of analyzing the nature and extent of the problem and at the same time not to forget to continue to take effective action while they were analyzing the problem. He thought it was important for them to give a lot of attention to the matter of defining the problem well. He thought there were many ways of obtaining this information through surveys, census data, etc. He said they needed to know who the low-income students were and where they were. They needed to know something about their characteristics as learners and what that meant in terms of teaching strategies. They could do a systematic search of what other people people had learned about this problem in other parts of the country. He felt that this was a high priority because they had done little to analyze the extent of the problem. He reported that he had attended hearings held by the CAB, and as Montgomery County became a more expensive

place to live, those with relatively lower incomes found themselves in effect poor even if in terms of dollar incomes they were doing well by some national standards. He intended to raise these issues in the Board's research and evaluation subcommittee.

Mrs. Praisner was glad they had mentioned some of the activities of Mrs. Bell because she, too, thought these were very positive. She said they had spoken about parents understanding the school system, and she wondered if they had any more ideas from having talked with Mrs. Bell. Ms. Snowden replied that she had just met with Mrs. Bell this evening for the first time. They were delighted that she was going into the community, and Ms. Snowden thought that perhaps they would start correcting some of the problems. She said they had one of the best school systems in the country, and from meeting with Dr. Cody she knew he was concerned about these problems. The Community Action Board was the bridge, and they hoped that the Board of Education would also be a bridge over the muddy waters that affected all low-income children regardless of their race and religion. Mrs. Praisner commented that they had not had the success on some issues related to county funding especially in the area of afterschool activity buses. She suggested that they work with the CAB to be advocates for those parts of the Board's budget. She asked about the recommendation having to do with the restructuring of the WOC curriculum. She asked about their specific concerns. Ms. Snowden replied that some parents had complained about the content and students not being given the counseling. With poor children, it was important to get them out into the work world and keep them in school. Parents had been concerned about the lack of counseling to help children to get into these programs. Mrs. Praisner noted that parents had to sign when students enrolled in a course. Counseling was a Board priority, and they were moving towards improving access to counseling services. It seemed to her that they needed to approach the WOC program from the standpoint of increasing and improving the kind of information that they shared with parents beyond the agreement forms. She asked staff to share the additional information given to WOC students. She suggested that they had to look at the kind of information that was provided and perhaps Mrs. Bell should assist them here.

Dr. Cronin urged staff to follow up on these recommendations. The first was the idea of the over-representation of minority and low-income students in special education. The Board had perceived that this was a problem and had asked staff to address that issue so that they not confuse low-income status with the need for special handicapped services. They had received a proposal from a staff member for the delivery of services closer to the school level. He said that in regard to item 10 they often worked with the police, recreation, social services, and community action, but very often services were duplicated. He thought that better cooperation among county agencies would improve services to children.

Mr. Countee stated that Dr. Cody's seminar held last June came to this same conclusion. Dr. Cronin thanked them for their remarks and indicated that there would be follow up within the school system.

This time next year he hoped that a number of these issues would be resolved. Ms. Snowden indicated that they would be happy to go before the County Council and county executive to help support the Board's budget. Mrs. DiFonzo noted that there was still time between now and May 15 for them to communicate their needs to the County Council. Ms. Snowden noted that the Council and executive had received a copy of their report. She suggested that if the Board had a specific request they should let the CAB know, and Dr. Cronin asked that the superintendent supply information on areas of the budget for services to low-income children.

Re: REPORT OF THE MATHEMATICS TASK FORCE

Dr. Cody reminded the Board and the audience that in May 1984 a committee was appointed as a math task force to examine Priorities 1 and 2 and make recommendations for improvement if they felt these were needed. The task force had been hard at work since then and had done an outstanding job. They had made some constructive suggestions, and staff was already proceeding on some of these. He explained that the purpose of this meeting was to present an overview of the report and engage in discussion.

Mrs. Katheryn Gemberling, chairperson, stated members of the task force did not always agree or come from the same initial perspective; however, their recommendation did represent the result of much exchange. They believed MCPS had a good math program; however, it could be and should be better. Because the Board had made mathematics a priority, if the priority was going to be met the recommendations contained in the report were essential for achieving that priority.

Mrs. DiFonzo commented that the report contained one of the most dynamic and profound statements she had ever seen. She quoted, "reality is that tests inevitably become the actual curriculum." She thought it was one of the strongest statements because it said what made them run. In spite of all of the things they might wish to do, they were driven by those tests. She did not know how they got around that. She regretted that they had so little time on the agenda to spend on this subject. In regard to the first recommendation where they talked about students not necessarily developing proficiency in the manipulative skills now routinely performed by calculators she would argue that what she was told when learning the multiplication tables was that she needed to do this for self discipline because it trained the mind. She asked how they reconciled the first and the fifth recommendations. If they were talking about teaching to the test, they might be able to do something with the Maryland State Department of Education. She asked what would happen when the students started taking SAT's.

Mrs. Gemberling replied that they were warning the Board that more and more the math tested in the future would be reflective of the needs for mathematics in the future. They were not suggesting that a student not learn some of the traditional manipulatives at all. They were well aware of the SAT's and the CAT's. The reality was that

MCPS was doing quite well measured against national norms on those kinds of tests, but there was much more to mathematics than a CAT test or an SAT. If they were talking about functional skills for students about to be adults, people could function effectively in a mathematical world if what they had been taught was problem solving and thinking in mathematics since they had the help of a calculator. She did not think they were in conflict on the first and fifth recommendations. In revising the testing program, as long as they only tested the very traditional type skills, they should not be surprised if that was the limit of teachers' instruction. They were suggesting they could not do one without the other.

Dr. Tom Rowan stated that some minimal efficiency with paper and pencil was critical to understanding what the mathematical process was about. They would not want to eliminate that level of treatment, but when they got beyond that level for understanding the calculator could enable the student to do that more quickly.

It seemed to Mrs. DiFonzo that they were still talking about teaching the methodology and the reasoning behind that but eliminating so much of that rote generation of numbers. Mrs. Gemberling said this would be done at a certain point in time for an individual student. Mrs. DiFonzo asked if calculators were allowed when students took the SAT's, and Mr. Foubert replied that they were not. Mrs. DiFonzo said that this was one of her concerns because if students became dependent on a calculator in their regular classes she wondered what happened when they took the math portion of the SAT's. Dr. Rowan replied that the effect on the SAT would have to be carefully considered until the SAT was changed. Several states now permitted the use of calculators on their basic proficiency tests. Dr. Cody added that Princeton was also considering the use of calculators in a whole series of examinations including the SAT.

Mrs. DiFonzo asked what business and industry was looking for in MCPS students. Ms. Joy Odom replied that they had held a math/science business conference about a month ago. Business and industry wanted students taught problem solving, not necessarily math problem solving, but business problem solving. They wanted students taught self-discipline and thinking skills. Mrs. DiFonzo commented that in talking to people in the field they would rather have a bright student who had been taught to think and who could find where to get the specific answers. She called attention to a sentence stating that "future career options for students who do not continue into higher-level mathematics courses will be severely restricted." She asked how they were defining higher level courses.

Mrs. Gemberling replied that they were talking beyond Algebra I which was the base of higher level courses. If they looked at the types of requirements necessary for various types of careers in terms of mathematics, 83 percent of the colleges required at least four years of high school math. They were concerned about the numbers of students who did minimal time in mathematics. When these students got to college they found a gap. She pointed out that no discipline was as greatly affected by time off as was mathematics. They were

trying to hold students in the mathematics program. Even for the student not going on to college, they were talking about examining the needs for the math skills that they had and not having a repetition of the same course, slower and louder each year. For those students going on to higher level education, the math background was a divider in terms of what opportunities were available to them. Once they closed this door, it was very difficult to open. This was the message they wanted to get to students. Data collection and statistics had become so much a part of society that mathematics was an integral part of the educated person.

Dr. Cronin suggested that they reschedule this discussion because they were running out of time. He asked that this be scheduled on a future agenda and hoped that by that time they would have some direction from Dr. Martin's office.

Mrs. DiFonzo pointed out that on page 8 they had talked about youngsters having extra time, smaller classes, and access to more than one math teacher. She felt it was important to be able to talk to a teacher who might be able to state things a little differently. Dr. Cody asked that an hour and a half be scheduled on this topic as soon as possible. Mrs. Gemberling suggested that Board look at section four which addressed the need for administrative reorganization and the issue of priorities. She called attention to the item recommending setting up a committee to review and keep the Board abreast and in touch with the progress being made in terms of whatever decisions were made.

Mrs. Praisner requested a timetable of how staff anticipated reviewing the recommendations and how decisions would be made as to whether they were adopted or not. She asked that the committee be more candid and share with the Board where the differences of opinion were strong. She would also like comments on the memo they had received from the Elementary School Administrators Association.

RESOLUTION NO. 253-86 Re: MONTHLY PERSONNEL REPORT

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Dr. Floyd 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. 254-86 Re: EXTENSION OF SICK LEAVE

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Dr. Floyd 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
Prowell, David	Building Service Worker Winston Churchill HS	30
Randolph, Bonnie	Bus Operator Long Term Leave from Area 2	30
Robinson, C.	Building Service Worker Westland IS	30
Williams, Robert	Building Service Worker Long Term Leave from Blair HS	30

RESOLUTION NO. 255-86 Re: DEATH OF MR. VINCENT C. DiBIASE,
SECONDARY SCHOOL COUNSELOR, SHERWOOD
HIGH SCHOOL

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

WHEREAS, The death on April 17, 1986, of Mr. Vincent C. DiBiase, a secondary school counselor at Sherwood High School, has deeply saddened the staff and members of the Board of Education; and

WHEREAS, Mr. DiBiase was a counselor for over 25 years, and he spent extra time as needed to accomplish his job and was always a positive force in the school; and

WHEREAS, Mr. DiBiase had excellent human relations skills and earned the respect of the staff and students, he was an excellent counselor, knowledgeable in counseling and the total school program, and he contributed positively to the growth and excellence of the school; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the members of the Board of Education express their sorrow at the death of Mr. Vincent C. DiBiase 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. DiBiase's family.

RESOLUTION NO. 256-86 Re: WOODWARD/WALTER JOHNSON HIGH SCHOOL
CONSOLIDATION

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

WHEREAS, The Transitional Advisory Committee has recommended that the planned split campus year be eliminated, and that the full

Woodward/Walter Johnson High School consolidation begin in September 1987; and

WHEREAS, After careful review, the superintendent and staff believe that the combined campus can be accommodated on the Walter Johnson High School site beginning in September 1987 by recapturing seven teaching stations within Walter Johnson and placing ten relocatable classrooms on site; and

WHEREAS, The Board of Education desires community input on this housing plan; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the following schedule for Discussion/Action is adopted:

Board of Education Discussion	4/28
Advertise Public Hearing	4/30
Board of Education Public Hearing/Action	5/15

RESOLUTION NO. 257-86 Re: ADOPTION OF A REVISED LONG-RANGE EDUCATIONAL FACILITIES PLANNING POLICY (FAA)

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Mrs. Slye 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 voting in the negative:

WHEREAS, The Board of Education recognizes that its existing Long-range Educational Facilities Planning policy is deficient in that it prescribes times for annual facility plan updates that are not congruent with the capital budget process; is primarily oriented to school closings and consolidations; does not conform to recent State Board of Education regulations concerning school closing processes; and is based on a concept of five-year major revisions and minimal annual updates which recent events have shown to be unrealistic; and

WHEREAS, The Board seeks to develop a policy that:

- o Recognizes that there are likely to be few, if any, school closings over the next 10 years and that enrollment growth and change will stimulate most facility decisions at least into the early 1990s
- o Recognizes that many facility planning decisions to accommodate growth and change will be implemented through the Six-year Capital Improvements Program and annual capital budgets
- o Eases the burden of facilities decision-making on both the Board of Education and the community by creating a more flexible process to seek solutions which depend on capital projects, relocatable classrooms, boundary changes or other solutions.

- o Modifies the facilities planning process to:
 - a. Identify future facilities problems and encourage communities to participate in developing priorities, concerns and potential solutions prior to any recommendations from the superintendent
 - b. Promote widespread dissemination and understanding of a Board of Education Comprehensive Long-range Master Plan for Educational Facilities which summarizes past facilities actions and projects future enrollments based on those actions
 - c. Result in superintendent recommendations that take cognizance of informed community discussions and input
 - d. Result in Board of Education decisions that will ensure, whenever possible, the availability of facilities as or before they are needed, thereby ensuring equity for the maximum number of students
 - e. Separate the procedures and requirements for school closing/consolidation from that for other facilities decisions

and

WHEREAS, The Board of Education discussed Concepts for a Long-range Facility Planning Policy/Process on February 27, and proposed revisions of the Long-range Educational Facilities Planning Policy on March 11, 24, and April 15; and

WHEREAS, Changes have been made to conform this policy to recommendations from Board members and interested citizens; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education hereby rescinds its Long-range Educational Facilities Planning policy adopted by Resolution 885-83 on October 11, 1983, and replaces it with the following Long-range Educational Facilities Planning policy; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education hereby rescinds the Capital Budget/Facilities Planning Calendars for 1986, adopted on December 10, 1985; and be it further

RESOLVED, That this new Long-range Educational Facilities Planning policy is effective immediately and shall be reviewed by the Board of Education for its effectiveness after one year; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the County Council, county executive, state superintendent of schools, State Interagency Committee for Public School Construction, and the Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission be sent copies of the new Long-range Educational Facilities Planning policy.

POLICY - Board of Education of Montgomery County

FAA

Related Entries: FAA-EA, JEE, JEE-RA

LONG-RANGE EDUCATIONAL FACILITIES PLANNING

I. GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

A. Goals

The primary goal of this policy is to provide guidelines that enable the Montgomery County Public Schools to address changing enrollment patterns and to provide the facilities and future school sites necessary to sustain high quality educational programs at reasonable cost.

A second goal is to promote public understanding of the Board's Comprehensive Master Plan for Educational Facilities and the process by which facilities decisions are made, and to encourage communities, local government agencies and municipalities to identify and communicate to the Board and superintendent their priorities and concerns for resolving facilities issues.

B. Objectives

The objectives of this policy are to:

1. Address changing enrollment patterns.
2. Provide the facilities and future school sites necessary to sustain high quality educational programs at reasonable cost.
3. Provide permanent classrooms to accommodate long-term enrollment trends and to promote continuity and stability of the K-12 program. This requires projections, and when possible advance construction of new classrooms to keep pace with or precede residential development, using relocatables only as temporary measures.
4. Provide services and resources fairly and equitably so that all students, including those in special education, are offered appropriate and high quality educational programs. Provide equal access to programs that are intended to serve students from an entire area or countywide.
5. Evaluate the impact of facility changes on educational programs and on the community.
6. Utilize schools in ways that are consistent with sound educational practice.
7. Organize high schools for grades 9-12, and to the extent possible, create clusters composed of one high school, one intermediate-level school and several elementary schools, each of which should send all students, including special education students, to the next higher level school in the cluster.
8. Provide opportunities for all students in accordance with the Board policy on Quality Integrated Education.
9. Provide space to accommodate regular students and those with special needs with regard to where they live, anticipating and providing for growth of both special and regular students.
10. Provide adequate school space to accommodate future improvements in educational programs and services to the extent these can be anticipated (i.e., all-day kindergarten, prekindergarten, lower pupil-teacher ratios).
11. Recognize that older school buildings must be renovated to continue their use on a cost-effective basis and that modernization to current educational program standards is necessary to maintain program quality for students in older schools. Recognize that capital expenditures promote educational effectiveness and equity, and that quality facilities and programs reap broad community and

economic benefits.

12. In building new schools and additions, anticipate the possibility of enrollment declines as well as increases. Consider the proximity of one school to another, capacity and potential for expansion or reduction through modular construction, and future alternative uses of space through joint occupancy and availability of community facilities.

II. DEFINITIONS AND SPECIFICATIONS

- A. BUILDING CAPACITY¹ is the maximum number of MCPS regular and special needs students that can be accommodated in a building based on current program requirements and staffing ratios in the current operating budget. Space currently used by joint occupants or MCPS programs that could be relocated to other facilities is included in building capacity.

¹ These are tentative definitions pending Board approval of new capacity formulas. Until new capacity formulas are adopted, the superintendent will use "state rated" capacity.

- B. BUILDING UTILIZATION is a percentage derived by dividing a school's actual and projected enrollments by its existing or projected program capacity.
- C. CAPITAL BUDGET is the compilation of recommended school site purchases, new school construction, additions, modernizations, relocatable classrooms, or other capital additions and improvements considered annually by the Board of Education and Montgomery County Council for the following fiscal year. It will contain a description of how its recommendations address the goals and objectives of this policy.
- D. CAPITAL PROJECT is a project contained in a capital budget or proposed for one of the subsequent fiscal years in a Six-year Capital Improvements Program.
- E. CIVIC GROUPS are local organizations, including civic associations registered with the Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission.
- F. CLUSTER of schools is one high school, and the intermediate-level and elementary schools that send students to it.
- G. COMPREHENSIVE MASTER PLAN FOR EDUCATIONAL FACILITIES is published by the superintendent each year on or about June 1.
1. For each high school cluster the plan will show:
 - a) Each school's current and projected total enrollment, current program and building capacities (see footnote 1), and utilization for the next six years, and for the 10th and 15th years, based on projections made the previous September, and the changes in enrollment or building capacity projected to result from capital projects, boundary or other changes authorized by the Board prior to the date of its publication;
 - b) The regular student population residing in the school service area and those who have transferred in from other school attendance areas; minority student enrollment; special programs (defined as level 3, 4, and 5 special education programs, area gifted and talented, ESOL, Head Start and Chapter I); and
 - c) Any school that fails to meet one or more of the criteria and desired standards for enrollment and utilization based on projections for the next six years.
- H. COUNTYWIDE ORGANIZATIONS are those with members throughout

the county, including such organizations as the League of Women Voters, Allied Civic Group, Montgomery County Civic Federation, etc.

- I. CRITERIA AND DESIRED STANDARDS that shall be applied to each school annually are:
 1. Minimum enrollment. Minimum enrollments for schools are:
 - (a) No fewer than 200 students enrolled in the regular program in an elementary school, regardless of the number of grades served;
 - (b) At least 500 regular students in two-grade intermediate schools and 600 students in three-grade intermediate schools; and
 - (c) At least 1,000 students in the regular program in a high school.
 2. Desired enrollment. Desired enrollments for schools, provided they have the building capacity to accommodate it, are:
 - (a) Two or more regular classes per grade in an elementary school;
 - (b) An average of 250 to 300 regular students or more per grade in middle/intermediate schools; and
 - (c) An average of 300 to 400 regular students or more per grade in high schools.
 3. Utilization. Each school's actual and projected utilization should be between 70 and 90 percent of building capacity. Less than 70 percent denotes underutilization; more than 90 percent denotes overutilization (see footnote 1).
- J. CURRENT PROGRAM CAPACITY is the number of regular and special education students that can be accommodated in a school based on current program requirements and staffing allocations in the most recently adopted operating budget. Current program capacity also includes current uses of classrooms for other MCPS purposes including elementary classrooms for Head Start, early childhood, and for joint occupants, primarily day care (see footnote 1).
- K. ENROLLMENT PROJECTIONS for each school are prepared under the superintendent's direction annually in September, based on the school's current total enrollment, past enrollment and housing occupancy patterns, information on new housing, and other relevant program and demographic factors. MCPS enrollment forecasts should be consistent with population forecasts of the Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission.
- L. SIX-YEAR CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PROGRAM (CIP) is an annual document required by Section 5-306 of the Education Article, Annotated Code of Maryland, and Section 302 of the Montgomery County Charter.
 1. These laws require this document to include:
 - (a) A statement of the objectives of the capital programs and the relationship of these programs to the long-range development plans adopted by the county;
 - (b) Recommended capital projects and a proposed construction schedule;
 - (c) An estimate of cost and a statement of all funding sources; and
 - (d) All anticipated capital projects and programs of the Board including substantial improvements and extensions of projects previously authorized.
 2. In addition, the Six-year CIP shall include:

- (a) Background information on the methodology of enrollment projections;
 - (b) Current enrollment figures from all schools, and projections from these for the next six years, plus the 10th and 15th years, and the resulting building utilization. If a school's building capacity and current program capacity are different, both will be shown.
 - (c) A list of the schools identified in the Comprehensive Master Facilities Plan which fail the criteria and desired enrollment standards during the next six years; and
 - (d) The superintendent's recommendations concerning each school which fails to meet criteria and desired enrollment standards.
- M. TOTAL ENROLLMENT is the number of MCPS students in a school who are enrolled in early childhood through grade 12 and special education programs.

III. PROCESS

- A. Community priorities and concerns
- 1. Each spring the superintendent will review all Board of Education facility decisions and capital budget requests and determine the extent to which these are projected to bring each school into compliance with the criteria and desired standards. For schools that are projected not to comply with these criteria and standards during the next six years, the superintendent will notify in writing:
 - (a) The area associate superintendent, principal, PTA president, and in secondary schools, the student government association president;
 - (b) The Montgomery County Council of Parent Teacher Associations (MCCPTA) cluster coordinator and area vice president;
 - (c) Appropriate local government agencies, municipalities and civic groups. The superintendent will advise these groups that clusters may be discussing possible facilities changes and suggest that, if interested, the organization should contact the appropriate cluster coordinator for involvement.
- 2. Following the superintendent's notifications, the area associate superintendent will initiate meetings between appropriate school, area, and Department of Educational Facilities Planning and Capital Programming staff and community representatives.
- 3. These and subsequent meetings of citizens convened by MCCPTA cluster coordinators should involve representatives from each cluster school, representatives from adjacent clusters when appropriate, and area office personnel as resources, for the purposes of:
 - (a) Sharing pertinent information about a school's lack of compliance with criteria and desired standards, focusing primarily on compliance within the next three years;
 - (b) Discussing feasible school program and facility alternatives that have the potential for enabling each school to meet criteria and desired standards; and
 - (c) Identifying concerns and priorities for seeking solutions for each cluster school that fails to meet (1) the criteria and desired standards, especially during the next three years, or (2) the goals of the Board policy on Quality Integrated Education.
- 4. On or before June 1, following County Council action on the Capital Budget, the superintendent will publish the Comprehensive

- Master Plan for Educational Facilities and make copies available to the public.
5. By July 1, cluster representative should state in writing to the superintendent any solutions, priorities or concerns that the cluster has identified for its schools. By July 15, area associate superintendents will review and comment to the superintendent on cluster reports from the area. The cluster may amend its views by September 15 if school officials notify cluster representatives that a school's fall enrollment differed greatly from earlier projections.
 6. Early in October, the superintendent will hold a public work session with the Board of Education to review new school enrollments and projections, and to inform and discuss with the Board cluster priorities and concerns about potential facility solutions.
- B. Six-year Capital Improvements Program
1. On or about November 1, the superintendent will publish a proposed Six-year Capital Improvements Program. The superintendent will notify PTA/PTSAs, municipalities, civic groups, student government associations and other interested groups of its publication, and will send copies of the proposed CIP for review and comment to the Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission, State Board of Education, State Interagency Committee on Public School Construction, County Council, County Government, municipalities, MCCPTA, Montgomery County Region of the Maryland Association of Student Councils (MCR) and Montgomery County Junior Council (MCJC).
 2. Using September school enrollments, and revised total enrollment and building utilization projections for the next six years, and the 10th and 15th years, the superintendent will determine if any schools fail to meet criteria and desired enrollment standards during the next six years. Further, the superintendent will determine if any school's enrollment is inconsistent with the Board policy on Quality Integrated Education.
 3. For each school that fails to meet criteria and desired enrollment standards, the superintendent will recommend:
 - (a) A project in the next fiscal year's Capital Budget;
 - (b) A capital project in the subsequent five years that is covered by the Six-year CIP;
 - (c) A solution such as a boundary change, grade level reorganization, closing/consolidation, or other similar solution which does not necessarily involve a capital project; or
 - (d) No action, or deferral pending further study of enrollment or other factors.
 4. During the first week of November, the Board will hold a work session at which members may propose alternative solutions. If any Board-member alternatives are proposed, the superintendent will develop data on them as soon as possible and communicate that data to the Board and to interested citizens.
- C. Board of Education Public Hearing
1. On or about the third Monday in November, the Board of Education will hold a public hearing(s) at which municipalities, countywide organizations and communities may express viewpoints concerning the superintendent's recommendations and any Board-member alternatives.
 2. Interested citizens and groups wishing to speak at the

hearing should contact the PTA cluster coordinator, who will coordinate all testimony at the hearing on behalf of the cluster schools. Municipalities and countywide organizations should contact the Board of Education office. Written comments will be accepted until 5 p.m. on the work day preceding final Board action, or as otherwise determined by the Board.

D. Board Action

On or about the fourth Monday in November, the Board of Education will act on the superintendent's proposed Six-year Capital Improvements Program. If more information is needed on any proposal, or there are issues which cannot be resolved satisfactorily at this time, the Board may defer action until a later date.

E. Deferred Proposals

If the Board has deferred action on any proposals in the superintendent's Six-year CIP, on or about the first Monday in February the superintendent will present these proposals again, or alternatives that have been requested by the Board or proposals that are based on additional discussions with community representatives.

F. Optional Public Hearing

If, in the Board's opinion, any proposals contain substantial changes from those deferred from November, the Board will accept comment and hold a public hearing on these recommendations during the last week of February.

G. Additional Board Facilities Decisions

On or before March 15, the Board of Education will act on any deferred proposals.

H. Unusual Circumstances

In the event the Board of Education determines that an unusual circumstance exists, the superintendent will establish a condensed time schedule for making recommendations to the Board, for scheduling hearings, and for Board action.

IV. SCHOOL CLOSINGS/CONSOLIDATIONS

A. Superintendent's Study and Preliminary Plan

1. In the event that the superintendent determines that it may be advisable to close a school, he shall, in addition to preparing other data required by this policy, present the following information on each school that may be affected by a proposed school closing:
 - a. Regular student population residing in the service area and those who have transferred from outside the school's attendance area;
 - b. Minority student enrollment;
 - c. Special programs (defined as level 3, 4, and 5 special education programs, ESOL, Head Start and Chapter 1);
 - d. A review of each school's location and site characteristics;
 - e. Building characteristics, including any modifications for special programs;
 - f. Needed renovations or additions, including the most recent school plant rating;
 - g. Operating costs;
 - h. Feeder patterns; and
 - i. Percentage of students transported.
2. This data is to be sent to each affected school's principal

- who will review the data with community representatives. Any discrepancies are to be reported to the superintendent.
3. The superintendent shall apply the screening criteria listed below to each school to determine which, if any, it does not meet, or is projected not to meet, during the next five years. Schools not meeting one or more of the criteria will be examined as a first step toward any kind of change.
 4. In addition to closing/consolidation, other changes may be necessary, such as boundary adjustments, building additions or new schools, relocating area and countywide special programs, establishing magnet schools or centers, or clustering schools. Every school potentially affected by a proposed closing will be included in the process of seeking solutions to problems, even if it meets all screening criteria. Any recommendation or action should increase the number of screening criteria which each school meets.
 5. The screening criteria and desired standards that shall be applied each year are the following:
 - a) Minimum enrollment. There should be no fewer than 200 students enrolled in the regular program in an elementary school, regardless of the number of grades served. There should be at least 500 students in two-grade intermediate schools, 600 students in three-grade intermediate schools and at least 1,000 students in the regular program in a high school. Schools that fail to meet these minimum enrollment standards will be identified for further study.
 - b) Utilization. The actual and projected utilization of a school (the enrollment divided by current enrollment capacity) should be between 70 and 90 percent. Less than 70 percent denotes underutilization; more than 90 percent denotes overutilization. Schools that have utilization below 70 percent or above 90 percent will be identified for further study.
 - c) Need for modernization or addition. If a school is in unsatisfactory condition as indicated by a building evaluation, and, therefore, in need of major capital improvements and/or its average age will be more than 25 years during the five-year period of the revision, it will be identified for further study.
 - d) Majority/minority enrollment. In accordance with the Quality Integrated Education Policy, when a school's majority/minority student population differs from the countywide average by 20 or more percentage points the school will be identified for further study.
 - e) Attendance patterns. Schools that deviate from the preferred attendance pattern (see I.B.7) will be identified for further study.
 6. The superintendent shall study each school potentially affected by a proposed closing that does not meet one or more of the screening criteria above. In studying and recommending solutions to changing enrollment problems, the superintendent shall consider the data and apply the following guidelines:
 - a) Begin with high schools, moving to intermediate level schools, with elementary schools considered last. High schools in a geographic area may be studied together. Decisions about a school or schools at a higher level become planning parameters for decisions about schools at the next lower level.
 - b) Consider each screening criterion for every school.

- c) Consider changes in existing school boundaries or feeder patterns.
 - d) Consider needs of special students and programs for them in each school and in relation to area and countywide special programs.
 - e) Consider a variety of options in response to conditions that require change.
 - f) Consider long-range needs including retention or disposal of future school sites.
 - g) Allow for phased implementation of the total plan.
 - h) Reassign the student body to a single school or to the fewest possible schools when a school closing is recommended.
7. The superintendent shall develop a recommendation for each school studied, which may include no change. Recommendations for change should attempt to achieve:
- a) Desired enrollments of two or more classes per grade in an elementary school, an average of 250 to 300 students or more per grade in middle/intermediate schools, and an average of 300 to 400 students or more per grade in high schools, so long as the school has sufficient capacity to accommodate this enrollment.
 - b) Utilization between 70 and 90 percent of current capacity.
 - c) Prudent capital improvements.
 - d) A solution consistent with the Board policy on Quality Integrated Education.
 - e) Elimination of split attendance patterns wherever reasonable.
 - f) Prudent operating and capital costs, including bonded indebtedness.
 - g) The greatest number of students being able to walk to school. Those who are bused should be transported the shortest possible distance, except when long distances are required to address racial or ethnic isolation.
 - h) A solution consistent with the Board policy on Education of Handicapped Children. Accommodation for special programs and students should be provided using the same considerations as for regular programs and students (e.g., stability, adequate facilities, reasonable transportation requirements) and placement of special students in the least restrictive appropriate setting.
 - i) Facilities that will accommodate the educational program of affected schools, such as gymnasiums, auditoriums, specialized vocational spaces and the impact on existing educational programs. Previous Board-adopted changes affecting students are to be considered, e.g., school consolidations, program relocations, boundary changes, and grade level reorganizations.
 - j) The impact on affected communities including prior consolidations and closings, existing day care services, community use of schools, and availability of other community resources.
 - k) The potential of a facility for alternate use. Where appropriate, comparative analyses of the potential for alternative uses should be furnished.
8. By November 1, the superintendent shall present to the Board of Education recommendations concerning any school closing, identifying and examining each problem caused by changing enrollment,

and recommended actions. The recommendation should be viable for at least five years. The superintendent's recommendations should be sent to the Board before being presented to the public.

9. The superintendent shall send copies of his recommendations for review and comment to the Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission, State Board of Education, State Interagency Committee, County Council, municipalities, county government, MCCPTA, MCR, and MCJC. The superintendent shall notify each PTA/PTSA, civic association, student government association, and other school/community organizations that the recommendations are available for review and comment and will be provided upon request.

B. Community Reactions to the Superintendent's Recommendations

The community's role in the process shall be as follows:

1. Individuals, schools, and/or community organizations may react to the recommendations for their school within two months after they are distributed. All reactions and community-developed proposals will be shared with the Board.
2. If an individual or community group wishes to develop an alternative proposal affecting its school and others in the area, it should involve representatives of all school communities affected by the recommendations or make efforts to secure such representation. Any community plans should be sent the superintendent within two months after the recommendations are distributed.

C. Formal Recommendations/Board Alternatives

1. The superintendent shall develop formal recommendations after considering individual and community reactions and alternatives, and submit them to the Board of Education by February 1.
2. If the Board chooses to request alternatives to the superintendent's formal recommendations, affected communities will be informed about them promptly.

D. Hearing Process

1. The Board will hold public hearings or forums to receive and discuss citizens' reactions to the superintendent's formal recommendations and Board proposed alternatives and will determine the allocation of time for speakers at these hearings. The Board, in addition to other means of notifying interested citizens, will advertise the public hearing concerning a school closing in two county newspapers at least two weeks before the hearing date. The notice will include procedures to be followed in making the Board's final decision.
2. Interested citizens and groups wishing to speak should contact the PTA president of their community school who will coordinate testimony on behalf of the school at the hearing. Municipalities and countywide organizations should contact the Board of Education office. All written comments will be accepted until 5 p.m. on the work day preceding final Board action or as otherwise determined by the Board. The Board should complete all hearings and forums during February.

E. Board of Education Action

1. In the event the Board votes to adopt a modification or alternative containing elements that differ substantially from those on which citizens have had an opportunity to comment, the decision shall be tentative and written comments shall be sought and considered prior to final action. Further, the Board reserves its

right to solicit further input or to conduct further hearings if, in its sole discretion, it considers them desirable.

2. In making its decision, the Board shall take into account the superintendent's recommendations and each of the criteria for solution. The minutes of the Board meeting will reflect reasons for individual Board members' actions with reference to the criteria.
3. All decisions should be made by the Board no later than March 15.
4. Decisions on school closures shall be made and announced at least 90 days prior to their effective date, but not later than April 30 of any school year, except in emergency circumstances described below.

F. Emergency Circumstances

In the event the Board of Education determines that an emergency circumstance exists, the superintendent will establish a condensed time schedule for making recommendations to the Board, for scheduling hearings, and for Board action. An emergency circumstance is one where the decision to close a school because of unforeseen circumstances cannot be announced at least 90 days prior to its effective date or before April 30 of any school year. For any actions of this type, however, affected communities will be notified and given pertinent information at the earliest possible time. All criteria specified in this policy will apply, although on a time schedule shortened as necessary.

V. FEEDBACK INDICATORS

The Comprehensive Master Plan for Education Facilities that will be published annually in June by the superintendent will reflect all facilities actions taken during the year by the Board of Education, project the enrollment and utilization of each school, and identify schools which fail to meet screening criteria.

Re: BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS

1. Mr. Foubert announced the new officers of MCR. The president is Shannon Miller from Springbrook, vice president is Mark Friedman from Springbrook, secretary is Stacy Cole from Gaithersburg, and the treasurer is Chris Smith from B-CC. He pointed out that this was the third MCR president in four years from Springbrook. The president of MCJC would be elected at the May meeting, but the vice president is Karen Steinback from Tilden and the treasurer is Mike Carter from Ridgeview.
2. Mr. Foubert reported that some plastic covers had been placed over the fire alarms at Blair, and the frequency of false fire alarms had decreased dramatically.
3. Dr. Floyd indicated that Takoma Park Intermediate School had won the math competition in Maryland. He congratulated the staff and students at Takoma Park for their achievement.
4. Dr. Floyd said that the Board had received correspondence from the Maryland competition for Olympics of the Mind. Four schools placed highly: Cannon Road Elementary, Cold Spring Elementary, Gaithersburg Junior High, and Gaithersburg Senior High. They would be representing the State of Maryland next month in competition in

Arizona. He congratulated those schools for their magnificent achievement.

5. Mrs. Praisner said that she and Mrs. DiFonzo had attended a drama performance at Seneca Valley High School on Friday evening. It was an opportunity to honor the first principal of that school, Nate Pearson. The auditorium was named for him, and she thought it would be appropriate for the Board president to send a letter of congratulations to Nate Pearson.

6. Mrs. Praisner said she had seen "The Wiz" at Seneca Valley and "Chorus Line" at Gaithersburg. She congratulated Tom Bogar and Charlotte Hehn. This raised a question about the implications of the size of high schools and the cost of dramatic programs. She knew they had talented students and staff at every high school in the county, but she would be interested in knowing what they could do to expand opportunities at all high schools given the costs involved and the implications of high school size.

7. Mrs. Praisner stated that MCPS had received a letter from the Sherwood High School community asking about the status of their request for attention to the condition of the school. She asked when the community could expect a response or some assurances about the condition of Sherwood High School. She has also raised some other questions about the Sherwood area as a result of the Olney Town Forum, and she would appreciate a response. Dr. Cronin indicated that he had plans to tour Sherwood High School as well.

8. Mr. Ewing reported that they had had a request to take a look at the issue of the Boyds Head Start program, and Dr. Cody had agreed to explore the feasibility of incorporating that into the MCPS program. He suggested that the Board should be informed if there were cost implications and should know before the operating budget was adopted by the Council. He urged the superintendent to bring the Board a recommendation as soon as possible.

9. Mrs. Slye stated that the Board had received a student newspaper where a question was raised about a large number of seniors not passing English. She asked if the superintendent could take a look at the number of seniors who were failing English for a variety of reasons and see if they had a situation which needed some attention before these students got to be second semester seniors.

10. Dr. Cronin said that when they came to the idea of special programs up-county he would like to discuss the life sciences and health facilities going into the western part of the county. If the Board was going to be looking at a special program up-county with a science bent to it, they might consider a life science program rather than a hard science. This could include biology, botany, gerontology, etc.

11. Mrs. DiFonzo reported that she had attended the countywide forensics awards night. The first place winner in each of ten categories presented his or her competition piece. She was impressed

with the caliber of material that the youngsters were doing and the manner in which they were doing it. She said that the winners were well balanced with minority youngsters among the top winners of the competition. She felt that all of the youngsters were justly deserving of the awards.

12. Mrs. DiFonzo said she had heard that the equipment in Northwood had yet to be distributed to other buildings. She asked the superintendent to check into this.

13. Dr. Cody reported that a former Mark Twain student had done the cover illustration of the April 21 edition of TIME Magazine. Alan Hersch is in his mid twenties, and staff at Mark Twain had brought this to Dr. Cody's attention.

14. Dr. Cody said he had attended the American Educational Research Association Convention of which he had been a member for 15 or 20 years. He had found this meeting to be one of the most stimulating he had attended in many years. He had attended sessions on teacher supply and demand and had come back with a framework for analyzing this at the local school level. He would be sharing this with the MCPS Personnel Department. He went to two sessions on organizational culture in schools and teacher perceptions that influenced their sense of worth and success, and he would share this information with Dr. Martin. He had given a presentation on a panel on assessment at the national and state level and had discussed future changes in the assessment picture on the national level. He thought they would be involved in more cognitive assessments including geography and history. They would also be very much in state to state comparisons. He had also attended a session on effective schools which was not very good, but one of the speakers had talked about the development of natural and social sciences and gave illustrations of belief systems which put blinders on the whole science field in terms of options. One example cited was the creation of the existence of adolescence which had taken on a sense of something inevitably linked to biological maturation. In fact, adolescence was a creature of Western civilization and did not exist in many other countries. This linked into the notion of individual differences and racial and class differences in the sense that their ability to overcome limitations was limited because of what children were born with. This would challenge the basic beliefs of what they could or could not do in education. He would share this paper with the Board.

15. Dr. Cronin stated that one of the local newspapers had reported that the principal of Gaithersburg High School had cancelled an overseas trip. This was cancelled by the teacher in charge rather than the principal.

RESOLUTION NO. 258-86 Re: EXECUTIVE SESSION - MAY 13, 1986

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

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

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education of Montgomery County hereby conduct its meeting in executive closed session beginning on May 13, 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.
Dr. Floyd assumed the chair.

RESOLUTION NO. 259-86 Re: MINUTES OF MARCH 11, 1986

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

RESOLVED, That the minutes of March 11, 1986, be approved.
Dr. Cronin assumed the chair.

RESOLUTION NO. 260-86 Re: DEATH OF DR. CLIFFORD K. BECK, FORMER
PRESIDENT OF THE MONTGOMERY COUNTY
BOARD OF EDUCATION

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

WHEREAS, The recent death of Clifford K. Beck, former president of the Board of Education, has deeply saddened the staff and members of the Board of Education; and

WHEREAS, Dr. Beck served as a member of the Montgomery County Board of Education from 1960 to 1969 in an era that established the national reputation for excellence now enjoyed by the Montgomery County Public Schools; and

WHEREAS, Dr. Beck served with distinction as president of the Board of Education in 1967 and as vice president in 1966, bringing to the Board his experience as a scientist and college professor; and

WHEREAS, Through his efforts and leadership, the Board of Education was able to improve mutual understanding, confidence and respect between the Board of Education and the employees of the school system which had eroded in the County; and

WHEREAS, While on the Board of Education, Dr. Beck supported a strengthened curriculum to meet the needs of students, lower class sizes for diverse student populations, and an expanded vocational education program for students and closer cooperation with Montgomery College to provide the transition from high school to college for technical programs; and

WHEREAS, After leaving the Board of Education, Dr. Beck continued his involvement in educational issues by serving as the president of the State Board for Community Colleges; now therefore be it Resolved, That the members of the Board of Education express their sorrow at the death of Clifford K. Beck 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 Dr. Beck's family.

RESOLUTION NO. 261-86 Re: BOE APPEAL NO. 86-5

On motion of Mrs. DiFonzo seconded by Mrs. Slye, 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 because he was not present to participate in the discussions on this particular appeal:

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education adopt its Decision and Order in BOE Appeal No. 86-5.

Re: ITEMS OF INFORMATION

Board members received the following items of information:

1. Staff Response to the Medical Advisory Committee
2. Monthly Financial Report

Re: ADJOURNMENT

The president adjourned the meeting at 11:10 p.m.

President

Secretary

WSC:mlw