

APPROVED
34-1987

Rockville, Maryland
July 14, 1987

The Board of Education of Montgomery County met in regular session at the Carver Educational Services Center, Rockville, Maryland, on Tuesday, July 14, 1987, at 10 a.m.

ROLL CALL Present: Mrs. Marilyn J. Praisner, President
in the Chair
Mrs. Sharon DiFonzo
Mr. Bruce A. Goldensohn*
Dr. Robert E. Shoenberg
Mrs. Mary Margaret Slye

Absent: Dr. James E. Cronin
Mr. Blair G. Ewing
Mr. Andrew Herscowitz

Others Present: Dr. Harry Pitt, Superintendent of Schools
Dr. Paul L. Vance, Deputy Superintendent
Mr. Thomas S. Fess, Parliamentarian

RESOLUTION NO. 365-87 Re: BOARD AGENDA - JULY 14, 1987

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

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education adopt its agenda for July 14, 1987.

Re: ANNOUNCEMENT

Mrs. Praisner welcomed Dr. Pitt and Dr. Vance to their first meeting as superintendent and deputy superintendent. She explained that Mr. Goldensohn would be joining the Board shortly. Mr. Herscowitz was out of the country, Dr. Cronin was out of town, and Mr. Ewing was attending a federal executive training program out of town.

Re: PRESENTATION OF CERTIFICATES

Mrs. Praisner read the following statement into the record:

"The Board would like to honor eight individuals, without whose unique abilities and quick thinking, we might have had a tragedy in our county late this winter.

"Four faculty members from Lucy Barnsley Elementary, a mainstreaming school for the hearing impaired, and four bus drivers from Area 2 were taking 200 children to a concert in Washington, D.C. on March 19 when a fire broke out on one of the buses. The occupants of the bus were unaware of the fire until one faculty member and the driver in another bus managed to get their attention and warn them to pull over -- using sign language. Once on the side of the road, the drivers,

teachers and interpreters worked together to evacuate the disabled bus and load the children safely on the other buses.

"These individuals are: Teri Burdette, music teacher; Fran Groman, grade six teacher; Martha Zanger and Debby Barr, interpreters for the hearing impaired; and bus drivers William Chartier, Virginia Weedon, Patricia Kennedy and Donna Springer.

"Clearly, their quick reactions and teamwork resolved a situation that threatened the lives of the four adults and about 40 children on the bus. We are very fortunate to have them on our staff and thank them for their dedication and a professional response to such an emergency."

Re: PRESCHOOL - GRADE 12 POLICIES: DRAFT STATEMENTS

Dr. Pitt remarked that this was a very complex issue. The packet in front of the Board contained three draft policies for the three levels of instruction. The early childhood/elementary policy would govern elementary schools regardless of different grade levels. The middle level policy would govern intermediate/middle level schools. The high school policy would govern all high schools and grade 9 in schools organized as junior highs. He had asked staff to prepare a preliminary analysis of the impact on other policies and regulations. The third item was a timeline for parent/community/staff input on the revised policy statements.

For the record, Mrs. Praisner explained that the Board was concerned about having all of these policies on the books and some inconsistencies that might be evident given the sequencing of when these policies were adopted. She recalled that the Board had acted to appoint a committee to review those policies and to come forward, not only with the modifications that might be necessary for consistency, but also to look at the issues of where they should be going in these areas. Therefore, this was broader than just cleaning up policies. It was to help the Board focus on educational and substantive issues in this area as well.

Mr. Carl Smith, committee chair, introduced Dr. Patricia Edmister, coordinator of child find; Steven Seleznow, principal of Highland View Elementary School; Dr. Peg Egan, principal of Eastern Intermediate School; and Dr. Dianne Mero, principal of Einstein High School. He stated that this was an outstanding committee, and the committee appreciated the opportunity to meet with the Board. The Board had asked the committee to view its charge broadly and to come back with recommendations that would help the Board and staff assess the present order of things and plan for the future. The more they studied, the more interested they became in their task.

Dr. Smith reported that after a year of work, the committee had completed its deliberations in May. They had reached consensus on every single major element of the proposed policy statement. They had started their work with the notion that they were dealing with

three and possibly four distinct levels of education and would have to treat each one as uniquely so. They ended up in a very different posture. The more they talked and thought about the issues, the more they realized that what they were saying about one level of education was fundamentally true of the others. They thought less and less about "elementary versus secondary" and more and more about the unitary view that emerged on so many issues. This view cut across the grades and labels that they ordinarily used. In the final draft, five out of the eight sections of the policy statements were the same for all levels.

Dr. Smith highlighted the major issues that they addressed. The first was the suggestion that they consider optional programs for four-year olds. Another was the option of an all-day or full-day kindergarten program for all children, if not in the same school at least in the same cluster with access guaranteed. The next was middle level schools containing three grades because of the need for more continuity for young adolescents during that period of physical, emotional, social, and intellectual change. Another was the reaffirmation of the comprehensive four-grade high school as the model best suited to the learning needs of most students and a corresponding caution about special programs that recruit students from their high schools except of course when social and educational issues made such programs necessary. In that context, they included the Blair and Bethesda-Chevy Chase magnet programs. Another issue was a call for increased attention to local school planning and the need to involve all staff broadly and to provide the time and resources for this to happen. Coupled with an emphasis on planning was an equal emphasis on better coordination among the levels of the school system to avoid duplication of efforts and overlapping. Another was the need for a higher degree of local autonomy and a greater emphasis on local school accountability. The final issue was a reaffirmation of the need to give more weight and time to the social and emotional domain of development at all levels and in all aspects of the curriculum. The job of examining values and ethics was certainly not theirs alone, but they believed that in recent times there had been a de-emphasis on that domain with a concentration on cognitive development. They believed it was time to create a better balance between the two.

Mr. Seleznow commented that they would hear that students at each level had tremendously unique characteristics requiring very specialized instructional practices, curricula and school organization. At the elementary level they would attempt to explain the committee's thinking and framework for developing these aspects of the policy as well as highlight areas which were significant departures from previous policy. Their suggestions provided a more unified and mutually reinforcing policy. This was found in each section and between each of the three sections.

Mr. Seleznow explained that the instructional practices section attempted to institutionalize Priorities 1 and 2 by emphasizing the communication of high expectations for all students and reinforcing this by teaching students how to think and how to learn to learn.

The policy attempted to minimize the fragmentation of the student day, to use staff creatively, and to improve student and program articulation. The curriculum section reinforced the instructional practices section. The curriculum gave students the strategies to learn how to learn. This was critical if youngsters were to deal with future trends and problems. This would require regular curriculum revisions and the elimination of content that was no longer essential or accurate. He said that without reasonable autonomy in organization and staffing the local elementary school would not achieve these policy goals. An examination of the final section would show how organization and staffing had mutually reinforcing elements within it which simultaneously reinforced the prior two sections. He called attention to new directions for policy.

In regard to prekindergarten programs, Mr. Seleznow explained that their recommendation was a qualified one. They were saying "optional programs at pre-K. It was clear to them that the economy of scale of such an undertaking was so great, particularly in view of the present budget climate and facilities needs, that all MCPS efforts in this direction would need to be carefully measured. The committee also recognized that the development of pre-K programs countywide might eventually involve some coordination with other county agencies, private providers and local child care associations. In regard to half-day and full-day kindergarten programs, it was the committee's finding that such an option for parents was something that was highly valued in the community. The committee did not suggest that all schools should offer both options, only that these options should be available to parents in each cluster. In addition, the committee felt strongly that before- and afterschool enrichment activities ought to become part of each school's organization. Lastly, the committee felt that counselors needed to be part of every elementary school staff. They believed that their proposed revised policy represented a cohesive, unified, and well-integrated policy statement which would create an elementary level educational program both responsive to student and community needs as well as adaptive to technological and information advancements.

Dr. Egan stated that the middle level group wanted to point out that at no other point in a person's life was the variability in students so great. Physically, students went from prepubescence to adolescence, cognitively from concrete operations to abstract reasoning, and emotionally from the certainty of childhood to the adolescent's search for identity. At this point students made life choices and program decisions which affect all future academic choices. The committee believed, therefore, that middle level schools should include grades 6 through 8. That grade level organization would permit staff to affect student decision-making in a positive manner, to help students develop leadership and problem-solving skills, and to help students meet their affinity needs. She pointed out that in an intermediate school, 50 percent of the population changed each year. In addition, 50 percent of the disciplinary incidents, K-12, occurred in grades 6 through 8.

Dr. Egan reported that they believed middle level schools should have the flexibility to organize in various ways to meet the needs of the student population. The school might be organized in interdisciplinary teams, in self-contained classes, or in departments. It might be organized in teams for grades 6 and 7 and in departments for grade 8 to help students make a smooth transition into the high school. They also supported the concept of a variety of instructional practices to meet the needs of the students. They wanted activities to underscore the relevance of the learning tasks, small group learning which used peer pressure positively and met student affinity needs and supported academic achievement of minority students, and structured activities which allowed for maximum time on task to meet the intellectual needs of students. To insure that a variety of activities were offered students, they must use the skills of all staff members throughout the school including alternative and special education staff. To do so, they must allow staff time to do the necessary planning. At the middle level they emphasized the development of the whole child. Physically, they stressed development of fundamental psychomotor skills and basic fitness to support a healthy life. Cognitively, they stressed that a dual process existed. They held high expectations for basic skill development along with the development of problem-solving and decision-making skills. Emotionally, they helped students in the search for their identities and acquiring skills to deal with diverse groups of people. They supported a cocurricular program which was integral to the school program.

Dr. Mero reported that her subcommittee members were dedicated to the concept of a four-year comprehensive high school as the basic organization and design for Montgomery County. In each senior high school there should be a comprehensive program of instruction available to each student. Within that comprehensive program, there must be a basic core of courses, each one to be offered in every high school. Efforts should be made on the county level and within each high school to demonstrate the way in which these courses and the curricula interrelate. Other courses and programs should be developed as feasible to meet special student needs in each school. Dr. Mero stated that all schools should develop a strong extracurricular program tailored to the needs of that specific student population. They believed a comprehensive high school should include the following broad areas: academic and higher order thinking skills, intellectual and aesthetic development, physical and emotional development, the role and responsibility of the individual in society, scientific and technological understanding, and career and post-high school development. Within the framework of the comprehensive high school, all senior highs should be expected to emphasize the following practices relating to curriculum and instruction: communicate high expectations for all students, foster a schoolwide emphasis on achievement, promote the mastery of basic skills as well as to provide opportunities for enrichment, incorporate ethnical and value issues as appropriate, and introduce students to technological advances as feasible.

Dr. Mero said that MCPS curriculum specialists should support the

efforts of schools in these areas by helping to minimize fragmentation of the curriculum through articulation across subject areas and by keeping the curriculum current and relevant. In addition, there was a need to strengthen reasonable autonomy and flexibility at the local school level. For example, they assign staff according to student needs and interest as well as staff skills and strengths. They could allow schools to contract for individualized staff development programs tailored to each school's needs. They could allow most decisions regarding the use of funds to take place at the local school level within certain budgeted allocations. They could allow schools to create organizational structures based on student needs within the community and staff input. They were well aware that with increased autonomy came increased accountability. They believed that reasonable methods for accountability could and should be devised to benefit the students, the schools, and the whole school system.

Dr. Edmister remarked that many committee members commented on the need for recognizing special education students and special needs students. It was pointed out that there was a policy on educating handicapped children, but it was suggested that they needed to look beyond handicapped children. They found 11,000 handicapped children, 10,000 youngsters registered with the International Student Office with 4,500 of those receiving ESOL services, and 1,000 youngsters in alternative and interagency programs. They were finding more and more youngsters falling into this special needs domain. They decided that the best way to include these youngsters was to integrate their special needs into the policy statements.

Dr. Edmister reported that they decided to increase awareness of special needs students. For example, they included a statement that they would "support appreciation for all cultures and foster sensitivity towards all those with special needs." They also stated that they would provide for the integration of handicapped within the total school program. Under instructional practices they indicated that they would minimize fragmentation of the student's day which was a major criticism of youngster's being pulled out for special programs and that they would integrate the unique skills of all staff members in regular, alternative, and special education. They were trying to encourage more interaction and sharing among various disciplines. In curriculum they stated that they would accommodate differing interests, backgrounds, learning needs and styles and would meet the needs of all students including those with special needs. Their major goal was integration because at some point in time many of their youngsters were considered as special needs youngsters and yet spent a great deal of their time in the regular education environment.

Mrs. Praisner noted that they needed wide dissemination and feedback before the Board would consider adopting these policies. Schools, communities, and organizations should have an opportunity to comment. Dr. Pitt commented that the issues represented here were not easy ones to deal with. They planned to distribute the documents around August 15 and ask principals and PTAs to review these documents. The

committee wanted to hold one forum in each administrative area, with the goal of Board discussion and action on December 8. He thought that this was a very ambitious schedule and pointed out that some of the issues here had budget impact; therefore, there might be some modification to this schedule.

Mrs. Praisner thought that the community needed to understand the continuum of impacts that they were talking about with these policies. In addition, some of these were goals that the system would be moving towards and would not be overnight changes. When they shared the documents with the community, it seemed to her it was important for people to understand that some of this was not reinventing the wheel and some of this was not a significant change. However, there were some impacts and people had to understand the implications of those. Dr. Pitt pointed out that for this reason they might have to extend the time schedule. Mrs. Praisner commented that some of these issues related to facilities, curriculum, and budget. She suggested that they see what Board member questions there were about what was in or not in the documents. She thought that Dr. Smith might want to highlight those issues.

Dr. Shoenberg remarked that the major area of overlap between this document and the Commission on Excellence report was the whole school autonomy thing. They needed to spell out a definition of autonomy and perhaps consider this in tandem with the two documents. He asked about the matter of integration of curriculum and where it occurred in the document. Dr. Mero replied that it was in number 7, and she said that Carlos Hamlin, the former assistant principal at Woodward, could comment on that. Dr. Shoenberg said that #7 had to do with discrete courses, and he was thinking about things that were not discrete but integrated across discrete courses. He said that part of this might be addressed in the notion of allowing for different organizational patterns. Dr. Mero replied that they had struggled with this issue. They thought it would take a major overhaul over a long period of time to get back to this. They might begin by looking at course sequencing. For example, there was a time when 10th grade English matched 10th grade social studies, and the teachers in the two departments were able to integrate and often did assignments together. She pointed out that total integration would involve planning time. Dr. Shoenberg wished there were something more in this document that pushed in this direction.

Mr. Hamlin said that before they could talk about integration they had to talk about paring down the curriculum. The curriculum was so rich, they could not integrate as much as they would like. Dr. Pitt added that this was a major issue and hard to get at and would take a lot of discussion. Over the years the curriculum had evolved into something that was fairly rigid and prescriptive. Some sources felt that that approach should be continued, and others felt that flexibility was needed to be able to differentiate with children. Dr. Shoenberg was interested in getting something into the policy which would provide some more encouragement for this.

Dr. Shoenberg asked if there was anything in the policies that spoke

to the notion of community service. Dr. Egan replied that there was nothing specific. Dr. Shoenberg wondered if this was something they should include. He would list this with the obligations of the individual to the community rather than in terms of the curriculum. Mrs. Praisner pointed out that the documents before the Board were not final and were subject to change following comments from the Board, community, and staff. She thought the committee should review questions raised by Board members such as Dr. Shoenberg's issues of the integration of curriculum at the high school level and of citizenship. Dr. Mero stated that they would support the addition of the role of the student as a citizen in society and thought they should revisit this issue. They saw that as separate from community service which was in each policy under the social umbrella. It seemed to Mrs. Praisner that Dr. Shoenberg was talking about something beyond school climate issues. Dr. Mero thought that this also related to the topic of ethics and morals and perhaps they should look at strengthening that.

Dr. Smith reported that it was the committee's intention to review suggestions and comments made by Board members so that these could be reflected in the documents sent out to the community. Mrs. Praisner thought that they would have to look at the practical budget and organizational implications. They would have to understand why the new policies were different from the former policies and what they were talking about educationally. She pointed out that not all Board members were present and there might be other opportunities for Board comment.

Dr. Shoenberg recalled that one of the Board priorities dealt with helping students to learn to become members of a group because so much of what went on in the workplace was group work. Again, he was not sure this was in the policy. Dr. Egan replied in the middle level policy they talked about using positive peer pressure, and perhaps they could make this more specific but it did mean working in groups with the responsibility for the product being shared across all the members of the group. Dr. Shoenberg thought this needed to be included in the curriculum or instruction area. He called attention to the section in the high school policy to "provide opportunities for students to explore ethical and value issues." He asked whether this item appeared in the middle level and elementary policies, and Dr. Smith agreed to revisit that issue. In regard to the section on "instructional guidelines for each subject that include strategies to help teachers to differentiate instruction," Dr. Shoenberg wondered whether this belonged in the policy statement because it was an operational kind of issue. Mr. Hamlin reported that the committee had discussed this issue. Dr. Mero thought that this might not be the appropriate place for this statement.

*Mr. Goldensohn joined the meeting at this point.

Dr. Shoenberg called attention to 6. K in the high school policy which states, "Integrate, in both the planning and the implementation of instruction, the UNIQUE skills of all staff members in regular,

alternative, and special education." He did not think that "unique" was the right word and suggested, "special" or "particular." This was in all three policies. Again in 6. d "assist students to develop basic learning and higher order intellectual skills," he thought that "higher order intellectual skills" had become a buzz phrase. Dr. Smith agreed to look into this. He also asked staff to look into rewording "instructional practices must help prepare students for life after high school."

Mrs. DiFonzo called attention to page 13 (17) of the first policy in #10 and asked that this be reworded to state, "encourage and support programming FOR students...." She asked staff to explain the phrase, "learning and affinity needs of the preadolescent and early adolescent." Dr. Egan replied that "affinity needs" were the needs for youngsters to get along with each other. This was a substitute for "peer pressure." It meant the needs for children to belong in a group.

Mrs. DiFonzo noted that section saying that each middle level school should include at least three grades whenever possible to help ensure that students have maximum opportunities for success. She thought a parent could jump on that sentence and say the Board was denying his or her child that opportunity because the child was in a two-year intermediate school. Dr. Egan suggested rewording the sentence to state, "greater opportunity to affect the child's development in a positive way." Mrs. DiFonzo said that it was her sense as she read this that these were "apple pie" and "motherhood." She did not see what anyone could really take exception to, once they hammered out what their broader goals were as a school system. While she had no problem with preschool education, she would want to see all-day kindergarten established before they thought about moving to a program for four-year olds. She thought the policies were readable and clear, and she thought she could live with them.

Mrs. Slye commented that as she read through the policies she had the feeling of "apple pie" until she started reading the statements in the context of one and other. Broadly taken as a document, this was a whole policy that set a rather rigorous standard for some specific approaches. She asked about the section stating, "afford opportunities for enrichment through before-school and after-school activities." Mr. Seleznow explained that this was related to the whole issue of extended day programs and all-day kindergartens. He pointed out that the elementary school day was a very short day and it was a fragmented day. There was little time to do enrichment activities, and many elementary schools were now offering afterschool activities through stipended programs. This was an effort to program before- and afterschool activities as well as enrichment activities. Mrs. Slye thought that this section might need some clarifying language. She would not have read it as programs supplemental to the school programs as well as equity issues.

Mrs. Slye asked about Dr. Mero's statement about paring the curriculum to focus on the core for students. Dr. Mero replied that they had come to consensus on the belief that there was a certain

body of knowledge that every student needed to be exposed to in senior high school. That was referred to as the core. To get to that core, so they could assure that when students graduated they all had exposure and mastery, they would revisit the curriculum and how it had gotten out of control. There was a question in their minds about what the core was in many of these subjects.

Dr. Shoenberg asked for a definition of core, and Dr. Mero replied that there were certain things that people needed to be exposed to before they went out in the world. This would be at a more specific level than "need to be exposed to great literature." She believed there was a core of courses as well as within a course there was a core of knowledge, and they needed to address both. Dr. Shoenberg noted that they had some agreement on a core of courses, and Dr. Mero said that they had to look at what was studied in certain of the core courses. Mrs. Slye said they were really talked about a multi-tiered issue. They were talking about the selection of courses that students would be offered or would be required to take. They were talking about the content of those courses as well in creating a critical body of knowledge. They were talking about making certain that students progressed through a certain amount of information in a certain number of courses and doing that by looking at either requirements or looking at the broad number of offerings. They could limit choices and not offer as many. She asked if that approach needed to start at the J/I/M or middle level.

Dr. Egan stated that in her view there was a body of knowledge that everyone ought to have. At the early adolescent level, they had youngsters who were still in concrete operations and others who could handle algebra in the eighth grade and had moved to abstract reasoning. They were still dealing with basic skill development. For example, in her school there were students still dealing with multiplication. They had to make some educational choices at this level and recognize that practices would cover a great expanse in order to meet all of the needs of the children.

In regard to process, Mrs. Slye asked if they planned to send out the entire timeline with the August distribution of materials. She was concerned about the planned phase that gathered input from staff and parents in October. These groups would not be prepared to do this unless they had the entire timetable. Dr. Smith agreed that the cover letter sending out the material would include the time line. Mrs. Praisner suggested that it would be useful if the committee could highlight or focus on areas where they were seeking comments. For example, people should know that 1 through 7 was the same for all three policies. She was concerned about the October 30 deadline because there was still a lot of back-to-school night focus at this point; therefore, they might need to slide that time frame given the fact they would be focusing on facility decisions for part of this time.

Mr. Goldensohn commented that he did not have a line by line problem with anything. He thought that everything that was good for the students and good for the system was in the policies. The policies

were concise which was excellent. He hoped the superintendent and staff could accomplish the majority of the goals in the policies.

Dr. Shoenberg called attention to the section on school and class attendance in the elementary school policy. The notion of attending classes in elementary school seemed to him to be a little bit strange. However, Board members and committee members disagreed. Mrs. Praisner thought they should emphasize the importance of a student's being where he or she needed to be. Under staff development in the same policy, Dr. Shoenberg thought the policy should state they would require ongoing training for all instructional staff IN new and revised curriculum.

Mrs. Praisner understood that the committee was referring to "middle level" because they did not want individuals to automatically assume that every school would look the same or it was the old middle school model. She wondered why they had moved a 7-8-9 school into the high school policy as opposed to being a middle level model as well. Dr. Egan explained that this was only the ninth grade that would be covered by the high school policy. However, within that grades 7-8-9 framework they could still do interdisciplinary teams as long as they met the special ninth grade requirements. Mrs. Praisner pointed out that a 7-8-9 school would be governed by two policies. Dr. Egan thought that Montgomery County was moving toward the 9-12 high school where feasible. The committee had accepted that as a given, but in a transitional period the ninth grade should still be covered by a high school policy because of Project Basic and other issues. Mr. Seleznow pointed out that they had the same issue with K-5 and K-6 schools.

Mrs. Praisner commented that she had a concern about the use of the term "reasonable" which was used frequently in the policies. However, there had been a significant amount of work done by the committee. They had been given a large task and had done a commendable job. Dr. Smith stated that he would like to thank Holly Joseph, Vicki Rafel and Ann Rose who had followed the work of the committee through the entire process. Mrs. Praisner thanked everyone for the work that had been done.

RESOLUTION NO. 366-87 Re: POLICY ON NONRESIDENT TUITION

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

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 old or older and under 16 shall attend a

public school regularly..."; and

WHEREAS, The State Board of Education has 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 State Board of Education has concluded that bona fide residency exists if at a minimum the student actually lives with a parent, guardian, or other individual who has legal custody; and

WHEREAS, Tuition may be charged for students without bona fide residency to attend county public schools; 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 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. Throughout this policy and any implementing regulations, if the parents live apart, use of the word "parent" shall

mean (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; and the child's bona fide residence shall be determined accordingly.

- b. A qualified 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 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 shall be based on documentation which establishes that the student is in a crisis situation. A crisis is defined as an acute situation where the general welfare of the child is in jeopardy due to unforeseeable and uncontrollable circumstances, which may include the death of a parent, abuse or neglect, financial deprivation of the child, health or 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 student placed in a group home or foster home in Montgomery County by the Departments of Social or Juvenile Service 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, but not necessarily be limited to, the following students:

- a. A qualified 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 apply:

- 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, an 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 to reside with a sponsoring family residing in Montgomery County; and has the approval of 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 student 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. This section shall not be interpreted to require a student admitted under Section B.3.b. (60-day grace period) to transfer schools upon expiration of the grace period.

- 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.

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 one or more of the conditions (a. through g.) in this section. 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.

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 schools, the full-year tuition rates shall equal the estimated average per-pupil costs, including debt service, and shall reflect as nearly as possible the actual costs of educating students at each of these grade levels.
- b. For students whose tuition rates are 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 rates 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 rates shall reflect as nearly as possible the actual costs of educating these students, including debt service, based on educational and special services provided.
- d. The rates of school-year and/or summer school tuition for the children of full-time MCPS employees who reside outside of Montgomery County shall be one-half the rates for other nonresident students who are enrolled at the same grade level and receiving the same level of services.
- 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 Commission; (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 Service 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 developing 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: RESPONDING TO CITIZEN INQUIRIES AND COMPLAINTS. 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 granted under the terms of Sections B.3.d. or B.4. (last paragraph) 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: EXECUTIVE SESSION

The Board met in executive session from 11:55 a.m. to 2:05 p.m. to discuss appeals and personnel matters. For the record, Mrs. Praisner stated that they had three Board members absent. Mr. Herscovitz was out of the country as an exchange student, Dr. Cronin was out of town, and Mr. Ewing was attending a federal executive institute. Board members would read the minutes and materials pertaining to the meeting.

Re: BOARD/PRESS/VISITOR CONFERENCE

Karen Barber appeared before the Board.

RESOLUTION NO. 367-87 Re: PERSONNEL MONTHLY REPORT

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

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

RESOLUTION NO. 368-87 Re: EXTENSION OF SICK LEAVE

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

WHEREAS, The employees listed below have suffered serious illness; and

WHEREAS, Due to the prolonged illness, the employees' accumulated sick leave has expired; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education grant extensions of sick leave with three-fourths pay covering the number of days indicated:

NAME	POSITION AND LOCATION	NO. OF DAYS
------	-----------------------	-------------

Baker, Joseph	Building Services Worker Julius West Middle School	30
Smith, Judith	Art Teacher Longview School	10

RESOLUTION NO. 369-87 Re: DEATH OF MRS. LOUISE R. BALL, CLASSROOM
TEACHER ON PERSONAL ILLNESS LEAVE FROM
TAKOMA PARK INTERMEDIATE SCHOOL

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

WHEREAS, The death on April 4, 1987, of Mrs. Louise R. Ball, a classroom teacher on personal illness leave from Takoma Park Intermediate School, has deeply saddened the staff and members of the Board of Education; and

WHEREAS, In the short time Mrs. Ball had been a member of the staff of Montgomery County Public Schools, she had developed good communication and rapport with students, parents, and staff; and

WHEREAS, Mrs. Ball had established high standards and earned the respect of her colleagues; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the members of the Board of Education express their sorrow at the death of Mrs. Louise R. Ball 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. Ball's family.

RESOLUTION NO. 370-87 Re: DEATH OF MRS. FRANCES K. HAGAR,
CLASSROOM TEACHER AT TRAVILAH
ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

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

WHEREAS, The death on June 7, 1987, of Mrs. Frances K. Hagar, a classroom teacher at Travilah Elementary School, has deeply saddened the staff and members of the Board of Education; and

WHEREAS, For the thirty-two years Mrs. Hagar was a member of the staff of Montgomery County Public Schools, she displayed the ability to provide maximally stimulating learning experiences through a happy, relaxed classroom environment; and

WHEREAS, Mrs. Hagar has earned the respect of her colleagues, pupils, and parents, now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the members of the Board of Education express their sorrow at the death of Mrs. Frances K. Hagar 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. Hagar's family.

RESOLUTION NO. 371-87 Re: PERSONNEL APPOINTMENTS AND TRANSFERS

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

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

APPOINTMENT	PRESENT POSITION	AS
Michael E. Glascoe	Administrative Asst. to the Deputy Supt. General Admin.	Principal Robert Frost IS Effective 7-15-87
TRANSFER	FROM	TO
Nancy H. Powell	Principal Magruder HS	Principal B-CC HS Effective 7-15-87
Thomas Warren	Principal Sherwood HS	Principal Quince Orchard HS Effective 8-1-87
APPOINTMENT	PRESENT POSITION	AS
Margaret S. Keller	Acting Supervisor of Secondary Instruct. Area 1 Admin. Office	Supervisor of Sec. Instruct. Area 1 Admin. Office Effective 7-15-87
Kimberly A. Sloan		School Psychologist Half-time Diagnostic & Prof. Support Team Effective 7-15-87
TRANSFER	FROM	TO
Carlos Hamlin	Assistant Principal Woodward HS	Assistant Principal Einstein HS Effective 7-15-87
Donald Jackson	Assistant Principal Mill Creek Towne ES	Assistant Principal Watkins Mills ES Effective 7-15-87

Jesse Beard

Assistant Principal
Academic Leave

Assistant Principal
Fox Chapel ES
Effective 7-15-87

RESOLUTION NO. 372-87 Re: TUITION FOR OUT-OF-COUNTY AND OUT-OF-STATE PUPILS FOR FY 1988

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

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

WHEREAS, The basis for the calculation of cost per pupil for tuition purposes in FY 1988 is as follows:

	KINDERGARTEN	ELEMENTARY	MIDDLE JUNIOR/SENIOR	SPECIAL EDUCATION
Estimated No. of Pupils	7,517	39,937	43,330	4,345
Out-of-county Maryland Pupils				
COST:				
Regular Prgm.	\$25,387,716	\$173,623,028	\$226,386,782	\$47,907,612
Debt Svs.	720,708	7,658,083	8,308,705	883,172
Total Cost	\$26,108,424	\$181,281,111	\$234,695,487	\$48,740,784
Cost Per Pupil:				
Reg. Prgm.	\$ 3,377	\$ 4,347	\$ 5,225	\$ 11,026
Debt Svs.	96	192	192	192
Total Cost	\$ 3,473	\$ 4,539	\$ 5,417	\$ 11,218
Full Day Kindergarten				
Reg. Prgm.	\$ 4,686			
Debt. Svs.	192			
Total Cost	\$ 4,878			
Out-of-State Pupils				
Cost:				
Reg. Prgm.	\$25,387,716	\$173,623,028	\$226,386,782	\$47,907,612
Debt Svs.	777,982	8,266,659	8,968,985	899,382
Total Cost	\$26,165,698	\$181,889,687	\$235,355,767	\$48,806,994
Cost Per Pupil:				
Reg. Prgm.	\$ 3,377	\$ 4,347	\$ 5,225	\$ 11,026

Debt. Svs.	104	207	207	207
	-----	-----	-----	-----
Total Cost	\$ 3,481	\$ 4,554	\$ 5,432	\$ 11,233
Full Day Kindergarten				
Reg. Prgrm.	\$ 4,686			
Debt. Svs.	207			

Total Cost	\$ 4,893			

COMPARISONS WITH PREVIOUS YEAR

	1986-87		1987-88	
	Out-of-county	Out-of-state	Out-of-county	Out-of-state
Kindergarten				
Half Day	\$ 3,266	\$ 3,280	\$ 3,473	\$ 3,481
Full Day	4,562	4,590	4,878	4,893
Elementary	4,312	4,340	4,539	4,554
Secondary	4,989	5,017	5,417	5,432
Special Ed.	8,680	8,708	11,218	11,233

now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the tuition rates for out-of-county Maryland pupils and out-of-state pupils for the 1987-88 school year shall be:

	Out-of-county	Out-of-state
Half Kindergarten	\$ 3,473	\$ 3,481
Full Kindergarten	4,878	4,893
Elementary	4,539	4,554
Secondary	5,417	5,432
Special Educ.	11,218	11,233

RESOLUTION NO. 373-87 Re: FY 1988 CATEGORICAL TRANSFER WITHIN THE EDUCATION CONSOLIDATION AND IMPROVEMENT ACT CHAPTER 2

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

RESOLVED, That the superintendent of schools be authorized to effect within the FY 1988 Education Consolidation and Improvement Act Chapter 2 the following categorical transfer in accordance with the County Council provision for transfers:

CATEGORY	FROM	TO
02 Instructional Salaries	\$ 8,920	
03 Instructional Other		\$11,407
10 Fixed Charges	2,487	
	-----	-----
TOTAL	\$11,407	\$11,407

and be it further

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

RESOLUTION NO. 374-87 Re: PROCUREMENT CONTRACTS OVER \$25,000

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

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

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
RFP 87-14	Annual Contract for Elevator Maintenance Barbee Curran Elevator Co., Inc.	\$ 28,650
RFP 87-21	Proposals from Auctioneers for a Public Auction George C. Hunt	7% of gross sales
149-87	Computer Supplies Benchmark Systems, Inc.	\$ 40
	Computerland of Rockville	21,600
	Cove Ribbon Mfg. Co., Inc.	1,611
	Data Systems Integration, Inc.	733
	Diamond Paper Corp.	253
	DK & R Company	3,900
	Frederick Computer Products, Inc.	3,780
	M. S. Ginn Company	216
	IBS/Spartan, Inc.	23,171
	Landon Systems Corp.	198
	Management Systems Services, Inc.	375
	Matrix Data Corp.	2,986
	Media Management & Magnetism, Inc.	1,313
	Memory Bytes	326
	TOTAL	----- \$ 60,502
157-87	Poultry Products, Frozen and Processed Carroll County Foods	\$ 65,400
166-87	Processed Meats Manassas Ice & Fuel Co., Inc.	\$ 31,195
	Interocean Seafoods Corp.	3,285
	TOTAL	----- \$ 34,480

170-87	Frozen Foods	
	Carroll County Foods	\$ 71,185
	Continental Smelkinson	13,141
	Edward Boker Foods, Inc.	24,592
	Frederick Produce Co., Inc.	293
	Manassas Ice & Fuel Co., Inc.	2,352

	TOTAL	\$111,563
187-87	MS/DOS Microcomputers	
	Computerland of Rockville	\$ 6,575
	Data Access Systems, Inc.	3,400
	Data Systems Integration, Inc.	20,821
	Frederick Computer Products, Inc.	48,918
	Kramer Systems International, Inc.	127,470
	Memory Bytes	14,537
	Memory Systems, Inc.	3,094
	Office Automation, Inc.	4,690
	Sears Business Systems Center	2,757

	TOTAL	\$232,262
192-87	Motor Vehicles, Refrigerated Van	
	District International Trucks, Inc.	\$ 53,532
	Dorsey/Records, Inc.	45,000

		\$ 98,532
193-87	Physical Education Equipment	
	BSN Corp.	\$ 1,050
	DVF Sporting Goods Company	4,947
	Dekan Athletic Equip.	2,990
	Gibson, Inc.	1,519
	Delmar F. Harris Co., Inc.	21,000
	NFA, Inc.	391
	Priceless Sales & Service, Inc.	23,209
	Sportmaster	33,894
	John W. Taylor Associates	23,850
	UCS, Inc.	6,200

	TOTAL	\$119,050
	GRAND TOTAL	\$750,439

RESOLUTION NO. 375-87 Re: RESURFACING OF RUNNING TRACKS AND
FIELD EVENT RUNWAYS 999-45

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

WHEREAS, Sealed bids were received on July 7, 1987, for unit prices to resurface running tracks and field event runways as follows:

BIDDER
The American Asphalt
Paving Co., Inc.

BASE BID	ADD ALT. 1	ADD ALT. 2	ADD ALT. 3
\$8.65/sq.yd.	\$30.00/sq.yd.	\$3,500	\$3.00/sq. yd.
installation	removal & base	track and	sealer coat
		runway	
		striping	

and

WHEREAS, Only one bid was received and it exceeds staff estimate; and

WHEREAS, School facilities staff feel it would be advantageous to rebid the resurfacing work in order to obtain a lower unit cost; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the bid from The American Asphalt Paving Co., Inc. for resurfacing of running tracks and field event runways be rejected and rebid.

RESOLUTION NO. 376-87 Re: MUDDY BRANCH ELEMENTARY SCHOOL (AREA 3)

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

WHEREAS, The following sealed bids were received on July 8, 1987, for the construction of Muddy Branch Elementary School:

BIDDER	BASE BID
The Gassman Corporation	\$5,770,000
Dustin Construction, Inc.	6,196,000
Henley Construction, Inc.	6,279,979
John R. Hess, Inc.	6,315,000

and

WHEREAS, The low bidder, The Gassman Corporation, has satisfactorily completed many schools for MCPS; and

WHEREAS, Sufficient funds are available to award the base bid; and

WHEREAS, Surplus funds are available in the Muddy Branch Elementary School project because the low bid was less than the estimated construction cost; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That a contract be awarded to The Gassman Corporation in the amount of \$5,770,000 for the construction of the new Muddy Branch Elementary School, contingent upon County Council approval of the amended Stonebridge development plan, in accordance with plans and specifications prepared by Grimm & Parker; and be it further

RESOLVED, That local appropriation authority in the amount of \$250,000 be transferred to the local unliquidated surplus account (Project 997) from the Muddy Branch Elementary School (Project 653-01); and be it further

RESOLVED, That the Board resolution of June 22, 1987, requesting an emergency supplemental appropriation of \$150,000 for the Phoenix II program (Project 886552) be rescinded; and be it further

RESOLVED, That local appropriation authority in the amount of \$150,000 be transferred from the local unliquidated surplus account (Project 997) to the Phoenix II program (Project 88652) and that \$100,000 be transferred from the local unliquidated surplus (Project 997) to the Asbestos Abatement project (Project 999-28); and be it further

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

RESOLUTION NO. 377-87 Re: GLENALLAN ELEMENTARY SCHOOL -
REROOFING (AREA 1)

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

WHEREAS, Sealed bids were received on June 23, 1987, for reroofing Glenallan Elementary School as follows:

BIDDER	LUMP SUM
1. R. D. Bean, Inc.	\$118,959
2. Agmilu & Co., Inc.	129,460
3. Meridian Construction Co., Inc.	159,175
4. J. E. Wood & Sons Co., Inc.	167,880
5. Raintree Industries, Inc.	168,500
6. Orndorff & Spaid, Inc.	205,016

and

WHEREAS, The low bidder, R. D. Bean, Inc., has performed similar projects satisfactorily for MCPS; and

WHEREAS, Low bid is within staff estimate and sufficient funds are available in Account 999-42 to effect award; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That a contract for \$118,958 be awarded to R. D. Bean, Inc., for reroofing Glenallan Elementary School in accordance with plans and specifications prepared by the Department of School Facilities.

RESOLUTION NO. 378-87 Re: ARCHITECTURAL APPOINTMENTS - FY 1988
CAPITAL PROJECTS

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

WHEREAS, It is necessary to appoint architects to provide required design services and administration of the construction contracts; and

WHEREAS, Funds were approved in the FY 1988 Capital Budget for the projects listed below; and

WHEREAS, The architectural/engineer selection procedures approved by the Board of Education on May 13, 1986, were employed in the following architectural appointments; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the Montgomery County Board of Education enter into a contractual agreement with each of the below-listed architectural firms to provide required design services and construction supervision for the following indicated capital improvement projects included in the FY 1988 Capital Budget:

PROJECT	ARCHITECT/ENGINEER	FEE
Whitman H.S. Modernization	Grimm & Parker	\$673,000
Hadley Farms E.S.	Tom Clark + Associates	359,000
Monocacy ES Modernization	Fox-Hanna Architects	102,000

RESOLUTION NO. 379-87 Re: FAIRLAND ELEMENTARY SCHOOL - GRANT OF RIGHT-OF-WAY EASEMENT TO WASHINGTON SUBURBAN SANITARY COMMISSION (AREA 1)

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

WHEREAS, The Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission plans to relocate an existing water meter vault located on the Fairland Elementary School site to another area within the school premises; and

WHEREAS, The proposed relocation is necessary to clear the right-of-way in conjunction with Montgomery County's Fairland Road Capital Improvements Project; and

WHEREAS, All construction, restoration, and future maintenance will be performed at no cost to the Board of Education, with the Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission and contractors assuming liability for all damages or injury; and

WHEREAS, This dedication of a right-of-way for a water meter vault and appurtenances, including service connections will benefit the surrounding community and the Fairland Elementary school site; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the president and secretary be authorized to executive a right-of-way for the 225 square feet of land required to relocate the existing water meter vault and appurtenances at the Fairland Elementary School.

RESOLUTION NO. 380-87 Re: AWARD OF BID FOR TELEPHONE SYSTEM

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

WHEREAS, The MCPS Telecommunications Plan verified the need for a substantial improvement in telephone services for schools and offices; and

WHEREAS, Bid 87-09 invited proposals for telephone services that included related costs over a ten-year period; and

WHEREAS, Bids were evaluated by a staff committee and an independent telecommunications consultant; and

WHEREAS, MCPS Custom Centrex Service to include touch tone, call forwarding and call transferring, long-distance restriction, and call pickup offered by Chesapeake and Potomac Telephone Company of Maryland (C&P) was lowest in ten-year costs and received the highest ratings on technical criteria; and

WHEREAS, The Audit Committee of the Board of Education reviewed the procurement process and the proposed offering by C&P; and

WHEREAS, C&P has agreed to hold most costs for this custom service constant for a ten-year period; and

WHEREAS, Network access and the cost of telephone moves and changes are governed by tariff actions by the Maryland Public Service Commission and the Federal Communications Commission; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the president and secretary be authorized to execute a contract with C&P for 3,045 lines for ten years of MCPS Custom Centrex Service for \$6,116,796, contingent on fund appropriation by the Montgomery County Council; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the contract with C&P be subject to cancellation without penalty by either party in the event of disapproval by the Maryland Public Service Commission of the rates, terms, and conditions provided under the contract; and be it further

RESOLVED, That as a part of this contract additional lines be guaranteed up to 5,515 with the same MCPS Custom Service features at the same rate per line and that network access, other optional features, and changes required by the school system be added to this contract amount, using current approved tariff rates.

*For the record, Mrs. Slye stated that the audit committee had spent

considerable time reviewing the bid, the costs, and the process used. A summary of their discussion is contained in the minutes of the audit committee dated June 23, 1987.

RESOLUTION NO. 381-87 Re: TRANSFER OF FUNDS FOR VARIOUS CAPITAL PROJECTS

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

WHEREAS, A need exists for additional funds at Jones Lane Elementary School for storm water management costs and Twinbrook Elementary School as a result of post-occupancy review; and

WHEREAS, Local residual appropriation authority exists at Moyer Road Elementary School; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That \$135,000 be transferred from Moyer Road Elementary School (706-01) to the local unliquidated surplus (997-01); and be it further

RESOLVED, That local appropriation authority in the amount of \$75,000 and \$60,000 be transferred from local unliquidated surplus (997-01) to Jones Lane Elementary School (360-02) and Twinbrook Elementary School (206-09), respectively; and be it further

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

RESOLUTION NO. 382-87 Re: PRESENTATION OF PRELIMINARY PLANS FOR CLEAR SPRING ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

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

WHEREAS, The architect for Clear Spring Elementary School has prepared the schematic design in accordance with the educational specifications; and

WHEREAS, The Clear Spring Planning Committee has approved the proposed schematic design; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the Montgomery County Board of Education approve the schematic design report prepared by Duane, Elliott, Cahill, Mullineaux & Mullineaux.

RESOLUTION NO. 383-87 Re: RESPONDING TO CITIZEN INQUIRIES AND COMPLAINTS

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

RESOLVED, That Resolution No. 355-72, May 9, 1972, be rescinded and that the following policy statement be adopted:

Responding to Citizen Inquiries and Complaints

A. Purpose

To ensure that citizens' differences or problems are resolved as expeditiously and satisfactorily as possible.

B. Process and Content

1. The Board of Education encourages the resolution of citizen inquiries and complaints at the local school or at the lowest possible administrative level and by the informal process of cooperative agreement among the affected parties.
2. When the results of the informal approach to a citizen's complaint are not satisfactory, the citizen should have the opportunity to pursue the matter through a formal complaint process.
3. The superintendent shall establish and publish both informal and formal procedures for processing and resolving such inquiries and complaints.
4. The procedures shall provide for at least the following steps and safeguards:
 - a. Encouragement of the informal process initially
 - b. Provisions for a formal documented decision making process regarding a complaint
 - c. Provisions for the children's right to appeal a decision
 - d. Establishment of reasonable time limits
 - e. Protection of individual rights with regard to such matters as equity, due process, and privacy
 - f) Requirements for case records and files
5. These procedures should be publicized annually.

C. Review and Reporting

This policy will be reviewed every three years in accordance with the Board of Education policy review process.

RESOLUTION NO. 384-87 Re: EXECUTIVE SESSION - JULY 27, 1987

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

WHEREAS, The Board of Education of Montgomery County is authorized by Section 10-508, State Government Article of the ANNOTATED CODE OF MARYLAND to conduct certain of its meetings in executive closed session; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education of Montgomery County hereby conduct its meeting in executive closed session beginning on July 27, 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.

Mrs. DiFonzo assumed the chair.

RESOLUTION NO. 385-87 Re: MINUTES OF MAY 12, 1987

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

RESOLVED, That the minutes of May 12, 1987, be approved.

Mrs. Praisner assumed the chair.

RESOLUTION NO. 386-87 Re: MINUTES OF MAY 27, 1987

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

RESOLVED, That the minutes of May 27, 1987, be approved.

RESOLUTION NO. 387-87 Re: BOE APPEAL NO. 1987-5

On motion of Mrs. Slye seconded by Dr. Shoenberg, the following resolution was adopted with Mr. Goldensohn, Mrs. Praisner, Dr. Shoenberg and Mrs. Slye voting in the affirmative; Mrs. DiFonzo voting in the negative:

RESOLVED, That in the matter of BOE Appeal No. 1987-5 the Board of Education affirms the decision with the superintendent with a written decision and order to follow.

RESOLUTION NO. 388-87 Re: BOE APPEAL NO. 1987-11

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

RESOLVED, That BOE Appeal No. 1987-11 be dismissed.

Re: ANNUAL REPORT OF THE MEDICAL ADVISORY
COMMITTEE

Mr. Michael Glascoe, liaison to the committee, introduced Dr. Miriam Schwartz, Dr. Nasreen Ahmed, Ms. Mickie O'Connell, Dr. Mary Adam, Ms. Betty Takahashi, and Ms. Clare Kownacki. He explained that the committee had dealt with tobacco use on school property, medical plans for children with Downs Syndrome, the mental health referral administration regulation, and medical clearance for participation in interscholastic athletics.

Dr. Schwartz reported that medical clearance for participation in interscholastic athletics had always been a problem and was being tidied up each year. In regard to mental health referrals, they thought the school counselors and pupil personnel workers could make mental health referrals. It was suggested that school staff make generic referrals rather than specific recommendations of particular psychiatrists. The medical clearance for children with Downs was something that had been done in a disorganized way in the past, and they wanted to clarify that. They were lucky to have an orthopedic surgeon as a member of their committee, and that surgeon had received advice from a surgeon on the national level. The letter the Board had seen had been altered slightly and was ready for distribution. The committee had also made recommendations about tobacco use on school property.

Mrs. Praisner stated that the staff would have an opportunity to respond to these recommendations. However, the mental health regulation did not have to come back for Board action. Dr. Pitt agreed that it would not and explained that everyone was in favor of this change. It was just a question of getting the consensus of medical groups who had had some questions about this in the past. Mr. Glascoe added that when the Mental Health Subcommittee had reviewed the proposal, the committee had had input from guidance counselors and pupil personnel workers associations.

In regard to the recommendation on using continuing care providers for physical examinations, Mr. Edward Masood reported that this recommendation was being placed in athletic handbooks for J/I/M and senior high schools. Mrs. Praisner noted that they could not make this a requirement but suggested this for better care.

Mrs. Praisner asked about the medical clearance for children with Downs Syndrome. Ms. Kownacki explained that the recommendation of the committee had been adopted by the School Health Services Division of the Health Department, and it would be the responsibility of the nurses to send letters about children with Downs Syndrome. Mr. Masood added that they were also preparing a letter to all physical education teachers and motor development specialists to provide guidelines for physical education activities for children with Downs Syndrome.

In regard to the use of tobacco on school property, Mrs. Praisner explained that the superintendent would take this under advisement. The Board's present policy allowed local schools to make a determination regarding smoking, and it was her understanding that next year at least one high school would be a nonsmoking school. She knew that Walt Whitman has made that determination, Seneca Valley was considering it, and Walter Johnson had considered it and decided to wait a year.

Dr. Pitt stated that he would be reacting to the recommendation of the committee, but he was not sure about the timing of that reaction. However, he was certain that his response would come in after the

opening of school in the fall. He emphasized that they already had a policy which allowed individual schools to ban smoking totally for students, and he believed there would be more than two schools moving in this direction in September.

Dr. Richard Dumais, principal of Seneca Valley High School, reported that he had surveyed six high schools. Ninety percent of the professional staff did not smoke and strongly supported a ban against smoking. Mrs. Praisner asked Dr. Dumais to share the information from his survey. She pointed out that in a couple of months the Board would have the benefit of the experiences under the two voluntary models. Mrs. Slye asked that the staff response to the recommendations of the committee include information on local practice with regard to chewing tobacco.

Mrs. Praisner indicated that the Board would return to the issue of the student smoking policy. She thanked the committee for the work it had done during the year and for their recommendations.

Re: IMPROVING THE EDUCATION OF MINORITY
STUDENTS

Mrs. Praisner recalled that on June 4 they had had some preliminary discussion on the plan which was an introduction to the issue. Dr. Pitt said on June 4 they had been talking about a number of different issues at one time. Their purpose was to deal with this plan in an orderly, specific, concrete way. They had planned two meetings on this subject. Following Dr. Cody's presentation, Dr. Pitt had asked Dr. Paul Scott, the director of minority education, working with other staff to focus in on some of the concerns that were expressed. They now had additional information about the role and function of the director of minority education; identification, validation, and dissemination of successful practices; and a proposed affirmative action policy. On July 27, they would have information on an accountability and management process. He had spent the last week in many meetings with staff, and he had stressed the importance of minority achievement. Unless they found a way of improving the achievement of minority youngsters, they would have a greater gap and great concern in this country. He believed that MCPS was a lighthouse school system and could be successful in this. He suggested that they start with the role and function of the director of minority education. He wanted Dr. Scott to serve as the central clearinghouse for developing and disseminating information about minority education and to look at programs. If things were not working, it was Dr. Scott's obligation to review, investigate, and recommend to the superintendent and deputy. It was then the superintendent's responsibility to move into these areas and correct them.

Dr. Scott recalled that at the end of the June 4 meeting he had been criticized for not having anything to say. The reality of the situation was the former superintendent had wanted to handle the presentation and the discussion. In addition to crafting this proposal, Dr. Scott had spent much of his time meeting with community

leaders and groups and professionals locally and nationally on this particular issue. The common thread in these interactions was that throughout the nation the attainment of quality education for minority students had been a day-to-day lifetime struggle. Desegregation of schools, much to the surprise of some, had not been the answer.

Dr. Scott said that the search for educational equity and the sincerity of purpose was the motivating force needed for change. He believed that they had not only the capacity but also the know-how to move it much further. He noted that even their critics agreed that they had made strides. He believed they had developed a purposeful document for improving the education of minority children. It was not perfect, and it was not a quick fix. It would continue to evolve and grow.

Dr. Scott believed that if they lived up to their reputation as one of the great school systems in the nation they would accomplish their goal. It was imperative that they have a sincerity of purpose on the part of the Board, the superintendent, the staff, parents, principals, and the community. He believed they were moving in the right direction.

Mrs. Slye pointed out that in the description of role and function there was a sentence which indicated that the director had the authority to speak to the superintendent on matters concerning minority education. She wanted to know whether this was in a directive or clarifying sense. Dr. Scott replied that it would be in both. It would be directive when necessary. Dr. Vance added that he and Dr. Scott would have a close working relationship. They wanted to work together on the whole issue of improving the education of minority youngsters. Therefore, Dr. Scott was the operative in the field speaking for the superintendent and addressing issues and action plans. He would speak for the superintendent in matters of minority education. Dr. Pitt said they were considering having a monthly report in which Dr. Scott would focus on specific concerns. Dr. Shoenberg expressed his appreciation for the clarity with which the documents were drafted. Dr. Scott's role was clear to everyone involved. He was not the person to whom all this responsibility had been shifted but the one who saw that other people assumed their responsibility. He did not have any questions because the documents were so clear.

Mrs. Praisner stated that in reading this document it was very clear and very specific. She said that the answers were there to many questions that might have been outstanding earlier. She thought there were fewer questions for the discussion because of the quality of the work that had gone into the preparation of this. She would probably have questions about operations once they started doing the things defined here.

Dr. Pitt remarked that this was unique in our school system. Dr. Scott's role was one of having the ability to look at a problem, investigate it, review it, and come in with his advice on how to

correct the problem. It would not be Dr. Scott's responsibility to correct all the problems. It would be his job to find the problems and help develop the plan itself.

In regard to successful practices, Dr. Pitt explained that this area caused them a good deal of concern. They had been asked a number of times how they knew when there was a successful practice. This was not an easy question to answer. It was easy to identify when someone was succeeding in terms of the goals. The question was what they were doing that worked. The staff had worked on how to do that and had come up with a process that was not complicated and would not take thousands of dollars and lots of time to implement.

Dr. Scott commented that many of their schools had been and continued to successfully meet the needs of individual children and in doing so, met the needs of their minority populations. To date, they had not had a systematic means of identifying, validating and disseminating those successful practices for others to share. The intent of the process was first to link the identification criteria to the accountability measures which would be brought forth on July 27 and secondly to make the validation process more rigorous. The third intent was to expedite the sharing and dissemination.

Dr. Shoenberg realized that the process could be far more elaborate and involve a complex, experimental design. On the other hand, this struck one as being a rather elaborate process or at least being expensive in terms of time. He wondered whether there wasn't a simpler way of doing this which was not so expensive of time. He understood the need for some kind of independent validation of the success, and he understood it would be helpful to have some analysis to understand what portion of what people were doing that was leading to the success. On the other hand, he thought they could use "if it is right, you will know it" theory.

Dr. Scott said that in terms of the validation, they had looked at that and felt that part would require some redirection of staff. They did not see this as having a real cost to it. They would have to take a look at the area of dissemination. He reported that initially they had had a much more elaborate process.

Dr. Pitt commented that he was of the intuitive school, too. He thought they should be able to tell when something was successful, but that might not satisfy many people. Therefore, they needed a process of validation. However, he did not want to have a complex project that would cost a great deal of money. They wanted something in between the two. The plan before the Board would cost some time and energy, but if this would help the process then it was worth the energy. He said that when they transmitted a successful practice, they had to have staff involved rather than a principal talking with another principal. This communication and work with the staff of the other school would take some time and some energy.

Dr. Vance recalled that they had thought of a number of simpler and easier routes to take, but there were a number of things they had to address. For example, he thought that an independent validation of what a successful practice was, was critical. He commented that it

was time to take the mystery out of being able to competently educate minority youngsters. The committee felt it had to resist the temptation to control the behavior of others from the top down. They felt it was important for teachers, specialists, principals, and counselors to be part of the unit going to a school other than their own.

Mrs. Praisner recalled that in the past they had said that part of their problems in trying to implement things was the top-down edict process. One way was to have individuals buy into what they were proposing, and that "buying-into" came from both experience and also having something other than one's intuitive sense that it was right. If everyone knew their school had an equal opportunity to be recognized, she thought there would be a greater acceptance of and receptivity to what was being suggested as an appropriate practice. It seemed to Dr. Shoenberg that there would be some prestige attached to having your program identified as an outstanding program. On the other hand, there were schools doing a good job without doing any one set of things that were identifiable and separable as an outstanding practice. He asked if there were ways in which they would give equal prestige to those schools doing a good job. Dr. Scott thought this was an issue they would need to address. In their newsletter, they were reporting on programs in schools and this had been done without rigorous validation. Dr. Pitt added that he saw accountability as a positive. Schools making progress toward the goals would have the opportunity to receive credit although they might not have a specific practice that was easily identifiable.

Re: PROPOSED POLICY ON AFFIRMATIVE STAFFING

Dr. Scott stated that although MCPS had not had a formal affirmative action policy, the concept had been applied to all organizational units as an integral part of an affirmative action program. They were proposing the adoption of an affirmative action policy that brought these pieces together and clearly expressed the school system's intent and purposes. This was also in conjunction with Priority 2, because they believed that youngsters should be exposed to people in a variety of roles and from a variety of backgrounds. They also recognized that there were aspects of an affirmative action policy that had much broader implications for the school system. A draft regulation accompanied the policy. His role as the director of minority education was to receive reports regarding the progress of the affirmative action program. Dr. James Shinn, director of personnel, and Mrs. Marion Bell, director of human relations, had been involved in the development of the policy. It seemed to Mrs. Praisner that it would be useful to have Dr. Shinn and Mrs. Bell review their roles and responsibilities within this policy.

Dr. Shinn remarked that it was clear to him that the Board felt very strongly about affirmative staffing even though they had not had a written policy. They had had success in increasing minority representation in their staff because of the Board's support and the support of the superintendent. He saw the personnel services role as

being multi-faceted. First, they needed to do a careful analysis of where they were. They had made some gains, but they needed to be able to document where the gains were. Secondly, they needed to survey where they could recruit additional minority staff. For example, the literature stated that the minority teaching force would be virtually nonexistent by 1992. Therefore, they had to do some creative things to help correct this. One of which was to go to MCPS high schools and ask minority youngsters to consider education as a career. He saw Personnel as helping to monitor the entire process and look at their entire work force to develop some very clear goals. They planned to ask the superintendent to set annual goals, and Dr. Scott had already assumed a great deal of the monitoring function and was reviewing the monthly reports on minority staff. Dr. Shinn saw the policy and the regulation as a reaffirmation of the Board's commitment.

Mrs. Bell saw the Department of Human Relations as assisting in the monitoring process and in the analysis of what was happening in the system. She thought it was clear that the Board and the superintendent were for affirmative action and had been for a long time. Because the Title IX coordinator was in her department, she was going to be very conscious of the women being hired in nontraditional spots. She also wanted to be sure that minorities, particularly those from other countries, were given support and were comfortable in their positions.

Mrs. Praisner assumed they would do a survey of current staff and their likely length of service before retirement. Dr. Pitt stated that he was also interested in staffing patterns within each school and office in Montgomery County. Where there was opportunity to improve that staffing, it was incumbent on them to do this. Mrs. DiFonzo recalled that the report of the Commission on Excellence spoke to returning autonomy and flexibility to the individual school. The report made the point that principals should be permitted to hire whomever they wanted to staff their schools to establish the tone of the school. She had had problems with that when she read it because they had been talking about establishing in writing something that they seem to have been committed to for a long time. Dr. Pitt thought there was an opportunity for flexibility, but they did have to set certain criteria and goals for people. For example, if a principal were to hire an all white, all male staff, that would be a concern. On the other hand, if there were three people who could do the job and the principal needed balance, he would hope the principal would have some discretion in the hiring process.

Mrs. DiFonzo stated that in the policy they had talked about retention, and the new editor of the BULLETIN had done a lengthy article talking about the experiences of the Hispanics recruited into the system and how some of them had chosen to return to Puerto Rico because of the lack of support here. She asked if they were planning to do any kind of outreach or were considering doing this in partnership with the Hispanic community or churches. Dr. Shinn reported that it was true that some people from Puerto Rico decided to go back. He noted that while some decided to go back because of

the teaching, others decided to go back because their spouses were unhappy here. They did intend to offer more support, and they would work with Dr. Scott and staff development to try to provide even more support than they did this year. Mrs. Bell added that the Human Relations Department had encouraged the Hispanics already in the system to organize themselves as well as the Asians so that they could provide some support to the new employees. Mrs. DiFonzo had heard reports of employees not comprehending the cost of housing and the cost of living. She encouraged them to reach out more effectively to elements in the community to ease the transition into Montgomery County and provide additional support outside the school system to make things more comfortable. She suggested networking to get the spouses of these teachers jobs, and she would like to see all of this as a goal for the county.

Mrs. Praisner asked about next steps for the policy. Dr. Pitt said that they would distribute the policy for comments and come back for Board adoption. He noted that the regulation was the staff's responsibility, but he had provided copies of the proposed regulation to the Board. Mrs. Praisner suggested that they would need to have this reviewed by their attorney, and Dr. Pitt agreed. Mrs. Praisner said that this would be scheduled for adoption on August 18 or at the September all-day meeting.

Mr. Goldensohn asked if staff had considered establishing an employee affirmative action advisory group, and Dr. Scott replied that they had not. Mr. Goldensohn said that he had seen this work in the corporate world. The in-house minority employees had formed an effective advisory group to help the Personnel Department recruit more minority employees. Dr. Pitt thought that this was an excellent suggestion but did not need to be part of the policy. Dr. Scott reported that some of that was being done with respect to recruiting and networking in terms of finding minority applicants. Mrs. Praisner suggested that Dr. Shinn share what had been done in this area. She thanked staff for their work.

Re: BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS

1. Mrs. DiFonzo said she had attended the superintendent's summer leadership conference in Gaithersburg, and she was very impressed with the spirit of team building and enthusiasm. It was obvious that the participants felt good about themselves and good about what they were doing in the school system. The staff at Kennedy had worked to put together a slide tape which set an excellent tone, and she urged Board members to view that tape.
2. Mrs. DiFonzo reported that she had visited the new Area 3 office, and it was a very peculiar feeling to see MCPS walking around in an office type environment because she was accustomed to seeing people in ex-school settings. That environment helped people feel they were professionals, and she did not know whether it was possible for MCPS to pursue office-type environments for their people. She thought they should look at this and attempt to get the sympathy of the County Council.
3. Mr. Goldensohn said he was pleased when they had confirmed the

appointment of the principal of Frost Intermediate School. People in the community were concerned that Frost was in a limbo mode of no principal and no vice principal. He thought the community would be pleased with Mike Glascoe, and he hoped that the vice principal would be assigned as quickly as possible.

4. Mr. Goldensohn commented that one of the recurring complaints in the school system had always been about the professional environment in terms of air conditioning in a school or office area. He knew that they tried to do their best, but the comment that he always got back was that employees in the corporate world would walk out the door if they had to work under these conditions. He requested that at the end of August, the Board receive a status report on air conditioning for the opening day of school. Dr. Pitt thought that Dr. Vance was probably working on this already.
5. Mrs. Praisner asked that the slide tape presentation developed by Kathy Gemberling and the staff at Kennedy be available at the July evening meeting or the August all-day meeting.

Re: ITEMS OF INFORMATION

Board members received the following items of information:

1. Items in Process
2. Construction Progress Report
3. Updating School Building Standards
4. Graduate Follow-up Study
5. Special Education Graduate Study
6. Recommended Approval of Proposed Pascal Course (for future consideration)

Re: ADJOURNMENT

The president adjourned the meeting at 4:35 p.m.

PRESIDENT

SECRETARY

HP:mlw