



WHEREAS, The school food service provided to students, faculties, and others is an integral part of the operation of the Montgomery County Public Schools; and

WHEREAS, School food service personnel deserve to be recognized for their dedication and continuing commitment to feeding students and providing a wide variety of nutritional food to other Montgomery County citizens; and

WHEREAS, William Donald Schaefer, Governor of the State of Maryland, has proclaimed Wednesday, May 13, 1987, as the Second Annual Salute to School Food Service Personnel Day; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education declare May 13, 1987, as the Second Annual Salute to School Food Service Personnel Day in the Montgomery County Public Schools; and be it further

RESOLVED, That this resolution be included in the minutes of this meeting.

Re: PRESENTATION OF CERTIFICATES OF  
OUTSTANDING SERVICE

On behalf of the Board of Education and the staff, Dr. Cody presented certificate of outstanding service to cafeteria managers and workers as follows: Marguerite Orndorff, Kensington/Parkwood; Helen King, Forest Knolls; Mary Ellen Burdette, Monocacy; Dorothy Bailey, Sherwood Elementary; Virginia McGowen, Wheaton High School; and Barbara Jackson; Montgomery Blair.

Re: PROPOSED POLICY ON NONRESIDENT TUITION  
AND ENROLLMENT

Mrs. DiFonzo moved and Dr. Cronin seconded the following:

WHEREAS, The Maryland Constitution directs the General Assembly to establish a "...System of Free Public Schools"; and

WHEREAS, Section 7-101(a) of the State Law provides that "all individuals who are 5 years old or older and under 21 shall be admitted free of charge to the public schools of this State"; and

WHEREAS, Section 7-301(a) provides that "Each child who resides in this State and is 6 years or older and under 16 shall attend a public school regularly..."; and

WHEREAS, The State Board of Education has concluded that the legislative intent of the education laws permits the charging of tuition to students whose parents or legal guardians are not residents of the State; and

WHEREAS, The State Board of Education has further concluded that the county Boards of Education are empowered to require that students

attending their schools be residents of their particular county; and

WHEREAS, The Department of Educational Accountability has examined MCPS policy and administrative procedures in its REPORT ON ENROLLMENT AND TUITION PROCEDURES FOR NONRESIDENT STUDENTS; and

WHEREAS, The superintendent of schools has made recommendations for changes in the MCPS policy and procedures, based on the report and discussions with staff and the Board of Education; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That Board Resolution 865-79, October 9, 1979, and Board Resolution 662-82, August 23, 1982, be rescinded; and be it further RESOLVED, That the following policy statement be adopted:

#### NONRESIDENT TUITION AND ENROLLMENT

##### A. Purpose

To establish the criteria for identification and the process for enrollment and tuition payments of students whose parents or legal guardians are nonresidents of Montgomery County.

##### B. Process and Content

###### 1. Resident Students

All qualified school-age persons, whether U.S. citizens or noncitizens, who have an established bona fide residence in Montgomery County shall be considered resident students and shall be admitted free to the Montgomery County Public Schools.

Bona fide residence is one's actual residence, maintained in good faith, and does not include a temporary or superficial residence established for the purpose of free school attendance in the Montgomery County Public Schools.

However, an intent to reside indefinitely or permanently at the present place of residence is not necessarily required. Determination of a person's bona fide residence is a factual one and must be made on an individual basis. In determining a bona fide residence in Montgomery County, the following criteria shall apply:

- a. The bona fide residence of a qualified school student who is under 18 years of age and not emancipated is the bona fide residence of both or one of the child's parents. If the parents live apart, the child's bona fide residence is the bona fide residence of (1) the parent to whom legal custody is awarded or (2) if legal custody is not awarded, the parent with whom the child regularly lives.
- b. A qualified school-age student who is 18 years of age or older and essentially self-supporting or an emancipated minor may establish a bona fide residence in Montgomery County without regard to the residency of the parents.
- c. A qualified school-age student residing with a court-appointed guardian who has an established bona fide residence in Montgomery County shall be considered a resident student provided that the guardianship was

obtained for necessary reasons concerning the child and not for the primary purpose of avoiding nonresident tuition or for the convenience of the persons involved. Examination of the reasons for obtaining guardianship must also be done on an individual basis. The determination should be based on documentation which establishes that the student is in a crisis situation. A crisis is defined as the acute situation where the general welfare of the child is in jeopardy due to unforeseeable and uncontrollable circumstances, which may include abuse or neglect, financial deprivation of the child, health or serious illness of the child's parent(s) or guardian(s), abandonment of the child, or other extremely undesirable and uncontrollable conditions in the home of the child's parent(s) or guardian(s).

- d. A qualified school-age student placed in a group home or foster home in Montgomery County by the Department of Social or Juvenile Services of Montgomery County, the State of Maryland, or any other agency specified in Section 4-120.1 of the Education Article of the Maryland Code shall be considered a resident student. (For student placements qualifying under Section 4-120.1, the Montgomery County Public Schools is eligible for reimbursement of actual educational expenses by another Local Educational Agency or the State of Maryland.)

2. Nonresident Students

All qualified school-age persons, whether U.S. citizens or noncitizens, who do not have an established bona fide residence in Montgomery County, as specified in Section B.1., shall be considered nonresident students. This category of nonresident students shall include, not but necessarily be limited to, the following students:

- a. A qualified school-age student under 18 years of age who is living in Montgomery County with friends or relatives who are not parents or court-appointed guardians.
- b. A qualified student placed in a group home or foster home located in Montgomery County by an agency other than those specified in Section B.1.d.
- c. A qualified student who is a resident of another educational jurisdiction, but who elects to seek enrollment in a Montgomery County public school.

Before a nonresident student is enrolled in the Montgomery County Public Schools, tuition shall be charged and paid unless an exception is granted under the terms of Section B.3.

3. Tuition Exceptions

Nonresident students shall be admitted without their paying tuition if any of the following circumstances applies:

- a. The nonresident student has an established bona fide residence in a Maryland county adjacent to Montgomery County, the Montgomery County public school is the

nearest school, and the county in which the student has a bona fide residence pays the tuition.

- b. Documentation is provided which establishes that the parent(s) or guardian(s) of the nonresident student have definite plans to establish a bona fide residence in Montgomery County, but for reasons beyond their control cannot establish such a residence prior to enrolling the student in a Montgomery County public school. Such a "grace period" for establishing residency shall not exceed 60 calendar days from the date of the student's enrollment or the first day of the school year, whichever is later. If a bona fide residence is not established by the end of the 60-day period, no extension shall be granted. Tuition shall be paid, or the student will no longer be permitted to attend school (See Section B.6.f. regarding tuition payment plans for nonresident situations anticipated to be of less duration than a full semester.)
- c. The nonresident student is a participant in an exchange program approved by the Montgomery County Board of Education; holds a valid J visa; and has completed plans made with a sponsoring family residing in Montgomery County, the principal of the receiving school, and the International Student Admissions Office.
- d. Under unusual and extraordinary circumstances, and with full documentation of the situation, the Residency and Tuition Review Committee may grant a special exception and waive tuition for a nonresident student. Any such case(s) shall be individually described in the superintendent's annual report to the Board of Education on the status of nonresident students and tuition payments.

4. Admission Exceptions

Regardless of their willingness to pay tuition, nonresident students shall be denied admission to the Montgomery County Public Schools if any of the following conditions exist:

- a. The school in which the nonresident student requests to enroll is closed to MCPS students transfers under the terms (e.g., space available or racial balance) of Board of Education Policy JEE: STUDENT TRANSFERS and MCPS Regulation JEE-RA: TRANSFER OF STUDENTS.
- b. The student is not of school age or has completed graduation requirements for a high school diploma.
- c. The student does not meet the enrollment criteria of the Montgomery County Public Schools for resident students.
- d. Necessary documentation or enrollment information required by the Montgomery County Public Schools under this or other policies and administrative regulations is not provided and kept current.
- e. Written evidence is not provided to show that the required tuition fee has been paid in advance, a tuition payment plan has been approved and the first

- payment made, or a waiver of tuition has been approved.
  - f. The student is a danger to himself/herself or to others.
  - g. Other cause is shown to deny admission.
5. Tuition Rates
- Tuition rates shall be established annually by the Board of Education upon the recommendation of the superintendent of schools, based on the following criteria:
- a. For kindergarten, grades 1-6, junior/intermediate/middle schools, and senior high school, the full-year tuition rate shall equal the estimated average per-pupil cost, including debt service, and shall reflect as nearly as possible the actual cost of educating students at each of these grade levels.
  - b. For students whose tuition rate is established under Section B.5.a., but who receive additional special services, such as instruction in English as a second language, the regular full-year tuition rate for the appropriate grade level may be increased by the estimated cost of providing the additional service(s).
  - c. For special education students, the full-year tuition rate shall reflect as nearly as possible the actual cost of educating these students, including debt service, based on educational and special services provided.
  - d. The rate of tuition for the children of full-time MCPS employees who reside outside of Montgomery County shall be one-half the rate for other nonresident students at the comparable grade and service level.
  - e. Full-year tuition rates may be prorated for students whose period of nonresidency is less than a full school year.
  - f. Tuition paid in advance for any period of enrollment for which it is subsequently determined that the student was a resident student or was otherwise entitled to a waiver of tuition shall be refunded on a prorated basis.
6. Responsibilities
- a. Parents, guardians, or students who have reached the age of majority are responsible for signing an affidavit as to their bona fide residence or nonresidence in Montgomery County as a prerequisite to a student's initial enrollment in the Montgomery County Public Schools and an acknowledgment that tuition will be paid for any period(s) of nonresidency, even if the period(s) of nonresidency should occur or be identified after the date of initial enrollment.
  - b. The school principal or designee (or the International Student Admissions Office for noncitizens) is responsible for making the initial determination of the residency status of students who seek enrollment in a Montgomery County public school and, based on that determination, for taking the appropriate administrative steps specified in MCPS regulations.

- c. The residency and tuition administrator is responsible for (1) coordinating the process described in this policy and any implementing administrative regulations; (2) expediting the processing of individual cases, especially when the parent(s) or guardian(s) desires immediate enrollment for the student; (3) serving as secretary of the Residency and Tuition Review Committee; (4) maintaining necessary records; and (5) preparing required reports.
- d. The Residency and Tuition Review Committee is responsible for determining the residency and tuition status of all students referred to it by the individual schools or the International Student Admissions Office. The committee shall be appointed by the deputy superintendent of schools and be composed of at least three members.
- e. The Department of Financial Services is responsible for collecting all tuition, based on tuition status information provided by the residency and tuition administrator.
- f. The deputy superintendent of schools (or designee) is responsible for approving tuition payment plans, which shall be granted only on an exception basis for one of the following reasons:
  - (1) The financial circumstances of the parent/guardian/eligible student limit their ability to pay the full amount of tuition in advance.
  - (2) The period of nonresidency is reasonably anticipated to be for a period of less than a semester, and it would be an unnecessary burden on the parent/guardian/eligible student to demand full tuition in advance.
- g. The superintendent of schools is responsible for development of the necessary administrative regulations to implement this policy.

7. Appeals

Decisions made under this policy and any implementing administrative regulations may be appealed under the provisions of MCPS Regulation KLA-RA: RESOLVING CITIZEN INQUIRIES, COMPLAINTS, AND APPEALS. The superintendent may designate a hearing officer to hear residency and tuition appeal cases.

C. Review and Reporting

- 1. The superintendent shall provide a report to the Board of Education at least annually regarding the status of nonresident students and tuition payments. Each special exception case in which tuition is waived under the terms of Section B.3.d. shall be individually described in the report.
- 2. This policy will be reviewed every three years in accordance with the Board of Education policy review process.

Re: NONRESIDENT TUITION

Mr. Clifford M. Baacke, director of the Division of Administrative Analysis and Audits, described the differences between the present policy and the proposed policy. Mrs. Praisner asked if the attorneys had reviewed the proposed policy, and Mr. Baacke replied that they had not seen the final version which had been amended to reflect budget action. Dr. Pitt agreed that the attorneys would have to reexamine the latest version. Mrs. Praisner suggested it would be appropriate to share the policy with the principals' association.

Dr. Shoenberg reported that one of the points of controversy had been about certain categories of noncitizens who were determined to be residents of the county for tuition purposes. He asked if the new policy and/or regulations addressed this issue. Mr. Baacke replied that the most significant change was in the F-1 student visas. The regulation tightened the process enormously, and the staff had already begun phasing in those new procedures.

Mr. Alberto Reluzco, supervisor of the International Student Admissions Office, stated that an educational institution must issue an I-20 certificate of eligibility before Immigration gave students an F-I visa. If a student obtained an I-20 from Montgomery County, the chances were that the student would be admitted in the country with an F-I visa. They now had new conditions before a student could obtain an I-20. For example, if the student wanted to attend a school closed to transfer, the I-20 would not be issued. If the student were not proficient in English, no I-20 would be issued. In addition, the sponsor was obligated to pay tuition for an I-20 to be given. He said at the end of last year they had issued about 120 I-20's, and to date, this year they had issued about four or five. Dr. Pitt added that the F-I visa was used when a young person was coming to this country to be a student, was able to study in their schools, and was able to pay tuition.

Dr. Shoenberg asked about children admitted who were in the "crisis" category and asked if they were handling that differently. Dr. Hiawatha Fountain, associate superintendent, said that this was described in the proposed policy; however, this was an administrative judgment. If they had appeals, this was one place where they would occur. Dr. Pitt commented that although they could define "crisis" to some extent, it was almost impossible to cover all circumstances. Dr. Cronin asked how they could determine a school was closed to transfers. Mr. Reluzco explained that when a student asked for an I-20, they had to have a sponsor living in Montgomery County. That sponsor's residence determined the schools the student would be attending.

In regard to crisis issues, Dr. Cronin commented that one issue was "financial deprivation" and wondered how this was determined. Dr. Fountain explained that it might be a divorce with the wife moving into the District or another county and receiving public assistance, yet wanting to have the child finish out the school year. He would grant a waiver until the end of the school year because the mother could not afford the tuition.

Dr. Shoenberg stated that the controversial situation was when a child came from another country where there was turmoil, where there was a claim the child was in danger, and where they did not have a good way of documenting this. He wondered if they envisioned guidelines for that judgment. Dr. Fountain replied that many times a student could only get out of the country on an F-I visa and would be sent to a relative or friend in Montgomery County. They would come to the International Students Admissions Office and attempt to enroll. Mr. Reluzco explained that if a student came with an F-I visa not issued through the Montgomery County I-20, the student would not be admitted to MCPS. Dr. Fountain added that this was a change in recent months. However, he didn't know what they were doing when the child came in without papers. Dr. Pitt added that this was an area they needed to discuss; however, it was his understanding that if a person was an illegal alien and a resident of the county, the courts had ruled the child was to get an education. Dr. Shoenberg commented that he was asking these questions because they had been raised by other people. It was not that he did not trust the judgment of people involved because he did trust them.

Dr. Pitt remarked that in terms of the student visa they had closed the loophole that people were concerned about, but in terms of crisis, this was always a judgment call. For example, if a person did not have papers, they would allow the youngster to register in school. Dr. Frankel added that they had checked with the INS to see whether or not the school system had an obligation to notify them, and they had been told there was no obligation to notify them. Mr. Ewing thought that they had to discuss this and determine how they were going to handle cases where there were no papers, incomplete papers, or no adults responsible for the child.

Dr. Pitt stated that their rule would be to admit that youngster. Mr. Ewing thought it was important that their attorneys look at this issue. It was important to know what state school law had to say on this subject and whether MCPS was consistent with state law. He remarked that related to his was the issue of not having someone doing this full time. They would not have the capacity to investigate and get documentation. They were going to have to make judgments, and he did not see much option to that unless they could find some money for this function. It should be upfront that they were not going to investigate these cases and were going to make judgments based on the evidence in front of them. Dr. Pitt was not sure they would have the ability to investigate even if they had the one position. Mrs. Praisner added that even if they had the personnel, there was documentation that would be impossible to obtain.

Dr. Cronin asked if they had a language requirement. Dr. Pitt replied that when they were talking about a student visa they were talking about someone who wanted to study in the United States. If that student could not speak English, MCPS was not going to provide further resources and would charge tuition. However, if the person was a resident of Montgomery County and did not speak English, the

school system had a moral and legal obligation to provide the person with an education. Dr. Pitt said that someone coming into the county and applying for citizenship would be taught by the school system. Mr. Ewing had raised the question of illegal residence. Their stance had been if the person met the residence criteria based on the Supreme Court decision and on what they had been told in the past by their attorneys, they had an obligation to educate that child.

Mrs. DiFonzo recalled that some time ago there was a concern that students not being granted tuition waivers would not attend school at all. She asked about how big this problem was. Mr. Reluzco replied that a student living with his or her parents in Montgomery County would be admitted. A number of students did not have all the documentation and would be put on hold. Staff made an effort to reach out to those students to find out if they had additional information or if their situation had changed. Yesterday, he had sent letters to 192 individuals asking that they complete information needed to admit them to Montgomery County.

Mrs. DiFonzo recalled that she had a call from people who were having a house built in the county, and when they applied for a waiver, the permission was given because they were in the process of moving into the county. However by the end of the semester, the house was not completed. The mother contended she had a letter from MCPS saying the tuition had been waived for a year, but had received a letter asking for tuition. She asked if this situation happened often. Dr. Fountain said that one time this did happen, and it was their mistake, so MCPS gave the waiver. In the past the grace period had been flexible, but now they were saying 60 days or the parents had to pay.

Mrs. DiFonzo called attention to page 5 and asked that the wording be clarified. Mr. Baacke assured her that they would reword the sentence. Mr. Ewing asked if he was interpreting the section on the role of the principal that the principal made the determination when there was no question at all. As soon as there was a judgment involved, the principal was to refer the case. Mr. Baacke replied that this was a correct interpretation. It seemed to Mr. Ewing that they had emphasized that point, and Mr. Baacke explained that they were thinking of having some in-service work for principals after the policy had been adopted.

Section 6A on page 5 of the policy seemed to Dr. Shoenberg to need some explanation. He asked if parents would have to sign a statement regarding citizenship, and Dr. Frankel replied that it was not citizenship, it was residency. Mr. Baacke explained that there was an enrollment information form that parents had to fill out. They would add a phrase, "I understand that I owe tuition if I falsely make this claim," and the same signature they had been getting would take care of it. It would not be a new burden on the schools. Mrs. Praisner said there had been suggestions from Board members about the document, there was a recommendation that the attorneys review the document, and there was a request to find out what the Maryland State Department of Education was doing in this area. She

said that because this was a policy they would be soliciting community reactions and comments before it came back to the Board for action. Mr. Ewing asked that the paper be sent to the Taxpayers League, and Dr. Cody asked that it be sent to representatives of the minority community.

Re: PROGRESS REPORT ON COUNSELING AND  
GUIDANCE PILOT PROGRAM

Dr. Lois Martin, associate superintendent, introduced Mrs. Diana Phelps, principal of Fields Road Elementary. She stated that the Board should be commended for its role in anticipating topics that were being discussed nationally. The Board had asked for a study of guidance services and then endorsed the development of a comprehensive guidance program before anyone was talking about it nationally. She reported that a study had been done by the Educational Testing Service because of a concern that all the school reform literature was leaving out guidance. She drew their attention to page 11 of their report where they quoted the recommendation of the College Board's commission which were so parallel to the conclusions of the DEA study of guidance. She said that the second one, "develop a program of guidance under the leadership of the school principal emphasizing the importance of guidance services and the importance of the role of the guidance counselor as a coordinator of services." She noted the first sentence which stated that, "counselors should be viewed primarily as educators who can make unique contributions to improve the learning climate of the school, the educational performance of students, and links to families." Dr. Martin felt they were well on their way to having improved and coordinated guidance services.

Mr. John Goodloe, supervisor of guidance, expressed appreciation to the Board for the emphasis they had given to guidance and counseling. He reported that in 1986 the NSBA had come out with a resolution stating that NSBA encouraged local school boards to support comprehensive guidance and counseling programs, K-12. However, this was after the MCPS DEA study had been produced. He stated that their challenge was to keep in mind the needs of their students, and in addressing the needs of their students they would move with programs keeping students at the center.

Mrs. Praisner said that the Board would like to find out the status of the pilot program and what the reactions had been from those individuals associated with it. She explained that she was interested in setting up a schedule for a presentation to the Council's education committee regarding guidance programs and how these related to the state's competencies for guidance and counseling. She would like to see the presentation in the early fall.

Dr. Shoenberg remarked that the conceptualization of the program was at such a high level of generalization that it was extremely difficult to tell what it was that counselors were doing in the schools. They had the results of the survey questions throughout the

report. If he were asked to respond, it would be extremely hard to know what the concrete activities were. Because he had been on the Board for a number of years, he was able to assign a few specific activities to some of these general terms. He wondered if there was something they could do to provide definitions of counselor duties without being anecdotal.

Mrs. Phelps commented that as a principal she had a great deal respect for the guidance and counseling program in Montgomery County and saw a value directly related to student achievement. She said the Board was asking what happened to make that performance improve. Some of those activities were formal, and some were informal. Her main concern in wanting to have a counselor was to help them get to the point where all of their students were available for learning. A number of students came to school without certain things they assumed students had and which included a sense of well being and a sense of security. They had children coming from homes which did not necessarily focus on the needs of the child. They also had children coming to school who were frightened because of the changes that were occurring. They had children at Fields Road who had already attended three or four other schools. She said that their counselor met with all of the students at grade level in the beginning of year who were new to the school. This helped give students the feeling that they belonged and gave them the sense that Fields Road was a caring place.

Mrs. Phelps reported that the county had highlighted the parent outreach program. Teachers and parents were partners in the educational process. In the school their counselor provided direct instruction to teachers for organization and study skills. Some children were not able to figure out the best way to structure their time and their efforts. There were also some children who had not developed a strong sense of self responsibility. At times the counselor met with small groups of children on issues they felt were important. At the total school level, the counselor's case load was developed primarily from students who were brought to the EMT. The counselor might work with the children in small groups or with individual children on specific objectives. The counselor worked with teachers from Head Start through the upper grades on areas they felt were developmentally important for children to feel good about themselves and succeed in school. The counselor would hold classes on how to be friends with other people. They developed a needs assessment for each grade level, and keyed into the issues that would make the majority of those children succeed in school. Mrs. Phelps introduced Ms. Judy Petrusic, a counselor at Fields Road. Dr. Shoenberg wondered if high school faculties knew what counselors did. He suspected that the faculty did know this in an elementary school. He explained that his comments had to do with ways of presenting this information so that it was not so highly generalized.

Mr. Goodloe called attention to a quote from a high school counselor who said that the program, because it was designed to integrate as many persons from the faculty as possible into the delivery of services, almost forced a move to have the guidance department involved with faculty. At this school the program called for the

counselors to go into the classroom and deal with large groups of students. For example, now they had the college fair coming up at Montgomery College, and counselor would go into the classrooms to talk with students about the process.

Dr. Pitt thought if they were to ask principals and teachers, there would be some difference in perceptions about counselor roles at the elementary and secondary levels. At the secondary level, more questions were raised about time away from teaching tasks, time involved in some processes, and the traditional role the counselors held before. However, he thought there was a willingness to work with that and try to get a full comprehensive guidance program. Mr. Ewing suggested it would be useful to know what the major factors were, one by one, that generated the workload of or need for counselors at the elementary level. While he had no doubts that they were needed and justified, there was a lack of understanding at the Council level. On the surface there was uncertainty at the secondary level about what a comprehensive program might be, but there was an understanding of what secondary counselor might be. At the elementary level, there was not an acceptance yet outside the school system. He thought it would be most helpful to be clear about what the factors were and how much workload they generated and why there were needs that the classroom teacher and principal could not cope with by themselves. He said it was important for them to identify things like a rising tide of family crises and an increasing number of children who felt there wasn't anyone at home to talk to. These were delicate matters to talk about because at times this came across as a criticism of parental behavior. Yet if they were not candid, they would not be able to make a case for elementary counseling.

Dr. Martin reported that they had asked some of the pilot counselors to keep logs of their daily activities. Therefore, they might have the wherewithal to identify these factors. Mrs. Praisner asked about time spent in-servicing principals regarding their acceptance of the program. Mrs. Phelps replied that her situation was unique because people were aware of her interest in the program. There were workshops planned before the pilot was implemented to explain the parameters, objectives, and activities. They also had an opportunity to meet with job-alike people to discuss needs at individual schools and began discussing ways of counselors implementing some things to meet the needs. She felt that the training was appropriate and adequate.

Mrs. Praisner said there were concerns regarding EYE days and the budget, and there were also other questions about modifying the program to accommodate special education classes and young pre-readers. She asked about modifications and what this meant for their summer program. Ms. Petrusic reported that they had plans for a summer workshop where a group of counselors would be working at each of the levels as writers and editors. They would be looking at the overall picture and using the data from the pilot schools. Mrs. Praisner asked about the pre-reader issue, and Mr. Goodloe explained that many of the activities in the guidance handbook asked the student to read something. A number of counselors suggested some

changes to get at the activities in another way that did not require the student to read. In regard to special education, a counselor had to modify the program to handle Level 4 classes, but the program was flexible enough to do that.

Dr. Pitt described the budget cuts in extended year employment. He intended to recommend that remedial services would be provided in the summer by reducing enrichment. This would allow them to continue training. Mrs. Praisner asked about expansion of pilot schools, and Dr. Pitt thought some of this might be done but he would need staff reactions. Mrs. Praisner thanked staff for the presentation.

Re: PRESENTATION OF CERTIFICATE OF  
OUTSTANDING SERVICE

On behalf of the members of the Board of Education, Mrs. Praisner presented a certificate of outstanding service to Mrs. Midge Larmore, who was retiring from the Board Office after 18 years of service to MCPS.

Re: EXECUTIVE SESSION

The Board of Education met in executive session from 11:35 to 2:05 p.m. Mr. Goldensohn joined the meeting during executive session.

RESOLUTION NO. 247-87 Re: AN AMENDMENT TO THE BOARD AGENDA FOR  
MAY 12, 1987

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

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education amend its agenda for May 12, 1987, to add an item on the Operating Budget.

RESOLUTION NO. 248-87 Re: FUNDING OF AGREEMENTS WITH MONTGOMERY  
COUNTY ASSOCIATION OF ADMINISTRATIVE  
AND SUPERVISORY PERSONNEL (MCAASP),  
MONTGOMERY COUNTY COUNCIL OF SUPPORTING  
SERVICES EMPLOYEES (MCCSSE), AND  
MONTGOMERY COUNTY EDUCATION ASSOCIATION  
(MCEA)

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

WHEREAS, The Montgomery County Council has taken action on the Board of Education's FY 1987-88 Operating Budget; and

WHEREAS, The County Council action reduced the Board of Education budget by almost \$20 million for FY 1987-88, thus necessitating the

Board's review of cuts in improvements and cuts in existing services;  
and

WHEREAS, On May 6, 1987, the Board of Education and the superintendent of schools met in executive session to deliberate whether or not the agreements with the three organizations should be included in a review of cuts; and

WHEREAS, The superintendent and Board agreed that while the Council in its action did not fully fund the contracts, the Board and superintendent believe that the agreements should be honored; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education allocate funds within its FY 1987-88 Operating Budget to fund all three agreements.

Re: BOARD/PRESS/VISITOR CONFERENCE

Mr. Joseph Simpson, Montgomery County Taxpayers League, appeared before the Board of Education.

RESOLUTION NO. 249-87 Re: PROCUREMENT CONTRACTS OVER \$25,000

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

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

WHEREAS, The specifications need to be reevaluated for Bid No. 113-87, Typewriters; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That Bid No. 113-87 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
87-07	Payroll Consulting Services Peat, Marwick, Mitchell & Co. (Not to exceed this maximum over a four-year period)	\$ 95,000
105-87	Industrial Arts Electronic Supplies Arcade Electronics, Inc. Arlington Electronic Wholesalers, Inc. ASI Electronic, Inc. Capitol Radio Wholesalers, Inc. Collins Brothers Electronics, Inc. Fairway Electronics, Inc. Mark Electronics Supply, Inc.	\$ 2,752 2,486 15,223 6,966 9,292 5,436 391

	Projector Recorder Belt Corp.	1,419
	TOTAL	\$ 43,965
109-87	Duplicating Supplies	
	ABM, Inc.	\$ 3,808
	American Typewriter Company, Inc.	2,005
	Chaselle, Inc.	6,038
	HANCOA	13,129
	I.E.S.S.	14,787
	Interstate Office Supply	2,922
	Kleen-Strike, Inc.	468
	Nashua Corporation	105,273
	Prairie Carbon & Ribbon	15,375
	Reliable Reproductions Supply Company	11,486
	Repeat-O-Type Mfg. Corp.	5,778
	United Audio Video Group, Inc.	3,053
	Xerox Corporation	1,560
	TOTAL	\$ 185,682
116-87	Printing Supplies	
	Arcal Chemicals, Inc.	\$ 2,427
	Patton Printing Supplies, Inc.	5,080
	Pitman Company	19,026
	Washington Printing Supplies	7,081
	TOTAL	\$ 33,614
119-87	Audiovisual Equipment and Supplies	
	Audio Fidelity Corp.	\$ 31,523
	Baltimore Stationery Co.	1,887
	Communications Televideo LTD	170,715
	Douron, Inc.	79,438
	Lee Hartman & Sons, Inc.	10,475
	I.E.S.S.	83,400
	Ken-A-Vision Mfg. Co., Inc.	2,100
	Kunz, Inc.	14,612
	J. S. Latta, Inc.	6,100
	MPCS Video Industries South, Inc.	18,175
	Penn Camera Exchange, Inc.	16,410
	Nicholas P. Pipino Associates	51,386
	RCA	374,870
	Standard Theatre Supply Co.	29,489
	Nelson C. White Company, Inc.	29,575
	47th Street Photo, Inc.	9,315
	TOTAL	\$1,055,967
127-87	Ceiling Board and Grid System Material	
	Clevenger Corporation	\$ 5,044
	J. B. Acoustical	16,380
	K-Line Supply, Inc.	8,467
	Lowes of Frederick	462

	Metro Building Supply	51
		-----
	TOTAL	\$ 30,404
129-87	Broadcast Electronic Equipment	
	Fairway Electronics, Inc.	\$ 1,360
	Peirce-Phelps, Inc.	27,358
	Professional Products, Inc.	101,104
		-----
	TOTAL	\$ 129,822
135-87	Computer Carts	
	Landon Systems Corporation	\$ 56,250
151-87	Overhead Projector	
	3M Company	\$ 80,000
	GRAND TOTAL	\$1,710,704

RESOLUTION NO. 250-87 Re: RICHARD MONTGOMERY HIGH SCHOOL (AREA 2)  
BOILER REPLACEMENT AND REVISIONS TO  
LIBRARY VENTILATION

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

WHEREAS, Sealed bids were received on April 16, 1987, for the replacement of boilers and revisions to library ventilation at Richard Montgomery High School as indicated below:

	PROPOSAL A	PROPOSAL B
	3 Boilers	Library Vent.
1. J. E. Hurley Machine & Boilers Works, Inc.	*\$150,300	\$19,690
2. M & M Welding and Fabricators, Inc.	158,555	13,969
3. G. W. Mechanical Contractors, Inc.	160,000	21,000
4. American Combustion, Inc.	172,000	25,396
5. W. B. Maske Sheet Metal Works, Inc.	No Bid	*11,635

\*Recommended award

and

WHEREAS, The low bidders, J. E. Hurley Machine & Boiler Works, Inc., and W. B. Maske Sheet Metal Works, Inc., have successfully performed similar projects on other MCPS schools; and

WHEREAS, Low bids are within staff estimate; now therefore be it



CONDITIONING FOR IMC (AREA 2)

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

WHEREAS, Sealed bids were received on May 5, 1987, for air-conditioning the IMC at Hoover Junior High School as indicated below:

BIDDER	LUMP SUM
1. W. B. Maske Sheet Metal Works, Inc.	\$27,821
2. Arey, Inc.	29,450

and

WHEREAS, The low bidder, W. B. Maske Sheet Metal Works, Inc., has performed similar projects satisfactorily for MCPS; and

WHEREAS, Sufficient funds are available for the project; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That a contract for \$27,821 be awarded to W. B. Maske Sheet Metal Works, Inc., for air-conditioning the IMC at Hoover Junior High School in accordance with plans and specifications prepared by the Department of School Facilities in conjunction with Morton Wood, Jr., consulting engineer.

RESOLUTION NO. 253-87 Re: TOILET PARTITIONS - VARIOUS SCHOOLS

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

WHEREAS, Sealed bids were received on May 7, 1987, for furnishing and installing toiler partitions at various schools as indicated below:

PROPOSAL	GREENWALD IND. PROD.	STEEL PRODUCTS	INTEXX CORPORATION	KNICKERBOCKER PARTITION CORP.
A Blair	\$ 2,225	*\$ 2,320	\$ 2,471	\$ 3,780
B McKenney	5,425	* 5,950	5,743	10,716
C Einstein	6,095	* 6,070	6,916	11,441
D Kennedy	6,350	* 7,210	7,583	12,350
E Spring Mill	7,080	* 7,140	8,188	13,955
F Olney	1,230	1,510	* 1,170	1,791
G Rock Crk For.	2,750	* 2,380	3,030	5,122
H Tuckerman	4,200	* 4,650	4,885	8,133
I Bells Mill	1,925	* 1,890	2,107	3,772
J Clarksburg	570	* 380	421	706
K Poolesville H	3,390	* 3,250	3,882	6,806
L Darnestown	465	260	* 235	418
M Diamond	570	* 380	421	679

N Travilah	2,635	2,540	* 2,523	4,276
O Lakewood	2,720	* 2,990	3,086	4,961
P Longview	605	* 380	421	672
Q Stedwick	2,800	* 2,250	3,126	4,838
R Watkins Mill	2,150	* 2,170	2,272	3,742
S Hoover	4,445	4,600	* 4,510	7,575
T COMBINED BIDS	\$54,750	\$58,320	\$62,990	\$105,713

\* Recommended award

and

WHEREAS, The apparent low bidder, Greenwald Industrial Products, Inc., based its bid proposal on a product that failed to comply with the specifications in several areas; such as the thickness of pilasters, hinge design, surface mounted latch, and attachment fasteners; and

WHEREAS, Since late last year, Greenwald Industrial Products, Inc., has failed to complete an agreed-upon trial installation of its product at Gaithersburg High School; and

WHEREAS, Steel Products, Inc. and INTEXX Corporation are in compliance with specifications and award of Proposals F, L, N, and S be awarded to INTEXX Corporation, and Proposals A through E, G through K, M, and O through R to Steel Products, Inc. is recommended; and

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

RESOLVED, That a contract be awarded to INTEXX Corporation for \$8,438 for Proposals F, L, N, and S, in accordance with plans and specifications prepared by the Department of School Facilities, and be it further

RESOLVED, That a contract be awarded to Steel Products, Inc. for \$49,410 for Proposals A through E, G through K, M, and O through R, in accordance with plans and specifications prepared by the Department of School Facilities.

RESOLUTION NO. 254-87 Re: DEDICATION OF LAND FOR PUBLIC STREET  
FUTURE LAYTONSVILLE JUNIOR HIGH  
SCHOOL SITE (AREA 3)

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

WHEREAS, The Montgomery County Government is planning to reconstruct the intersection of Warfield and Dorsey Roads which will require a public dedication of land from the Board of Education where the proposed realignment abuts the future Laytonsville Junior High School site; and

WHEREAS, All construction, restoration, and future maintenance activities will be performed at no cost to the Board of Education with the Montgomery County Government and contractors to assume liability for all damages or injury; and

WHEREAS, This easement and the land dedication for an improved roadway will benefit the surrounding community and subject school site; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the president and secretary be authorized to execute a final deed for the dedication of 923 square feet of land from the future Laytonsville Junior High School site to the Montgomery County Government as shown on Right-of-way Plat File No. 159.

RESOLUTION NO. 255-87 Re: AUTHORIZATION TO PURCHASE MUDDY BRANCH  
ELEMENTARY SCHOOL SITE (AREA 3)

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

WHEREAS, The County Council appropriated funds to plan and construct the new Muddy Branch Elementary School, to open in September, 1988; and

WHEREAS, The proposed site is an 11.76 acre parcel located south of Darnestown Road (Maryland Route 28) and west of Travilah Road within the Stonebridge subdivision; and

WHEREAS, The owner of this parcel of land has made a preliminary offer to sell the proposed school site for \$1,800,000; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the president and secretary be authorized to purchase an 11.76 acre site, known as Schedule "A", within the Stonebridge subdivision at a cost of \$1,578,810 for the proposed Muddy Branch Elementary School; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the funds for the purchase come from Montgomery County Advance Land Acquisition Revolving Fund (ALARF); and be it further  
RESOLVED, That the Board of Education request funds in its FY 1989 Capital Budget to reimburse the ALARF.

RESOLUTION NO. 256-87 Re: CAPITAL PROJECTS TO BE CLOSED EFFECTIVE  
MAY 15, 1987

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

WHEREAS, The Board of Education continues to close capital projects in a timely manner and to transfer the unencumbered balance to the appropriate account; and

WHEREAS, The Department of School Facilities has reviewed capital projects that may be closed effective May 15, 1987, providing the capitalization of \$15,031,250; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the superintendent be authorized to close, effective May 15, 1987, capital construction projects listed below and to transfer the local unencumbered balance totaling \$70,888.54, subject to final audit, to the Local Unliquidated Surplus Account, project 997:

PROJECT NO.	SCHOOL	BALANCE
*051-11	Laytonsville Elementary	\$ -0-
*104-10	Seneca Valley High	-0-
*106-03	Fox Chapel Elementary	-0-
108-01	Lake Seneca Elementary	-0-
*152-13	Poolesville Jr/Sr High	-0-
*216-05	Travilah Elementary	-0-
*230-10	Rockville High	-0-
*302-07	Burtonsville Elementary	-0-
*310-01	Cannon Road Elementary	-0-
*401-06	Westover Elementary	-0-
410-07	Bradley Hills Elementary	-0-
*427-18	Walt Whitman High	-0-
552-08	Washington Grove Elementary	-0-
*554-14	Gaithersburg Jr. High	-0-
*566-03	Fields Road Elementary	-0-
*701-12	Damascus High	-0-
704-05	Woodfield Elementary	18,596.68
755-09	Takoma Park Jr. High	39,165.26
*761-08	Pine Crest Elementary	-0-
*774-08	Highland Elementary	-0-
*782-10	Wheaton High	-0-
*789-11	Albert Einstein High	-0-
789-12	Albert Einstein High	-0-
798-07	Springbrook High	150.98
*815-13	John F. Kennedy High	-0-
*815-15	John F. Kennedy High	-0-
*917-16	Lincoln Center	-0-
*919-25	Carver Educational Services Center	-0-
968-04	Portable Classrooms	-0-
968-05	Portable Classrooms	-0-
968-06	Portable Classrooms	-0-
969-01	State Denied	-0-
*990-07	Lathrop E. Smith Environ, Ed. Center	-0-
*999-03	Carpet	-0-
*999-06	Winches	-0-
*999-09	Lighting	-0-
999-21	Continuum Education	812.43
*999-29	Fencing	-0-
*999-30	Carpet	-0-
999-35	Furniture and Equipment	9,157.00
999-45	Exterior Resurfacing	2,267.81
*999-49	Robey Road Parking	-0-

999-68	Closure Consolidation	738.00
999-80	Mechanical Equipment	.38
*999-83	Boiler Modification	-0-
		-----
	TOTAL	\$70,888.54

\*Locally funded capital improvements

and

WHEREAS, Additional funds in the amount of \$70,000 are required at Montgomery Blair High School to procure equipment for the Magnet Program; and

WHEREAS, Sufficient funds reside in the Local Unliquidated Surplus Account, project 997 for this purpose; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That a transfer in the amount of \$70,000 be approved transferring funds from the Local Unliquidated Surplus Account to the Montgomery Blair High School Capital Account; and be it further

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

RESOLUTION NO. 257-87 Re: AMENDMENTS TO FY 1988 CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PROGRAM

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

WHEREAS, The Board of Education, county executive, and County Council have agreed that it would be desirable to allow more time to plan and construct our major capital projects; and

WHEREAS, To begin implementing this concept, the Council will appropriate construction funds for the new Clear Spring and Hadley Farms Elementary Schools scheduled to open in September 1989; and

WHEREAS, Before the Council can appropriate funds, the Board of Education must make a request; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education amend its FY 1988 Capital Budget and Capital Improvements Program to request in FY 1988 \$6,309,000 for construction of Clear Spring Elementary School and \$6,554,000 for planning and construction of Hadley Farms Elementary School.

RESOLUTION NO. 258-87 Re: FY 1987 SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION FOR INTENSIVE VOCATIONAL ENGLISH AND SKILLS PROGRAM

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

unanimously:

RESOLVED, That the superintendent of schools be authorized to receive and expend a \$36,561 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 of the Refugee Act of 1980 (P.L. 96-212) for the FY 1987 Intensive Vocational English and Skills Program:

CATEGORY	AMOUNT
02 Instructional Salaries	\$31,806
03 Instructional Other	2,200
10 Fixed Charges	2,555
	-----
TOTAL	\$36,561

and be it further

RESOLVED, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the county executive and the County Council and that the county executive be requested to recommend approval of this supplemental to the County Council.

RESOLUTION NO. 259-87 Re: FY 1987 SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION FOR  
ON JOB SITE SPECIFIC ENGLISH CLASSES  
FOR EMPLOYED REFUGEES

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

RESOLVED, That the superintendent of schools be authorized to receive and expend a \$35,300 grant award within the following categories from the Maryland Department of Human Resources under the Immigration and Nationality Act Targeted Assistance for Refugees, Title IV of the Refugee Act of 1980 (P. L. 96-212) for the FY 1987 On-job-site Specific English Classes for Employed Refugees:

CATEGORY	AMOUNT
02 Instructional Salaries	\$31,480
03 Instructional Other	1,302
10 Fixed Charges	2,518
	-----
TOTAL	\$35,300

and be it further

RESOLVED, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the county executive and the County Council and that the county executive be requested to recommend approval of this supplemental to the County Council.

RESOLUTION NO. 260-87 Re: FY 1987 CATEGORICAL TRANSFER WITHIN  
THE VOCATIONAL EDUCATION PROGRAM

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

RESOLVED, That the superintendent of schools be authorized, subject to County Council approval,; to effect within the FY 1987 vocational education programs, the following categorical transfers:

CATEGORY	FROM	TO
02 Instructional Salaries	\$10,512	
03 Instructional Other		\$20,911
10 Fixed Charges	10,299	
	-----	-----
	\$20,911	\$20,911

and be it further

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

RESOLUTION NO. 261-87 Re: RECEIPT AND EXPENDITURE OF AN FY 1987  
GRANT AWARD TO PROVIDE BAY RELATED  
MATERIALS AND ACTIVITIES FOR ELEMENTARY  
CHILDREN TO SUPPORT THE MARYLAND  
CHESAPEAKE BAY PROGRAM

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

RESOLVED, That the superintendent of schools be authorized, subject to County Council approval, to receive and expend an FY 1987 grant award of \$5,865 from MSDE, for the development of materials and to conduct in-service training for fourth grade teachers, in the following categories:

CATEGORY	AMOUNT
01 Administration	\$5,511
10 Fixed Charges	354
	-----
TOTAL	\$5,865

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

transmitted to the county executive and the County Council.

RESOLUTION NO. 262-87 Re: SUBMISSION OF AN FY 1988 GRANT  
PROPOSAL FOR SUMMER INSTITUTE

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

RESOLVED, That the superintendent of schools be authorized to submit an FY 1988 grant proposal for \$36,500 to the United Jewish Appeal for a summer institute; and be it further

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

RESOLUTION NO. 263-87 Re: FY 1987 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. DiFonzo seconded by Dr. Cronin, the following resolution was adopted unanimously:

RESOLVED, That the superintendent of schools be authorized, subject to County Council approval, to receive and expend \$67,990 from the Service Delivery Agency under the Job Training Partnership Act for a summer vocational orientation program for economically disadvantaged youth:

CATEGORY	AMOUNT
02 Instructional Salaries	\$49,484
03 Instructional Other	7,000
07 Student Transportation	7,720
10 Fixed Charges	3,786
	-----
TOTAL	\$67,990

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. 264-87 Re: MONTHLY PERSONNEL REPORT

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Mrs. DiFonzo seconded by Dr. Cronin, 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. 265-87 Re: EXTENSION OF SICK LEAVE

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

WHEREAS, The employee listed below has suffered serious illness; and

WHEREAS, Due to the prolonged illness, the employee's 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
Vazquez, Susan	Instructional Assistant Rosemary Hills Elementary	30

RESOLUTION NO. 266-87 Re: DEATH OF MRS. BARBARA A. FISK, RESOURCE TEACHER ON PERSONAL ILLNESS LEAVE FROM ROBERT FROST IS

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

WHEREAS, The death on May 5, 1987, of Mrs. Barbara A. Fisk, a resource teacher on personal illness leave from Robert Frost Intermediate School, has deeply saddened the staff and members of the Board of Education; and

WHEREAS, For over twenty years, Mrs. Fisk was a highly qualified teacher who demonstrated a thorough quality of excellence; and

WHEREAS, Mrs. Fisk's pride in her work and her dedication to duty were recognized by staff and associates; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the members of the Board of Education express their sorrow at the death of Mrs. Barbara A. Fisk 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 forwarded to Mrs. Fisk's family.

RESOLUTION NO. 267-87 Re: DEATH OF MRS. HANNAH HENKIN, SCHOOL SECRETARY I ON PERSONAL ILLNESS LEAVE FROM BETHESDA-CHEVY CHASE HS

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



REASSIGNMENT	FROM	TO
Sandra B. Killen	Principal Pine Crest ES	Elementary Teacher Effective July 1, 1987
Edith Robacker	Principal Travilah ES	Assistant Principal Effective July 1, 1987
Arthur Iddings	Principal Harmony Hills ES	Assistant Principal Effective July 1, 1987
Frank Wal	Principal Weller Road ES	Assignment to be determined Effective July 1, 1987 Retirement effective July 1, 1989

Re: REPORT FROM MONTGOMERY COUNTY EDUCATION  
CONNECTION

Ms. Sally Keeler, school/business relations coordinator, introduced Mr. William Jones; Clifford Kendall, president of the Connection; and Merle Garvis.

Mr. Kendall reported that the Connection was formed to identify those needs of the school system and the needs of the business community. For the last several years they had been identifying and initiating projects. The business community shared the Board's interest in having well educated students. They also had some selfish interests because many people joining local firms wanted their children to attend a first class school system. In addition, many of the graduates of MCPS ended up as employees of local firms and should have a good opinion of the business community and be well educated.

Mr. Kendall explained that about 40 companies and government agencies participated in the Connection. They all had contributed their own funds to be members of the Connection, and all members donated their time and effort without pay. He said that the school system supported them by assigning Ms. Keeler half-time, and she had done an outstanding job in coordinating their activities. He said that the Connection was not a political organization and was not involved in the administration of the school system. They were careful not to overlap or duplicate the activities of the Chamber of Commerce. In regard to the Connection Resource Bank, Mr. Kendall explained that they had about 1100 resources identified from business, government, and universities. These were available to MCPS teachers who wanted expertise in a subject. They had a computer in the central office and in three high schools for the resource bank. The bank was supported by a half-time coordinator. During this school year, over 9,000 children had benefitted from the resources, and they were receiving about 2,000 calls a month to the bank.

Mr. Kendall said that from a conversation with Dr. Cody, they had

started a teacher of the month program to recognize teachers who used business resources. These teachers received a certificate, \$100, and a day off to visit industry and business. In addition, they had a job bank, and last summer they placed 12 teachers in jobs. This year they expected to do a lot more than that, and they hoped to assist new teachers with housing. They had just initiated a job readiness skills program which was to let the students know what were the desirable attributes in a business community. They were working with Montgomery Blair and Richard Montgomery High Schools on this.

Mr. Kendall commented that they wanted to make Montgomery County one of the best school systems and to keep it in front of the technology arena. They were starting technology seminars and had recruited Dr. Alan Dodd to help them with this. He reported that the Connection was still growing with the purpose of meeting the needs of the school system and the business community. Mr. Garvis added his thanks for the support the school system had provided.

Mr. Jones reported that they saw a two-way avenue here. They were proud of what they had been able to do in working with the school system. In the business community, they saw a longer term program developing here. They had needs in business where the school system could help them. They spent millions of dollars on training their employees, and the school system had the talent and resources to do a lot of that retraining. He hoped that over time they could develop a school system bank for business to use. Dr. Cody commented that he had discovered the dedication of business in Montgomery County to help young people. He had thought for some time that the training expertise and needs in private business and the training expertise and needs in the school system had a lot to offer each other.

Dr. Cronin inquired about the business institute for educators and asked if they were going to have difficulties with this. Mr. Kendall believed the Connection had been the catalyst to get this going, but they did not believe that it belonged in the Connection for the long term. Mr. Garvis explained that the purpose of the project did dovetail with the purpose of the Connection. It is a summer institute where they would bring teachers into the business community to be trained on a whole host of subjects. However, this was a regional program involving about a dozen of the districts in the Washington area involved in the project. While they were proud that they had created the project, they thought it should have a life of its own. Dr. Cronin asked about a foundation and an executive director, and Mr. Garvis replied that they did have a superb executive director who had been working full time on the institute. The recruiting was going on now, and teachers were registering for the summer institute. They were also working with the universities to get credit, and funding was coming in to support the institute. Mr. Kendall reported that the funding for the institute was separate from the Montgomery Education Connection. The Connection charged its members \$500 a year, but they were tight on funds. They had started collecting information in math and sciences, and they were not working on collecting information in the social sciences, but they did not have the budget to go ahead with this part of the program.

He knew that the Board had a budget crunch, but he urged them to guard this small portion of the budget. Dr. Pitt noted that this was part of Category 1 which was part of the problem. This was really system-wide support and should be supported in the budget.

Dr. Shoenberg stated that he was aware of the resource bank but not of the other activities of the Connection or of the extensiveness of the use of the resource bank. He thought this was a marvelous example of how people could quietly go about and do something that was extraordinarily useful.

Ms. Keeler introduced Judy Kramer who was with them through a grant from the U.S. Department of Education. She had produced a newsletter to get the word out about the resource bank. Ms. Kramer said that teachers were excited about the resource bank. For example, students at Banneker were provided with mentors through the bank.

On behalf of the Board, Mrs. Praisner thanked the members of the Montgomery County Education Connection for their support. She suggested that they needed to let the greater public know of the success of the Connection.

Re: POLICY ON LONG-RANGE FACILITIES  
PLANNING (FAA)

Dr. Cronin moved and Mrs. DiFonzo seconded the following:

WHEREAS, The Board revised its Long-range Educational Facilities Planning policy in April 1986 to better synchronize the facilities planning and capital budgeting processes; and

WHEREAS, Although the new policy generally has worked well, several amendments would further enhance or clarify the facilities planning process; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education adopts the amendments shown below to the Long-range Educational Facilities Planning policy (FAA):

LONG-RANGE EDUCATIONAL FACILITIES PLANNING

I. PURPOSE

A. Goals

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

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

B. Objectives

The objectives of this policy are to:

1. Address changing enrollment patterns.

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

## II. DEFINITIONS AND SPECIFICATIONS

- A. Building utilization is a percentage derived by dividing a

- school's actual and projected enrollments by its existing or projected capacity.
- B. Capital budget is the compilation of recommended school site purchases, new school construction, additions, modernizations, relocatable classrooms, or other capital additions and improvements considered annually by the Board of Education and Montgomery County Council for the following fiscal year. It will contain a description of how its recommendations address the goals and objectives of this policy.
  - C. Capital project is a project contained in a capital budget or proposed for one of the subsequent fiscal years in a Six-Year Capital Improvements Program.
  - D. Civic groups are local organizations, including civic associations registered with the Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission.
  - E. Cluster of schools is one high school and the intermediate-level and elementary schools that send students to it.
  - F. Comprehensive Master Plan for Education Facilities is published by the superintendent each year on or about June 1.
    - 1. For each high school cluster the plan will show:
      - a) Each school's current and projected total enrollment, capacity and utilization for the next six years, and for the 10th and 15th years, based on projections made the previous September, and the changes in enrollment or capacity projected to result from capital projects, boundary or other changes authorized by the Board prior to the date of its publication;
      - b) The regular student population residing in the school service area and those who have transferred in from other school attendance areas; minority student enrollment, special programs (defined as level 3, 4, and 5 special education programs, area gifted and talented, ESOL, Head Start and Chapter 1); and
      - c) Any school that fails to meet one or more of the criteria and desired standards for enrollment and utilization based on projects for the next six years.
  - G. Countywide organizations are those with members throughout the county, including such organizations as the League of Women Voters, Allied Civic Group, Montgomery County Civic Federation, etc.
  - H. Criteria and desired standards that shall be applied to each school annually are:
    - 1. Desired enrollment. Desired enrollments for schools, provided they have the building capacity to accommodate them are:
      - a) Two or more regular classes per grade in an elementary school;
      - b) An average of 250 regular students or more per

grade in middle/intermediate/junior high schools;  
and

- c) An average of 300 regular students or more per grade in high schools.
2. Utilization. Each elementary school's actual and projected utilization should be between 80 to 100 percent of current program capacity. Each secondary school's actual and projected utilization should be between 70 and 90 percent of current state-rated capacity. Utilization of less than the lower figure denotes underutilization; utilization greater than the higher figure denotes overutilization.
- I. Current educational program capacity represents, under the approved operating budget staffing ratios and current MCPS program requirements, the number of regular and special education students that can be accommodated using the total building. It is calculated using ratios of 25:1 for grades 1-6, 44:1 for kindergarten (22:1 if all-day), and actual staffing ratios for special and alternative education programs. Current program capacity includes space in the building that could be recovered for educational programs from joint occupants or other MCPS programs that could be located elsewhere.
  - J. Enrollment projections for each school are prepared under the superintendent's direction annually in September, based on the school's current total enrollment, past enrollment and housing occupancy patterns, information on new housing and other relevant program and demographic factors. MCPS enrollment forecasts should be consistent with population forecasts of the Maryland National Capital Park and Planning Commission.
  - K. Six-year Capital Improvements Program (CIP) is an annual document required by Section 5-306 of the Education Article, Annotated Code of Maryland, and Section 302 of the Montgomery County Charter:
    1. There laws require this document to include:
      - a) A statement of the objectives of the capital programs and the relationship of these programs to the long-range development plans adopted by the county;
      - b) Recommended capital projects and a proposed construction schedule;
      - c) An estimate of cost and a statement of all funding sources; and
      - d) All anticipated capital projects and programs of the Board including substantial improvements and extensions of projects previously authorized.
    2. In addition, the Six-year CIP shall include:
      - a) Background information on the methodology of enrollment projections;
      - b) Current enrollment figures from all schools, and projections from these for the next six years, plus the 10th and 15th years, and the resulting building utilization;

- c) A list of the schools identified in the Comprehensive Master Facilities Plan which fail the criteria and desired enrollment standards during the next six years; and
  - d) The superintendent's recommendations concerning each school which fails to meet criteria and desired enrollment standards.
- L. State-rated capacity is used for secondary schools. It is calculated using a ratio of 25:1 for regular programs and actual staffing ratios for special and alternative education programs.
- M. Total enrollment is the number of MCPS students in a school who are enrolled in early childhood through grade 12 and special education programs.

### III. PROCESS AND CONTENT

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

each school to meet criteria and desired standards;  
and

- c) Identifying concerns and priorities for seeking solutions for each cluster school that fails to meet: (1) the criteria and desired standards, especially during the next three years, or (2) the goals of the Board policy on Quality Integrated Education.
  4. On or before June 1, following County Council action on the Capital Budget, the superintendent will publish the Comprehensive Master Plan for Education Facilities and make copies available to the public.
  5. By July 1, cluster representatives should state in writing to the superintendent any solutions, priorities or concerns that the cluster has identified for its schools. By July 15, area associate superintendents will review and forward to the superintendent, comments on cluster reports from the area. Copies of the area superintendent's comments will be sent to cluster representatives in the area. The cluster may amend its views by September 15 if school officials notify cluster representatives that a school's fall enrollment differed greatly from earlier projects.
  6. Early in October, the superintendent will hold a public work session with the Board of Education to discuss new school enrollments and projections, and to inform and discuss with the Board cluster priorities and concerns about potential facility solutions. The superintendent will include comments regarding cluster-proposed solutions.
- B. Six-year Capital Improvements Program
1. On or about November 1, the superintendent will publish a proposed Six-year Capital Improvements Program. The superintendent will notify PTA/PTSAs, municipalities, civic groups, student government associations and other interested groups of its publication, and will send copies of the proposed CIP for review and comment to the Maryland National Capital Park and Planning Commission, State Board of Education, State Interagency Committee on Public School Construction, County Council, County Government, municipalities, MCCPTA, Montgomery County Region of the Maryland Association of Student Councils (MCR) and Montgomery County Junior Council (MCJC).
  2. Using September school enrollments, and revised total enrollment and building utilization projections for the next six years, the the 10th and 15th years, the superintendent will determine if any schools fail to meet criteria and desired enrollment standards during the next six years. Further, the superintendent will determine if any school's enrollment is inconsistent with the Board policy on Quality Integrated Education and make appropriate recommendations.
  3. For each school that fails to meet criteria and desired

enrollment standards, the superintendent will recommend:

- a) A project in the next fiscal year's Capital Budget;
- b) A capital project in the subsequent five years that is covered by the Six-year CIP;
- c) A solution such as a boundary change, grade level reorganization, closing/consolidation, or other similar solutions which does not necessarily involve a capital project; or
- d) No action, or deferral pending further study of enrollment or other factors.

4. During the first week of November, the Board will hold a work session at which members may propose alternative solutions. If any Board member alternatives are proposed, the superintendent will develop data on them as soon as possible and communicate that data to the Board and to interested citizens.

C. Board of Education Public Hearing

1. On or about the third Monday in November, the Board of Education will hold a public hearing(s) at which municipalities, countywide organizations and communities may express viewpoints concerning the superintendent's recommendations and any Board-member alternatives.
2. Interested citizens and groups wishing to speak at the hearing should contact the PTA cluster coordinator, who will coordinate testimony at the hearing on behalf of cluster schools. Civic groups, municipalities and countywide organizations should contact the Board of Education Office. Written comments will be accepted until 5 p.m. on the work day preceding final Board action, or as otherwise determined by the Board.

D. Board Action

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

E. Deferred Proposals

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

F. Optional Public Hearing

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

G. Additional Board Facilities Decisions

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

H. Unusual Circumstances

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

IV. SCHOOL CLOSINGS/CONSOLIDATIONS

A. Superintendent's Study and Preliminary Plan

1. In the event that the superintendent determines that it may be advisable to close a school, he shall, in addition to preparing other data required by this policy, present the following information on each school that may be affected by a proposed school closing:
  - a) Regular student population residing in the service area and those who have transferred from outside the school's attendance area;
  - b) Minority student enrollment;
  - c) Special programs (defined as level 3, 4, and 5 special education programs, ESOL, Head Start and Chapter 1 1);
  - d) A review of each school's location and site characteristics;
  - e) Building characteristics, including any modification for special programs;
  - f) Needed renovations or additions, including the most recent school plant rating;
  - g) Operating costs;
  - h) Feeder patterns; and
  - i) Percentage of students transported.
2. This data is to be sent to each affected school's principal who will review the data with community representatives. Any discrepancies are to be reported to the superintendent.
3. The superintendent shall apply the screening criteria listed below to each school to determine which, if any, it does not meet, or is projected not to meet, during the next five years. Schools not meeting one or more of the criteria will be examined as a first step toward any kind of change.
4. In addition to closing/consolidation, other changes may be necessary, such as boundary adjustments, building additions or new schools, relocating area and countywide special programs, establishing magnet schools or centers, or clustering schools. Every school potentially affected by a proposed closing will be included in the process of seeking solutions to problems, even if it meets all screening criteria. Any recommendation or action should increase the number of screening criteria which each school meets.
5. The screening criteria and desired standards that shall be applied each year are the following:
  - a) Minimum enrollment. There should be no fewer than 200 students enrolled in the regular program in an

elementary school, regardless of the number of grades served. There should be at least 500 students in two-grade intermediate schools, 600 students in three-grade intermediate schools and at least 1,000 students in the regular program in a high school. Schools that fail to meet these minimum enrollment standards will be identified for further study.

- b) Utilization. The actual and projected utilization of a school (the enrollment divided by current enrollment capacity) should be between 80 to 100 percent of program capacity for elementary schools and 70 to 90 percent of state-rated capacity for secondary schools. Schools that have utilization below the lower figure or above the higher figure will be identified for further study.
  - c) Need for modernization or addition. If a school is in unsatisfactory condition as indicated by a building evaluation, and, therefore, in need of major capital improvements and/or its average age will be more than 25 years during the five-year period of the revision, it will be identified for further study.
  - d) Majority/minority enrollment. In accordance with the Quality Integrated Education Policy, when a school's majority/minority student population differs from the countywide average by 20 or more percentage points the school will be identified for further study.
  - e) Attendance patterns. Schools that deviated from the preferred attendance pattern (see I.B.7) will be identified for further study.
6. The superintendent shall study each school potentially affected by a proposed closing that does not meet one or more of the screening criteria above. In studying and recommending solutions to changing enrollment problems, the superintendent shall consider the data and apply the following guidelines:
- a) Begin with high schools, moving to intermediate level schools, with elementary schools considered last. High schools in a geographic area may be studied together. Decisions about a school or schools at a higher level become planning parameters for decisions about schools at the next lower level.
  - b) Consider each screening criterion for every school.
  - c) Consider changes in existing school boundaries or feeder patterns.
  - d) Consider needs of special students and programs for them in each school and in relation to area and countywide special programs.
  - e) Consider a variety of options in response to conditions that require change.
  - f) Consider long-range needs including retention or

- disposal of future school sites.
  - g) Allow for phased implementation of the total plan.
  - h) Reassign the student body to a single school or to the fewest possible schools when a school closing is recommended.
7. The superintendent shall develop a recommendation for each school studied, which may include no change. Recommendations for change should attempt to achieve:
- a) Desired regular enrollments of two or more classes per grade in an elementary school, an average of 250 students or more per grade in middle/intermediate/junior high schools, and an average of 300 students or more per grade in high schools, so long as the school has sufficient capacity to accommodate this enrollment.
  - b) Utilization between 70 and 90 percent of state-rated capacity for secondary schools, and between 80 and 100 percent of program capacity for elementary schools.
  - c) Prudent capital improvements.
  - d) A solution consistent with the Board policy on Quality Integrated Education.
  - e) Elimination of split attendance patterns wherever reasonable.
  - f) Prudent operating and capital costs, including bonded indebtedness.
  - g) The greatest number of students being able to walk to school. Those who are bused should be transported the shortest possible distance, except when long distances are required to address racial or ethnic isolation.
  - h) A solution consistent with the Board policy on Education of Handicapped Children. Accommodation for special programs and students should be provided using the same considerations as for regular programs and students (e.g., stability, adequate facilities, reasonable transportation requirements) and placement of special students in the least restrictive appropriate setting.
  - i) Facilities that will accommodate the educational program of affected schools, such as gymnasiums, auditoriums, specialized vocational spaces and the impact on existing educational programs. Previous Board-adopted changes affecting students are to be considered, e.g., school consolidations, program relocations, boundary changes, and grade level reorganizations.
  - j) The impact on affected communities including prior consolidations and closings, existing day care services, community use of schools, and availability of other community resources.
  - k) The potential of a facility for alternate use. Where appropriate, comparative analyses of the potential for alternate uses should be furnished.

8. By November 1, the superintendent shall present to the Board of Education recommendations concerning any school closing, identifying and examining each problem caused by changing enrollment, and recommended actions. The recommendation should be viable for at least five years. The superintendent's recommendations should be sent to the Board before being presented to the public.
  9. The superintendent shall send copies of his recommendations for review and comment to the Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission, State Board of Education, State Interagency Committee, County Council, municipalities, county government, MCCPTA, MCR and MCJC. The superintendent shall notify each PTA/PTSA, civic association, student government association, and other school/community organizations that the recommendations are available for review and comment and will be provided upon request.
- B. Community Reactions to the Superintendent's Recommendations  
The community's role in the process shall be as follows:
1. Individuals, schools, and/or community organizations may react to the recommendations for their school within two months after they are distributed. All reactions and community-developed proposals will be shared with the Board.
  2. If an individual or community group wishes to develop an alternative proposal affecting its school and others in the area, it should involve representatives of all school communities affected by the recommendations or make efforts to secure such representation. Any community plans should be sent the superintendent within two months after the recommendations are distributed.
- C. Formal Recommendations/Board Alternatives
1. The superintendent shall develop formal recommendations after considering individual and community reactions and alternatives, and submit them to the Board of Education by February 1.
  2. If the Board chooses to request alternatives to the superintendent's formal recommendations, affected communities will be informed about them promptly.
- D. Hearing Process
1. The Board will hold public hearings or forums to receive and discuss citizens' reactions to the superintendent's formal recommendations and Board proposed alternatives and will determine the allocation of time for speakers at these hearings. The Board, in addition to other means of notifying interested citizens, will advertise the public hearing concerning a school closing in two county newspapers at least two weeks before the hearing date. The notice will include procedures to be followed in making the Board's final decision.
  2. Interested citizens and groups wishing to speak should contact the PTA president of their community school who

will coordinate testimony on behalf of the school at the hearing. Civic groups, municipalities and countywide organizations should contact the Board of Education office. All written comments will be accepted until 5 p.m. on the work day preceding final Board action or as otherwise determined by the Board. The Board should complete all hearings and forums during February.

E. Board of Education Action

1. In the event the Board votes to adopt a modification or alternative containing elements that differ substantially from those on which citizens have had an opportunity to comment, the decision shall be tentative and written comments shall be sought and considered prior to final action. Further, the Board reserves its right to solicit further input or to conduct further hearings if, in its sole discretion, it considered them desirable.
2. In making its decision, the Board shall take into account the superintendent's recommendations and each of the criteria for solution. The minutes of the Board meeting will reflect reasons for individual Board members' actions with reference to the criteria.
3. All decisions should be made by the Board no later than March 15.
4. Decisions on school closures shall be made and announced at least 90 days prior to their effective date, but not later than April 30 of any school year, except in emergency circumstances described below.

F. Emergency Circumstances

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

V. REVIEW AND REPORTING

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

Re: A MOTION BY DR. SHOENBERG TO AMEND THE  
PROPOSED POLICY ON LONG-RANGE FACILITIES  
PLANNING (FAILED)

A motion by Dr. Shoenberg to amend the proposed policy on long-range facilities planning by deleting "utilization of less than the lower figure denotes underutilization: utilization greater than the higher figure denotes overutilization" from II. H. 2 failed for lack of a second.

Dr. Cronin assumed the chair.

RESOLUTION NO. 270-87 Re: AN AMENDMENT TO THE PROPOSED POLICY ON LONG-RANGE FACILITIES PLANNING

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

RESOLVED, That the proposed policy on long-range facilities planning be amended by deleting "local organizations including" from II. D.

RESOLUTION NO. 271-87 Re: POLICY ON LONG-RANGE EDUCATIONAL FACILITIES PLANNING (FAA)

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

WHEREAS, The Board revised its Long-range Educational Facilities Planning policy in April 1986 to better synchronize the facilities planning and capital budgeting processes; and

WHEREAS, Although the new policy generally has worked well, several amendments would further enhance or clarify the facilities planning process; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education adopts the amendments shown below to the Long-range Educational Facilities Planning policy (FAA):

#### LONG-RANGE EDUCATIONAL FACILITIES PLANNING

##### I. PURPOSE

###### A. Goals

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

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

###### B. Objectives

The objectives of this policy are to:

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

## II. DEFINITIONS AND SPECIFICATIONS

- A. Building utilization is a percentage derived by dividing a school's actual and projected enrollments by its existing or projected capacity.
- B. Capital budget is the compilation of recommended school site purchases, new school construction, additions, modernizations, relocatable classrooms, or other capital additions and improvements considered annually by the Board of Education and Montgomery County Council for the following fiscal year. It will contain a description of how its recommendations address the goals and objectives of this policy.
- C. Capital project is a project contained in a capital budget or proposed for one of the subsequent fiscal years in a Six-Year Capital Improvements Program.
- D. Civic groups are civic associations registered with the Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission.
- E. Cluster of schools is one high school and the intermediate-level and elementary schools that send students to it.
- F. Comprehensive Master Plan for Education Facilities is published by the superintendent each year on or about June 1.
  - 1. For each high school cluster the plan will show:
    - a) Each school's current and projected total enrollment, capacity and utilization for the next six years, and for the 10th and 15th years, based on projections made the previous September, and the changes in enrollment or capacity projected to result from capital projects, boundary or other changes authorized by the Board prior to the date of its publication;
    - b) The regular student population residing in the school service area and those who have transferred in from other school attendance areas; minority student enrollment, special programs (defined as level 3, 4, and 5 special education programs, area gifted and talented, ESOL, Head Start and Chapter 1); and
    - c) Any school that fails to meet one or more of the criteria and desired standards for enrollment and utilization based on projects for the next six years.
- G. Countywide organizations are those with members throughout the county, including such organizations as the League of Women Voters, Allied Civic Group, Montgomery County Civic Federation, etc.
- H. Criteria and desired standards that shall be applied to each school annually are:
  - 1. Desired enrollment. Desired enrollments for schools, provided they have the building capacity to accommodate them are:
    - a) Two or more regular classes per grade in an elementary school;
    - b) An average of 250 regular students or more per

grade in middle/intermediate/junior high schools;  
and

- c) An average of 300 regular students or more per grade in high schools.
2. Utilization. Each elementary school's actual and projected utilization should be between 80 to 100 percent of current program capacity. Each secondary school's actual and projected utilization should be between 70 and 90 percent of current state-rated capacity. Utilization of less than the lower figure denotes underutilization; utilization greater than the higher figure denotes overutilization.
- I. Current educational program capacity represents, under the approved operating budget staffing ratios and current MCPS program requirements, the number of regular and special education students that can be accommodated using the total building. It is calculated using ratios of 25:1 for grades 1-6, 44:1 for kindergarten (22:1 if all-day), and actual staffing ratios for special and alternative education programs. Current program capacity includes space in the building that could be recovered for educational programs from joint occupants or other MCPS programs that could be located elsewhere.
  - J. Enrollment projections for each school are prepared under the superintendent's direction annually in September, based on the school's current total enrollment, past enrollment and housing occupancy patterns, information on new housing and other relevant program and demographic factors. MCPS enrollment forecasts should be consistent with population forecasts of the Maryland National Capital Park and Planning Commission.
  - K. Six-year Capital Improvements Program (CIP) is an annual document required by Section 5-306 of the Education Article, Annotated Code of Maryland, and Section 302 of the Montgomery County Charter:
    1. There laws require this document to include:
      - a) A statement of the objectives of the capital programs and the relationship of these programs to the long-range development plans adopted by the county;
      - b) Recommended capital projects and a proposed construction schedule;
      - c) An estimate of cost and a statement of all funding sources; and
      - d) All anticipated capital projects and programs of the Board including substantial improvements and extensions of projects previously authorized.
    2. In addition, the Six-year CIP shall include:
      - a) Background information on the methodology of enrollment projections;
      - b) Current enrollment figures from all schools, and projections from these for the next six years, plus the 10th and 15th years, and the resulting building utilization;

- c) A list of the schools identified in the Comprehensive Master Facilities Plan which fail the criteria and desired enrollment standards during the next six years; and
  - d) The superintendent's recommendations concerning each school which fails to meet criteria and desired enrollment standards.
- L. State-rated capacity is used for secondary schools. It is calculated using a ratio of 25:1 for regular programs and actual staffing ratios for special and alternative education programs.
  - M. Total enrollment is the number of MCPS students in a school who are enrolled in early childhood through grade 12 and special education programs.

### III. PROCESS AND CONTENT

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

each school to meet criteria and desired standards;  
and

- c) Identifying concerns and priorities for seeking solutions for each cluster school that fails to meet: (1) the criteria and desired standards, especially during the next three years, or (2) the goals of the Board policy on Quality Integrated Education.
  4. On or before June 1, following County Council action on the Capital Budget, the superintendent will publish the Comprehensive Master Plan for Education Facilities and make copies available to the public.
  5. By July 1, cluster representatives should state in writing to the superintendent any solutions, priorities or concerns that the cluster has identified for its schools. By July 15, area associate superintendents will review and forward to the superintendent, comments on cluster reports from the area. Copies of the area superintendent's comments will be sent to cluster representatives in the area. The cluster may amend its views by September 15 if school officials notify cluster representatives that a school's fall enrollment differed greatly from earlier projects.
  6. Early in October, the superintendent will hold a public work session with the Board of Education to discuss new school enrollments and projections, and to inform and discuss with the Board cluster priorities and concerns about potential facility solutions. The superintendent will include comments regarding cluster-proposed solutions.
- B. Six-year Capital Improvements Program
1. On or about November 1, the superintendent will publish a proposed Six-year Capital Improvements Program. The superintendent will notify PTA/PTSAs, municipalities, civic groups, student government associations and other interested groups of its publication, and will send copies of the proposed CIP for review and comment to the Maryland National Capital Park and Planning Commission, State Board of Education, State Interagency Committee on Public School Construction, County Council, County Government, municipalities, MCCPTA, Montgomery County Region of the Maryland Association of Student Councils (MCR) and Montgomery County Junior Council (MCJC).
  2. Using September school enrollments, and revised total enrollment and building utilization projections for the next six years, the the 10th and 15th years, the superintendent will determine if any schools fail to meet criteria and desired enrollment standards during the next six years. Further, the superintendent will determine if any school's enrollment is inconsistent with the Board policy on Quality Integrated Education and make appropriate recommendations.
  3. For each school that fails to meet criteria and desired

enrollment standards, the superintendent will recommend:

- a) A project in the next fiscal year's Capital Budget;
- b) A capital project in the subsequent five years that is covered by the Six-year CIP;
- c) A solution such as a boundary change, grade level reorganization, closing/consolidation, or other similar solutions which does not necessarily involve a capital project; or
- d) No action, or deferral pending further study of enrollment or other factors.

4. During the first week of November, the Board will hold a work session at which members may propose alternative solutions. If any Board-member alternatives are proposed, the superintendent will develop data on them as soon as possible and communicate that data to the Board and to interested citizens.

C. Board of Education Public Hearing

1. On or about the third Monday in November, the Board of Education will hold a public hearing(s) at which municipalities, countywide organizations and communities may express viewpoints concerning the superintendent's recommendations and any Board-member alternatives.
2. Interested citizens and groups wishing to speak at the hearing should contact the PTA cluster coordinator, who will coordinate testimony at the hearing on behalf of cluster schools. Civic groups, municipalities and countywide organizations should contact the Board of Education Office. Written comments will be accepted until 5 p.m. on the work day preceding final Board action, or as otherwise determined by the Board.

D. Board Action

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

E. Deferred Proposals

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

F. Optional Public Hearing

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

G. Additional Board Facilities Decisions

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

H. Unusual Circumstances

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

IV. SCHOOL CLOSINGS/CONSOLIDATIONS

A. Superintendent's Study and Preliminary Plan

1. In the event that the superintendent determines that it may be advisable to close a school, he shall, in addition to preparing other data required by this policy, present the following information on each school that may be affected by a proposed school closing:
  - a) Regular student population residing in the service area and those who have transferred from outside the school's attendance area;
  - b) Minority student enrollment;
  - c) Special programs (defined as level 3, 4, and 5 special education programs, ESOL, Head Start and Chapter 1 1);
  - d) A review of each school's location and site characteristics;
  - e) Building characteristics, including any modification for special programs;
  - f) Needed renovations or additions, including the most recent school plant rating;
  - g) Operating costs;
  - h) Feeder patterns; and
  - i) Percentage of students transported.
2. This data is to be sent to each affected school's principal who will review the data with community representatives. Any discrepancies are to be reported to the superintendent.
3. The superintendent shall apply the screening criteria listed below to each school to determine which, if any, it does not meet, or is projected not to meet, during the next five years. Schools not meeting one or more of the criteria will be examined as a first step toward any kind of change.
4. In addition to closing/consolidation, other changes may be necessary, such as boundary adjustments, building additions or new schools, relocating area and countywide special programs, establishing magnet schools or centers, or clustering schools. Every school potentially affected by a proposed closing will be included in the process of seeking solutions to problems, even if it meets all screening criteria. Any recommendation or action should increase the number of screening criteria which each school meets.
5. The screening criteria and desired standards that shall be applied each year are the following:
  - a) Minimum enrollment. There should be no fewer than 200 students enrolled in the regular program in an

elementary school, regardless of the number of grades served. There should be at least 500 students in two-grade intermediate schools, 600 students in three-grade intermediate schools and at least 1,000 students in the regular program in a high school. Schools that fail to meet these minimum enrollment standards will be identified for further study.

- b) Utilization. The actual and projected utilization of a school (the enrollment divided by current enrollment capacity) should be between 80 to 100 percent of program capacity for elementary schools and 70 to 90 percent of state-rated capacity for secondary schools. Schools that have utilization below the lower figure or above the higher figure will be identified for further study.
  - c) Need for modernization or addition. If a school is in unsatisfactory condition as indicated by a building evaluation, and, therefore, in need of major capital improvements and/or its average age will be more than 25 years during the five-year period of the revision, it will be identified for further study.
  - d) Majority/minority enrollment. In accordance with the Quality Integrated Education Policy, when a school's majority/minority student population differs from the countywide average by 20 or more percentage points the school will be identified for further study.
  - e) Attendance patterns. Schools that deviated from the preferred attendance pattern (see I.B.7) will be identified for further study.
6. The superintendent shall study each school potentially affected by a proposed closing that does not meet one or more of the screening criteria above. In studying and recommending solutions to changing enrollment problems, the superintendent shall consider the data and apply the following guidelines:
- a) Begin with high schools, moving to intermediate level schools, with elementary schools considered last. High schools in a geographic area may be studied together. Decisions about a school or schools at a higher level become planning parameters for decisions about schools at the next lower level.
  - b) Consider each screening criterion for every school.
  - c) Consider changes in existing school boundaries or feeder patterns.
  - d) Consider needs of special students and programs for them in each school and in relation to area and countywide special programs.
  - e) Consider a variety of options in response to conditions that require change.
  - f) Consider long-range needs including retention or

- disposal of future school sites.
  - g) Allow for phased implementation of the total plan.
  - h) Reassign the student body to a single school or to the fewest possible schools when a school closing is recommended.
7. The superintendent shall develop a recommendation for each school studied, which may include no change. Recommendations for change should attempt to achieve:
- a) Desired regular enrollments of two or more classes per grade in an elementary school, an average of 250 students or more per grade in middle/intermediate/junior high schools, and an average of 300 students or more per grade in high schools, so long as the school has sufficient capacity to accommodate this enrollment.
  - b) Utilization between 70 and 90 percent of state-rated capacity for secondary schools, and between 80 and 100 percent of program capacity for elementary schools.
  - c) Prudent capital improvements.
  - d) A solution consistent with the Board policy on Quality Integrated Education.
  - e) Elimination of split attendance patterns wherever reasonable.
  - f) Prudent operating and capital costs, including bonded indebtedness.
  - g) The greatest number of students being able to walk to school. Those who are bused should be transported the shortest possible distance, except when long distances are required to address racial or ethnic isolation.
  - h) A solution consistent with the Board policy on Education of Handicapped Children. Accommodation for special programs and students should be provided using the same considerations as for regular programs and students (e.g., stability, adequate facilities, reasonable transportation requirements) and placement of special students in the least restrictive appropriate setting.
  - i) Facilities that will accommodate the educational program of affected schools, such as gymnasiums, auditoriums, specialized vocational spaces and the impact on existing educational programs. Previous Board-adopted changes affecting students are to be considered, e.g., school consolidations, program relocations, boundary changes, and grade level reorganizations.
  - j) The impact on affected communities including prior consolidations and closings, existing day care services, community use of schools, and availability of other community resources.
  - k) The potential of a facility for alternate use. Where appropriate, comparative analyses of the potential for alternate uses should be furnished.

8. By November 1, the superintendent shall present to the Board of Education recommendations concerning any school closing, identifying and examining each problem caused by changing enrollment, and recommended actions. The recommendation should be viable for at least five years. The superintendent's recommendations should be sent to the Board before being presented to the public.
  9. The superintendent shall send copies of his recommendations for review and comment to the Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission, State Board of Education, State Interagency Committee, County Council, municipalities, county government, MCCPTA, MCR and MCJC. The superintendent shall notify each PTA/PTSA, civic association, student government association, and other school/community organizations that the recommendations are available for review and comment and will be provided upon request.
- B. Community Reactions to the Superintendent's Recommendations  
The community's role in the process shall be as follows:
1. Individuals, schools, and/or community organizations may react to the recommendations for their school within two months after they are distributed. All reactions and community-developed proposals will be shared with the Board.
  2. If an individual or community group wishes to develop an alternative proposal affecting its school and others in the area, it should involve representatives of all school communities affected by the recommendations or make efforts to secure such representation. Any community plans should be sent to the superintendent within two months after the recommendations are distributed.
- C. Formal Recommendations/Board Alternatives
1. The superintendent shall develop formal recommendations after considering individual and community reactions and alternatives, and submit them to the Board of Education by February 1.
  2. If the Board chooses to request alternatives to the superintendent's formal recommendations, affected communities will be informed about them promptly.
- D. Hearing Process
1. The Board will hold public hearings or forums to receive and discuss citizens' reactions to the superintendent's formal recommendations and Board-proposed alternatives and will determine the allocation of time for speakers at these hearings. The Board, in addition to other means of notifying interested citizens, will advertise the public hearing concerning a school closing in two county newspapers at least two weeks before the hearing date. The notice will include procedures to be followed in making the Board's final decision.
  2. Interested citizens and groups wishing to speak should contact the PTA president of their community school who

will coordinate testimony on behalf of the school at the hearing. Civic groups, municipalities, and countywide organizations should contact the Board of Education office. All written comments will be accepted until 5 p.m. on the work day preceding final Board action or as otherwise determined by the Board. The Board should complete all hearings and forums during February.

E. Board of Education Action

1. In the event the Board votes to adopt a modification or alternative containing elements that differ substantially from those on which citizens have had an opportunity to comment, the decision shall be tentative and written comments shall be sought and considered prior to final action. Further, the Board reserves its right to solicit further input or to conduct further hearings if, in its sole discretion, it considered them desirable.
2. In making its decision, the Board shall take into account the superintendent's recommendations and each of the criteria for solution. The minutes of the Board meeting will reflect reasons for individual Board members' actions with reference to the criteria.
3. All decisions should be made by the Board no later than March 15.
4. Decisions on school closures shall be made and announced at least 90 days prior to their effective date, but not later than April 30 of any school year, except in emergency circumstances described below.

F. Emergency Circumstances

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

V. REVIEW AND REPORTING

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

Re: UPDATE ON ANNUAL GROWTH POLICY (AGP)

Board members reviewed the most recent proposals on the AGP from the

Planning Board and Council member Leggett. Mr. Bruce Crispell, demographic planner, described the differences in the various proposals and the County Council timeline for reviewing proposals. After discussion, Mrs. Praisner stated that the Board would write to Mr. Leggett and state that they still found the Planning Board's original proposal as the one they favored although there were elements of Mr. Leggett's that were significantly better than the county executive's proposal. She said that they had the Board's previous action on the AGP and the Board had already conveyed its unhappiness with the county executive's proposal.

RESOLUTION NO. 272-87 Re: PARK AND PLANNING ANNUAL GROWTH POLICY PROPOSAL

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

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education convey to Park and Planning that their new proposal appeared to be the least desirable option thus far proposed because it would introduce an unacceptable level of instability and uncertainty and that the Board would appreciate further discussion about their proposal.

Mrs. DiFonzo and Mr. Goldensohn temporarily left the meeting at this point.

RESOLUTION NO. 273-87 Re: EXECUTIVE SESSION - MAY 26, 1987

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Dr. Cronin seconded by Mr. Ewing, 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 May 26, 1987, 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. 274-87 Re: MINUTES OF MARCH 31, 1987

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

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education minutes of March 31, 1987, be approved.

RESOLUTION NO. 275-87 Re: MINUTES OF APRIL 29, 1987

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

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education minutes of April 29, 1987, be approved.

Mrs. DiFonzo and Mr. Goldensohn rejoined the meeting at this point.

RESOLUTION NO. 276a-87 Re: RESOLUTION HONORING THE HONORABLE  
LUCILLE MAURER

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

WHEREAS, The Honorable Lucille Maurer played a leadership role as a member of the Montgomery County Board of Education from 1960 to 1968 in establishing goals that would assure a high quality of education in Montgomery County Public Schools; and

WHEREAS, In her role as a Montgomery County delegate and leader in the Maryland General Assembly from 1969 to 1986, Lucille Maurer repeatedly authored legislation to strengthen public education at the state and local levels; and

WHEREAS, Lucille Maurer has given unstintingly of her time and expertise to many state commissions working to improve the governance and funding of public education in Maryland; and

WHEREAS, Lucille Maurer is the first woman elected state treasurer by the Maryland General Assembly, a position in which she will continue to exert a positive influence on public education in Maryland; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the Montgomery Board Board of Education hereby expresses its deep appreciation to the Honorable Lucille Maurer for her many years of thoughtful and dedicated service on behalf of public education in Maryland; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education hereby adopts this resolution and makes this presentation to the Honorable Lucille Maurer.

RESOLUTION NO. 276b-87 RE: RESOLUTION HONORING THE HONORABLE  
HELEN KOSS

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

WHEREAS, The Honorable Helen Koss effectively and with integrity represented Montgomery County as a delegate in the Maryland General Assembly from 1970 to 1986; and

WHEREAS, Helen Koss was the first woman to chair a standing committee in the Maryland House of Delegates, the Committee on Constitutional and Administrative Law; and

WHEREAS, Helen Koss brought a broad and deep understanding of state and local government to her role as chairman of that committee from 1978 to 1986; and

WHEREAS, Helen Koss exercised effective leadership in dealing with issues affecting the governance of public education in Maryland; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the Montgomery County Board of Education expresses its deep appreciation to the Honorable Helen Koss for her thoughtful and caring attention to public education in Maryland; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education hereby adopts this resolution and makes this presentation to the Honorable Helen Koss.

RESOLUTION NO. 277-87 Re: MINUTES OF APRIL 9, 1987

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

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education minutes of April 9, 1987, be approved.

RESOLUTION NO. 278-87 Re: TIMETABLE FOR CONSIDERATION OF  
RECOMMENDATIONS ON ROCKVILLE-  
GAITHERSBURG-GERMANTOWN AREA BOUNDARY  
ADJUSTMENTS

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

RESOLVED, That due to the unusual circumstances of opening two new high schools and the request of the community to establish boundaries as soon as possible, the Board of Education adopts the timetable proposed by the superintendent for consideration of recommendations on Rockville-Gaithersburg-Germantown area boundary adjustments.

Re: SUPERINTENDENT'S RECOMMENDATIONS ON  
ROCKVILLE-GAITHERSBURG-GERMANTOWN  
AREA BOUNDARY ADJUSTMENTS

Mrs. Praisner reported that the purpose of this discussion was for the Board to propose alternatives to the superintendent's recommendations. If alternatives were proposed, four votes would be required for adoption. The Board would be holding a public hearing on the recommendations and alternatives, if any, at Wheaton High School on May 27. The Board would take final action on June 4.

Re: A MOTION BY MRS. DIFONZO FOR AN  
ALTERNATIVE REGARDING COLD SPRING  
ELEMENTARY SCHOOL (FAILED)

A motion by Mrs. DiFonzo that the superintendent be asked to prepare an alternative moving Cold Spring Elementary into the Richard Montgomery Cluster feeder pattern failed with Dr. Cronin, Mrs. DiFonzo, and Mrs. Praisner voting in the affirmative; Mr. Goldensohn voting in the negative; Mr. Ewing, Dr. Shoenberg, and (Mr. Steinberg) abstaining.

Re: A MOTION BY MR. GOLDENSOHN FOR AN  
ALTERNATIVE REGARDING RITCHIE PARK  
AND FARMLAND ELEMENTARY SCHOOL (FAILED)

A motion by Mr. Goldensohn that the superintendent be asked to prepare an alternative including the area of Ritchie Park east of Falls Road and the Farmland area north of Montrose Road to the Richard Montgomery Cluster failed for lack of a second.

Re: BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS

1. Mrs. Praisner extended congratulations to the Rockville High School team on winning their fifth national championship in the Knowledge Master Open.
2. Mrs. Praisner announced that Justin Swope, a student at College Gardens, was one of 150 national winners out of one million contest entrants in the national essay contest on the U.S. Constitution. Mrs. Praisner read Justin's entry into the record:  
"WHAT THE U.S. CONSTITUTION MEANS TO ME AND OUR COUNTRY  
On July 4, 1976, our country celebrated our 200th birthday. I wasn't born until 1978 so I missed that celebration. However on Sept. 17 in Philadelphia, Pa., we will celebrate the birthday of our Constitution. The Constitution is having its 200th birthday and I want to be there.  
The Constitution is important to me. It lets me go to my church. No one is allowed in my house without my permission. I can say anything I want. When I get big I even get to vote for our leaders and maybe I'll be one.  
I think our country is lucky we have the Constitution. We all pay taxes to help build roads, schools, parks, courts and we pay policy (and) firemen but most importantly good leaders. They may the laws that we must live by in America. I think the men who wrote the Constitution in 1787 were pretty smart. I'm glad we have the Constitution. I love living in America."
3. Mrs. Praisner reported that on Saturday she had had an

opportunity to take a walking tour of the New Hampshire Estates community with Barbara Frank, the principal, and Oliver Lancaster, area superintendent. This was an excellent opportunity to get a sense of the community and see the construction work at the school.

4. Mrs. Praisner thanked the mayor and council members of the City of Gaithersburg for their drug awareness program and the efforts they put forth visiting local schools. She would prepare a letter thanking them for their commitment to the public schools.
5. Mrs. DiFonzo stated that last week she had escorted John Strobe, who was from the University of South Alabama and on an internship from AASA. They had visited the Smith Center, Phoenix I, Kennedy High School, the Area 1 Office, Rock Creek Valley, Noyes, Lake Seneca and the Area 3 Office. Dr. Strobe was impressed with Montgomery County and the level of support offered to youngsters.
6. Mr. Ewing provided the Board with a brief summary of the research and evaluation committee meeting. The committee had discussed next steps on the effective schools proposal, Sizer issues, a proposed summer school system, and implications for research from the recommendations of the Commission on Excellence in Teaching. He reported that after the budget had been completed, the committee would meet again in June to look at the research program for the next year.
7. Dr. Pitt said that he had attended a dinner catered by the Edison Center gourmet food services and hotel and travel students. Marriott Corporation was working these students, and the good was excellent.

RESOLUTION NO. 279-87 Re: EARLY RETIREMENT INCENTIVE PROGRAM

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

WHEREAS, On April 22, 1985, the Board of Education approved an Early Retirement Incentive Program for the period of July 1, 1985, to June 30, 1987; and

WHEREAS, The Memorandum of Understanding Between the Montgomery County Education Association and the Montgomery County Public Schools established a joint implementation and review committee to make recommendations and report on the status of the Early Retirement Incentive Program; and

WHEREAS, The committee, on January 14, 1987, recommended that the Early Retirement Incentive Program should be continued and extended past the expiration date of June 30, 1987; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the Early Retirement Incentive Program as currently in effect be continued for one more year to June 30, 1988; and be it further

RESOLVED, That this program will be effective for MCPS employees retiring during FY 1988; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the Early Retirement Incentive Program shall cover all

