

86-14	Productivity Software Packages for Computer Systems Development Cullinet Software, Inc. DBMS, Inc.	\$ 35,000 (FY86) 15,000 (FY86)
	TOTAL	----- \$ 50,000
132-86	Industrial Arts Electronic Supplies Allied Electronics Arlington Electronic Wholesalers ASI Electronics Cameo Electronic Co., Inc. Capitol Radio Wholesalers, Inc. Centronic Wholesalers, Inc. Empire Electronic Supply Co. Fairway Electronics FIC Corp. Mark Electronic Supply, Inc. Pioneer/Washington Electronics Inc. Print Products International	\$ 317 786 65 364 22,819 5,190 5,941 144 58 816 277 291
	TOTAL	----- \$ 37,068
139-86	Saltines, Specialty Crackers, and Taco Shells Continental Smelkinson Frederick Produce Co. Kraft Foodservice	\$ 39,680 39,840 26,460
	TOTAL	----- \$105,980
147-86	Poultry Products Continental Smelkinson Dutterers of Manchester Corp. Great Lakes Food Brokers Manassas Frozen Foods	\$ 81,024 10,540 16,326 72,450
	TOTAL	----- \$180,340
154-86	Canned Fruits and Vegetables Edward Boker Foods, Inc. Carroll County Foods Continental Smelkinson Frederick Produce Co., Inc. Mazo-Lerch Co., Inc.	\$ 1,318 17,068 2,984 4,816 1,538
	TOTAL	----- \$ 27,724
155-86	Groceries and Staples Carroll County Foods Continental Smelkinson Frederick Produce Co. A. I. Litteri, Inc. Manassas Ice Fuel Co., Inc. Mazo-Lerch Co., Inc.	\$ 27,528 19,500 26,050 1,628 1,780 104

Frank A. Serio & Sons, Inc.	36,040
Stanley Food & Equipment Co.	37,852
Wechsler Coffee Corp.	649
Wilkins Corp.	143

TOTAL	\$151,274
190-86 Printing Adult Education Course Bulletin	
Record Printing	\$ 52,663
GRAND TOTAL	\$605,049

RESOLUTION NO. 365-86 Re: GAITHERSBURG HIGH SCHOOL - STADIUM LIGHTING

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

WHEREAS, The Gaithersburg Mayor and City Council appropriated funds for lights for the stadium at Gaithersburg High School; and

WHEREAS, MCPS' involvement will include a Use Agreement, development of plans and specifications, bidding, contract award, and supervision of construction; and

WHEREAS, Sealed bids were received on June 19, as indicated below:

BIDDER	LUMP SUM
1. S. Rock Corporation	\$56,100.00
2. Paul J. Vignola Electric Co. Inc.	59,359.00
3. Paul Stone Electric Construction, Inc.	62,426.00

and

WHEREAS, The low bidder, S. Rock Corporation, has performed similar projects satisfactorily; and

WHEREAS, Low bid is within the estimate and the cost will be temporarily charged to the Local Capital Improvements Account, pending receipt of funds from the City of Gaithersburg; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That a contract for \$56,100 be awarded to S. Rock Corporation to accomplish stadium lighting, contingent upon receipt of funds form the City of Gaithersburg, for the football field at the Gaithersburg High School, in accordance with plans and specifications prepared by the Department of School Facilities.

RESOLUTION NO. 366-86 Re: RESURFACING OF RUNNING TRACKS AND FIELD EVENT RUNWAYS - BETHESDA-CHEVY CHASE HIGH SCHOOL AND THOMAS S. WOOTTON HIGH SCHOOL (AREAS 2 and 3)

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

WHEREAS, Sealed bids were received on June 11 to resurface the running tracks and field event runways at Bethesda-Chevy Chase and Thomas S. Wootton High School, as indicated below:

BIDDER	UNIT PRICE (per sq. yd.)	ALT. #1 Sq. Yd.	ALT. #2 Track
1. The American Asphalt Paving Co., Inc.	\$7.40	\$30.00	\$3,250.00
2. Ratrie, Robbins & Schweitzer, Inc.	8.00	35.00	7,500.00

* Total of approximately 10,000 sq. yds.

DESCRIPTION OF ALTERNATES:

ALTERNATE #1 - Price per square yard for removal of base bid material on existing tracks or runways and its replacement with new base material as directed and described in specifications.

ALTERNATE #2 - Price per track, including field event runways for repainting of lines on new resilient surface material as directed in specifications.

and

WHEREAS, The low bidder has performed successfully on similar projects and the bid is within staff estimate and sufficient funds exist to permit contract award; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That a contract (base bid and Alternates 1 and 2) be awarded The American Asphalt Paving Co., Inc., for resurfacing of the running tracks and field event runways at Bethesda-Chevy Chase and Thomas S. Wootton High Schools, in accordance with specifications entitled "Resurfacing of Running Tracks and Field Event Runways Bethesda-Chevy Chase High School and Thomas S. Wootton High School," dated May 28, 1986.

RESOLUTION NO. 367-86 Re: ROSEMARY HILLS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
ADDITION/MODERNIZATION (AREA 2)

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

WHEREAS, Sealed bids were received on June 12, 1986, for the modernization and addition at Rosemary Hills Elementary School as indicated below:

BIDDER

1. Fitts Construction Co., Inc. \$3,705,000 (Base Bid); \$160,000 (Add. Alt. #1); \$160,000 (Add Alt. #2); \$93,000 (Add Alt. #3); \$4,118,000* (Total Base Bid Plus Alternates).
2. The Gassman Corporation \$3,887,000 (Base Bid); \$150,000 (Add Alt. #1); \$150,000 (Add Alt. #2); \$60,000 (Add Alt. #3); \$4,247,000 (Total Base Bid Plus Alternates).
3. The Merit Corporation \$3,988,000 (Base Bid); \$167,000 (Add Alt. #1); \$167,000 (Add Alt. #2); \$59,000 (Add Alt. #3); \$4,381,000 (Total Base Bid Plus Alternates).
4. Kimmel & Kimmel, Inc. \$4,162,000 (Base Bid); \$139,000 (Add Alt. #1); \$139,000 (Add Alt. #2); \$60,000 (Add Alt. #3); \$4,500,000 (Total Base Bid Plus Alternates).

*Indicates acceptance of base bid and Add Alternates 1 through 3.

Add Alternate #1: New construction of a prefabricated modular building addition for two classrooms

Add Alternate #2: New construction of a prefabricated modular building addition for two classrooms

Add Alternate #3: Expansion of existing parking lot.

and

WHEREAS, Additional funds are required in the amount of \$369,117 to effect award; and

WHEREAS, Fitts Construction Co., Inc.'s bid proposal is in compliance with the specifications; and

WHEREAS, Fitts Construction Co., Inc.'s work history with respect to similar projects is marginal; and

WHEREAS, Fitts Construction Co., Inc.'s proposed surety for construction bonding is not certified by the State of Maryland; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the contract for Rosemary Hills Elementary School Addition/Modernization be offered to Fitts Construction Co., Inc., contingent upon its furnishing, within seven calendar days of approval of this action by the Board to the Division of Construction a letter of intent from a State of Maryland certified bonding company with a triple A (AAA) rating, which contains the following statement and is signed by an authorized representative of the bonding company:

As surety for Fitts Construction Co., Inc., (NAME OF BONDING COMPANY) hereby agrees to furnish the 100 percent performance bond and 100 percent labor and materials payment bond, as required by the specifications entitled, "Additions and

Renovation: Rosemary Hills Elementary School," dated May 27, 1986, prepared by Garrison-Babarsky Associates, Architects, in the event that Fitts Construction Co., Inc. is awarded a contract for this project within sixty days of the (DATE OF THIS LETTER). This offer is irrevocable for the sixty day period indicated, and (NAME OF BONDING COMPANY) agrees to reimburse Montgomery County Public Schools for any damages incurred by Fitts' failure to execute and deliver to Montgomery County Public Schools the contract and the required bond within seven calendar days after receipt of the contract, providing that the contract is forwarded to Fitts Construction Co., Inc., for execution within the sixty day award period.

and be it further

RESOLVED, That failure on the part of Fitts Construction Co., Inc. to deliver the above letter, within seven calendar days of approval of this action by the Board, will result in the rejection of the bid submitted by Fitts Construction Co., Inc.

RESOLUTION NO. 368-86 Re: FY 1986 CATEGORICAL TRANSFER WITHIN THE EDUCATION CONSOLIDATION AND IMPROVEMENT ACT, CHAPTER 2 (ECIA)

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

RESOLVED, That the superintendent of schools be authorized, subject to County Council approval, to effect the following categorical transfer within the FY 1986 Education Consolidation and Improvement Act, Chapter 2 Block Grant:

CATEGORY	FROM	TO
10 Fixed Charges	\$21,714	
03 Instructional Other		\$21,714
	-----	-----
TOTAL	\$21,714	\$21,714

and be it further

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

RESOLUTION NO. 369-86 Re: FY 1986 SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION TO PROVIDE A SEQUENTIAL PROGRAM FOR LEARNING EXPERIENCES AT THE CHESAPEAKE BAY

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

RESOLVED, That the superintendent of schools be authorized, subject to County Council approval, to receive and expend a \$4,000 grant award in the following categories from MSDE under the Environmental Grant Program to develop a sequential program for learning experiences at the Chesapeake Bay:

CATEGORY	SUPPLEMENTAL
01 Administration	\$3,770
10 Fixed Charges	230

TOTAL	\$4,000

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. 370-86 Re: REORGANIZATION/RESTRUCTURE OF THE DEPARTMENT OF MANAGEMENT INFORMATION AND COMPUTER SERVICES, DIVISION OF SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT

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

WHEREAS, The Department of Management Information and Computer Services, Division of Systems Development, has been assigned major responsibility for development over a multiyear period of complex integrated systems in the business area, increased development of school support systems, and support for administrative use of microcomputers in schools and offices; and

WHEREAS, The department should be reorganized to better utilize staff and manage projects; and

WHEREAS, The reorganization/restructure of the Department of Management Information and Computer Services requires a change in the bargaining unit structure; and

WHEREAS, Such change must be negotiated; and

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 chief negotiators have agreed to language and principles that will allow implementation of this reorganization/restructure; and

WHEREAS, These principles state that no MCEA member will suffer any loss of salary or position; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That three new units and accompanying supervisory positions in the Division of Systems Development be created to supervise the development of major functional areas, such as 1) Payroll, Personnel, Fringe Benefit, Salary Encumbrance, Retirement, and related systems; 2) Finance, Budget, and related business systems; and 3) School Support and School Microcomputer systems and these three supervisory positions, to be classified as Grade 0, systems development supervisor, will be provided for by abolishing three existing Grade H systems development project manager positions; and be it further

RESOLVED, That all of the above actions shall become effective July 1, 1986, and shall be incorporated in the FY 1987 budget.

RESOLUTION NO. 371-86 Re: PRUCARE DENTAL MAINTENANCE ORGANIZATION
On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Mrs. Praisner seconded by Mrs. DiFonzo, the following resolution was adopted unanimously:

WHEREAS, The Prudential Insurance Company of America has started a Dental Maintenance organization (DMO) in this geographic area; and

WHEREAS, The plan is offered as an enhancement to the traditional fee-for-service dental program currently provided; and

WHEREAS, A transfer can be made within the Prudential dental program by subscribers at the beginning of each month; and

WHEREAS, The Prudential Insurance Company has offered a three-year rate guarantee; and

WHEREAS, The Joint Employee Benefit Committee has reviewed and recommended the plan; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the Prudential Pru Care Dental Maintenance Organization be added to the existing MCPS traditional fee-for-service dental program for employees opting for this coverage, effective July 1, 1986; and be it further

RESOLVED, That Prudential guarantees there will be no increase in the dental rates for at least three years from the starting date of the plan; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the DMO plan will be automatically terminated after

the three-year period unless renewed by the Montgomery County Board of Education and the employee associations, in compliance with their respective collective bargaining agreements; and be it further

RESOLVED, That Prudential will make a contractual commitment that any losses caused by the DMO will not be reflected in fee increases in any other programs serviced by Prudential for that three-year period, or the future; and be it further

RESOLVED, That Prudential will meet at least once yearly with the Joint Employee Benefit Committees to explain claim experience and premium structure for all programs; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the Montgomery County Board of Education has the right to terminate the DMO program within an appropriate 90-day notice period, according to standard terms of the contract; and be it further

RESOLVED, That Prudential may not terminate the DMO program before the three-year period within permission of the Montgomery County Board of Education and the employee associations, in compliance with their respective collective bargaining agreement.

Re: PROCUREMENT PROGRAM FOR MINORITY,
FEMALE, OR DISABLED-OWNED BUSINESS (MFD)

Dr. Cody reported that what the Board had was a report prepared by Mr. Leon Stafford, acting superintendent for supportive services, and his staff concerning efforts to increase the percentages of minority firms selling goods and services to the school system. Attached to that report was some advice from the Board's attorney regarding the discretion the school system had in giving special consideration to minority firms. He recalled an article about Prince George's efforts in this regard and explained that they operated under a county charter. Mr. Reese had indicated that MCPS operated under the State bidding law and must give the award to the lowest bidder. It would take a special bill in the legislature to give MCPS discretion in awarding contracts, and Mr. Reese had provided some proposed language for such a bill. Dr. Cody would check into the deadline for prefiling bills.

Dr. Cody said that he and Mr. Stafford had talked with several minority business people regarding MCPS bid practices and attempting to eliminate unintentional barriers to minority and small firms. He intended to form a special committee to see if practices could be modified. For example, they might look at awarding several smaller bids rather than one large one.

Dr. Shoenberg assumed that minority firms were having a difficult time because they were small firms, and changing the procedures were likely to benefit all small firms. Dr. Cody replied that the minority business people were not unanimous in their view that MCPS should channel its work to small firms because some of the minority firms were larger companies.

Board members discussed the format of the report. Dr. Floyd asked about their goal of 10 percent for minority vendors, and Mr. Stafford explained that the 10 percent figure referred to 10 percent of the dollar amount bid. Mr. Ewing suggested that they needed a presentation of this information in a format that was easier to understand. He requested that the information be expanded to include information on what was in Bid Analysis and Generation System (BAGS), the value of that, and the total amount including the percentage of the total amount awarded to minority vendors. He agreed with having a committee including minority businessmen. He noted that they would not have computer support for procurement reporting until the FY 1988 budget process. He understood that, but he pointed out that this issue had been before the Board for eight of his nearly ten years on the Board.

Mr. Stafford stated that BAGS would give them a redesigned report the next time this issue came before the Board. He noted that only 16 bids out of a total of 88 annual bids were issued under BAGS during the first quarter. For the next report, every bid would go through BAGS including written and telephone quotations.

Mrs. DiFonzo asked about the cost of implementation of the system. Mr. Stafford replied that if they had to provide technical assistance they would need two additional staff people, a junior buyer and an office assistant. At the request of vendors they had been sending out bids on a wide range of items, and they found that vendors could not respond. Therefore, they were now asking vendors whether they wanted to continue to receive bids on such a wide range of materials. They thought it would take about a year to get the process whittled down to be responsive to their goals.

Mrs. DiFonzo pointed out that they were providing technical assistance to minority vendors and had said they would provide it to other vendors on request. She asked whether they were notifying vendors that this was available. Mr. R. G. Nagarajan, director of procurement, replied that they were doing this through the prebid conferences. Mrs. DiFonzo noted that the report went to on say that this whole business hinged on their being able to get additional staffing. Dr. Cody replied that this was the technical assistance part. Mr. Stafford pointed out that they were doing a lot of this now. For example, they had identified 1,600 minority vendors and if all participated in this program, staff would be in a bind.

Mrs. Praisner was pleased about the committee proposed and asked if a general session had already taken place and if there were written materials. It seemed to her there were general kinds of understandings about the process and the bidding that once a company had learned it, it should not have to have continual assistance. She said that if they had materials and large one-shot presentations they might be able to cut back on the staff they would be requesting. Mr. Nagarajan replied that he had attended presentations at the County government for minority vendors. Ultimately the response of the bidders depended on understanding the technical requirements, but

MCPS requirements changed from year to year. He thought there was a continuous need for the one-to-one talks. Mrs. Praisner requested copies of what was sent to prospective bidders on MCPS process and purchasing regulations.

Mrs. Slye requested information about the key next steps and how the committee's input would interact with what was before the Board. Dr. Cody replied that he would appoint the committee and set the charge. They would be asked to examine MCPS procedures and make recommendations. By then they would be near the next quarterly report which would give them a better sense of the whole mechanism. At that time they would bring back a consideration of change in State law. Mrs. Slye asked if the committee could help them develop some short-term recommendations. Dr. Cody said that some people had already started to meet on these issues. For instance, they wanted to look at the process of architect selection. He would like to see the committee's recommendations and inform the Board in two or three months of activities to improve the situation.

Dr. Floyd thanked staff for the report and indicated that the Board would look forward to the next report.

RESOLUTION NO. 372-86 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
Laura Hart	Elem. Principal Trainee Cannon Road ES	Principal Damascus ES Effective 7-1-86
Beverly J. Hopkins	Acting Principal Luxmanor ES	Principal Luxmanor ES Effective 6-24-86
David L. Rotter	Principal North Chevy Chase ES	Supervisor of Elem. Instruction Area Admin. Office Grade 0 Effective 7-1-86
David Chalfant	Admin. Intern Walt Whitman HS	Assistant Principal Walt Whitman HS Effective 7-1-86
Elizabeth Glowa	Admin. Intern E. B. Wood JHS	Assistant Principal E. B. Wood JHS Effective 7-1-86

Gladys McClain	Admin. Intern B-CC HS	Assistant Principal B-CC HS Effective 7-1-86
Phyllis A. Preston	Admin. Intern Zadok Magruder HS	Assistant Principal Zadok Magruder HS Effective 7-1-86
Jack A. Schoendorfer	Acting Asst. Principal J. F. Kennedy HS	Assistant Principal J. F. Kennedy HS Effective 7-1-86
Cynthia A. Summers	Admin. Intern W. Churchill HS	Assistant Principal R. Montgomery HS Effective 7-1-86
H. William Davis	PPW Intern Interagency Program Unit	Pupil Pers. Worker Interagency Program Unit Grade G Effective 7-1-86
TRANSFER	FROM	TO
Russell Fleury	Assistant Principal Ridgeview JHS	Assistant Principal B-CC HS Effective 7-1-86
William Brown	Assistant Principal Seneca Valley HS	Assistant Principal Ridgeview JHS Effective 7-1-86

Re: ACHIEVEMENT FOR MINORITY STUDENTS AS A
FUNCTION OF YEARS IN MCPS

Dr. Cody reported that they had come across some interesting information in data that Dr. Frankel and his staff had provided. This was not a full report with a lot of analysis, because they were cautious about reaching any conclusions at this time. It had to do with looking at achievement as a function of the years that students had been in MCPS. He said they had data in which it appeared that students in the upper grades did not do as well as students in the lower grades. They had concluded a substantial number of those students in the upper grades had not spent their whole educational career in Montgomery County. For example, most of the third graders had spent almost all their educational careers in Montgomery County.

Dr. Cody said they looked at students in grade levels as to how well a group who had been here five years had done, four years, and so forth. He showed a series of overheads on the California Achievement Tests showing that students who had been in MCPS three years or more did better on the tests. There were some anomalies which Dr. Cody noted. He pointed out that when they looked at the Project Basic tests the results were even more dramatic. He said that the only

unanimously:

WHEREAS, Section 6-510 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 Council of Supporting Services Employees was properly designated as the employee organization to be the exclusive representative for this negotiation; and

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

WHEREAS, The Montgomery County Council specifically requested the Montgomery County Board of Education and the Montgomery County Council of Supporting Services Employees to keep overtime costs at a rate lower than the Fair Labor Standards Act would require under the current language of the Agreement; and

WHEREAS, The parties entered into negotiations to reopen the Agreement to change the overtime language for the third year of the Agreement; and

WHEREAS, The parties have reached a tentative agreement on that amendment to be effective July 1, 1986; and

WHEREAS, The chief have agreed to language amending Article 8, Overtime; and

WHEREAS, That language is contained in the following:
Article 8, Section B.2, will now read,

Overtime shall be distributed as equally as possible among the unit members qualified to do the work except for those building service workers who work overtime for ICB on weekends. Those unit members will normally be Grade 6 building service workers in order to meet the commitment made to the Montgomery County Council.

For weekdays and holidays, the equitable distribution language will hold.

and be it further

RESOLVED, That the Montgomery County Board of Education approve the amendment of the Agreement; 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.

*Dr. Cronin joined the meeting at this point and assumed the chair.

Re: RETURN OF TESTS POLICY

Dr. Cody explained that the proposed policy before the Board was to allow teachers to retain only semester and final examinations. The policy would require that teachers provide the results of these examinations to students for their examination, but because of the difficulty of developing and the importance of carefully designed test items teachers would not have to give copies of those to students. All other work that was evaluated by teachers and part of the grade would be returned to students to take home. He explained that "teacher-developed" test meant not California Achievement Tests or other standardized tests. Scantron sheets would be returned, and students could request copies of the questions. He said that one problem was a teacher might use 25 copies of one test, and administer the test in four or five sections. Rather than make 100 or 125 copies of the test, the students would be given the opportunity to examine a copy.

Dr. Cronin asked if they would have classroom files in the event the test was not returned to students. Dr. Cody replied that there would be a file kept, but they did not see this as related to the policy on return of tests. Dr. Cronin asked if a teacher could satisfy the policy by saying there was a copy of the test in the file, and Dr. Pitt replied that the teacher could not. Dr. Pitt explained that if tests were returned it would be up to the teacher if the teacher wanted to maintain a file except for semester and final exams.

Dr. Shoenberg thought that the wording of the proposed policy needed some work. In the case where it was too expensive to make multiple copies of a test, he assumed a parent could request a copy and the teacher would provide it. Dr. Cody agreed and indicated that a student could request the questions as well. Dr. Shoenberg asked if a student could request his answers to a final or semester exam even if the teacher retained the questions. Dr. Pitt said he would not have a problem with that as long as the answers were separate.

Dr. Shoenberg thought that the policy needed rewording because a lot of what they had discussed did not come through in the policy. Mrs. Praisner agreed and asked that this draft not go out for public comment. She asked whether they still had a policy that required keeping student essays in a folder until their senior year. She would like to see term papers and reports returned. Dr. Cody explained that the intent would be to change the other policy. Mrs. Slye asked that this be clarified, and Mrs. Praisner suggested they needed a rationale for that other policy.

Mr. Foubert suggested that where tests and quizzes were to be returned permanently, the language should state this. He assumed that "papers" included essays and compositions. He reported that MCR had adopted a resolution to support a plan by the Board of Education which enabled the students to permanently keep copies of all written tests and quizzes with the exception of final exams taken in the classroom. He would support the policy before them.

Mr. Ewing thought the proposed policy was a big improvement in its intent but needed considerable work. In regard to final and semester exams, he understood that students would be able to look at the exams once they had been graded, both the questions and the answers. The questions would be retained, and he asked if students could keep those or whether it depended on the kind of test. Dr. Cody thought they would have to look at the different kinds of semester examinations. Dr. Pitt pointed out in some cases it might be difficult to separate the questions and answers. Mr. Ewing pointed out that the policy could be read now that the student would never see what the student got wrong, which would bother him. He hoped the students would be permitted to see the questions and answers together and be able to ask questions about those. Dr. Cody agreed and stated that the issue was whether they could separate out the questions and the answers.

Mr. Ewing stated that one of the things that had been a problem with the existing policy was that many teachers did not act on the policy. He thought they had to have a regulation stating how teachers would learn about the policy or that needed to be part of the policy as well. He also thought that the purpose section of the policy could be more forceful because they had neglected the whole body of research which stated that students did better if they had information on how well they were doing so that they would know how to improve.

Mrs. DiFonzo thought they had to be clear about what was meant by "papers" because some people referred to these as compositions, themes, etc. This could be defined in the policy or in the regulations. She was also concerned about teachers not returning tests in a timely fashion. In some cases, students took the second test before they got the results of the first test. She suggested language to indicate that tests be returned as soon as feasible. Dr. Cronin pointed out that in some cases teachers held back on returning tests in one class because the other class was not at the same place.

Dr. Pitt stated that they had to be careful they did not try to write into a policy the whole concept of good teaching. He said it was important that principals have the responsibility to see that things were done in a timely fashion, but he did not know how much of that they could write into one policy. Dr. Cronin suggested using "reports and other graded exercises" in regard to Mrs. DiFonzo's concern. Dr. Shoenberg suggested "written work."

Mrs. Praisner said that part of the problem was the wording they were trying to work with. The point was they wanted students to have their tests back so that they could use them to improve and prepare for the final examination. In addition, they wanted parents to have access to this work. She suggested they start with a more general policy statement of the intent of the Board and then follow up with a regulation developed by staff. It seemed to her they were talking about high school because final examinations were only given in high school. She said that they had to make this clear if that were their

intent. Dr. Pitt replied that they were talking about this in terms of the senior high school policy. Dr. Cronin said he would like the policy to apply to K-8. Mr. Foubert pointed out that MCJC had reported a lot of complaints from junior high school students. Mrs. Praisner said that in that case they were looking at the whole issue. She asked about the difference between "semester" and "final" exams because all students took semester examinations. She also suggested informing students through the school handbooks rather than requiring teachers to tell students about this. It also seemed to her they should look at all implications of the policy and the impact of the change. Dr. Cody suggested that some language for review and impact be put in the resolution which recommended adoption of the policy.

Dr. Floyd cautioned that new knowledge itself was growing, and they were having a difficult time with helping current teachers keep up with new knowledge. People coming into the profession were being trained to extend their knowledge base. He thought it would be a big mistake to treat this as if they were dealing with a top secret pool of information brought into contact with students periodically. He noted that a lot of what they were talking about safeguarding would be outmoded before students had a chance to deal with it.

Dr. Cronin stated that the policy should be redrafted with Board comments. Dr. Cody agreed to do this next week in order to get reactions over the summer. Dr. Cronin asked that this be sent to MCCPTA and MCEA.

Re: BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS

1. Mr. Ewing called attention to a story in the Montgomery JOURNAL which spoke to a report by the Planning Board which forecast 11,000 to 12,000 housing units in the next couple of years, with the worst case being 17,000 in two years. He suggested they obtain a copy of this report and get together with the Planning Board and the Council to find out where they stood on the Adequate Public Facilities Ordinance. Dr. Cronin said he had asked Dr. Rohr to make a presentation on this issue, and Dr. Cody indicated that they were preparing a written response rather than a presentation.

2. Mr. Ewing asked for a status report on the up-county program issue. He said there was a lot of community concern and confusion over where they were. This was due to the fact they had not scheduled time to take action on the task force report. In addition, there was confusion over the 2+2 proposal and the engineering proposal. People did not know whether that was intended to be a substitute for the one of the high schools planner or as the answer to the task force proposal. He hoped they could begin to clarify those matters. He remained skeptical about the 2+2 and the engineering program, but he was not skeptical about vocational education. He hoped people understood those were still in the form of proposals and that the Board had not endorsed anything. He still thought there needed to be an up-county special program. In the February 26 minutes there was a resolution to schedule a discussion/action item on the establishment of a special program in

the up-county area. However, that had not been scheduled. He had been pursuing it for a year and a half, and in his nearly 10 years on the Board he did not know of any issue delayed as often as that one. He asked when that would be scheduled. Dr. Cronin replied that the last session was the first session of the discussion about up-county programs. He pointed out that they did not have a recommendation from the superintendent and could not have an action session. Dr. Cody did not see any reason why they could not schedule another discussion. He said that they really didn't have a proposal yet but rather a preliminary outline of ideas that the staff had been working on. Mr. Ewing asked if there would be a staff response to the task force, and Dr. Cody assured him that there would be. Mr. Ewing hoped that they would not tie themselves in knots waiting for a recommendation from the superintendent because he might not recommend anything in the Area 3 Task Force Report. He said that because they had a resolution saying they would act on something he would propose a motion similar to the one adopted on Richard Montgomery.

3. Mrs. Praisner noted that the Board had received a letter from Mr. Hanna complimenting staff on the Master Plan for Educational Facilities. She asked that this be shared with appropriate staff.

4. Mrs. Praisner noted that the county executive, Council president, and Dr. Cronin had sent a letter to the IAC on the recommendations of the school construction task force. As a member of the task force in conjunction with Delegate Coughlin and Senator Kramer, she had also sent a letter to the IAC. She was concerned about the set-aside of 10 percent for mechanical systems which would take away from the inadequate amount for renovations and new schools. They also urged movement toward modification of the capacity formula for elementary schools.

5. Mrs. Praisner reported that the item on foreign languages was taken from the agenda because of the request for additional information which the Department of Educational Accountability was developing on the success of students as a measure of when they enrolled in foreign language programs.

6. Mrs. Praisner also reported the E2 review committee might not have a proposal for Board action at the July all-day meeting because they had asked for additional information from the state.

7. Mrs. Praisner said that three years ago she had the pleasure of introducing a proposal to fund a special alternative program for students in Area 3. The program was established at the secondary school level. She had received a copy of survey results expressing the satisfaction of parents, staff and students with that program. The program was located at Poolesville Junior-senior High School. She displayed a "Journey" T-shirt designed by students and given for such accomplishments as honor roll, perfect attendance and humanitarian efforts. She suggested that reporters visit the program at Poolesville.

8. Dr. Cronin asked if they had information on when the state would

provide materials on E2. Mr. Fess replied that the Board's attorney had indicated today that they had received some materials.

9. In regard to the E2 policy, Dr. Shoenberg said there was a piece of information that did not seem to be forthcoming. He asked about the behavior of students under the loss of credit policy as opposed to the E2 policy. He asked what percentage of grades were LC's as opposed to the percentage of grades that were E2's. Mrs. DiFonzo and Mrs. Slye reported that they both had asked for this information, and Mrs. DiFonzo said she was told that information did not exist. Mrs. Slye asked that staff look at the effectiveness of the policy on the most at risk learner if they were successful in getting this information.

10. Dr. Cronin pointed out that this was the last official business meeting for Dr. Shaffner who would be retiring. Dr. Shaffner replied that while he would miss the people, he would not miss the night meetings.

11. Dr. Floyd also noted that this was the last business meeting for John Foubert.

RESOLUTION NO. 374-86 Re: EXECUTIVE SESSION - JULY 7, 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 July 7, 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 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; and be it further

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

RESOLUTION NO. 375-86 Re: MINUTES OF APRIL 28, 1986

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Mrs.

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

RESOLVED, That the minutes of April 28, 1986, be approved.

RESOLUTION NO. 376-86 Re: MINUTES OF MAY 15, 1986

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

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

RESOLUTION No. 377-86 Re: MINUTES OF MAY 22, 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 May 22, 1986, be approved.

RESOLUTION NO. 378-86 Re: COMMENDATION OF ARDYTHE JONES

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

WHEREAS, Ardythe Jones has been committed to the concept of community use of schools long before it became public policy; and

WHEREAS, Ardythe Jones was instrumental in the establishment of the Interagency Coordinating Board for Community Use of Educational Facilities and Services (ICB); and

WHEREAS, Her ICB activities and her service to her own community as president of the E. Brooke Lee Intermediate School PTA exemplify the high quality of volunteer service in Montgomery County; and

WHEREAS, Ardythe Jones has served as a Board of Education representative on the ICB since its creation in 1978; and

WHEREAS, One June 30, 1986, Mrs. Jones will complete her service; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the Montgomery County Board of Education commends Mrs. Ardythe Jones for her active participation in the establishment and development of the Interagency Coordinating Board; and be it further

RESOLVED, That on behalf of the citizens of Montgomery County, the Board of Education extends its appreciation for the efforts and commitment made by Ardythe Jones toward the successful implementation of the goals of the Interagency Coordinating Board.

Re: NEW BUSINESS

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

RESOLVED, That the superintendent be requested to develop a feasibility study for a recreational summer camping experience for MCPS youngsters who are orthopedically, auditorially and visually handicapped; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the proposal cover such elements as:

- o the possibility of pairing or teaming youngsters with others who do not suffer the same disability such as an orthopedically handicapped child with a visually handicapped one
- o the possibility of pairing handicapped youngsters with nonhandicapped youngsters
- o the possible inclusion of an educational component although the summer camping experience would be primarily focused on a recreational theme so that youngsters may enjoy as normal a camping experience as possible
- o exploration of whether the program could be done strictly through MCPS or include other county agencies such as the Health Department and the Recreation Department
- o determination of which agency might be the one to implement and manage such a program

and be it further

RESOLVED, That the feasibility study cover such elements as the need for the program, the cost, the location, the positive and negative implications of the implementation of such a program, the length of the program, numbers and ages of children involved, and the legal implications; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the proposal and feasibility study be brought to the Board of Education for its consideration by November 1, 1986, so that if it is accepted, it can be implemented during the summer of 1987.

* Mrs. Praisner seconded the motion with the understanding that one of the possibilities might be that MCPS would not run the program and that another agency might.

2. Mr. Ewing noted that the Board had received the monthly financial report as an item of information. He asked when the Board would be taking action on reconciliation of the budget at the end of the fiscal year. Dr. Cody replied that they hoped to do this in August when the accounts were settled.

Re: ITEMS OF INFORMATION

Board members received the monthly financial report as a item of information.

Re: ADJOURNMENT

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

PRESIDENT

SECRETARY

WSC:mlw