



RESOLVED, That this resolution be made part of the minutes of the meeting and a copy be forwarded to each retiree (LIST TO BE APPENDED TO THESE MINUTES).

\* Mrs. DiFonzo joined the meeting at this point.

Re: REVIEW OF BOARD POLICIES INCLUDED IN  
SECTION I (INSTRUCTION) AND SECTION J  
(STUDENTS) OF THE POLICIES AND  
REGULATIONS HANDBOOK

Mrs. Praisner moved and Mrs. DiFonzo seconded the following:

WHEREAS, Resolution No. 316-82 authorized the superintendent to publish a POLICIES AND REGULATIONS HANDBOOK containing certain selected policy statements; and

WHEREAS, Resolution No. 655-83 established a review schedule for all policies contained in the Handbook; and

WHEREAS, All policies included in Sections I and J have now been reviewed and categorized by a staff committee, the Administrative Team, the superintendent, and the Board of Education; and

WHEREAS, That review process has identified both some confirming actions and some changes on which the Board should act; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the following 24 policies (Category 1) be continued in the POLICIES AND REGULATIONS HANDBOOK without further content change:

IAA	IIA	IPD	JCA	JFE
IFB	IKB	ISA	JEB	JHA
IGN	IOB	ISB	JEE	JHD
IGS	IOG	ISD	JEF	JPC
IHA	IPB	ISE	JFC	

and be it further

RESOLVED, That the following 22 policies (Category 2) be removed from Sections I and J, but not rescinded:

IGB	IGG	IGO	IPA	JGB
IGC	IGH	IGP	IRC	JOA
IGD	IGI	IGQ	ISF	
IGE	IGJ	IGR	JFD	
IGF	IGL	IOC	JGA	

and be it further

RESOLVED, That the following 5 policies (Category 3) be rescinded as no longer necessary and appropriate to the governance and operation of the school system:

IBA IEE IFA IQA JHB

and be it further

RESOLVED, That the following 4 policies (Category 4) be amended as shown:

IGA IIB IOD JIA

and be it further

RESOLVED, That the entire STUDENT RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES document be included in the Handbook as a new section; and be it further

RESOLVED, That policy statements which are not currently written in the standard format specified in Resolution No. 425-84, Policy on Policysetting, be rewritten without content change and brought back to the Board for approval; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the typographical, directory information, and similar minor corrections noted be made without further Board approval; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the superintendent of schools be directed to effect implementation of this action at the earliest possible time.

RESOLUTION NO. 327-86 Re: FIRST RESOLVED CLAUSE OF PROPOSED  
RESOLUTION ON BOARD POLICIES

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

RESOLVED, That the following 24 policies (Category 1) be continued in the POLICIES AND REGULATIONS HANDBOOK without further content change:

IAA IIA IPD JCA JFE  
IFB IKB ISA JEB JHA  
IGN IOB ISB JEE JHD  
IGS IOG ISD JEF JPC  
IHA IPB ISE JFC

and be it further

RESOLUTION NO. 328-86 Re: SECOND RESOLVED CLAUSE OF PROPOSED  
RESOLUTION ON BOARD POLICIES

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



IOD - Education of Limited English Proficient Students

delete "incoming" from B. 1.

Substitute the following for B. 2

2. Provide appropriate instruction for limited English proficient students through a program at an Intensive English Language Center (IELC) or through an ESOL program using itinerant teachers. These programs may include:

- a) ESOL Classes
- b) Alternative Content Classes
- c) Transitional Bilingual Classes
- d) Tutorial Classes

JIA - Honor Rolls and Honor Students

delete "both" and insert "middle, intermediate" in the Resolved clause

add "middle, intermediate" to the clause authorizing the establishing of honor societies in the Resolved clause

RESOLUTION NO. 332-86 Re: FIFTH RESOLVED CLAUSE OF PROPOSED  
RESOLUTION ON BOARD POLICIES

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

RESOLVED, That the entire set of adopted policies codified as the Student Rights and Responsibilities document including the four relocated policies JFD, JGA, JGA, and JOA be included in the handbook as a new section.

Mrs. Praisner assumed the chair.

RESOLUTION NO. 332-86 Re: NEW SIXTH RESOLVED CLAUSE OF THE  
PROPOSED RESOLUTION ON BOARD POLICIES

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

RESOLVED, That the following 13 policies (Category 5) be scheduled for Board discussion and possible major changes:

IEA IEB IEC IED IGK  
IJA IKA IOA IRA JED  
JFB JHC JNA

Dr. Cronin assumed the chair.

RESOLUTION NO. 333-86 Re: REVIEW OF BOARD POLICIES INCLUDED IN  
SECTION I (INSTRUCTION) AND SECTION J  
(STUDENTS) OF THE POLICIES AND  
REGULATIONS HANDBOOK

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

WHEREAS, Resolution No. 316-82 authorized the superintendent to publish a POLICIES AND REGULATIONS HANDBOOK containing certain selected policy statements; and

WHEREAS, Resolution No. 655-83 established a review schedule for all policies contained in the Handbook; and

WHEREAS, All policies included in Sections I and J have now been reviewed and categorized by a staff committee, the Administrative Team, the superintendent, and the Board of Education; and

WHEREAS, That review process has identified both some confirming actions and some changes on which the Board should act; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the following 24 policies (Category 1) be continued in the POLICIES AND REGULATIONS HANDBOOK without further content change:

IAA	IIA	IPD	JCA	JFE
IFB	IKB	ISA	JEB	JHA
IGN	IOB	ISB	JEE	JHD
IGS	IOG	ISD	JEF	JPC
IHA	IPB	ISE	JFC	

and be it further

RESOLVED, That the following 22 policies (Category 2) be removed from Sections I and J, but not rescinded:

IGB	IGG	IGO	IPA	JGB
IGC	IGH	IGP	IRC	JOA
IGD	IGI	IGQ	ISF	
IGE	IGJ	IGR	JFD	
IGF	IGL	IOC	JGA	

and be it further

RESOLVED, That the following 5 policies (Category 3) be rescinded as no longer necessary and appropriate to the governance and operation of the school system:

IBA	IEE	IFA	IQA	JHB
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----

and be it further

RESOLVED, That the following 4 policies (Category 4) be amended as shown:

IGA - High School Core Courses  
New final Resolved clause:

RESOLVED, That the superintendent list the core courses annually in the MCPS course bulletin and that appropriate revisions in the

list be made when the Board of Education amends the Program of Studies

IIB - Evaluation and Selection

delete "and the School Library Bill of Rights of the American Association of School Librarians" from the Second WHEREAS clause

Add "videotapes" after "textbooks" in the third Resolved clause and delete "16 mm" from that clause

IOD - Education of Limited English Proficient Students

delete "incoming" from B. 1.

Substitute the following for B. 2

2. Provide appropriate instruction for limited English proficient students through a program at an Intensive English Language Center (IELC) or through an ESOL program using itinerant teachers. These programs may include:

- a) ESOL Classes
- b) Alternative Content Classes
- c) Transitional Bilingual Classes
- d) Tutorial Classes

JIA - Honor Rolls and Honor Students

delete "both" and insert "middle, intermediate" in the Resolved clause

add "middle, intermediate" to the clause authorizing the establishing of honor societies in the Resolved clause

and be it further

RESOLVED, That the entire set of adopted policies codified as the Student Rights and Responsibilities document including the four relocated policies JFD, JGA, JGA, and JOA be included in the handbook as a new section; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the following 13 policies (Category 5) be scheduled for Board discussion and possible major changes:

IEA IEB IEC IED IGK  
IJA IKA IOA IRA JED  
JFB JHC JNA

and be it further

RESOLVED, That policy statements which are not currently written in the standard format specified in Resolution No. 425-84, Policy on Policysetting, be rewritten without content change and brought back to the Board for approval; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the typographical, directory information, and similar minor corrections noted be made without further Board approval; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the superintendent of schools be directed to effect

implementation of this action at the earliest possible time.

Re: DISCUSSION OF K-12 POLICIES

Dr. Cody reported that Dr. Carl Smith was the chairman of the group he had appointed to examine the four policies and make recommendations to him for modifications. The major task of the group was to advise him on what topics and issues these policies should address. The policies themselves had been developed at different times for different purposes. One issue was whether there should be a pre-K through elementary policy and then a secondary policy or four policies, early childhood education, elementary, intermediate, and high school or whether there should be one policy. He had suggested that they start with the substance of what should be covered in the policies.

\*Dr. Floyd joined the meeting at this point.

Dr. Cody said the group might come across issues which were important policy matters for the school system but might not fit in the overall framework. They should not lose sight of these issues. Today he hoped that Board members would look at the policies and reflect on what they thought was important. He said that one way to view this was to look at what problems these policies with their lack of congruence created. They needed some overall comprehensive sense of how education flowed in Montgomery County whether it was in one policy or a series of policies.

Dr. Cronin thanked Ms. Lib Boone for her letter and her description of "middle level" education. He said that he liked the ideas presented in her letter, and Ms. Boone said that the letter represented the views of her association.

Dr. Shoenberg recalled the controversy over promotion and retention in the elementary school policy; however, he had not heard any static about this. He hoped that there would be some estimate of how this policy was in fact working. He said there had been some static about the homework policy, and he would like to see the group look at this. This policy also contained a number of statements about the nature of the learning environment which were good but raised a question about how they knew these things were happening or not. The policy had a statement about feedback indicators, and he was not aware that the Board had received any reports on the implementation of the policy.

Dr. Shoenberg noted there was the Middle States evaluation of high schools, but they had no similar process for elementary and J/I/M schools. He wondered if they should develop some kind of internal mechanism for doing a self-study. They were doing something similar with the PRAT teams, and they might consider doing ten or twelve schools every year. He would like to see the group look at the way in which they used standardized test scores as a measure of success. In regard to the middle school policy, Dr. Shoenberg commented that this policy probably should be incorporated into a more general policy. He said that the high school policy made far too little

specific references to higher order intellectual skills. He pointed out that page 4, B-5 needed attention in regard to reasons for absences.

Mr. Ewing explained that except for the junior high school policy all of these policies were adopted while he was on the Board of Education, but with the exception of the middle school policy he had voted for them. He endorsed a full scale review of these policies. He commented that usually with committees the end result reflected a compromise, the status quo, or some version of the past. Another one was to address themselves to where they should be headed in the future. He hoped that the recommendations from the committee would be in the latter category. He would echo Dr. Shoenberg's view with respect to the feedback indicators in the elementary school policy. He commented that he had never liked the term "feedback indicators" and suggested the Board might want to consider changing that. He explained that he was looking for some evidence that the outcomes were the consequences of the actions taken to implement the policy. He did not think that a policy statement needed necessarily to always come out in a certain way, but he did think they needed to know whether the policy was having the desired outcome in a way that gave them some assurances that what was done was, in fact, being measured in a realistic way. He wanted them to be sure that whatever measures they used were sensible.

In the elementary school policy, Mr. Ewing was bothered by the statement about grouping students. While he was not opposed to grouping students, the thrust of the policy was that everyone should be grouped all the time for everything. He recalled that at the time the intent was to get all the smart children together and separate them from the other students.

Mr. Ewing was delighted that the superintendent was now talking about a prekindergarten through twelfth grade review. He said they had a vast variety of early childhood, preschool programs which had developed relationships with all kinds of private sector activities, particularly day-care. He felt that these really lacked some kind of clear policy guidance to bring them together in a coherent way that focused on what needed to be done for young children. It was clear from the evidence that what they did there was extremely important. In the last couple of years he had learned that there were serious breakdowns from time to time in terms of the transition from day-care to Head Start to kindergarten to first grade. For example, kindergarten roundup was done by each principal in each principal's own way, and parents were confused about the options available for their children. Some principals and kindergarten teachers felt that Head Start children did not belong in all-day kindergarten because it was an academic program. He was also pleased to see that the list of people on the committee included a number of people with early childhood experience.

Mrs. DiFonzo noted that they had a K-8 policy, a middle school policy dealing with 6-7-8, a junior high policy dealing with 7-8-9, and no intermediate school policy dealing with 7-8. She wondered if the

existing policies were contradictory. She explained that she was not suggesting an intermediate school policy, but they had to figure out where the youngsters in Grades 7 and 8 were being addressed in these policies and where the policies were not appropriate for these youngsters.

Mrs. Praisner understood that the committee would begin working after some identification of issues by the Board. She wondered how people other than Board members could identify issues. She hoped that at least MCCPTA and some other groups would be contacted. She also suggested that before adoption they would build in an opportunity for community input. Dr. Cody replied that this was part of their regular process, and they would meet with the PTA leadership of the county for a discussion.

Dr. Shoenberg commented that the review could be used as a way of rationalizing the policies and looking at specific elements of them, but it could also be used to reshape educational process. He was not clear what they were going to do here. Dr. Cody explained that his charge to the committee was to use their judgment of what they thought policies for the school system should be in this area. It was not a matter of making these four separate pieces fit.

Mrs. Praisner said they should use this as an opportunity to shape some focus for the future in the school system. She hoped that they would learn from making policies restricted to certain grades. If they had a philosophy for how seventh and eighth graders should be educated, it should not matter whether they were in a 6-7-8 school or a 7-8-9 school. They should use this opportunity to codify, communicate, and reach forward and think about these issues in a proactive way. She thought the time would be well spent and probably was not adequate for the kind of discussion that needed to take place. She saw this as an opportunity to look at the schools of the future.

Dr. Shoenberg commented that the timeline seemed appropriate for cleaning up the policies but not for reshaping. It did not seem to him that there would be opportunity to get the public input they wanted. He had no problem with the committee's being made up of school system members, but he thought there had to be an opportunity for input from students and parents.

Mrs. Praisner remarked that they might be asking the committee to do more than they expected to do. She was suggesting that they identify issues that needed to be addressed. It might be that there were issues they would have to take from the work of the committee and discuss. Dr. Cody explained that the work of the committee was to propose policies to the Board, but he agreed that the committee might want to bring issues to the Board. He agreed that the timeframe should not be sacred. He said that the issues to be dealt with would be philosophical issues, and it would be important for a group of people to work together to get deeper and deeper into it. He saw this as a study group working together, listening to others, and offering ideas.

Dr. Floyd was glad to see that teachers were involved in the work group. He asked if they were going to get comments from the elementary school administrators and from the teacher association. Dr. Cronin replied that they might wish to comment. Dr. Floyd called attention to a comment in Ms. Boone's letter which stated that early adolescent development was characterized by the genesis of the adult personality. Ms. Boone replied that in the research there was indication that some place between sixth grade and ninth grade a person turns into an adult. They were saying that this was the beginning of those developmental issues that needed to be addressed. She said that there was clear evidence in the research that could be used by the task force in looking at middle level education. Dr. Peg Egan commented that early adolescents lived in a caldron. They were finishing off their childhood issues of confidence and starting to deal with the adolescent issues of justice and the emerging adult personality. Dr. Floyd remarked that if they were talking about the set of behaviors they tended to observe in adults and manifesting themselves at this age that was fine. However, there was research that spoke to personality development in the earlier years.

Dr. Cronin stated that this was a golden opportunity. They were not looking for a typical administrative walk down both sides of the street at the same time. It was an opportunity because they had a Board of Education that was open to their ideas. This was an opportunity to explore the issues that the committee thought were important for children educationally. He suggested they look at the way they wanted to educate children in the future. For the junior/middle level schools, he would like the group to answer the issues raised in Ms. Boone's letter. He agreed that articulation was critical. The child in 7-8 was becoming someone, and they had to make that transition from one level to the next. It might be that the best thing 7-8 could do would be to make these students comfortable with themselves. The idea of success in high school depending on the background in elementary schools tied into the K-6 policy and the mastery of skills. However, he thought they needed a broader objective than mastery of skills in 7-8.

In regard to kindergarten, Dr. Cronin said they needed to look into whether they actually had created a whole new system where they started students totally fresh as though nothing that occurred for these children. They had to look at whether they had a continuum from early childhood to kindergarten to first grade. He said that everyone had talked about test scores, but no one had come up with a measure beyond test scores. He would like to know some of the other feedback indicators to measure school effectiveness.

Dr. Cronin commented that they seemed to give a lot of thought to reorganization, but he wondered if they meant organized to change the curriculum or the process within the school. He also wondered if the principals talked to each other about what they were doing in their individual schools. He said that the committee had an opportunity, and he would hope Dr. Smith could lead the committee and encourage them to be as creative as they could.

Dr. Shoenberg remarked that one of the things he liked about the high school policy was that the content of the high school education was stated in such a way that it did not dictate any particular organization of instruction to deliver that. He suggested they might want to think about shifting the focus of that policy to student outcomes. The high school policy did not have a lot to say about outcomes and what they wanted students to be when they finished school. He said that they ought to consider something that all students would do before they finished which would demonstrate how students had put their education together. This would be more than an accumulation of 22 credits or passing the functional tests.

Dr. Smith stated that the Board had broadened the charge to the committee, and the committee would do its best to respond to the challenge they had received.

Re: EXECUTIVE SESSION

The Board of Education met in executive session from 12:10 to 3 p.m. to discuss personnel issues.

Re: ANNOUNCEMENT

Dr. Cronin announced that Mrs. Slye had planned to attend the meeting, but she had been detained at work.

Re: BOARD/PRESS/VISITOR CONFERENCE

Mrs. Betty Jo Gemmill, Fairland PTA, appeared before the Board.

RESOLUTION NO. 335-86 Re: AMENDMENT TO THE AGREEMENT BETWEEN  
THE MONTGOMERY COUNTY BOARD OF  
EDUCATION AND THE MONTGOMERY COUNTY  
EDUCATION ASSOCIATION

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

WHEREAS, Section 6-408 of THE PUBLIC SCHOOL LAWS OF MARYLAND requires the Board of Education to enter into negotiations with the designated employee organization concerning "salaries, wages, hours, and other working conditions;" and

WHEREAS, The Montgomery County Education Association was properly designated as the employee organization to be the exclusive representative for this negotiation; and

WHEREAS, The Montgomery County Education Association and the Board of Education of Montgomery County are parties to a collective bargaining agreement through June 30, 1987; and

WHEREAS, The parties entered into negotiations to reopen the

Agreement to change the salary schedule for the third year of the Agreement; and

WHEREAS, The parties have reached a tentative agreement on a new salary schedule to be effective July 1, 1986; and

WHEREAS, The MCEA has informed the Montgomery County Board of Education that the tentative agreement reached has been ratified by its membership; and

WHEREAS, The chief negotiators have agreed to language amending Articles 5, Salaries; 34, Duration; and the substitute teacher section of the Agreement; and

WHEREAS, That language is contained in the document which will serve to implement the amended Agreement; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the Montgomery County Board of Education approve the amendment to the Agreement and the document; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the president of the Board of Education be authorized to sign the document which will serve to implement the amended Agreement, all according to the current Agreement and to the law.

RESOLUTION NO. 336-86    Re:    ADOPTION OF THE MEDIATOR'S REPORT AND  
RECOMMENDATIONS IN THE MATTER OF  
IMPASSE OVER THE MASTER TEACHER PLAN  
WITH THE MONTGOMERY COUNTY EDUCATION  
ASSOCIATION

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

WHEREAS, Section 6-408 of THE PUBLIC SCHOOL LAWS OF MARYLAND requires the Board of Education to enter into negotiations with the designated employee organization concerning "salaries, wages, hours, and other working conditions," and

WHEREAS, The Montgomery County Education Association was properly designated as the employee organization to be the exclusive representative for this negotiation; and

WHEREAS, The Montgomery County Education Association and the Board of Education of Montgomery County are parties to a collective bargaining agreement, effective August 31, 1984, and Article 33, Master Teacher Plan, of the Agreement provides:

"A joint MCEA/MCPS committee will be established to discuss a master teacher plan to present recommendations to the parties as the subject of bargaining for FY87 of this agreement," and

WHEREAS, The joint committee met periodically from March to October, 1985 and issued a report dated October 28, 1985; and

WHEREAS, The parties subsequently engaged in negotiations to impasse on the issue of a master teacher plan and participated in impasse mediation sessions on February 11 and 13, 1986, before Mediator Arthur Eliot Berkeley; and

WHEREAS, On February 21, 1986, Mediator Berkeley issued a Report and Recommendations to the parties; and

WHEREAS, The Montgomery County Education Association has informed the Montgomery County Board of Education that it accepts the Mediator's report in its entirety; and

WHEREAS, The chief negotiators have tentatively agreed to language that would put the Mediator's recommendations in place as an amendment to Article 33 of the current Agreement; and

WHEREAS, That language is contained in the following:

- A. No program under the rubric of "master teacher" or "mentor" will be instituted during the duration of this Agreement.
- B. MCEA and the Board shall establish promptly a joint study committee which will research and examine the many issues any such program raises.
- C. The joint study committee may issue non-binding recommendations for resolution of the many issues discussed in the Mediator's Report and Recommendations.
- D. The joint study committee shall issue its report in advance of negotiations for a successor collective bargaining agreement, and no later than September 1, 1986.

and be it further

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education approve the Mediator's report and its attached document; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the president of the Board of Education be authorized to sign the document which will serve to implement the Mediator's report, all according to the current Agreement and to the law.

RESOLUTION NO. 336b-86 Re: APPROVAL OF DANCE COURSES TO MEET FINE ARTS GRADUATION REQUIREMENT

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

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

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

WHEREAS, The Maryland State Board of Education simultaneously issued guidelines for course content and curricular goals for all art, dance, music, and theater courses meeting this requirement; and

WHEREAS, The Board of Education on April 9, 1985, mandated adherence to the state guidelines for content and curricular goals; and

WHEREAS, The physical education curriculum currently provides opportunities for students to receive instruction in dance courses which do not presently cover the content areas mandated for meeting the fine arts credit; and

WHEREAS, The aesthetic education curriculum offers only a summer school course in dance which meets the content requirement for the fine arts credit; and

WHEREAS, Staff has prepared course descriptions and objectives for two semester courses, DANCE AS FINE ART 1A AND 1B, which meet local and state content requirements; and

WHEREAS, DANCE AS FINE ART 1A AND 1B have been recommended by the Council on Instruction and the superintendent; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education approve DANCE AS FINE ART 1A AND 1B for inclusion in the MCPS PROGRAM OF STUDIES for the 1986-87 school year and thereafter.

RESOLUTION NO. 337-86 Re: PROCUREMENT CONTRACTS OVER \$25,000  
On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Mrs. Praisner\* seconded by Mr. Ewing, the following resolution was adopted unanimously:

\*Mrs. Praisner temporarily left the meeting before the vote was taken.

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

WHEREAS, Staff inquiries have shown that a rebid would gain more competition for Bid 193-86, Earth Science Equipment; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That Bid 193-86 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:

NAME OF VENDOR(S)

DOLLAR VALUE OF CONTRACTS

86-15	Annual Contract for Elevator Maintenance		
	Montgomery Elevator Co.	\$	32,166
110-86	Industrial Arts Hardware		
	Brodhead-Garrett Co.	\$	3,738
	Fasteners, Inc.		5,007
	Fries, Beall & Sharp Co., Inc.		7,381
	Gaithersburg Farmers Supply, Inc.		3,152
	MSF County Services Co., Inc.		5,204
	McKilligan Supply Corp.		434
	Standard Supplies, Inc.		2,003
	TOTAL	\$	26,919
124-86	Industrial Arts Graphic Arts Supplies		
	Acme Type Foundry	\$	85
	Dick Blick East		1,075
	Chaselle, Inc.		943
	A. B. Dick Company		731
	Hartco Products Company, Inc.		150
	Itek Graphic Systems		1,556
	Magnetics, Inc.		1,262
	Meeks Printing Supply Company, Inc.		5,424
	Patton Printing Supplies, Inc.		27,743
	Penn Camera Exchange, Inc.		3,070
	Polychrome Corporation		1,087
	T. G. Roberts, Inc.		2,694
	Satco, Division of Satterlee		193
	Southern Business Communication of D.C.		680
	E. H. Walker Supply Company, Inc.		122
	TOTAL	\$	46,815
161-86	Early Learning and Kindergarten Supplies and Equipment		
	ABC School Supply	\$	2,550
	Beckley Cardy Company		36
	Chaselle, Inc.		15,461
	Community Playthings		29,544
	Constructive Playthings		2,188
	Creative Publications		90
	Crown Educational & Teaching Aids		6,015
	Cuisenaire Co. of America		206
	DLM Teaching Resources		1,216
	Educational Teaching Aids		4,215
	J. L. Hammett Company		617
	Kaplan School Supply Corporation		3,186
	London Bridge, Inc.		7,537
	Nasco		1,711
	TOTAL	\$	74,572
166-86	Driver Education Behind the Wheel Training		
	Easy Method Driving School	\$	30,096

	Poly Method Driving School	4,896
	Potomac Driving School	4,896
	TOTAL	\$ 39,888
158-86	Health Room Supplies and Equipment	
	Adams Medical, Inc.	\$ 4,267
	J. Cole Associates	12,134
	Fire Brand, Inc.	1,301
	Foster/Murray Baumgartner	2,450
	Gamma Medical Systems, Inc.	8,795
	Lima Medical Supplies	75
	William V. MacGill & Co.	2,880
	Medex Products Corp.	9,565
	Mine Safety Appliances Co.	28
	Monumental Paper Co.	2,023
	National Health Supply Corp.	4,041
	School Health Supply Co.	6,773
	TOTAL	\$ 54,332
176-86	Floor Tile	
	Hudson Supply & Equipment Co.	\$ 26,112
188-86	Instructional Microcomputers Equipment	
	Apple Computer, Inc.	\$1,000,000
	3-B Administrative Service, Inc.	3,500
	Landon Systems Corp.	55,000
	TOTAL	\$1,058,500
228-86	Instructional Minicomputer System	
	Montgomery Blair Magnet Program	
	Digital Equipment Corporation	\$ 65,252
	ESS Computer Brokers	3,745
	GRAND TOTAL	\$1,428,301

RESOLUTION NO. 338-86 Re: WOOTTON HIGH SCHOOL GYMNASIUM  
ADDITION

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

WHEREAS, Sealed bids were received on May 22, 1986, for the Wootton High School gymnasium addition as indicated below:

A = Base Bid and Site Work  
B = Deduct Alt. 1 Operable Wall  
C = Deduct Alt. 2 Gym Equip.

BIDDER

1. Hess Construction Company, Inc. \$717,870 (A), \$25,000 (B), \$10,000 (C)
2. CMS Construction, Inc. \$777,000\* (A), \$30,000 (B), \$14,000 (C)
3. The Gassman Corporation \$782,000 (A), \$20,000 (B), \$24,000 (C)
4. Patrick Quinn Inc. \$797,000 (A), \$28,000 (B), \$8,000 (C)
5. C.M. Parker & Co., Inc. \$812,929 (A), \$23,752 (B), \$75,011 (C)
6. H.S. Stavrou Construction Co., Inc. \$873,000 (A), \$23,000 (B) \$12,000 (C)
7. Ronald Hsu Construction Co., Inc. \$886,000 (A), \$27,000 (B), \$25,000 (C)

\* Recommended award indicates acceptance of base bid.

and

WHEREAS, The low bidder, Hess Construction Company, Inc., has formally withdrawn their bid proposal in a letter dated May 23 because of a major error in bid tabulation; and

WHEREAS, The second low bidder, CMS Construction, Inc., has done similar type work in other surrounding jurisdictions and is highly recommended; and

WHEREAS, Additional funds are required in the amount of \$173,744 for project award; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That a contract for \$777,000 be awarded to CMS Construction, Inc., which includes the base bid and site work, contingent upon approval by the Montgomery County Council of a FY 1987 Capital Budget emergency supplemental appropriation in the amount of \$173,744, in accordance with plans and specifications entitled, "Wootton High School Gymnasium Addition," prepared by Fox, Hanna, architects; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the county executive be requested to recommend approval of this emergency appropriation to the County Council.

RESOLUTION NO. 339-86 Re: THOMAS W. PYLE INTERMEDIATE SCHOOL - ACCESSIBILITY MODIFICATIONS FOR THE HANDICAPPED (AREA 2)

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

WHEREAS, Sealed bids were received on May 28, 1986, for the construction of accessibility modifications for the handicapped at Thomas W. Pyle Junior High School, as indicated below:

BIDDER	BASE BID
1. Ernest R. Sines, Inc.	\$162,800
2. C. M. Parker & Co., Inc.	211,814

and

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

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

RESOLVED, That a contract for \$162,800 be awarded to Ernest R. Sines, Inc. to accomplish the construction of accessibility modifications for the handicapped at Thomas W. Pyle Intermediate School in accordance with plans and specifications covering this work dated April 15, 1986, prepared by Arley J. Koran, Inc., architect.

RESOLUTION NO. 340-86 Re: MONTGOMERY KNOLLS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL  
BOILER REPLACEMENT

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

WHEREAS, Sealed bids were received on May 29, 1986, for boiler replacement at Montgomery Knolls Elementary School, as indicated below:

BIDDER	LUMP SUM
1. M & M Welding & Fabricators, Inc.	\$36,890
2. G. W. Mechanical Contractors, Inc.	49,000
3. Capitol Boiler Works, Inc.	54,845
4. American Combustion, Inc.	56,407
5. Combustioneer, Division of Kirlin Ent., Inc.	60,450

and

WHEREAS, The low bidder, M & M Welding & Fabricators, Inc., has performed satisfactorily on other boiler projects for MCPS; and

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

RESOLVED, That a contract for \$36,890 be awarded to M & M Welding & Fabricators, Inc. to accomplish boiler replacement at Montgomery Knolls Elementary School, in accordance with plans and specifications covering this work dated May 15, 1986, prepared by the Department of School Facilities in conjunction with Morton Wood, Jr., consulting engineer.

RESOLUTION NO. 341-86 Re: PROPOSED GUNNERS LAKE ELEMENTARY  
SCHOOL (AREA 3)

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

WHEREAS, Sealed bids were received on May 29, 1986, for the proposed new Gunners Lake Elementary School, as indicated below:

BIDDER	BASE BID
1. John C. Grimberg Company, Inc.	\$6,230,000
2. The McAlister-Schwartz Co.	6,263,264
3. Jesse Dustin & Son, Inc.	6,289,000
4. The Glassman Corp.	6,340,000
5. Henley Construction Co., Inc.	6,413,000
6. Kimmel & Kimmel Inc.	6,525,000

and

WHEREAS, The low bidder, John C. Grimberg Company, Inc., is on the approved contractor's list and has successfully completed similar projects in the Washington Metropolitan area; and

WHEREAS, Additional funds are required in the amount of \$302,102 to effect award; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That a contract for \$6,230,000, which constitutes acceptance of the base bid be awarded to John C. Grimberg Company, Inc., contingent upon approval by the Montgomery County Council of a FY 1987 Capital Budget emergency supplemental appropriation in the amount of \$302,102, in accordance with plans and specifications entitled, "Gunners Lake Elementary School," prepared by Thomas Clark Associates, architects; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the county executive be requested to recommend approval of this emergency appropriation to the County Council.

RESOLUTION NO. 342-86 Re: STEPS, RAMPS, DECKS AND SKIRTING  
PORTABLE CLASSROOM BUILDINGS

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

WHEREAS, Sealed bids were received on June 4, 1986, to provide steps, ramps, decks and skirting for new and locally-owned portable classroom buildings as follows:

BIDDER	BASE BID
1. H & H Enterprises	\$51,500
2. Commercial Modular Systems, Inc.	51,615

and

WHEREAS, Low bids are within staff estimate and sufficient funds are available in account 968-06 to effect award; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That a contract for \$51,500 be awarded to H & H

Enterprises, to provide steps, ramps, decks and skirting for new and locally-owned portable classroom buildings at the designated locations in Montgomery County in accordance with plans and specifications covering this work dated May 21, 1986, prepared by the Department of School Facilities.

RESOLUTION NO. 343-86 Re: TV EASEMENT FOR SCHOOL CONNECTIONS

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

WHEREAS, Tribune United Cable of Montgomery County has agreed to extend an activated cable drop for approximately 54 schools that are located in current television subscription areas; and

WHEREAS, A need will exist to grant limited easements for the construction activity as engineering plans are completed; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the superintendent be authorized to execute limited construction easements on behalf of the Board of Education to the cable franchise operator for Montgomery County for the purpose of installing cable to schools when the following guidelines are met:

1. The superintendent determines that the best interests of the school system and of the individual school would be served by granting such limited easement;
2. The cable franchise operator assumes all liability for damages or injury resulting from installation and any future maintenance of the television cable which is the subject of the easement;
3. The easement area is restored by the cable franchise operator to a condition which is equal to or better than that which existed prior to the cable installation or subsequent repair of the cable;
4. The easement provides that the Board of Education shall bear no cost for construction, installation, restoration, or future maintenance of the television cable which is the subject of the easement;
5. The easement is for the minimum area needed to accomplish the purpose consistent with the school system use of the easement area and areas adjacent to it;
6. The easement provides that the cable can be relocated as from time to time may be required based on the needs of the Board of Education, its successors or assigns; and
7. Any approval of the easement agreement which may be required by the state or county governments are obtained.

RESOLUTION NO. 344-86 Re: NEW CINNAMON WOODS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL  
UTILITIES EASEMENT (AREA 3)

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

WHEREAS, The Potomac Electric Power Company (PEPCO) has requested a public utilities easement across the west side of the proposed Cinnamon Woods Elementary School site; and

WHEREAS, The project will not affect any land now utilized for school programming and recreational activities nor adversely affect future development of the area; and

WHEREAS, PEPCO will assume all liability for damages or injury resulting from the installation and future maintenance of the subject utilities; and

WHEREAS, All construction, full restoration, and future maintenance will be performed at no cost to the Board of Education; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the president and secretary be authorized to execute a permanent easement between the Board of Education and The Potomac Electric Power Company, consisting of a ten-foot wide easement and right-of-way across the proposed Cinnamon Woods Elementary School site.

Mrs. Praisner rejoined the meeting at this point.

RESOLUTION NO. 345-86 Re: RELOCATABLE CLASSROOM BUILDINGS

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

WHEREAS, On April 29, 1986, the County Council reduced the Board's request for relocatable classroom buildings by \$96,000 with the intent that eight of the twenty-two units would be similar to units purchased by Fairfax County, Virginia; and

WHEREAS, Bids were received on June 11 to furnish and erect the eight relocatable classroom buildings, as indicated below:

BIDDER	LUMP SUM
1. Commercial Modular Systems, Inc. (CMSI)	\$255,904
2. Helco Space	No bid
3. Nationwide Homes	No bid
4. Parkline, Inc.	No bid
5. Porta Space, Inc.	No bid
6. Williams Mobile Homes	No bid

and

WHEREAS, Considerable staff time was spent to encourage increased bid participation from qualified vendors with limited success, partially due to the completion date of September 1, 1986, and the volume of requests received from other jurisdictions for relocatable classrooms; and

WHEREAS, CMSI's bid stipulated a completion date of September 15, 1986; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That a contract for \$255,904 be awarded to Commercial Modular Systems, Inc., for eight relocatable classroom buildings in accordance with plans and specifications prepared by the Department of School Facilities, dated May 28, 1986.

RESOLUTION NO. 346-86 Re: FY 1986 SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION FOR A JOB TRAINING PARTNERSHIP ACT GRANT TO PROVIDE A SUMMER VOCATIONAL ORIENTATION PROGRAM FOR ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED YOUTH

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

RESOLVED, That the superintendent of schools be authorized, subject to County Council approval, to receive and expend \$43,106 from the Service Delivery Agency under the Job Training Partnership Act for a summer vocational orientation program for economically disadvantaged youth:

CATEGORY	SUPPLEMENTAL
02 Instructional Salaries	\$30,922
03 Instructional Other	4,600
07 Student Transportation	4,908
10 Fixed Charges	2,676
	-----
TOTAL	\$43,106

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 the County Council.

RESOLUTION NO. 347-86 Re: FY 1986 SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION TO PROVIDE INSERVICE TRAINING FOR TEACHERS AND STUDENTS IN A "CROSS-AGE SCIENCE TEACHING" (CAST) PROGRAM

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

adopted unanimously:

RESOLVED, That the superintendent of schools be authorized, subject to County Council approval, to receive and expend a \$2,300 grant award from the MSDE under the Education for Economic Security Act in Category 1; and be it further

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

RESOLUTION NO. 348-86 Re: FY 1986 SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION FOR A VOCATIONAL EXPLORATION PROGRAM FOR SPECIAL EDUCATION STUDENTS

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

RESOLVED, That the superintendent of schools be authorized to receive and expend a supplemental grant award of \$30,407 in the following categories from the Job Training Partnership Act for a vocational exploration program for handicapped students:

CATEGORY	SUPPLEMENTAL
04 Special Education	\$28,417
10 Fixed Charges	1,990
	-----
TOTAL	\$30,407

and be it further

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

RESOLUTION NO. 349-86 Re: MONTHLY PERSONNEL REPORT

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

RESOLVED, That the following appointments, resignations, and leaves of absence for professional and supporting services personnel be approved: (TO BE APPENDED TO THESE MINUTES).

RESOLUTION NO. 350-86 Re: EXTENSION OF SICK LEAVE

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Mrs. Praisner seconded by Mrs. DiFonzo, 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
Armstead, Carole	Media Assistant E. B. Lee IS	30
Bueso, Yolanda	Instructional Assistant On Personal Illness Leave from Oak View ES	30
Jefferson, Charlie	Building Service Worker Parkland JHS	15
Williams, Robert	Safety & Security Asst. Bethesda-Chevy Chase HS	30
Wilson, Geraldine	Social Services Aide Division of Head Start	30

RESOLUTION NO. 351-86 Re: PERSONNEL REASSIGNMENTS

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

RESOLVED, That the following personnel reassignments be approved:

NAME	FROM	TO
Elizabeth Bohince	Classroom Teacher Earle B. Wood JH MEQ+30-L1	Instructional Asst. School to be determined Effective 7-1-86 Will maintain salary status and retire 7-1-87
Bernice Garner	Classroom Teacher Montgomery Blair HS M+30-L3	Instructional Asst. School to be determined Effective 7-1-86 Will maintain salary status and retire 7-1-87
Alvis Grigsby	Classroom Teacher Earle B. Wood JHS M+30-L3	Instructional Asst. School to be determined Effective 7-1-86 Will maintain salary status and retire 7-1-88

William Homick	Classroom Teacher Richard Montgomery HS M+30-L3	Instructional Asst. School to be determined Effective 7-1-86 Will maintain salary status and retire 7-1-88
Madeline Johnson	Classroom Teacher Kemp Mill Elementary M+30-L3	Instructional Asst. School to be determined Effective 7-1-86 Will maintain salary status and retire 7-1-87
Gerald Lindell	Classroom Teacher On Personal Ill. Lv. MEQ+30-L3	Instructional Asst. School to be determined Effective 7-1-86 Will maintain salary status and retire 7-1-87
Mary Shaw	Classroom Teacher Poolesville High MEQ+30-L3	Instructional Asst. School to be determined Effective 7-1-86 Will maintain salary status and retire 1-1-88

RESOLUTION NO. 352-86    Re:    DEATH OF MISS CAROL J. EISERER,  
CLASSROOM TEACHER AT PARKLAND JUNIOR  
HIGH SCHOOL

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

WHEREAS, The death on May 22, 1986, of Miss Carol J. Eiserer, a classroom teacher at Parkland Junior High has deeply saddened the staff and members of the Board of Education; and

WHEREAS, Miss Eiserer had been a highly effective physical education teacher with Montgomery County Public Schools for over twenty-one years; and

WHEREAS, Miss Eiserer was a responsible teacher who approached her job with great professionalism, and she had good rapport with her students which was reflected by their participation in the physical education activities and enjoyment in the physical education program; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the members of the Board of Education express their sorrow at the death of Miss Carol J. Eiserer and extend deepest sympathy to her family; and be it further

RESOLVED, That this resolution be made part of the minutes of this meeting and a copy be forward to Miss Eiserer's family.

RESOLUTION NO. 353-86 Re: PERSONNEL APPOINTMENTS AND TRANSFERS

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

RESOLVED, That the following personnel appointments and transfers be approved:

APPOINTMENT	PRESENT POSITION	AS
Horace Ashby	Principal Charles Carroll of Carrollton ES Baltimore, MD.	Principal Mill Creek Towne ES Effective: 7-1-86
Mark D. Mann	Assistant Principal Richard Montgomery HS	Principal Parkland JHS Effective 7-1-86
Stephen Lanham Tarason	Assistant Principal White Oak JHS	Principal Takoma Park IS Effective 7-1-86
Delores Baden	Principal Edgewood ES Baltimore, MD	Principal N. Chevy Chase ES Effective 7-1-86
Mary Ann Britton	Elem. Princ. Trainee Lucy Barnsley ES	Principal Rosemont ES Effective 7-1-86
Eric Mills	Elem. Princ. Trainee Bel Pre ES	Principal Georgian Forest ES Effective 7-1-86
Carolyn Starek	Elem. Princ. Trainee Rolling Terrace ES	Principal Forest Knolls ES Effective 7-1-86
Mary Eliz. Tannhauser	Elem. Princ. Trainee Fields Road ES	Principal Cashell ES Effective 7-1-86
Sally Veres	Elem. Princ. Trainee Rock Creek Valley ES	Principal Somerset ES

Effective 7-1-86

TRANSFER	FROM	TO
Richard J. Ervin, Jr.	Principal Damascus ES	Principal Fox Chapel ES Effective 7-1-86
Kathleen Holliday	Principal Academic Leave	Principal Bells Mill ES Effective 7-1-86

APPOINTMENT	PRESENT POSITION	AS
Ann Richardson	Program Supervisor Art, Foreign Languages and Gifted & Talented Charles County BOE LaPlata, MD	Coordinator of Interrelated ARTS and Program Admin. Connecticut Park Center School Dept. of Aesthetic Education, Grade N Effective 7-1-86
Luba Dowhaluk	Per Diem Psychologist MCPS	Psychologist Area Admin. Office Grade G Effective 7-1-86
Sandra McAmis	Acting PPW Area 3 Admin. Office	PPW Area Admin. Office Grade G Effective 7-1-86

Re: CONTINUED DISCUSSION OF THE REPORT OF  
THE MATHEMATICS TASK FORCE

Dr. Cody reported that this was a continuation of a previous discussion. Dr. Cronin inquired about the charge to the committee. Mrs. Katheryn Gemberling, chairperson, said they were to look at the curriculum in terms of revision K-12, instructional strategies K-12, resources, and cooperation and exchange between business, the community, and the school system. When the Board priorities were established, they were directed to revisit the whole issue which brought them into the issue of assessment and higher order intellectual thinking skills. They also looked at minority achievement. These were incorporated under the four general recommendations.

Dr. Shoenberg stated that they had a letter from Judy Kenney and Gabe Massaro which raised the question of the school system's ability to carry out the recommendations of the report. It had to do with the notion of introducing too much, too fast in the way of curriculum and being able to provide the training for teachers to implement the curriculum. He assumed the recommendation for a mathematics

specialist in the school was precisely to enhance the training and implementation process. He asked if they envisioned this person as an addition to the staff or someone with teaching responsibilities and function more like a high school resource teacher. Mrs. Gemberling replied that the discussion centered around the existing concept of a reading specialist in all of the elementary schools. This was the model that was originally drawn. There was a strong feeling from the university people on the task force that there was not as much expertise among elementary teachers in the area of mathematics as there existed in reading. She was well aware that a math specialist in every school would be a very expensive proposition. She said that if it was necessary to have a reading specialist in every school, and there were those who thought it was not, then it was equally justifiable to have a math specialist there. She suggested that perhaps some reallocation of staff could be addressed. The task force was trying to make the case for the need for someone in the building with a strong background in content and strategy and who would be available to staff and special needs students. They did not assume that these individuals would not have teaching or student responsibilities.

Dr. Shoenberg wondered if the reading specialist was the best analogy because the reading specialist generally dealt with students with special needs. Mrs. Gemberling replied that in some schools the reading specialist was remedial because of the nature of the population. However, if the design of the position were remedial, they would not be allocating those positions one per school given the different populations in the schools.

Dr. Shoenberg asked if they considered the notion of assigning an appropriate number of people to each school who would teach math. Mrs. Gemberling replied that they had considered this, but this was the main issue of disagreement among committee members. She thought the elementary people on the committee had made a strong case for the generalist teacher working in all content areas. She pointed out that if they grouped for mathematics it had a domino effect on other instructional areas. The task force had come up with a compromise which allowed for both models.

Mrs. Joan Israel, principal of Wyngate Elementary, explained that the intent was to say there should be math expertise in every school, but that did not have to be in a body called a math specialist. She said that most principals attempted in their staffing to develop a cadre of people who had the expertise needed in all areas. For example, one staff member would really know computers and serve as a resource. Some schools had math aides who were expert math teachers. She pointed out that the curriculum specialists were important to elementary principals. When they hired curriculum specialists, they might hire someone with math expertise if they did not already have that on their staff. She hoped that they would not get locked in to the notion that there had to be a math specialist.

In regard to departmentalization, Mrs. Israel thought their recommendation was somewhat inconsistent with another recommendation

that they should not be tracking students. If they departmentalized and wanted to move a youngster to a faster moving group, they would change that youngster's entire day. Most principals preferred to have all teachers teach math, and if they wanted to change the child's grouping it did not affect the rest of his day. She recommended putting funds into training and bringing teachers up to the point where they were adequate and then have an expert on her staff to use as a resource for teachers and work with small groups of students.

Dr. Floyd noted that all of the four items had cost dimensions. He suggested that they look at what needed to be done to improve the program and not worry about costs at this point. Dr. Shoenberg did not think they could separate these. He pointed out that one recommendation was to develop teacher training in higher order intellectual skills in mathematics. From his work with college students, he felt there were some who would not be trainable in higher order intellectual skills in mathematics. He said that doing this training was probably fiscally beyond what they could be able to accomplish in a reasonable period of time and might be a futile effort for some proportion of that group. He noted that what they were able to do fiscally affected the model they were going to adopt. Dr. Cronin asked whether the issue had come up about how they were going to identify teachers who needed this training. He said they were on touchy ground because of negotiations about a master teacher plan. In addition, they should discuss evaluation plans in executive session before discussing these in public.

Mrs. Praisner remarked that the issue that probably would occupy their time was the issue of the math subject specialist. She found Mrs. Israel's comments very useful. She said that once they started down the road of some expectation they had to know both the financial implications and the educational implications. Their judgments had to be made with both in mind. She had similar concerns about the math specialist issue. She reported that when she had heard parents lament about the lack of skills of the elementary school teacher it had been in the area of science rather than math. She could see them with a science task force recommending a science specialist. She said that the staff responses seemed to indicate that they were going to look at different models. She asked if they were going to look at different models of the math specialist or the math specialist versus the curriculum coordinator position.

Dr. Thomas Rowan, K-8 math coordinator, stated that with Title II funds they were selecting 18 schools in which teachers would be trained. They would meet with principals to come up with the various models that they would use. Title II money was for training, and they needed funds for released time. Unless they could find funds to release teachers on a longer term basis, they would not be able to try out the content specialist model that the university people had in mind. They were going to try to come up with a variety of ways to use people trained in the Title II project.

Mrs. Praisner pointed out that the report said that appropriate

recommendations would be made for the FY89 budget. She asked if this related to the elementary school math teacher or to the issue of class size and curriculum coordinator roles, etc. Dr. Lois Martin, associate superintendent, replied that this referred to the organization of math instruction in the schools. They had not seen tying curriculum specialists into this. They saw themselves dealing with the role of training teachers in the way the various organizational models use teachers trained in math. Mrs. Praisner did not know what appropriate recommendations would be made in the budget. She asked about timeframes and how they were going to evaluate models. She asked how the curriculum specialist position would be evaluated. Dr. Martin replied that curriculum specialists were not part of this at all and were not mentioned in the task force report. They were mentioned in a letter from the elementary principals association. She understood that the Department of Educational Accountability was incorporating questions about the curriculum specialist in its study of the elementary principalship. They did not see elementary curriculum specialists as central to this.

Mrs. Praisner said she had a problem because all these things were going on in the same elementary schools. She was personally interested in looking at different models of organizing elementary schools and the delivery of the curriculum. If they were going to start down the road of putting in a curriculum position and then recommendations about math, they were going to have to justify what they were doing. Dr. Martin replied that the job description of the curriculum specialists had led to some belief that those were people who worked on overall school management of the instructional program, not in any specialized way with a given program. This did not mean that the whole issue could not be reexamined and probably should be. Mrs. Praisner said that if they were going to leave some autonomy within a school and leave some decision-making to the staff and principal of the school, these people would define the needs in the school for internal staff support in order to deliver the curriculum. With assigning people from the central office, they would never be able to deliver the total expectation because their budgets would never be everything that they wanted. If they could work with identified needs and give the school some latitude of additional support, they could allow the schools to determine how the support would be used. She had concerns about adding another specialist without the expectation of being able to achieve this over any long term timeframe.

Dr. Cronin said that as they put in the ring of resources to hire the people to organize the school and articulate the program, they had to ask themselves what they were trying to do. They had to look at the teaching they were attempting to communicate and the goals for students in math skills when they graduated.

Mrs. Praisner wanted to know how they assessed the effectiveness of the different models and the role of the curriculum person. She said a legitimate question was why a curriculum person within the local school could not satisfy this need. Dr. Rowan stated that he agreed

with the larger picture she was painting. The math coordinators in developing the response did not take the larger perspective because they were math people looking at a math issue. They were concerned that if they gave way to the larger issue, the math part would get lost. In regard to evaluation, he reported that the Title II monies to try out organizational models did not include an evaluation component. He had met with DEA on the issue of evaluating the organizational models, and they were interested in doing this. He was hopeful that the National Science Foundation would provide funds to extend the project to build in an evaluation component.

Mr. William Clark, director of academic skills, stated that they might not be able to try out all of the models because the resources did not exist in the budget for each one of the models. He noted that the full content specialist was one model that depended upon available resources which did not exist in the current budget. Unless a school was willing to provide a position, they would not be able to try out that model. He assumed that if they could get an evaluative component funded they would come back and tell the Board which models were effective and make this a recommendation for consideration by various elementary school principals. They were looking at the FY 1989 budget as an opportunity to come forth with some recommendations for instructional support. However, they might have some recommendations in 1988 and continue with others in 1990 and 1991. He said that they had a good math program, but they felt math instruction needed to be improved, particularly in the elementary schools.

Dr. Cronin asked how they made the distinction between saying they had a good math program and saying they needed to be sure it was being taught in the schools. Mr. Clark replied that they had a good curriculum, but it needed to be improved. In terms of test results, their students did very well, but not as well as they would like. He said that by the time students got to twelfth grade they would like students to have an appreciation for mathematics and an idea about what math was needed in various careers.

Dr. Martin said the elementary schools were crucial because of data they had about the pass rate in ninth grade in functional math. While they had made improvements, it was so far from the pass rate on reading that it was painful. The second issue was the targets they set for Priority 2 to get students into college preparatory math in ninth grade. Those data were not good. She believed they had very serious issues about increasing student achievement.

Mrs. Gemberling reported that there was strong feeling on the task force that the Board had established strong priorities in the area of mathematics achievement as they had in reading/language arts. There was strong feeling among the task force and math educators that the supports provided to make those goals were not comparable. If they could not talk about a math specialist in every school, she thought they should revisit the idea of putting specialists in those schools where students were having difficulties achieving. The Board did need to revisit this issue. They were saying that the Board had

goals and the mathematics achievement, particularly for minority and disadvantaged students, lagged dramatically behind the reading/language arts achievement and would continue to lag unless they had early intervention.

Mrs. Praisner thought the recommendation should be "additional supports where needed." Mrs. Gemberling replied that that recommendation was in the report. Mrs. Praisner pointed out that people would identify other weaknesses, and from expectation to delivery it might take so long that they would not achieve what they wanted. Mrs. Gemberling said task force members felt there were places in the budget that might need to be revisited. Providing additional math supports in schools with high need populations was critical. She suggested the Board should look at getting some supports from places where they were not needed as critically.

Dr. Cronin requested a schematic of the support structure for reading, writing, language arts, and mathematics. Dr. Martin replied that the big support structure was the reading specialist, and the job description was staff support plus direct instruction. She said that the issue at the moment was the extension of writing to the role of the reading specialist. In addition, there were area-based teachers of reading/language arts. Dr. Cronin asked for something in writing that would show the supports that were given to subjects by title, description, and number.

Mr. Ewing commented that the task force had done a good job of answering the basic questions they were asked to answer. He was prepared to support the basic thrust of these recommendations, but he did not know how much they could do in the coming year. He agreed that they did need to put more resources into this. He said the issue was how they translated this into a persuasive case for those providing the money for improvements. He was concerned about where they were headed with this in terms of what they wanted to accomplish. For example, did they want to have bare minimum standards for high school graduation? Did they want to establish some desirable minimums going beyond that for all students? Did they want to do similar things for all college-bound students? Did they want to specify what the three credits in math should look like? Was there some way they could remediate students who had trouble understanding the basic concepts of math? He thought they needed to be very clear and provide simple explanations of what they were trying to accomplish. He said that this was not up to the task force to do this. It was up to others in the room to explain this. He pointed out to Dr. Cody that there was more work to be done.

Dr. Floyd stated that in terms of the four questions raised by the task force and answered, these had given the Board some recommendations. They had given some ideas about curriculum needed to better prepare students for their future roles in a technological society. The task force had given them some notions about how to enable students to learn independently and think creatively about mathematics. The task force also pointed out some things that should be done to help students acquire a background to participate in

higher level mathematics. However, the Board had spent most of its time talking about organization.

Dr. Cody thought that the discussion had been constructive and helpful. He said that this was the time of the year to deal with major content and organization issues in advance of the budget season for next fall. The report was an outstanding one, and some issues had been raised which were important for the school system. He said that he, Dr. Martin, and committee representatives needed to go back and put this in the broader context and come up with a specific plan. He noted that many of the things were proceeding anyway. He said that sometime in advance of the budget he would bring another report to the Board.

Dr. Shoenberg said that he felt unsatisfied because they did not get an opportunity to talk about secondary school mathematics. He said that while they were talking about mathematics when they pulled this thread a lot would come unravelled. There were ideas implicit in the organization of the secondary school math curriculum. Another question was the way in which they wanted math addressed as a subject not only in mathematics but in other areas of the curriculum. He said the way in which the discussion went on in this content area would affect what they talked about in the morning in relation to the preschool to 12 policies. He was concerned that these things might go on separately from each other. He said that the report was thought provoking, and he appreciated this. He hoped that they would come back to this issue because it was not just mathematics they were talking about.

Dr. Cronin thanked the committee for their excellent paper.

RESOLUTION NO. 354-86 Re: B-CC CLUSTER STUDENT REASSIGNMENTS

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

WHEREAS, The Board of Education previously adopted certain student assignments for the B-CC mini cluster of magnet schools which would have begun to phase students into Chevy Chase and North Chevy Chase for grade 3 in September 1986; and

WHEREAS, The B-CC cluster has presented a cluster-wide proposal to the Board for consideration as part of the 1986 facilities planning process; and

WHEREAS, Student assignment elements in the proposal have September 1986 implications; and

WHEREAS, Testimony before the Board of Education at a May 22 public hearing supported the 1986 student assignment changes; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That students be reassigned as follows:

- o Students living in Rosemary Village continue to attend Rosemary Hills for grades HS/K-2, but be reassigned from North Chevy Chase to Chevy Chase Elementary for grades 3-6 beginning with grade 3 in September 1986
- o Students living in the former Lynnbrook area continue to attend Rosemary Hills for grades HS/K-2, but be reassigned from North Chevy Chase to Bethesda Elementary for grades 3-6 beginning with grade 3 in September 1986
- o Students living in Paddington Square continue to attend Rosemary Hills for grades HS/K-2, but be reassigned from Chevy Chase to Bethesda Elementary for grades 3-6 beginning with grade 3 in September 1986

RESOLUTION NO. 355-86 Re: BOUNDARY CHANGE: AVENEL SUBDIVISION

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

WHEREAS, The subdivision of Avenel, located south of Persimmon Tree Road, is selling lots for occupancy beginning in September 1987; and

WHEREAS, The developing property is at the western edge of the Carderock Springs, Pyle, and Whitman school boundaries; and

WHEREAS, These Whitman cluster schools are projected to be over desired utilization levels while underutilization is projected for two adjacent Churchill cluster elementary schools; and

WHEREAS, Citizens from the Churchill and Whitman clusters of schools testified in favor of a reassignment proposal during a public hearing before the Board of Education on May 22, 1986; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the developing Avenel subdivision be assigned as follows:

- o Assign to Potomac Elementary, Hoover Junior, and Churchill High School all students from the single-family houses and townhouses with access to Oaklyn Drive on the west side of the future water treatment plant site
- o Assign to Seven Locks Elementary, Hoover Junior, and Churchill High School all students from the single-family houses and townhouses on the east side of the future water treatment plant site and north of Rock Run stream
- o Retain in Carderock Springs Elementary, Pyle Intermediate, and Whitman High School all students from the single-family houses in the portion of Avenel south of Rock Run with access to

MacArthur Boulevard

and be it further

RESOLVED, That the residences adjacent to but not legally part of the Avenel subdivision plat are not included in this boundary change.

Re: BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS

1. Mrs. Praisner reported that the Board had appointed a committee to look at the E2 policy and since that time the committee was requested not to meet until information had been gathered from the state. She requested staff to follow up and try to accelerate the receipt of that information so that the committee could proceed.
2. Mrs. Praisner noted that the Gaithersburg Junior High School team had won the Odyssey of the Mind Competition, the world finals. She pointed out that two students from Montgomery County, Henry Harris from Walter Johnson and Tom Finn from Blair, had won scholarships in the Washington POST summer school for journalism.
3. Mrs. Praisner said she had received a copy of the recommendation from the IAC to the Board of Public Works on the recommendations of the governor's task force on school construction. There would be an opportunity for comments by June 26, and she hoped that at the evening meeting in June the Board could take some action on those issues. She was concerned that renovations to major structures such as boilers did not indicate that funds for that would be in addition to the money for school construction. There were no recommendations on the state-rated capacity for elementary schools and they were deferring that for future study. The Board needed to find out what the timetable for that was and repeat its support for a modification of that.
4. Mrs. DiFonzo reported that she had the honor of attending a number of other commencements for special programs including Bridge, Phoenix, Lynnbrook, and Noyes. Yesterday she was asked by Dr. Floyd to attend a commencement of five teachers who had been recertified in Level 5 special education. One of these teachers was a thirty-six year employee of MCPS who completed the three year training program. She asked that the Board send a letter of congratulations to these five individuals.
5. Mr. Ewing stated that several people in the B-CC community had raised the question of what the Board intended to do with the recommendations on resources needed. Mrs. Praisner had raised a question about how the budget cuts had affected the B-CC cluster, and the Board had received a response. He asked what kind of response they would give the cluster in regard to the rest of their request. Dr. Cody replied that the rest of the proposal which he felt positive about would go into the fall's series of considerations. Mr. Ewing suggested that given the kinds of commitments made by the Board in 1983 that it might be worthwhile for the Board to have before it a formal action which could make those alterations. Dr. Cody said that

there might be some merit in doing this. Dr. Pitt said that as far as this year there was about a one position difference and about four or five thousand dollars, and they were looking at this. The other items would be additional in the next budget. He thought it was important to go back and indicate what they had committed to that cluster.

6. Mr. Ewing reported that the principal at Takoma Park Elementary had announced she had requested a transfer, and the community members had asked when that was likely to occur and when the process for selecting the new principal would be initiated. Dr. Cody replied that they had not yet resolved the new assignment for the current principal. When that was decided, staff would establish a time schedule for the selection of her replacement. This information would be provided to the Board in the new couple of days.

7. Mrs. DiFonzo stated that sometime back she had asked the superintendent to ask schools to compile a list of strategies they were using in terms of involving parents in the educational process. She asked if she could have this information back by the end of the summer so that it could be compiled in an informal document to send out to schools. Dr. Cody said he would check into this and discuss with her what she had in mind. He did not think they had an activity generating a major report to the schools. Mrs. DiFonzo recalled that the question was to determine what schools were doing and to put these strategies together for distribution to schools not having that activity.

8. Dr. Floyd said that last week the Board participated in the awards program at Sligo Middle School for students and staff. Mrs. Praisner mentioned the Gaithersburg Junior High School group that won the Odyssey of the Mind. The program at Sligo was appreciated by the participants. He expressed his appreciation to David Fischer and Ann Shebovsky for doing a wonderful job of organizing the ceremony.

9. Dr. Floyd stated that last Saturday they had participated in the recognition of the awards program for staff members with long and distinguished service. There were some 400 or 500 of those which was another exciting experience.

10. Dr. Floyd said that on the downside about ten days ago there was another student suicide in the school system. He said that Mrs. DiFonzo had spearheaded efforts to get a committee on this subject, but this was a reminder that they still had a long way to go. He hoped they would keep pushing on this subject so that this would never happen again.

11. Dr. Cody reported that he had just been through a very valuable experience and would be sharing it with the staff and the Board. He had spent a lot of time reviewing the literature and thinking through the issue of teacher supply and demand in the United States as it related to quality. In the past when there was a teacher shortage, the standards were lowered to fill the vacancies. The question now was how they could deal with an upcoming shortage and also improve

the quality of teaching. He thought there were some ways of dealing with that. For example, the National School Boards Association should start a much expanded series of Future Teachers of America Clubs in the high schools across the United States and turn them into high prestige membership qualification activities. They needed to abolish undergraduate teacher training in the United States and have all the pedagogical training at the master's level. He thought there were ways of tying the master of education degree with an internship in the school system which would make it economically attractive. He suggested they would keep more teachers in the profession if they had a national teacher retirement system. He was also convinced that they needed to have ways to encourage people to stay in teaching longer such as half time teaching after retirement. He indicated that he would be coming back to this issue.

RESOLUTION NO. 356-86 Re: EXECUTIVE SESSION - JUNE 23, 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 Section 10-508, State Government Article 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 June 23, 1986, at 7:30 p.m. to discuss, consider, deliberate, and/or otherwise decide the employment, assignment, appointment, promotion, demotion, compensation, discipline, removal, or resignation of employees, appointees, or officials over whom it has jurisdiction, or any other personnel matter affecting one or more particular individuals and to comply with a specific constitutional, statutory or judicially imposed requirement that prevents public disclosures about a particular proceeding or matter as permitted under the State Government Article, Section 10-508; and that such meeting shall continue in executive closed session until the completion of business.

RESOLUTION NO. 357-86 Re: APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS OF LOCAL ADVISORY COUNCIL FOR VOCATIONAL-TECHNICAL EDUCATION

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

WHEREAS, The Local Advisory Council for Vocational-technical Education has been active since its establishment in 1977; and

WHEREAS, The subcommittee on membership is charged with maintaining the membership; and



superintendent; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education appoint the following persons to a two-year term beginning immediately and terminating in June, 1988:

John R. Doody	William Harman
Terry M. Irwin	Lori Magum
Robert Smith	Beverly Suffanti

and be it further

RESOLVED, That the following individuals be reappointed for a two-year term terminating in June, 1988:

Thelma Bates	Oswaldo Diaz-Espada
Ronald Johnson	Ruth Priest
Helen Youth	

RESOLUTION NO. 359-86 Re: CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR FAMILY LIFE AND HUMAN DEVELOPMENT

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

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

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

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

RESOLVED, That the following individuals be appointed to represent their respective organization for a two-year term:

Carolyn Milkey	Mary Pappas
----------------	-------------

RESOLUTION NO. 360-86 Re: MINUTES OF APRIL 15, 1986

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

RESOLVED, That the minutes of April 15, 1986, be approved.

Re: ITEMS OF INFORMATION

Board members received the following items of information:

1. Items in Process
2. Construction Progress Report
3. Principal Selection Process
4. Seat Belts
5. Additional Relocatables Needs Assessment

Re: ADJOURNMENT

The president adjourned the meeting at 5:05 p.m.

-----  
President

-----  
Secretary

WSC:mlw