



86-16	Audits of Independent Activity	
	Mr. Craig R. Casper, CPA	\$ 5,600
	Mrs. Judith A. Kellogg, CPA	5,600
	Mr. W. D. Poynter and Assoc., CPA	5,600
	Mr. Ronald D. Roush, CPA	5,600
	Mr. Carl L. Royster, CPA	5,600
	Mr. Benjamin Weinman, CPA	5,600
		-----
	TOTAL	\$ 33,600
145-86	Frozen Fish, Fruit Juices, Vegetables	
	Auth Sausage Co., Inc.	\$ 2,985
	Edward Boker Frosted Foods, Inc.	7,056
	Carroll County Foods	6,880
	Continental Smelkinson Co.	12,274
	Frederick Produce Co.	31,750
	Mazo-Lerch Co.	28,995
	Manassas Frozen Foods	2,184
	Quality Kitchen Corp.	2,363
	RMI Corp.	13,488
	A. W. Schmidt	1,842
		-----
	TOTAL	\$109,817
182-86	Lamps	
	C. N. Robinson Lighting Supply Co.	\$190,366
184-86	Cafeteria Disposable Supplies	
	Acme Paper and Supply Co.	\$ 45,709
	Thomas Buccheri and Sons, Inc.	3,791
	Calico Industries, Inc.	3,321
	Kahn Paper Co., Inc.	106,976
	Leonard Paper Co.	57,551
	Monumental Paper Co.	47,090
	Penny Plate, Inc.	44,081
		-----
	TOTAL	\$308,519
233-86	Optical Scanners	
	Chatsworth Data Corp.	\$ 45,000
	GRAND TOTAL	\$687,302

RESOLUTION NO. 391-86 Re: ASBESTOS REMOVAL AND REINSULATION AT  
VARIOUS SCHOOLS

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 July 2, 1986, for accomplishing asbestos removal and reinsulation at Bannockburn Elementary School, Westland Intermediate School, Viers Mill Elementary School, New Hampshire Estates Elementary School, and Rolling Terrace Elementary School, as indicated below:

BIDDER

1. TBN Associates, Inc. \$22,414 (A); \$55,314 (B); \$25,314 (C);  
\$20,592 (D); \$21,066 (E); \$145,336\* TOTAL Proposals A through E
2. Independent Asbestos Removal Services, Ltd. \$29, 125 (A);  
\$98,125 (B); \$47,058 (C); \$22,432 (D); \$35,876 (E); \$232,616  
TOTAL Proposals A through E

Proposal A - Bannockburn; Proposal B - Westland; Proposal C - Viers Mill; Proposal D - New Hampshire Estates; Proposal E - Rolling Terrace

\* Indicates acceptance of Proposals A through E

and

WHEREAS, Sufficient funds reside for project award; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That a contract be awarded to TBN Associates, Inc., in the amount of \$145,336, for accomplishing asbestos removal and reinsulation at Bannockburn Elementary School, Westland Intermediate School, Viers Mill Elementary School, New Hampshire Estates Elementary School, and Rolling Terrace Elementary School (Proposals A through E), in accordance with plans and specifications prepared by the Department of School Facilities dated June 25, 1986.

RESOLUTION NO. 392-86 Re: AWARD OF CONSTRUCTION CONTRACT - CEDAR GROVE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL, ALTERATIONS AND ADDITIONS (Area 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 26, 1986, for the Cedar Grove Elementary School alterations and additions as indicated below:

BIDDER	BASE BID
1. The McAlister-Schwartz Company \$7,784 (Deduct Alt.1); \$5,827 (Deduct Alt. 2); \$11,471 (Deduct Alt. 3); \$18,480 (Deduct Alt. 4); \$48,825 (Deduct Alt. 5); \$9,000 (Deduct Alt. 6); \$66,000 (Deduct Alt. 7); \$7,000 (Deduct Alt. 8); \$10,925 (Deduct Alt. 9)	*\$3,369,408
2. Dustin Construction, Inc. \$6,500 (Deduct Alt. 1); \$5,000 (Deduct Alt. 2); \$8,000 (Deduct Alt. 3); \$16,400 (Deduct Alt. 4); \$44,000 (Deduct Alt. 5); \$9,600 (Deduct Alt. 6); \$74,400 (Deduct Alt. 7); \$6,700 (Deduct Alt. 8); \$12,000 (Deduct Alt. 9)	\$3,497,000

- |    |   |             |
|----|---|-------------|
| 3. | Henley Construction   | \$3,524,000 |
|    | \$8,000 (Deduct Alt. 1); \$4,700 (Deduct Alt. 2);<br>\$10,000 (Deduct Alt. 3); \$13,400 (Deduct Alt. 4);<br>\$46,000 (Deduct Alt. 5); \$10,300 (Deduct Alt. 6);<br>\$63,000 (Deduct Alt. 7); \$6,500 (Deduct Alt. 8);<br>\$9,000 (Deduct Alt. 9)  |             |
| 4. | Waynesboro Construction Co., Inc.   | \$3,618,000 |
|    | \$12,500 (Deduct Alt. 1); \$5,000 (Deduct Alt. 2);<br>\$7,000 (Deduct Alt. 3); \$14,000 (Deduct Alt. 4);<br>\$3,500 (Deduct Alt. 5); \$9,400 (Deduct Alt. 6);<br>\$66,200 (Deduct Alt. 7); \$7,300 (Deduct Alt. 8);<br>\$2,100 (Deduct Alt. 9)    |             |
| 5. | Furman Builders, Inc.   | \$4,089,000 |
|    | \$8,016 (Deduct Alt. 1); \$4,750 (Deduct Alt. 2);<br>\$10,000 (Deduct Alt. 3); \$17,600 (Deduct Alt. 4);<br>\$46,500 (Deduct Alt. 5); \$9,414 (Deduct Alt. 6);<br>\$148,220 (Deduct Alt. 7); \$6,000 (Deduct Alt. 8);<br>\$13,822 (Deduct Alt. 9) |             |

\* Indicates acceptance of base bid

Description of Alternates:

- Deduct Alternate 1: Delete venetian blinds and projection screens
- Deduct Alternate 2: Delete wheel chair lift
- Deduct Alternate 3: Delete door number 68
- Deduct Alternate 4: Delete metal shelving
- Deduct Alternate 5: Delete unit kitchen and kitchen equipment
- Deduct Alternate 6: Substitute vinyl composition tile for synthetic floor surfacing
- Deduct Alternate 7: Delete casework
- Deduct Alternate 8: Delete third coat of paint
- Deduct Alternate 9: Delete concrete for "Exterior Assembly"

and

WHEREAS, The low bidder, The McAlister-Schwartz Company, has successfully performed similar projects; and

WHEREAS, Sufficient funds are available to effect award; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That a contract for \$3,369,408 be awarded to The McAlister-Schwartz Company, which indicates acceptance of the base bid to accomplish the requirements of the plans and specifications entitled, "Alterations and Additions to Cedar Grove Elementary School," dated June 4, 1986, prepared by Smolen/Rushing + Associates, Architect.

RESOLUTION NO. 393-86     Re:    AWARD OF CONSTRUCTION CONTRACT - JONES LANE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL (AREA 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 July 1, 1986, for the construction of Jones Lane Elementary School as indicated below:

BIDDER	BASE BID
1. Jesse Dustin & Son Inc. \$29,500 (Add Alt. 1); \$15,000 (Add Alt. 2); \$66,000 (Add Alt. 3); \$118,000 (Add Alt. 4); \$63,600 (Add Alt. 5); \$9,600 (Add Alt. 6); \$130,000 (Add Alt. 7); \$17,000 (Add Alt. 8) \$56,000 (Add Alt. 9)	\$4,548,000
2. Kimmel & Kimmel, Inc. \$47,700 (Add Alt. 1); \$15,600 (Add Alt. 2); \$72,600 (Add Alt. 3); \$120,000 (Add Alt. 4); \$51,900 (Add Alt. 5); \$9,900 (Add Alt. 6); \$141,200 (Add Alt. 7); \$15,900 (Add Alt. 8); \$63,200 (Add Alt. 9)	\$4,988,000
3. Henley Construction, Inc. \$45,000 (Add Alt. 1); \$19,700 (Add Alt. 2); \$65,000 (Add Alt. 3); \$118,000 (Add Alt. 4); \$54,000 (Add Alt. 5); \$9,800 (Add Alt. 6); \$117,000 (Add Alt. 7); \$17,000 (Add Alt. 8); \$48,000 (Add Alt. 9)	\$5,024,000
4. The Davis Corporation \$21,100 (Add Alt. 1); \$21,000 (Add Alt. 2); \$67,500 (Add Alt. 3); \$139,800 (Add Alt. 4); \$56,200 (Add Alt. 5); \$9,800 (Add Alt. 6); \$152,000 (Add Alt. 7); \$30,000 (Add Alt. 8); \$74,000 (Add Alt. 9)	\$5,346,365
5. Kora & Williams Corporation \$19,000 (Add Alt. 1); \$15,500 (Add Alt. 2); \$49,500 (Add Alt. 3); \$141,000 (Add Alt. 4); \$54,000 (Add Alt. 5); \$10,000 (Add Alt. 6); \$300,000 (Add Alt. 7); \$30,000 (Add Alt. 8); \$33,000 (Add Alt. 9)	\$5,525,500

Description of of Alternates:

Add Alternate 1: Building Canopies

Add Alternate 2: Operable Walls

Add Alternate 3: Skylights, gym cupola, classroom air exchange

Add Alternate 4: Air Conditioning

Add Alternate 5: Kitchen equipment, appliances and unit kitchen

Add Alternate 6: Athletic flooring

Add Alternate 7: Paving, landscaping, flagpoles, and miscellaneous site improvements

Add Alternate 8: Glazed CMU and corridor acoustic CMU

Add Alternate 9: Miscellaneous equipment

and

WHEREAS, The low bidder, Jesse Dustin & Son, Inc., has successfully performed similar projects; and

WHEREAS, Sufficient funds are available to effect award; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That a contract for \*\$4,913,700 be awarded to Jesse Dustin & Son, Inc., which indicates acceptance of the base bid, and add alternates 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, and 7 to accomplish the requirements of the plans and specifications entitled, "Jones Lane Elementary School," dated June 10, 1986, prepared by Grimm and Parker, Architect.

\*Indicates acceptance of base bid and alternates 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, and 7

RESOLUTION NO. 394-86 Re: CONTINUATION OF CONTRACT - ENERGY  
MANAGEMENT PROGRAM

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

WHEREAS, The Board of Education in FY 1978 awarded a contract to Computerized Electrical Energy Systems, Inc., now Complete Building Services, Inc., (CBS) to furnish and install an energy management computer and system; and

WHEREAS, CBS has agreed to extend the unit equipment prices quoted in its original bid with an agreement that equipment which has a cost lower than that quoted in the original bid will be provided at the new, lower cost; and

WHEREAS, CBS is the only vendor qualified to effect software/equipment changes to the computerized energy management system without nullifying the original equipment warranties; and

WHEREAS, CBS has performed satisfactorily under the existing contract; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the contract with Complete Building Services, Inc., for expansion of the computerized energy management system be extended from July 1, 1986, to June 30, 1987, to provide software and equipment maintenance services, and connect additional schools, at the Board's option, utilizing funds appropriated in the FY 1987 Capital Budget for this purpose.

RESOLUTION NO. 395-86 Re: UTILIZATION OF FY 1987 FUTURE SUPPORTED  
PROJECT FUNDS FOR THE INTENSIVE  
VOCATIONAL ENGLISH AND SKILLS PROGRAM

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

RESOLVED, That the superintendent of schools be authorized to receive and expend, within the FY 1987 Provision for Future Supported Projects, a \$29,855 grant award within the following categories from the Montgomery County Department of Social Services, Division of Family Resources, under the Immigration and Nationality Act Targeted Assistance for Refugees, Title IV, for the FY 1987 Intensive Vocational English and Skills for Refugees:

CATEGORY	AMOUNT
02 Instructional Salaries	\$26,500
03 Instructional Other	1,102
10 Fixed Charges	2,253
	-----
TOTAL	\$29,855

and be it further

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

RESOLUTION NO. 396-86 Re: TUITION FOR OUT-OF-COUNTY AND OUT-OF-STATE PUPILS FOR FY 1987

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

WHEREAS, Resolution 364-77 which established the basis for noncounty tuition charges provides that the per pupil cost shall be based on the current year's estimated cost, including debt service; and

WHEREAS, The basis for the calculation of cost per pupil for tuition purposes in FY 1987 is as follows:

	Kindergarten	Elementary	J/I/M Senior	Spec. Ed.
Est. No. of Pupils	7,148	37,766	45,203	4,360

Out-of-County Maryland Pupils

Cost:

Regular Program	\$22,748,673	\$156,575,634	\$217,992,088	\$37,119,454
Debt Service	593,462	6,271,033	7,505,945	723,977
	-----	-----	-----	-----
Total Cost	\$23,342,135	\$162,846,667	\$225,498,033	\$37,843,431

Cost Per Pupil:

Regular Program	\$	3,183	\$	4,146	\$	4,823	\$	8,514
Debt Service		83		166		166		166
<hr/>								
Total Cost	\$	3,266	\$	4,312	\$	4,989	\$	8,680

Out-of-State Pupils

Cost:

Regular Program	\$22,748,673	\$156,575,634	\$217,992,088	\$37,119,454
Debt Service	693,796	7,331,249	8,774,942	846,376
<hr/>				
Total Cost	\$23,442,469	\$163,906,883	\$226,767,030	\$37,965,830

Cost Per Pupil:

Regular Program	\$	3,183	\$	4,146	\$	4,823	\$	8,514
Debt Service		97		194		194		194
<hr/>								
Total Cost	\$	3,280	\$	4,340	\$	5,017	\$	8,708

Comparisons with Previous Year

	1985-86		1986-87	
	Out-of-County	Out-of-State	Out-of-County	Out-of-State
Kindergarten	\$2,873	\$2,891	\$3,266	\$3,280
Elementary	4,087	4,123	4,312	4,340
Mid./Jr./Sr.	4,546	4,582	4,989	5,017
Special Ed.	8,295	8,331	8,680	8,708

now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the tuition rates for out-of-county Maryland pupils and out-of-state pupils for the 1986-87 school year shall be:

	OUT-OF-COUNTY	OUT-OF-STATE
Kindergarten	\$3,266	\$3,280
Elementary	4,312	4,340
Middle/Junior/Senior	4,989	5,017
Special Education	8,680	8,708

Re: BOARD/PRESS/VISITOR CONFERENCE

The following individuals appeared before the Board of Education:

1. Robert Hopkins
2. Bruce Goldensohn
3. Melvin Laney
4. Scott Snider

RESOLUTION NO. 397-86 Re: MONTHLY PERSONNEL REPORT

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Dr. Shoenberg seconded by Mr. Ewing, 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. 398-86 Re: PERSONNEL REASSIGNMENT

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

RESOLVED, That the following personnel reassignment be approved:

NAME	FROM	TO
Frances Hendrickson	Classroom Teacher Bethesda Elem. M+30-18	Instructional Asst. (.5) School to be determined Effective July 1, 1986 Will maintain salary status and retire 7-1-88

RESOLUTION NO. 399-86 Re: PERSONNEL APPOINTMENTS AND REASSIGNMENT

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

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

APPOINTMENT	PRESENT POSITION	AS
Paul F. Scott, Jr.	Supervisor of Elem. In. Area 1 Admin. Office	Director of Minority Ed. Coordination Off. of the Supt. Grade O/P Effective July 8, 1986
Judy Patton	Assistant Principal Sligo Middle	Supervisor of Teacher Training Grade 0 Effective July 8, 1986
Rebecca K. Newman	Principal Regional Institute for Children and Adolescents (RICA)	Principal Mark Twain School Effective July 8, 1986
Phinnize J. Brown	Principal Cedarbrook Elem. School Plainfield BOE	Principal Takoma Park Elem. School Effective July 21, 1986

Plainfield, New Jersey

Janice M. Turpin	Development Specialist Washington Metro Area Transit A Washington, D.C.	Site Administrator Dept. of School Facil. Grade G Effective July 8, 1986
------------------	--	---

REASSIGNMENT                      FROM                                      TO

Lynn S. Bandy	Principal Monocacy ES	Assistant Principal School to be determined Effective July 8, 1986 Retirement July 1, 1988
---------------	--------------------------	---

RESOLUTION NO. 400-86    Re:    PERSONNEL APPOINTMENT

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Dr. Shoenberg seconded by Mrs. Slye, the following resolution was adopted with Dr. Cronin, Mr. Ewing, Dr. Shoenberg, and Mrs. Slye voting in the affirmative; Mrs. DiFonzo and Mrs. Praisner abstaining:  
RESOLVED, That the following personnel appointment be approved:

APPOINTMENT	PRESENT POSITION	AS
Linda H. Weber	Curriculum Specialist Intermediate Unit I California, Pennsylvania	Principal Burning Tree Elementary Effective July 21, 1986

Re:    ORGANIZATIONAL ISSUES AND MANAGEMENT  
PRINCIPLES

Dr. Cody reported that the memo before the Board would serve as a basis for his comments at a leadership conference of administrators and directors. He said that he and senior staff had been through a constructive process in recent months which started with the question of how to best organize the area offices. They had a study done by Peat, Marwick, and Mitchell, and their recommendations and those of principals had been discussed at length by the executive staff. At a retreat the executive staff came up with some alternatives of three ways of organizing area offices. In the midst of their discussion, they concluded they were having some trouble deciding on the basis for their choice. In a number of cases, they needed to clarify role and function. For example, they looked at the role of the area office and the role of the Office of Instruction and Program Development in implementation of curriculum. PMM had recommended reorganizing the area offices and then looking at role and function. The executive staff concluded it should be done the other way around.

The executive staff realized that organizations like school systems, private industries, and private businesses that were most successful had some common characteristics of general management principles. They next looked at management values to keep in mind as they dealt with questions of objectives, ways of determining success, and questions of role and function. They decided to ask for some help to

identify management principles which brought them to the document before the Board. A consultant provided a long list, and the administrative team and executive staff looked at the list which led to the draft document.

Tomorrow Dr. Cody would be making a presentation to principals and directors based on the document and would make some statements about how they applied these things in Montgomery County. The following day, the participants would be asked to engage in discussions about applications of these principles. During the next two or three months, he and staff would look at parts of the school system in terms of role and function. They needed to resolve some organizational issues such as coordination of pupil services activities, assignment of staff in the superintendent's office, and assignment of programs in the deputy's office. They needed to develop an annual process of schools and departments setting specific objectives on the same kind of cycle. They were to develop a series of criteria for how they would determine success in terms of schools. He thought that by the middle of next year he would be proposing some changes in the organization of the school system.

Dr. Shoenberg thought it would be difficult to take exception to the management principles suggested and asked about the points of debate. Dr. Cody replied that the issue was not whether or not these were believable. The issue was whether they prevailed as management principles and what did organizations do about these things. For example, it was not a consistent practice for organizations for every unit to have a specific set of objectives and ways of determining success in accomplishing those objectives.

Dr. Cody remarked that the last principle had to do with incentives and rewards. He said they might have principals and directors practicing these concepts, but as a school system they were not doing what organizations did. He was not talking about salary or money but rather other ways of recognizing success.

Dr. Shoenberg noted the second item on degrees of discretion in deciding methods to use to achieve results. At some point he would like a definition of what was meant by "discretion" and what goals and objectives were determinable by the school or the department which were determined in other places. Dr. Cody indicated that after his presentation he would provide the Board with a copy of his speech. He did not think they could operate as a confederation of 150 plus independent units. He was pleased about the receptivity of local school staffs to the substitute days they provided. Dr. Shoenberg said they were talking about things that had to do with the way the Board set policy and the way in which management behaved. It did have to do with an attitude and an understanding that pervades the school system. It was an area in which the superintendent and Board would have to work together to set that tone. He suggested they devote some time to talk about this.

Mrs. Slye pointed out the fifth principle on prizing and promoting innovation and creativity. She said that the paper went on to say,

"it must remain open to new opportunities for success, recognizing that educated risks are necessary to continuing success...." She said they needed to create a climate that would tolerate risk in the search of more creative solutions. The degree of clarity they used in articulating these principles became an issue. She felt that they had an excellent summary of the characteristics of excellent organizations, but she wondered how specifically they could state these and what their next steps were in moving in that direction. Dr. Cody said that the leadership had to continually articulate these concepts and apply them in many different ways.

Mr. Ewing commented that this was a good summary of management literature on excellent organizations. It had the same disability that the literature had because it was not specific to their particular circumstance. While it was not a problem yet, it would become a difficulty when they attempted to apply it. He noted that in several places in the paper there was discussion of what needed to happen not only in terms of expectations for success and giving people some discretions and flexibility in achieving goals but also in terms of accountability and measuring success. Management literature made clear that organizations needed goals, but they also needed ways of measuring the extent to which they achieved those goals. If they did not have a way of assuring and measuring accountability, they would not succeed.

Mr. Ewing said that in the school system they heard a great deal about the need for flexibility and delegation, but they did not hear anyone saying they needed to reemphasize their commitment to accountability and measuring success. He suggested they had to figure out a way to do that systematically. He would prefer some additional emphasis on that in the list of management principles.

Mr. Ewing said he had another point, one that he made over nine years ago. One of the things the school system needed to do was to figure out how it expected to deliver its products. In the private sector there were descriptions of the way in which people worked as teams. In MCPS they had one model, and that was the committee. He felt that there were lots of other good models. He said that one of the things that organizations hated was the "relay race" or handing things off because people did not like to be required to specify what it was they had done and what the next step in the process ought to be and what the next group should do with it. That required a great deal more trust and a great deal more creativity and specificity. He thought that was a better model for MCPS.

It seemed to Mr. Ewing that it was important that people knew what it was for which they were responsible and what the expectations were for them. He thought that was another good principle. If people knew that, it could be communicated outside the school system, and they were not very good about communicating outside the system. He agreed that they should talk about principles and then derive from those principles the actions that need to be taken. He thought that if they were committed to this approach the consequence would be that they would think that organizational change was much less important

than it was believed to be.

Mrs. DiFonzo commented that when she had finished reading the paper she had written a note stating that it read like apple pie and motherhood. If they were able to achieve all of these things, they would be the best organization in the entire universe. The problem to her was how they did these things, how they knew when they had achieved them, and how did they sustain them.

Mrs. DiFonzo reported that at the secondary administrators conference, someone had stated that people in education did not celebrate their successes. They were so busy meeting the next goal that they did not stop to celebrate the success that they had made. She did not think that they did enough positive reinforcement. They did have some of that with their recognition evening and the BULLETIN; however, this was one thing that they could do which would not cost a great deal of money. She recalled that when Takoma Park Intermediate improved its math scores they had a party to celebrate. She suggested that this was something that they could do.

Mrs. DiFonzo noted that in regard to the item on creativity there was a fine line they had to walk because some people would hear "innovative" and say "dynamic." Other people would hear "innovative" and say "experimentation with children." They had to assure that there was structure to the creativity, but it did not have to have everyone marching to the same little drummer. The problem was how they did all of this, how did they know they had achieved it, and how did they sustain it. Dr. Cody commented that each principle could be applied in many ways in Montgomery County. There was no one way to handle recognitions and rewards, but principals and others could exchange ideas. He said that the dissemination of ideas on all of these things would serve them extremely well.

Mrs. Praisner said she had been involved in a similar process in a large government institution which developed similar goals and values. She thought the value of this for employees was the extent to which they were part of the process of developing the strategies and the extent to which it was viewed as something with long-term meaning and commitment. She indicated that she would be most interested in the next steps and the involvement of smaller units in the system. She was also interested in the comments of staff members when this was discussed.

Dr. Cody said that these should become part of language of articulation and advocacy by the Board, superintendent, and senior staff over and over again. There would be continuing activities of units involved in objectives and measures of success. This would become part of a whole series of ongoing tasks.

Dr. Cronin said he was looking for a transition between the values on the first page to the individual managers in the system. He wanted to see how they were going to communicate to them the value of change in their particular job. For example, why would the lead dog want to change positions? If individual managers had particular styles of

leadership, he wondered how they would articulate for that manager the value of change of their personal style of management. He said that at the recent secondary administrators conference, there was a discussion on discipline. Some principals did not know what the other schools were going. These people felt they needed more opportunity to talk to each other.

Dr. Cronin called attention to the first sentence in number seven which stated, "people perform better when they can determine what knowledge and skills are needed to do their work now and in the future and when they have a variety of opportunities and means for acquiring them." He asked how they did that in evaluating teachers and staff without having the evaluation also become a threatening mechanism.

Dr. Cody reported that part of tomorrow's afternoon program was a personalized staff development program for 200 people. It was linked to the perception of coworkers and staff members on strengths and weaknesses. This would be handled confidentially, and the individual administrator would select the specific things he or she wanted to work on during the following year to improve. He noted that much of their staff development in MCPS was group activity. They did not do much on individual improvement. For example, he had heard positive comments about the program that allowed staff to visit other schools. They were long on very good group staff development programs, but they were very short on individualized programs. For example, they did not support their staff members to go to conferences or see what was happening in other places.

Dr. Cody stated that he would provide the Board with more details and more information and schedule another discussion on the topic.

Re: REPORT ON NEED FOR J/I/M LEVEL  
ALTERNATIVE PROGRAM

Dr. Cody reported that this topic came out of a budget work session when a question arose about the need for a specialized program for J/I/M students in regular and special schools. The Board had received a summary report on the magnitude of the problems and the conclusion that students would be better served by additional specialized programs in the regular school buildings and by specialized programs outside. In preparation for budget planning, he would prepare a more detailed plan.

Mrs. Praisner thanked staff for the list of current programs. As she understood it, staff would be preparing a detailed program description for a program next year. She asked whether the program would be at one site or more than one site. She wanted to know whether it would be a pilot or based on an existing program. Dr. Hiawatha Fountain, associate superintendent, understood that the report would generate an open discussion rather than having staff come with a preconceived idea. Mrs. Praisner stated that staff had identified problems and issues that needed to be addressed. She said that the Journey program for nonspecial education students with low

self-esteem might be the kind of program they were talking about. However, they might need a program for students with emotional problems or drug-related problems. It seemed to her they might be talking about a variety of programs. She asked whether the alternative would be for the whole junior high school experience or for a short period of time with the expectation that the student would return to the regular school. She said she would like to know about Banneker's program and how they were using that one teacher. She commented that they had a range of needs, and she did not know whether it was possible to identify one program to satisfy all those needs.

Dr. Fountain reported that as they talked with principals and pupil personnel workers, the suggestion was made to look at students in the upper elementary schools who were exhibiting some of the beginnings of these problems. They had a group of J/I/M students who would be helped by in-school programs, and then they had a hard core of students needing an off-site experience. Dr. Cody stated that they needed the help of the staff to define that "hard core."

Ms. Lib Boone, principal of Banneker Junior High School, reported that DEA had done a study of the six positions in the budget last year. She understood that each principal chose to use the position a little differently based on their school needs and populations. At Banneker they were able to meet the needs of a number of students who were not handicapped but were finding difficulty in being successful in a middle level setting. There were a small number within that population who were still not successful, and in some cases they were able to move these students to Mark Twain, RICA, or one of the alternative programs. Some students were not eligible for handicapped services but still needed help, and she thought this was the one percent the principals identified. She felt that an alternative program based at the school level was critical, and she appreciated the support the Board had given to that. This enabled them to keep a certain population out of the handicapped condition. She reported that while there could have been some drug and alcohol overlay, the problem was more significantly impacted by character disorders or dysfunctional family situations. This one percent could be helped by an out-of-school based program.

Ms. Joan Monaco, pupil personnel worker, stated that the models all had one thing in common which was to give youngsters another way of looking at the world and taking an interest in school. It was building up a self-concept in students that they could learn something.

Dr. Cody stated that he was familiar with a program that had a simplified course content which had as a major portion, applications. For older students, it was work, and for young students, it was a project that resulted in a product. It had a low staff ratio of seven or eight to one, and the school was kept at 75 to 80 students to create a small sense of family. That smallness and teaching style provided support and encouragement to calm the students down. After a year or two, the students were able to return to their regular school.

Mrs. DiFonzo reported that in her visits to alternative programs the one constant theme made by students was that they were lost in high school because it was too big. These students liked the alternative programs because of the almost personal relationship they established with adults and other students. When these students developed coping skills and self-assurance, they were able to go back into the mainstream and handle the stress and strain of a large school. She thought they were going to be talking about a program of 20 to 30 youngsters, and the superintendent had been talking about a school.

Dr. Cronin commented that before they could define what they were looking for, they had to analyze the problem and look at the varieties of solutions. Then they could come back in with a program recommendation. He noted that the original question had been raised in connection with drug and alcohol, which had now been broadened.

Dr. Richard Towers, director of interagency, alternative and supplementary programs, thought there was general agreement among school based staff that at this age the problems were interrelated. The same precursors to suicidal behavior, teenage pregnancy, drug abuse, disruptive behavior, etc. were very similar. Students became alienated because of their personality or because of the circumstances they grew up in. Dr. Cronin explained that he was interested in junior high school because students started to unravel when they got to this age. A program could be one of the ways to reexamine what they did in junior high schools.

Dr. Cody suggested that they consider defining the population as students who demonstrate these behaviors and have multiple problems. Dr. Towers stated that as one looked at the alternatives programs across the country there were many variations on a few themes. These programs had low pupil/teacher ratios, personalization, basic coping skills, learning how to communicate, and learning how to make decisions. These would affect students whether it was a drug problem, disruptive behavior or truancy. If they could get students at the ages of 10 to 14 and teach them life skills, they would save themselves a lot of grief. In regard to the 180 students mentioned, he noted that not all of them were sitting out there totally neglected because some of them might have come to the attention of the Juvenile Court. In terms of the scope of the problem, he reported that Fairfax had just started a school for junior high school students and Frederick had started one a year ago.

Mrs. Slye stated that the PPWs had mentioned prevention and early intervention, and she wondered if they had specific suggestions. Mr. Michael Graban, pupil personnel worker, thought that staffing such as alternative teachers within the building could help some of those youngsters needing that support before they had to be placed in an alternative program. They should also look at counselor intervention in the elementary school. In addition, they should focus on the need of the family. The programs he had seen that were effective worked with the school and kept that communication open.



RESOLVED, That the Montgomery County Council and the county executive be given copies of this resolution and urged to approve the request.

Re: NEXT STEPS ON RETURN OF TESTS POLICY

Dr. Pitt explained that their objective was to send the policy out for comment and schedule it for action in August. Board members reviewed the proposed policy and made suggestions for changes. Dr. Cronin indicated that the policy would be scheduled for Board action on August 25.

Re: BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS

1. Mrs. Praisner asked for information on the status of the county executive's response to the Board's request to reclaim school sites.
2. Mrs. Praisner said that the information she had received about the Adequate Public Facilities Ordinance was very useful, but she was interested in knowing whether they had had any cases recently similar to the case in the Kennedy area where staff following Board guidelines recommended denial and the Planning Board decided not to accept the recommendation.
3. Mrs. Praisner asked staff to check on the school construction recommendations that had come out since the Board wrote its last letter. There was reference again to the eligible expenditures, but there was no reference to percentage of state funds being set aside for systemic renovations. She wondered if this had been dropped, and she asked staff to check as to whether that was still an issue. If they were still going to say that 10 percent of the funds for school construction should be set aside, she would suggest that prior to July 18 the Board write a letter again raising a concern about that issue.
4. Mr. Ewing wanted a clarification about Broad Acres, Cresthaven and other Springbrook schools. There was a letter to the cluster coordinators dated June 26 which spoke to some plans for those two schools for this fall and said that they would look at school needs in terms of the capital improvements program. He asked if they would be looking at all the Springbrook schools this summer and fall, and Dr. Cody replied that they would. Mr. Ewing hoped that this was clear to the Springbrook cluster coordinators, and Dr. Cody thought they were involved in coming up with proposals for solutions.
5. Mr. Ewing recalled that in the past when they had closed schools they had sometimes transferred them under state law to the county government when there was no longer a school or educational use. Sometimes because of debt service, they had leased them to the county government. This had been a low-grade issue and was worrisome because of its lack of resolution with respect to uses of those schools and the responsibility for those schools. He asked about the number of schools they had not fully transferred but only leased, which ones they were, the terms of the leases, and whether there were any issues there that needed to be resolved.

6. Dr. Cronin reported that it was a pleasure attending the Secondary Principals' meeting. He only wished that there had been more time to get into substantive issues.

7. Dr. Cronin requested an assurance that Walter Johnson High School had functional air conditioning. He asked that when they finally had an air conditioning contract that they select a company that could handle the varieties of air conditioning that they had in MCPS.

RESOLUTION NO. 402a-86 Re: EXECUTIVE SESSION - JULY 21, 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 21, 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. 402b-86 Re: MINUTES OF MAY 13, 1986

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

RESOLVED, That the minutes of May 13, 1986, be approved.

RESOLUTION NO. 403-86 Re: RECREATIONAL SUMMER CAMP FOR THE PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED

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

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.

RESOLUTION NO. 404-86 Re: APPOINTMENT TO THE INTERAGENCY  
COORDINATING BOARD

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

WHEREAS, Montgomery County Council Bill No. 43-78, enacted October 17, 1978, created a School Facilities Utilization Act by adding a new Article 1 to Chapter 44, title "Schools and Camps," of the Montgomery County Code (1972 edition, as amended); and

WHEREAS, This act created The Interagency Coordinating Board for Community Use of Educational Facilities and Services; and

WHEREAS, The Interagency Coordinating Board's nine members include the chief administrative officer of the County Government, superintendent of schools, president of Montgomery College, a member of the County Planning Board, staff director of the County Council,

two citizens appointed by the county executive and confirmed by the County Council, and two citizens appointed by the superintendent and confirmed by the Board of Education; and

WHEREAS, Mrs. Ardythe Jones has served as a Board of Education citizen member since October 23, 1978; and

WHEREAS, Mrs. Jones has retired from membership on the ICB; and  
WHEREAS, A new citizen member is needed to serve on the ICB; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That on recommendation of the superintendent of schools, the Board confirms the appointment of the following citizen member of the ICB, effective immediately for a two-year term ending on June 30, 1988:

Mrs. Linda Burgin, 9217 Paddock Lane, Potomac, MD 20854

and be it further

RESOLVED, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the Montgomery County Council, county executive, the director of Community Use of Educational Facilities and Services, and to members of the Interagency Coordinating Board for Community Use of Educational Facilities and Services.

Re: ITEMS OF INFORMATION

Board members received the following items of information:

1. Items in Process
2. Construction Progress Report
3. Status of Adequate Public Facilities Ordinance and Related Growth Management and Legislation
4. Progress Report on Priorities, Initiatives and Special Projects

Re: ADJOURNMENT

The president adjourned the meeting at 11:25 p.m.

-----  
President

-----  
Secretary

WSC:mlw