

RESOLVED, That on behalf of the staff, superintendent, and students of Montgomery County Public Schools, the Board of Education congratulates Mr. Maneesh Agrawala, Mr. Howard Gobioff, Mr. Sven Khatri, and Mr. Dan Mall for this outstanding achievement; and be it further

RESOLVED, That Mrs. Mary Ellen Verona, computer science teacher at Montgomery Blair High School, and Dr. Michael Haney, coordinator for the Montgomery Blair High School Math/Science/Computer Science Program, be commended for the support, guidance, and instruction they provided to the team members.

Re: PROFESSIONAL GROWTH OPPORTUNITIES FOR
SECONDARY ASSISTANT PRINCIPALS

Dr. Pitt commented that he saw the position of elementary assistant principal as a training role for the principalship. He saw the role of the secondary assistant principal as being different. This was a major training ground for principals. The assistant principal at the secondary level was also a professional position, and not everyone would be a principal or even wanted to be a principal. He believed the position of secondary assistant principal needed to be treated with dignity and respect and was a professional position. He felt that these two roles were not in conflict. These administrators were part of a professional team administering secondary schools.

Dr. Vance reported that following their last discussion in April they involved central office, staff development, area offices, and school-based people. The recommendations out of the various subcommittees had been placed under seven topics.

Mr. Michael Glascoe, principal of Frost IS, introduced Mary Hall, Wayne Whigham, Dr. Elizabeth Glowa, Fred Lowenbach, Dr. Donna Stephens, and Karolyn Rohr. He said that his function as the chair of the Professional Development and Training (PDT) Committee was to look at the training needs of assistant principals. When they presented their report to the superintendent, they outlined some major areas for the superintendent to consider. One incorporated in the paper was executive level support for secondary assistant principals. They now had periodic meetings of assistant principals with the area associate superintendent as well as the deputy superintendent. They had asked Dr. Pitt to review opportunities for assistant principals and to look at the rotating positions which had been a fruitful training ground for assistant principals.

Mr. Glascoe said that the people around the table were ready to respond to questions. They felt this was a formalized emphasis as far as the assistant principalship was concerned. They wanted to support their assistant principals in both roles spoken to by Dr. Pitt.

Mrs. DiFonzo asked why someone would want to be an assistant principal as a career. Dr. Stephens replied that this was an opportunity to work with teachers and students in a different role

than a teaching role. The role did not have total responsibility for a whole school, and it was an opportunity to work with other administrators and parents in the community. She thought there were some very positive parts of being an assistant principal in a leadership team.

Dr. Cronin expressed his agreement with the recommendations. He liked the concept of "recognition" and part of it was letting the community know that the assistant principal was there. He asked about appropriate methods of recognition and a timeline for implementation. Dr. Pitt replied that they would explore this. However, they were also working on recognizing the importance of the job. Every secondary principal had to recognize the role of the assistant principal and elevate that role. They had to give people opportunity for variations in assignments. The assistant principals had to give their input to the associate superintendent so they felt they were making a contribution. Dr. Pitt stressed that they had to make sure people felt they were important. He pointed out that there wasn't a principal around who would want to be in a school if the assistant principals were missing.

Dr. Cronin felt that they had to have an on-going program by which they would say that a particular assistant principal was important. Mr. Glascoe explained that specific steps were not listed in this paper. He hoped that the various assistant principal groups would work with the associate superintendents and staff development in looking at some specific things. He said their aim was to go beyond the myth where the assistant principal walked around with keys all day. They wanted more exposure and recognition. Assistant principals wanted to be involved with community relations activities and have some fiscal responsibility and know how to run a school. In terms of evaluation, Dr. Cronin said the paper used the words, "ask area associate superintendents to encourage secondary principals." He would prefer to see "tell the area associates to have secondary principals include such discussions." He said that part of the package had to be the direct statement that the assistant principals would like to have particular options for professional growth.

Mrs. Praisner reported that in certain skills because of skills or preferences of principals and assistant principals, certain assistant principals were always assigned the scheduling responsibility or the x- or the y-responsibility. She felt they needed to make sure those individuals also had opportunities to do other assignments. She asked if they would identify gaps in an assistant principal's experiences or opportunities to make sure that individual had those expanded experiences.

Dr. Pitt said that Mrs. Praisner was on target. Dr. Vance had the responsibility for directing that some of that got done. This was a critical point and one they had not paid enough attention to. Some people had received excellent experiences and others ended up in a very repetitive and limited experience.

Mr. Lowenbach commented that if a person became an expert in scheduling, the way to give that person recognition was to have that individual working with people in the system to help them with their scheduling. He thought there were a lot of means of recognition that were already in place. Area 1 did an excellent job of recognizing outstanding teachers, and the Washington POST recognized outstanding teachers and principals. Mrs. Praisner thought that using them for training was a very good point.

In regard to training, Mrs. Praisner asked if they had a list of recommended activities that all assistant principals should review or a list of courses that they might want to look at. Mrs. Rohr replied that as interns they received a year's training. They were exposed to financial accountability and many other aspects that they would use at different times in their careers. Beyond that there was the administrative and supervisory institute which had offerings for administrators. Mrs. Praisner asked if they were told which courses were recommended. Mrs. Rohr replied that all the courses would be appropriate.

Dr. Pitt thought there was a gap there. They did a very good job in training the interns. After they had identified those who were going to be principals, they did a reasonably good job. However, there was a gap in the training of the person in the middle, the assistant principal. He thought they had to sit down and develop a plan each year for that person which was one of the recommendations in the paper. Mrs. Praisner pointed out that this related back to the staff development recommendations coming out of the Commission on Excellence report as far as individual teachers having a professional development plan.

Dr. Cronin asked if the individual plan for assistant principals be in effect for this year's evaluation. Dr. Vance replied that it would not. They had set up two planning groups, one with the elementary assistant principals and the secondary administrators. He would begin meeting with representatives, and he could not promise that it would be happening this year. However, they would be working in that direction. He added that they would be working with Mrs. Rohr and staff development because some training was going to have to take place.

Mr. Goldensohn remarked that in most instances when a principal looked really good it was only because the assistant principals behind that person were really good. The assistant principal level was the critical management level in a secondary operation, and any effort to give them greater recognition was appropriate. He would like to see greater recognition, training, and growth potential. He felt that being a career assistant principal could be a very rewarding position.

Mr. Ewing assumed that along the way either in a formal educational setting or as interns or assistant principals people picked up a fair amount of experience in and knowledge about general management and principles and practices. However, he didn't see anything about

that. He asked if there was an attempt to do something formal in addressing general management. Mrs. Rohr replied that this came in several ways. There were prerequisites for being considered to be an intern. They had highly recommended courses on a survey of management theory and practice. In addition to that, interns received management training. This included curriculum, oral communications, and written communications. They also had the regular A&S offerings provided by staff development and the specific training offered by the areas.

Mrs. DiFonzo noted that there was a model for the elementary school principals that was developed by the National Association of Elementary School Principals. She wondered whether there was anything like that at the secondary level. Mrs. Rohr replied that there was nothing like this program for secondary principals. Mrs. DiFonzo asked about the possibility of developing something like this for assistant principals. Mrs. Rohr replied that this was an interesting concept.

Dr. Pitt explained that it was their intent to come back in the following year and give the Board feedback on what they were doing. Dr. Cronin asked if this year's budget reflected possible ways to implement this. Dr. Pitt replied that they had staff training in the budget and the funds were flexible. Dr. Cronin asked how staff development planned to begin this kind of implementation even in a minor scale. Dr. Pitt explained that they were in the process of working this through staff development. Dr. Cronin said that when they got to the budget he would like to know more details about categories for support staff, assistant principals, principals, and teachers. Dr. Pitt agreed to talk to their plans when they got to the budget.

Mrs. DiFonzo thanked staff for their report.

Re: ELEMENTARY SCIENCE CURRICULUM

Dr. Pitt reported that they had a task force working on science K-12; however, the report he had received was confusing because it did not priority-list the recommendations. That report had been redone, and he would be forwarding it to the Board with his recommendations. Mr. William Clark, director of the Department of Academic Skills, introduced Dr. Charles La Rue, coordinator of elementary science. Dr. La Rue stated that the curriculum as they knew it and as he worked with it was driven by the PROGRAM OF STUDIES. Included in the PROGRAM OF STUDIES were the goal statements of the Board of Education. The curriculum documents used by the teachers emanated from those statements. The curriculum was an opportunity for children to acquire knowledge through the processes of science. Another major purpose was to develop in children a liking for science and an appreciation for the role of science in their lives. Underlying the program were opportunities for children doing these curriculum activities to develop and apply rational thinking skills where they learned how to solve problems.

Dr. La Rue explained that the program was a unit design. Within the units were activities which were experienced-based. The teachers making presentations today would be talking about hands-on science. In general, each grade level had several curriculum units divided into energy, matter, concepts of living things as entities, living things in their environment, and earth science. In the elementary schools, they like to talk about process skills. Children were expected to do observations, looking at plants and making records, doing measurements, and classifying. Children were expected to classify objects and events. All of this was underpinned by data collection, and from that children learned to make inferences and predictions. Lab skills ran through each grade level, and they focused on variables and a scientific way of separating out things. Children learned hypothesis formation by making a statement about what they were trying to look at.

Dr. La Rue noted that in science they emphasized areas of communication, both oral and written. Children wrote reports, kept notebooks, and maintained logs. He hoped that these activities would improve the attitudes of children about science. He hoped that science would pique their curiosity, gain confidence, and recognize that there were different ways of solving problems. In regard to basic skills, he said they had heard a lot about integrating subject matter. The science specialists were among the biggest proponents of that because of the nature of science instruction. Science curriculum activities gave children opportunities to read, to write, and to use mathematics.

Mrs. Lynn Ferrell, first grade teacher at Strawberry Knoll Elementary School, commented that the key to primary science was a hands-on approach. Children must be actively and totally involved if they were to have a workable knowledge and understanding of science. Teachers always ask children, "what would happen if?" In science, teachers had children find out first hand. In K-3 children learned science lab skills through investigation using hand magnifying lenses, balancing scales, and classifying objectives by size, shape, color, and origin. Children looked at living things by caring for and growing plants, observing life cycles of insects and animals, and watching animals for movement and development. In matter, the students discovered texture, odor, taste, and sinking and floating of objects. They learned to classify objects and did problem solving. Students discovered simple and more complex food chains. They learned the basic needs of seed plants and saw that environmental factors influenced the growth and development of plants and animals. Energy was taught through investigations involving magnets and the force of push or pull. Children were also asked to illustrate or build a closed electric circuit.

Mrs. Ferrell said that in first grade they began recording weather, learning about shadows, and observing the difference between revolution and rotation of objects. By third grade, students started a model of the sun, earth, and moon.

Mrs. Ferrell explained that she worked in a team situation with five

first grade teachers. They had started the first day of school with three science activities. They observed the weather and recorded what they had observed. They looked for things that were living and nonliving. In the afternoon, they took the students on a science crawl with hand lenses. Now the children were looking at the life cycles of caterpillars.

Mrs. Nancy Wong, fourth grade teacher at Waters Landing Elementary School, stated that the units in the upper grades included collecting rocks for earth science, talking about food chains, and studying about pollution and their environment. In the upper grades they used microscopes for lab skills. They also used a hands-on approach to science. They worked in lab groups of four to five students learning how to share and communicate. It was up to the teachers to make science exciting and a hands-on experience for children. A fifth grade teacher had used peaches to illustrate a geology unit and to develop a vocabulary of the earth using the crust, the mantle, and the core.

Mrs. Wong explained that teachers looked at long-range plans and integrated objectives. When they taught science, they also focused on math, computers, social studies, and reading and language arts. They also concentrated on higher order thinking skills. Another example was children growing salt crystals in the classroom. In order to do that they had to measure water, string, and salt. Students kept a journal showing the purpose of the experiment as well as a lab sheet every day. Students used higher order thinking skills in predicting what was going to happen and why. They grew other crystals and looked at chemical changes. They used the library to look at books about using chemistry. She said that all of these things tied together to make science an important part of classroom activities.

Mr. Franklin Chisley, Area 3 teacher specialist, reported that the roles and responsibilities of teacher specialists involved planning and organizing, science content training, and special projects. Specialists interacted with the classroom teachers by request. About 90 percent of the requests were initiated by the teachers themselves. He said they could disseminate information in a variety of ways. They did total staff in-service, grade level in-service, science grade level teams, and individual teacher in-service. The topics included long- and short-range planning, science miniunits, science for the gifted and talented, and science field trips.

Mr. Chisley stated that the specialists also dealt with content training. They offered voluntary afterschool in-service from 2:30 to 5 p.m. They did this seven to nine times a year, and these sessions were attended by 15 to 30 teachers. The specialists also worked with staff development to design modules which were topics in science. These ranged from planning objectives to maximum use of hands-on activities to computer applications to science for students with special needs. Last year 652 classroom teachers participated in these modules, and 165 new teachers participated. They offered a science seminar which was an intensive content training program

followed by student seminars. They had been asked to present that seminar for the National Association of Gifted and Talented Children in Orlando, Florida.

Mr. Chisley explained that the teacher specialists were involved in special projects including linking community resources to enrich educational opportunities for students. He noted that 75 percent of the requests for services in the Resource Bank came from elementary school teachers. They worked with Little Bennett Park, Brookside Gardens, and NASA to get lessons and demonstrations. They were also involved in the Chesapeake Bay Project which took children to the bay to use the bay as a classroom, and last year 3,500 fourth grade students participated. The science specialists also helped schools design and write minigrant applications. They also assisted schools in putting on science expositions on the classroom, grade level, and school level. They worked with Montgomery College to train teachers in intensive science concepts based on MCPS objectives.

Mr. Clark reported that in cooperation with QIE and the Mid-Atlantic Center for Race and Sex Equity they had been involved in a program trying to encourage and motivate more female and minority students into doing better in science and considering science as a career. Dr. La Rue added that eight schools were directly involved in this project and four other schools had some form of participation. Mr. Clark explained that the focus was to provide training to the teachers to make science and mathematics more interesting to the students.

Mrs. DiFonzo asked about how long the current curriculum has been in place and the extent to which it was being used by the average classroom teacher. She wondered about the actual delivery of the program in the classroom. If they did not have the program, she asked what they were doing to try to get the teachers to deliver the program. Dr. La Rue replied that they did not know the answer classroom by classroom because there were 1,900 Grade 1 to 6 teachers. When visiting schools, he did see science programs, and the specialists told him there were science programs but not across the board. The program was started in 1972 and implemented area by area starting in 1975. The principals were expected to carry out the science program in their management objectives. They had had the current PROGRAM OF STUDIES since 1981 with the curriculum guides listing 50 or 60 activities at each grade level. He said they had the machinery for every school and every teacher to have access to the curriculum itself. However, they had some schools where very little or no science instruction was going on, but in a large number of schools they did have a complete science program. He would estimate that in 70 to 75 percent they had a complete science program.

Mrs. DiFonzo asked what they did about schools having no science program, and Dr. La Rue replied that to his knowledge there were no schools devoid of science. He said that with the management plans, principals were responsible for the total school program, and there had been an improvement in the delivery of science. One problem was

that some principals were complaining that they did not have enough money to buy science materials. To do a normal program it cost between \$5,000 and \$6,000 for the school to be equipped.

Mr. Clark added that it was a concern because science materials were consumable. However, last year funds for supplies and materials had been increased and would help in that direction. They would have to examine whether these funds were enough. Another concern was teacher training. Elementary school teachers should have 12 credits in science and six in math to be certified. However, some teachers were uncomfortable with science and required additional training. Mrs. Ferrell commented that when they offered priority training for teachers it was generally done by a teacher at their grade level. Therefore, they could take this knowledge back and use it in their classrooms.

It seemed to Mrs. DiFonzo that when they put more money into programs, the schools with good programs would have a better program. Those schools with a poor program would not see this as a priority. She asked what they were doing to help those schools with little or no science curriculum. Dr. Pitt replied that they now had management plans in place. The area superintendents would get input from their staffs and set priorities for the local school. The area superintendents set the priorities for the use of the teacher specialists. The areas could provide additional training and additional funding for that school. The management plan would focus on a total plan for that school and put the emphasis on the weakness in that school. In addition, this year areas had more flexibility in the use of staff. For example, they could focus on science instruction for a year. He thought that this year they would start seeing results of the management plans.

Mrs. DiFonzo asked if they had any information that would lead them to conclude that the science curriculum at the elementary level was responsible for more girls going into science and math at the secondary level. Dr. La Rue replied that they did not have any way of getting that information. When he visited classrooms K-6, he saw all of the children involved in science. However, studies had shown that when minority children had an opportunity to participate in science they did better in all aspects of school work. Dr. Pitt added that if they looked at data, many more girls were now involved in science and mathematics. However, when they looked at their magnet programs, boys outnumbered girls by a significant percentage in the science programs at Blair and Takoma Park. In the Eastern communications skills magnet, girls outnumbered boys. Mr. Clark commented that they had had improvements in enrollment at the high school level, but there were still some problems with courses. For instance, there were more girls enrolled in anatomy and physiology, and more boys were enrolled in advanced physics and chemistry. Mrs. DiFonzo would be interested in knowing if there were any way they could get to the out-years of the elementary curriculum to see what effect, if any, that was having at the high school level in terms of the sciences. This might be something the research and

evaluation committee might wish to take up.

Dr. Vance reported that they had asked Mrs. Fran Dean, acting associate superintendent, to work with the staff to give them an indication of where they were on the indicators of a well-implemented and effective elementary school program, K-6. Once this was defined, they could look at steps to take to assure this was replicated throughout the county in each of their elementary schools. The other thing was the question Mr. Ewing asked about what youngsters should be expected to know when they were promoted from the sixth grade. They had just begun to look at that.

Mr. Ewing commented that he was very impressed with what Mrs. Ferrell and Mrs. Wong were doing and with their obvious mastery of this field. He thought that the curriculum itself was excellent. However, he was concerned about the science curriculum and the unevenness of its implementation. There was evidence that parents had a great hunger for science education for their children based on the growth of the PTA Hands-on Science Program. This program was not limited by the absence of materials because they largely made their own. The problem with this program was that it was unequally allocated depending on the ability of parents to pay the fees. He thought that if there were shortages of materials and supplies, the Board ought to do something about that this year in the budget. He understood that there were a good many elementary teachers who did not come up to the 12 credit hours. Dr. La Rue replied that there were a number who did not. This had been reported by the science task force.

It seemed to Mr. Ewing that it would be possible to ask principals if they had programs in their schools at every grade for all children. He asked that the Board and the superintendent be provided with that information. Then they could find out what was standing in the way of some schools having such a program. He suggested that the Board needed to come back to this issue in the future. Mr. Ewing felt that if anything had been neglected in the elementary school curriculum, it was science. He asked for information about supplies and equipment and teacher preparation prior to Board budget action. Dr. Pitt thought that the management plans would be a way of determining program at least.

Mrs. Praisner said she had been looking forward to the elementary science discussion with great interest because of the concerns she had heard from parents. It was important for the Board to know what was going on, what they needed to do, and to do a better job of communicating to parents as to what was going on. Money was certainly a factor because a lot of the materials were disposable. She thought that it might not necessarily be more money, but a redirecting of existing money. It seemed to her that schools could focus their current resources and planned resources once they had defined where their gaps in their curriculum were. There was also a need to look at demographics for the school, teacher skills and training, teacher discomfort or comfort with science, and organizational issues within a school to take advantage of the

enthusiasm.

Mrs. Praisner said she had a question about the amount of time that was actually spent on science in a school day that was full of lots of objectives. She had heard that Howard County was doing a lot of hands-on activity, and she wondered if they could work cooperatively with other school districts. She also wondered about the whole issue of science centers similar to the one in Prince George's County. Mrs. Ferrell replied that in the first grade she was expected to spend 25 minutes a day. However, she had a problem staying within that limit because she integrated curriculum and included math and writing skills. She commented that the priority training was showing benefits in classroom instruction. She had experienced this through the instruction her own children were receiving and had learned of this from other parents.

Mrs. Wong reported that in fourth grade they spent 45 minutes a day on science, but they did hope to integrate science with other instruction. She did not think money was the key. The teachers were the key, and the administrators who told teachers that science was important were also the key. She pointed out that every month what she taught in math was on the principal's desk, and at the end of the year her CRTs in math and reading were on his desk. However, she received no recognition for activities in science. She suggested that there needed to be an accountability other than long-range plans. She noted that when she was held accountable, she would find the money for science.

Dr. Pitt expressed his agreement with Mrs. Wong's remarks. They had put their emphasis on reading and mathematics, and over the past years they had not put much emphasis on science. The science people had worked very hard, and they had some excellent outdoor education centers. However, the same level of accountability and intensity was not there.

Mr. Chisley suggested that they needed to think about how they were training for content and objectives. There needed to be a purely content-based training program as well as a training module for first grade teachers in different schools to get together to share ideas.

Dr. Cronin recalled that the Board had had a retreat, and Tom Rowan had attended. They had talked about the elementary math people training toward the foundation for high school and college. The science people were doing the same thing. However, he was disturbed that teachers were only required to have six credits in math and 12 credits in science. They did not have teachers who were trained in chemistry, physics, biology, earth sciences, etc. Therefore, they were not able to expand beyond the training sessions. He liked the thought of having a training program which was content based and not curriculum based. Follow-up would give them some idea of the content weaknesses of individual teachers. At some future time he would like to see some real monies put into the training of teachers in the content area. The school system could work with the University of Maryland or Montgomery College to develop science courses for

teachers in the K-6 program. Mr. Chisley thought there needed to be a combination of content training and techniques to deliver the content. Once they got the first grade or the second grade teachers together, they had an exchange of ideas and a sharing of content and the styles of delivery.

Mr. Clark thought they had a model in the Title II training in mathematics which had been very successful. This focused on content training for select teachers in various schools as well as successful and effective instructional strategies. The problem was that Title II had limited funds, and they had concentrated on mathematics. Dr. Pitt had a word of caution. He was worried about how much pressure they put on elementary school teachers. In American education it might be that they were going to have to change the whole concept of how they taught in an elementary school. It seemed to him that they were saying they were going to make scientists and mathematicians and social scientists out of these teachers. The complexity of what they did was related to the level of the child. As they got more sophisticated in the upper grades, they had to look at expectations they had of teachers. One suggestion had been to put a specialist in each school. He did not think that anyone was dealing with this problem nationally. Everyone was saying what they ought to do and what the teacher ought to do, but no one was looking at what the teacher could do.

Dr. Cronin said he was thinking about sabbatical leaves for teachers for an entire year. This would provide them with training and remove them from the pressure environment of teaching.

Mr. Goldensohn agreed with much of what he had heard. It was not only a question of knowledge, it was a question of enthusiasm and their method of delivery. They could train a teacher and show them techniques, but if they did not have that innate ability to create the enthusiasm, the training would go for naught. He called attention to the curriculum books the two teachers had for their grade levels. When they got up to sixth grade, the book got a little thicker, and this was an awful lot to accomplish. He wondered how they could possibly know what a given teacher had accomplished in a year. He asked if the next level teacher made an automatic presumption that the previous level teacher had covered this material. Mrs. Wong replied that they could learn this from the long-range plans that teachers turned into teachers. The curriculum was a spiral, and she knew what had been taught before the students got to her. She could go back and pick up the thread and give the students the two or three things they needed to know before she covered her objective.

Dr. La Rue recalled that when the program was developed there was a set of criterion-referenced tests started. However, some teachers were still using these as pretests and posttests. These tests were on the knowledge students had gained based on their classroom experiences.

Mr. Goldensohn commented that in the United States they were becoming

more and more aware that too many of their children were not knowledgeable of the world around them and the environment and how things interacted. He said they had to have some way of measuring that. They had SAT scores that fit into the verbal category and math category, but science was just out there. He suggested that there had to be another way to measure that scientific knowledge and understanding.

Dr. La Rue reported that teachers must record an evaluation for science, K-6. Therefore, the teacher must have some science activities according to the regulations they followed. He said that all of the fourth graders went to the Bay experience as a part of their science and social studies program. He pointed out that while Mrs. Ferrell and Mrs. Wong were outstanding teachers, he had a pool of 30 or 40 teachers from which to select. He felt there was a host of well-qualified teachers out there teaching science. He said that teachers were attending the modules, and Mrs. Ferrell instructed them in managing an objectives-based curriculum. He reported that 680 teachers had gone through the modules this year. This was the third year, and in the first year 650 took module instruction. He thought there were a lot of good things happening in the schools.

Dr. La Rue commented that there were a lot of things to do. The first was to look at the curriculum which was finished in 1978. They might want to look at the Howard County program, but he had the feeling that it was less than what MCPS wanted to do. He had just attended a forum sponsored by the American Association for the Advancement of Science. They were discussing a new way of getting teachers ready to teach. One recommendation was that elementary school teachers get a bachelor's degree in an area and then get some training in other areas. They were currently looking at a new generation of science programs, and the science task force report would be out shortly.

Mr. Ewing observed that on this agenda the discussion of emotionally disturbed reflected a concern about increasing numbers of children at an early age who experienced that problem. The study of dropouts and the study of suspensions indicated that those problems began early. They had talked about a National Science Foundation study on how minority students seemed to begin to fall behind on math in the elementary schools. Now they were talking about the importance of science in terms of subsequent performance in the high school. Dr. Pitt had mentioned the need to take a look at options about the way the elementary school might be organized. It seemed to him that given the focus on the elementary school and the major concerns before them that it was perhaps time for them to take a look at that and models that others might have used for operating elementary schools. For example, there might be a model of two teachers in every classroom. One might be a science/math specialist, and the other might be a social studies/reading/language arts specialist. Class size reductions of a dramatic kind might be another very useful way to get more of the job done. He agreed that they were beginning to pile on more and more demands on the elementary school. Students themselves were bringing increasing numbers of problems to school,

and the community expected the school system to deal with more and more of those problems. Therefore, he thought they had to deal with how they managed the elementary school before they found themselves less able to cope with what was needed at that level.

Dr. Pitt stated that he was very interested in looking at the elementary school. He reported that the two studies mentioned by Mr. Ewing focused in on the fact that children who fought started fighting in kindergarten. Children who were truant starting missing school at a very early age. He was interested in improving early childhood opportunities that were fiscally viable. For example, they could focus in on parenting approaches to get at a lot of these behaviors. Then they could look at the child education part of it. He saw some possibilities of moving in that direction. There were some federal initiatives that ought to be started, and the focus of the presidential candidates should be on child care and these educational initiatives.

Mrs. DiFonzo thanked staff for a very fruitful and productive discussion. She hoped that they could maintain a level of good elementary school science curriculum and improve the delivery of that curriculum.

Re: EXECUTIVE SESSION

Board members met in executive session from 12:15 to 2:15 p.m. to discuss personnel and legal issues. *Dr. Shoenberg joined the meeting at this time.

Re: ANNOUNCEMENT

Mrs. DiFonzo announced that Mrs. Praisner and Dr. Shoenberg were in the building and would join the Board shortly.

RESOLUTION NO. 513-88 Re: PROCUREMENT CONTRACTS OVER \$25,000

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

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

WHEREAS, It is recommended that Bid No. 27-89, Furnish and Install Playground Equipment at Quince Orchard High School, be rejected due to the fact that all bids received were nonresponsive by not supplying the required safety data; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That Bid No. 27-89, Furnish and Install Playground Equipment at Quince Orchard High School, be rejected; and be it further

RESOLVED, That having been duly advertised, the contracts be awarded to the low bidders meeting specifications as shown for the bids as

follows:

AWARDEE(S)		
180-88	Library Furniture	
	Baltimore Stationery Company	\$ 737
	Brodart Company	12,808
	Chaselle, Inc.	708
	Douron, Inc.	37,224
	The Highsmith Company	782
	The Library Store, Ltd.	47,024*
	Systems Furniture Gallery	4,810

	TOTAL	\$104,093
26-89	Cargo Vans	
	District International Trucks, Inc.	\$ 53,412
	Dorsey Records Transport Systems	48,448

	TOTAL	\$101,860
	TOTAL OVER \$25,000	\$205,953

*Denotes MFD vendors

RESOLUTION NO. 514-88 Re: ARCHITECTURAL APPOINTMENTS FOR VARIOUS SCHOOLS

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

WHEREAS, The County Council has mandated that existing designs be used for new school projects whenever possible; and

WHEREAS, Staff and the communities have recommended that the Brooke Grove and Middlebrook elementary schools' designs be resited for the Bowie Mill and Kentlands elementary schools, respectively; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the Montgomery County Board of Education enter into contractual agreements to obtain required design and construction administration services associated with resiting the existing Brooke Grove and Middlebrook elementary schools' designs as the Bowie Mill and Kentlands elementary schools, respectively, as follows:

SCHOOL	ARCHITECT	FEE
Bowie Mill ES	Eugene A. Delmar	\$260,000
Kentlands ES	Duane, Elliott, Cahill, Mullineaux & Mullineaux	291,400

RESOLUTION NO. 515-88 Re: ROCK CREEK FOREST ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Dr. Cronin

seconded by Mr. Goldensohn, the following resolution was adopted unanimously:

WHEREAS, Sealed bids were received September 29, 1988, for Rock Creek Forest Elementary School addition as indicated below:

BIDDER	BASE BID	DEDUCT ALT. 1
1. Columbia Construction Co., Inc.	\$1,794,900	\$104,800
2. Hess Construction Co., Inc.	1,800,000	91,373
3. Doyle, Inc.	1,818,000	80,000
4. Kimmel & Kimmel, Inc.	1,878,000	100,000
5. The McAlister-Schwartz Company	1,890,000	123,000
6. Keller Brothers, Inc.	1,983,000	145,123
7. Smallwood & Sons, Inc.	1,989,000	80,000
8. Dustin Construction, Inc.	2,168,000	92,000

Deduct Alternate 1: Sprinkler system in existing building

and

WHEREAS, While this represents excellent bid activity, sufficient funds are not available at this time to award the sprinkler system in the existing building that was required by the fire department in the final stages of planning and not previously budgeted in the project; and

WHEREAS, Columbia Construction Co., Inc., is currently constructing the Cloverly Elementary School, and progress to date is satisfactory; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That a \$1,690,100 contract be awarded to Columbia Construction Co., Inc., for the addition to Rock Creek Forest Elementary School that constitutes acceptance of the base bid and Deduct Alternate 1; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the county executive be requested to recommend to the County Council a \$110,000 supplemental appropriation to fund Deduct Alternate 1, with a modest contingency, and that the contract be amended to include this Deduct Alternate contingent upon additional funding.

RESOLUTION NO. 516-88 Re: RICHARD MONTGOMERY HIGH SCHOOL SITE WORK

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

WHEREAS, Sealed bids were received September 29, 1988, for landscaping at Richard Montgomery High School as indicated below:

BIDDER	LUMP SUM
1. Paul E. Schlosser Co., Inc.	\$26,495.00

2. McDonnell Landscape, Inc. 41,338.08

and

WHEREAS, The lowest bid is below the staff estimate and sufficient funds are available for contract award; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That a \$26,495 contract be awarded to Paul E. Schlosser Co., Inc., for landscaping at Richard Montgomery High School in accordance with plans and specifications prepared by Grimm & Parker, Architects.

RESOLUTION NO. 517-88 Re: MONTGOMERY KNOLLS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
MODERNIZATION/ADDITION

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

WHEREAS, The following sealed bids were received on October 4, 1988, for the Montgomery Knolls Elementary School modernization and addition:

BIDDER	BID
1. Dustin Construction, Inc.	\$3,915,300
2. Kimmel & Kimmel, Inc.	3,928,300
3. The Gassman Corporation	4,104,000
4. Northwood Contractors, Inc.	4,109,000

and

WHEREAS, Dustin Construction, Inc., has satisfactorily completed numerous capital projects for MCPS; and

WHEREAS, The rebid represents a considerable savings over the initial bid of May 19, 1988, (\$4,203,000); and

WHEREAS, Although this represents excellent bid activity, additional funding is required to award the low bid and provide a modest contingency; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That a \$3,915,300 contract be awarded to Dustin Construction, Inc., for the Montgomery Knolls Elementary School modernization and addition in accordance with the plans and specifications prepared by SHWC, Inc., Architects, contingent upon the County Council's approval of a \$349,000 emergency supplemental appropriation; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the county executive be requested to recommend to the County Council that an FY 89 emergency supplemental appropriation of \$349,000 be approved to fund the Montgomery Knolls Elementary School modernization and addition.

RESOLUTION NO. 518-88 Re: DISPOSITION OF FUTURE MUNCASTER MANOR
ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

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

WHEREAS, The Board of Education, with the approval of the state superintendent of schools, is required by law to transfer school sites to the County Council that are no longer needed for school purposes; and

WHEREAS, Disposition of future school sites that have been determined to be surplus to the school system's needs is consistent with the goals and objectives of the Board's Long-range Educational Facilities Planning Policy; and

WHEREAS, The Board of Education, in exchange for the conveyance of a comparable 10-acre school site from the Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission (M-NCPPC), considers it to be in the best interest of the school system to take the following action; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the following future school site is no longer needed for school purposes and is hereby declared surplus and, with the approval of the state superintendent of schools, shall be conveyed through the County Council to the M-NCPPC:

SCHOOL SITE	GENERAL LOCATION
Muncaster Manor Elementary	Derwood

RESOLUTION NO. 519-88 Re: ACCEPTANCE OF STRAWBERRY KNOLL
ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

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

RESOLVED, That having been duly inspected on October 3, 1988, Strawberry Knoll Elementary School now be formally accepted, and that the official date of completion be established as that date upon which formal notice is received from the architect that the building has been completed in accordance with the plans and specifications, and all contract requirements have been met.

RESOLUTION NO. 520-88 Re: ACCEPTANCE OF STONE MILL ELEMENTARY
SCHOOL

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

RESOLVED, That having been duly inspected on October 10, 1988, Stone Mill Elementary School now be formally accepted, and that the official date of completion be established as that date upon which formal notice is received from the architect that the building has been completed in accordance with the plans and specifications, and all contract requirements have been met.

RESOLUTION NO. 521-88 Re: ACCEPTANCE OF GOSHEN ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

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

RESOLVED, That having been duly inspected on October 5, 1988, Goshen Elementary School now be formally accepted, and that the official date of completion be established as that date upon which formal notice is received from the architect that the building has been completed in accordance with the plans and specifications, and all contract requirements have been met.

*Dr. Shoenberg rejoined the meeting at this point.

RESOLUTION NO. 522-88 Re: UTILIZATION OF FY 1989 FUTURE SUPPORTED PROJECT FUNDS FOR PROJECT MULTICULTURAL CONNECTION

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

RESOLVED, That the superintendent of schools be authorized to receive and expend within the FY 1989 Provision for Future Supported Projects a grant award of \$1,000 from the Maryland State Department of Education under ECIA, Chapter 2, for Project Multicultural Connection in Category 3 Instructional Other; and be it further

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

RESOLUTION NO. 523-88 Re: UTILIZATION OF FY 1989 FUTURE SUPPORTED PROJECT FUNDS FOR PROJECT CUBS II (COUNSELING UNITS FOR BUILDING SELF-CONCEPT)

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

RESOLVED, That the superintendent of schools be authorized to receive and expend within the FY 1989 Provision for Future Supported Projects a grant award of \$4,000 from the Maryland State Department of Education under ECIA, Chapter 2, for Project CUBS II in the following categories:

CATEGORY	AMOUNT
02 Instructional Salaries	\$ 325
03 Instructional Other	3,650
10 Fringe Benefits	25

TOTAL	\$4,000

and be it further

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

RESOLUTION NO. 524-88 Re: FY 89 SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION FOR
PROVISION FOR FUTURE SUPPORTED PROJECTS

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

WHEREAS, The FY 89 Operating Budget adopted by the Board of Education on May 23, 1988, included \$200,000 for the Provision for Future Supported Projects; and

WHEREAS, As of September 30, 1988, the balance in the Provision for Future Supported Projects was \$24,395; and

WHEREAS, The Board will receive a number of additional projects that are eligible for funding through this Provision for Future Supported Projects during FY 89; and

WHEREAS, A supplemental appropriation to increase the Provision for Future Supported Projects will help to avoid delays due to the time required to process each eligible project individually; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education requests a supplemental appropriation from the County Council in the amount of \$150,000 for the FY 89 Provision of Future Supported Projects, in the following categories:

CATEGORY	AMOUNT
01 Administration	\$ 55,000
02 Instructional Salaries	70,000
03 Other Instructional Costs	15,000
10 Fixed Charges	10,000

TOTAL	\$150,000

and be it further

RESOLVED, That the county executive and the County Council be given a copy of this request and that the county executive be requested to

recommend approval of this supplemental appropriation to the County Council.

RESOLUTION NO. 525-88 Re: UTILIZATION OF FY 1989 FUTURE SUPPORTED PROJECT FUNDS FOR THE INTENSIVE VOCATIONAL ENGLISH AND SKILLS PROGRAM

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

RESOLVED, That the superintendent of schools be authorized to receive and expend an FY 1989 supplemental appropriation of \$42,599 from the Montgomery County Department of Social Services, Division of Family Resources, under the Immigration and Nationality Act Targeted Assistance for Refugees, Title IV of the Refugee Act of 1980 (P.L. 96-212) for the FY 1989 Intensive Vocational English and Skills Program in the following categories:

CATEGORY	AMOUNT
02 Instructional Salaries	\$38,480
03 Other Instructional Costs	1,040
10 Fixed Charges	3,079

TOTAL	\$42,599

and be it further

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

RESOLUTION NO. 526-88 Re: UTILIZATION OF FY 1989 FUTURE SUPPORTED PROJECT FUNDS FOR THE HEAD START CHILD DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

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

RESOLVED, That the superintendent of schools be authorized to receive and expand within the FY 1989 Provision for Future Supported Projects a grant award of \$31,227 from the Montgomery County Department of Family Resources, Community Action Agency, for the Head Start program in the following categories:

CATEGORY	AMOUNT
02 Instructional Salaries	\$27,119
03 Other Instructional Costs	1,378
10 Fixed Charges	2,780

TOTAL	\$31,277

and be it further

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

RESOLUTION NO. 527-88 Re: FY 1989 SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION FOR
THE INTENSIVE ENGLISH LANGUAGE PROGRAM

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

RESOLVED, That the superintendent of schools be authorized, subject to County Council approval, to receive and expend an FY 1989 supplemental appropriation of \$134,917 from the Montgomery County Department of Social Services, Division of Family Resources, under the Refugee Act of 1980 (P.L. 96-212) for the FY 1989 Intensive English Language Program in the following categories:

CATEGORY	AMOUNT
01 Administration	\$ 135
02 Instructional Salaries	121,242
03 Other Instructional Costs	3,180
08 Operation of Plant and Equipment	660
10 Fixed Charges	9,700

TOTAL	\$134,917

and be it further

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

RESOLUTION NO. 528-88 Re: FY 1989 SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION TO
ESTABLISH AN MCPS SUBSTANCE ABUSE
PREVENTION PROJECT

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

RESOLVED, That the superintendent of schools be authorized, subject to County Council approval, to receive and expend an FY 1989 supplemental appropriation of \$227,867 from the U. S. Department of Education through the MSDE under the General Curriculum Branch, Division of Instruction, to initiate implementation of the MCPS Substance Abuse Prevention Project in the following categories:

CATEGORY	POSITIONS*	AMOUNT
01 Administration	2.0	\$ 79,748
02 Instructional Salaries		14,129

03 Other Instructional Costs	106,491
10 Fixed Charges	27,499

TOTAL	\$227,867

*1.0 Substance Abuse Prevention Specialist, Grade G
 1.0 Secretary, Grade 10

and be it further

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

* Mrs. Praisner rejoined the meeting at this point.

RESOLUTION NO. 529-88 Re: PRESENTATION OF PRELIMINARY PLANS
 BEALL ELEMENTARY SCHOOL (MODERNIZATION/
 ADDITION)

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

WHEREAS, The architect for the Beall Elementary School modernization and addition has prepared a schematic design in accordance with the educational specifications; and

WHEREAS, The Beall Elementary School Facilities Advisory Committee has approved the proposed schematic design; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education approve the preliminary plan report for the Beall Elementary School modernization/addition prepared by John S. Samperton Associates, Architects.

RESOLUTION NO. 530-88 Re: PRESENTATION OF PRELIMINARY PLANS
 STEDWICK ELEMENTARY SCHOOL (ADDITION)

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

WHEREAS, The architect for the Stedwick Elementary School addition has prepared a schematic design in accordance with the educational specifications; and

WHEREAS, The Stedwick Elementary School Facilities Advisory Committee has approved the proposed schematic design; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education approve the preliminary plan report for the Stedwick Elementary School addition prepared by Fox, Hanna Architects.

RESOLUTION NO. 531-88 Re: PRESENTATION OF PRELIMINARY PLANS

E. BROOKE LEE MIDDLE SCHOOL (ADDITION)

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

WHEREAS, The architect for the E. Brooke Lee Middle School addition had prepared a schematic design in accordance with the educational specifications; and

WHEREAS, The E. Brooke Lee Middle School Facilities Advisory Committee has approved the proposed schematic design; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education approve the preliminary plan report for the E. Brooke Lee Middle School addition prepared by Ayres/Saint/Gross Architects.

RESOLUTION NO. 532-88 Re: MONTHLY PERSONNEL REPORT

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

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

RESOLUTION NO. 533-88 Re: PERSONNEL APPOINTMENTS

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

RESOLVED, That the following personnel appointments be approved:

APPOINTMENT	PRESENT POSITION	AS
Ann E. Briggs	Acting Director Dept. of Ed. Facilities Planning & Capital Programming	Director Dept. of Ed. Facilities Planning & Capital Programming Effective: 10-12-88
James T. Terrill	Principal Martin Luther King JHS	Supervisor of Secondary Instruction Area Admin. Office Effective: 10-12-88

Re: PROGRAMS FOR STUDENTS WHO ARE SERIOUSLY
EMOTIONALLY DISTURBED

Dr. Pitt reported that Dr. Fountain had had a spring conference on at-risk students. Additionally, a group of principals, area, and

central office staff met and discussed the specific needs of the seriously emotionally disturbed (SED) population. The county also had a task force to look at how they could better cooperate in working with students. The report he had received from Dr. Fountain's group was reasonable in that it focused on some of the needs, but it was not acceptable to him in terms of really getting at the needs of this total population. The report did not answer a lot of questions such as numbers of students, facility availability, potential needs, and potential costs. The data he had seen so far raised more questions than it answered.

Dr. Pitt believed that they needed a task force, and he had asked Dr. Fountain to put a group together. He felt there needed to be a broader professional group of people involved in the task force as well as some lay people who had a particular interest in this area. They also needed to look at what was being done nationally. He said that he was also concerned about what was being done in the schools to prevent problems from occurring and to identify these students. He also believed that the school system could not do all of this by itself.

Dr. Vance explained that one reason Dr. Fountain's work group wasn't further along was the necessity of having the executive staff participate fully in the process and becoming well oriented. He recalled that in April Mr. Ewing had described the situation as a slowly building crisis to which MCPS was responding without a plan of action for long-range needs. He said that they had to involve psychologists, school-based counselors, mental health professionals, and county agencies. He had asked Dr. Fountain and his staff to discuss existing programs, the growing needs, and the programmatic implications of meeting these needs.

Dr. Hiawatha Fountain, associate superintendent, introduced Ms. Micki O'Connell, principal of Cedar Grove ES; Dr. Thomas O'Toole, director of the Department of Special Education and Related Services; and Mr. Tony Paul, principal of RICA. He said that Montgomery County had made an outstanding commitment to serving seriously emotionally disturbed students for many years, going back to the days of Owen Knight in the early 1960's when students were sent to private providers. This commitment continued with the establishment of Mark Twain in 1972, the Bridge Program in 1973, and the beginnings of RICA in 1975. He explained that 1975 was also the year in which the federal law came into being.

Dr. Fountain reported that the use of private providers had been an integral part of their mosaic of programming for these youngsters over the years. Now with concern about the least restrictive environment, they were bringing many of these youngsters back into the county. This year they had only 80 students in residential treatment. He felt that they needed a better and more consistent level of support for Levels 1 to 4 programs in the schools. They needed to examine how they were going to work with early childhood programs, and they needed to increase the emphasis on training for regular teachers and special education teachers. He thought they

needed a closer collaboration between Montgomery County and the mental health communities. He said that MCPS psychologists had a working paper on identification and the Maryland School Psychologists Association had a paper as well.

Dr. Fountain said that right now they were looking at the pieces prior to establishing the task force to look at a comprehensive program to serve the needs of all youngsters from early childhood through age 20. They also had to work hand in hand with community mental health associations and the families of the children. He reminded them that mental health was a community concern. The child was not only seriously emotionally disturbed during the day, but also in the evenings and on the weekends.

Dr. Cronin was not sure what they were expecting. He asked if he would see a work product in three or four months. Dr. O'Toole was not sure they could have specifics in three or four months from now. He said that Dr. Fountain's original group took a look at what they were doing in-house. They identified the youngster as early as possible and tried to come up with a way that would allow them to provide service for that youngster as close to the home school situation as possible. They had to look harder at the kind of support they were giving at the local school level vis-a-vis additional training for staff the area of identification. They would be looking at the kind of supports needed at the local school level to maintain youngsters in that school. They would also look at the resources they had or might need.

Dr. Cronin asked if community groups, county agencies, and state agencies would be included on the task force. Dr. Pitt replied that he would want to involve some of the people on the mental health committee and some of their professionals not on the original committee such as school psychologists. He hoped that the group would come up with a long-range plan, a good definition of who these students are, what the projected needs are, what services they could provide, and how they could better coordinate what they are doing with other agencies. Dr. Cronin asked about citizen membership, and Dr. Pitt agreed that they needed citizens on the group. He had asked Dr. Fountain to chair the committee and would ask him to put the group together so that he could review the composition before appointing the members. Dr. Cronin hoped that the report would include cost implications, and Dr. Pitt agreed that this was important. He also hoped the report would give them a good picture of where they were now.

Dr. Cronin asked how they built in an evaluation of a program of this type which might or might not be subject to either the vagaries of medication or personal problems. Dr. Fountain thought the product was probably the best indication of the success of the program for SED children. Before they could talk about resources, he thought they needed to look at how they were currently using resources and see if they could not apply them in better ways. They should look at cooperation between the psychologists and the counselors and how they could do better training for regular teachers to identify early signs

and signals. He said that many of these youngsters could be moved back into the regular program, and at RICA the recidivism rate was less than 15 percent. Dr. Cronin felt that he would like to examine the evaluation component, and Dr. Fountain indicated that it would be part of the plate.

Mrs. Rafel asked if the task force was going to look at staffing implications including training, support, and clustering staff. Dr. O'Toole replied that their in-house study mentioned training at several levels including training for the regular teacher because most of their SED children were in regular school buildings. Mrs. Rafel suggested they begin to put together an explanation of what was meaningful, relevant parental involvement for the seriously emotionally disturbed and what was going to be relevant for the school system and county agencies to do for those parents to support them. Dr. O'Toole commented that one of the roles of the task force would be look at how the variety of people out there could work with the family.

Mr. Ewing stated that they had an extraordinarily dedicated staff working in the special schools, area offices, and in the schools themselves. They had done far more than most school systems could even conceive of doing, and he complimented the staff. He recalled that for the last four or five years at budget time he had asked Dr. Fountain if they had adequate resources in this area and the responses varied. This year Dr. Fountain had arranged for him to meet with the principals of the three schools and area and central office staff. In the course of that meeting it was pointed out that the numbers of students with serious emotional disturbances was increasing both in absolute terms and as a proportion of the student population. Secondly, the age at which onset was identified was steadily dropping, and they were now looking at preschool children. Thirdly, the seriousness of the problems was steadily increasing. As a consequence staff was strained and turnover was increasing. Finally, the increasing incidence of those problems in regular schools was placing strains on those regular school teachers as well. If he had described the problem accurately, it made the case for elementary school counselors and for a whole range of other kinds of special programs. It made the case for staff training and for some staff rotation. It made the case for doing a whole range of other things to assist those who were running the special schools to deal with more and more serious problems. He hoped that if this was a reasonably accurate description of the problem it would get prominence in the report of the committee. Dr. O'Toole agreed that this was still an accurate description.

Mr. Paul explained that he had administrated SED programs for the past seven years. Working with SED students was extremely taxing and stressful. He noted that people dealt with violence, disrespect, suicide, physical and/or sexual abuse, and despair. To provide services to these children required dedication and commitment. Dr. Pitt did not think that they suddenly had more people who were emotionally disturbed than there were 10 years ago. What the school

system had done was to take students who used to be institutionalized and put them back in special schools. The students who used to be in special schools might be in a satellite program and mainstreamed into a school. It was his impression that they had taken students who were more severe and brought them back into the educational environment of the public schools. He thought this was for the better because the closer they brought the children to their family environment the better off they were and the more chance that child had to move into the real world.

Mr. Paul expressed his agreement with Dr. Pitt's remarks. He said they had provided very excellent services at the upper level and had been able to bring students back into the regular school environment. However, more children were being referred at the upper levels in the older age group. The study committee had suggested focusing resources in early intervention and prevention in those lower levels of services so that students did not have to be referred to level five.

Dr. Shoenberg noted that they had been talking about severely emotionally disturbed students, and he wondered if they had a formal category of moderately or mildly emotionally disturbed. Dr. Fountain replied that the term seriously emotionally disturbed was directly from the law, and this was one of the issues. He thought that the committee might look at making that terminology more understandable to all. Right now they had SED at levels one through six, the residential level. Mr. Paul explained that they had to go by the Maryland bylaw. He said they really haven't known what behaviors youngsters could exhibit and what kinds of interventions they could give at the lower level of service. However, once a youngster got to Mark Twain or RICA at the upper end of the continuum, they did know behaviors and patterns. They had to look at behaviors and characteristics from levels one to six.

Dr. Shoenberg pointed out that Dr. Fountain has used the term, "mosaic of services." He didn't know whether this was meant to be neutral, good, or bad. Dr. Fountain explained that he could have used the term, "continuum of services," just as easily. They looked at the unique needs of the child and tried to build a program that would fit those needs. He reported that when he came to Montgomery County they had almost 300 youngsters in residential placement, and now they were down to 80. Yet at the same time all those things described by Mr. Ewing were happening. As far as "mosaic," he felt they should continue to have a wide variety of program offerings for youngsters to meet their unique needs. The task force might be able to clarify the definition of SED and categorize what piece of the service was to be used for what particular situation. Now they had youngsters who were able to be successful in level four programs in some schools, and in other schools they were not as successful. They needed to look at the environment these youngsters needed to be successful. He would say, however, that when a youngster was successful, the principal and the counselor were spending a tremendous amount of time with that youngster.

It seemed to Dr. Shoenberg that one of the characteristics of MCPS was its inclination to define programs with sufficient differentiation in minuteness that they hoped were maximally responsive to individual children. He wondered whether in some cases they extended themselves farther than really made sense and promised more than they could deliver by defining the program too minutely. These new programs became institutionalized but not expanded; therefore, they remained experimental programs. He also hoped that the committee would look at the role of the schools versus the role of other community agencies. MCPS did so well compared to what other agencies could do that MCPS became the place that was expected to solve the problems that the other agencies could not solve. This created a crisis of rising expectations that had subjected MCPS to criticism for not being willing to take on more than the too much it had already taken on. He hoped that the study would come up with some sensible kind of differentiation that would allow MCPS to focus on those things that they were well prepared to focus on.

Dr. Pitt agreed that MCPS did a lot of things very well, but the expectations that MCPS established for itself and those people whom it served were sometimes too high and unreachable. He thought they needed to define what they could do and what was reasonable for them to do. This went beyond the SED program.

It seemed to Mr. Ewing that it was not enough for them to say what they could do or what they were most capable of doing in terms of ability, experience, and knowledge. The fact was that the school system didn't function very well in many cases because it faced the consequences of what children brought to school with them. Children could not learn if they were being abused, if they were mentally ill, if they were handicapped in some other fashion, if they were fighting all the time, and if they were suspended for truancy. They could not say that the parents or the community were going to deal with all of that. The schools were stuck with an awful lot of this, and it was not going to go away.

Dr. Fountain remarked that he had been saying to his colleagues in other agencies that they needed to take on a larger portion of those responsibilities that were not educational responsibilities. He hoped that the committee would be able to make this clearer to the whole county.

Mrs. Praisner noted that Dr. Fountain had stated that where a student was succeeding they might find that the counselor was spending more time with that student. It seemed to her that the task force had to look at what was required when there was a successful setting in a local school. She recalled that several years ago they had a long-range plan for program placement in different areas, and she suggested that maybe they should look at that again from the standpoint of mix or levels of placement, numbers of programs within schools, and the services and support that had to be in place in a local school to ensure program success.

Dr. Fountain commented that another variable was the training.

Maryland had generic certification in special education, and this didn't work well in dealing with SED students. Therefore, they had started to look for teachers who had certification in SED, and they used Dr. Fagan's office to work with teachers to prepare them to deal with SED students.

Dr. Cronin agreed that they had to be sure that other county services were cooperating with MCPS to provide the extensive programs that had to be given to children for support. They might have a child with alcoholic parents, and family services and other agencies had to be brought to bear. MCPS should not be left to attempt to deal with the situation which was far larger than an educational issue. In line with Mr. Ewing's remarks, he wondered if MCPS was becoming so good at identification that they were lowering the age at which they were now identifying children. Dr. Fountain didn't think so. He thought there was something happening in society that had a bearing on what they were experiencing in school. Their whole society was under a tremendous amount of stress and because of that they were seeing this behavior in the schools. However, he felt they were much better at serving SED youngsters today than they were when Mark Twain opened or even when RICA opened. Everything including training was better, but at the same time they had the problem constantly moving along at its own pace.

Dr. Cronin asked if people were moving to the county to take advantage of SED programs in MCPS. Dr. Fountain was not sure, but he could say that more definitively about other programs. Dr. O'Toole agreed, and he pointed out that they did have youngsters coming into the county with other handicaps who had SED as a secondary type of problem.

Dr. Cronin pointed out that the school system was responsible from birth to 21. He asked if they were building in a component which included postsecondary adulthood. Dr. O'Toole replied that they were working closely with other agencies for post graduation services, but it was his sense that there were more gaps there than in MCPS programs. One positive idea was the single point of entry the county had set up and the kind of support youngsters were getting before they graduated. There was also an awareness at the county level that more adult-type services were needed. He also felt that MCPS graduates were better able to cope with life. Dr. Fountain added that they were trying to get parents in earlier to point out that there was an end to education and to prepare parents to transfer records to the next level of services in the county.

Mr. Paul commented that they had had a number of youngsters graduating from RICA and attending Montgomery College plus youngsters mainstreamed back into the home school and then going on to Montgomery College. They did have some liaison with the College even when that youngster had left RICA. He agreed that they needed a cohesive and comprehensive approach to SED education. They had success when they believed these students could grow and learn like everyone else. These were students with average or above average intelligence. If they were able to plug in resources early, the

investment didn't have to be for the next 10 or 15 years.

Mrs. DiFonzo asked how they identified the child who was SED versus the child who was just being a brat. On the flip side was the child, who did not exhibit behavior problems, but was deeply troubled. Mrs. Maria Carbonell, school psychologist, explained that they were qualified examiners. They had a variety of tools including projective tests, and students were compared to national norms. Ms. O'Connell added that this was a long and painful process. It began with behaviors they were observing in the school and was defined through parent conferencing, observations, and reports before they even got to the stage of inviting other resource staff into the building.

Mrs. DiFonzo said that mention had been made about getting these children back into the mainstream and into their homes. She had visited level six schools in New England, and some of these children came from homes where they were abused physically, sexually, or emotionally. She asked about their moral obligation to put these children back into that kind of home environment. Dr. Fountain replied that there were places in the community where the child could be placed rather than in the home. Ms. Mary Lee Phelps explained that there was a trend in the state and within the county government to work together to develop group homes to house students in these situations. Mr. Paul added that the reality was that the children would go back into that community, and services had to be provided. They did not want to create an institutionalized mentality wherein these children would become dependent because the American society did not tolerance dependence.

Dr. Pitt reported that the next step was for Dr. Fountain to recommend a group of people for the task force. He would provide the Board with a copy of the refined charge and the names of the people on the committee. Mrs. DiFonzo thanked staff for their presentation.

Re: REPORT OF THE COMMISSION ON THE FUTURE

Dr. Pitt reported that he had asked Dr. Kenneth Muir, acting director of the Department of Information, to pull together the major recommendations of the Commission on Education. He had provided the Board with his reactions as a point of discussion; however, he did not expect Board action on these reactions.

Mr. Ewing thought the superintendent's paper was very helpful. It seemed to him it would be useful for the Board to adopt a position paper and communicate this to the Commission as well as the Council and the executive. In line with the Board's previous discussion, one of the recommendations was that the school system ought to be more definitive about its mission. He felt that the mission issue was related to the range of educational responsibilities they had as well as those responsibilities which tended to be thrust upon them because MCPS was the agency of last resort. He thought that the superintendent had responded well to the other recommendations. Mrs. Praisner agreed with Mr. Ewing's remarks. She suggested using

the superintendent's paper and adding to it or modifying the responses. Mrs. DiFonzo thought there was nothing in the paper that hadn't been articulated by the Board to the Council in one way or another.

Mrs. Praisner stated that there was one recommendation about the business community, and she had asked that the Board be provided with an earlier memo about the magnitude and range of things MCPS was doing with the business community. When they sent in their statement to the county, this memo should be attached. She suggested that in regard to the recommendation about the mission of the public schools, they might want to use that as the avenue for the Board to review with the Council and the community the diversity of the student population and the range of needs those students presented within the educational area. She added that they had to raise the issue of sharing some concern and responsibility for students who came to school not prepared to learn.

Dr. Shoenberg felt that the Commission on the Future report showed a very strong influence from the Commission on Excellence report. However, in some instances the Commission on the Future went beyond what the Commission on Excellence had recommended particularly in the recommendation having to do with the area offices. The notion of fiscal accountability was another one. He felt that they had to take note of the conclusions to which the Commission could have come to sensibly within the amount of time they had and the range of issues they had to deal with.

Mr. Goldensohn said he had attended the Chatauqua the county had held a couple of weeks ago, and one of the working groups was on education. Someone had been taking notes, and he asked staff to obtain copies of these notes of key issues that came up during that discussion.

Dr. Cronin pointed out that one recommendation was on parental involvement. He said there was an infinite amount of information they sent home, and they had marvelous PTA participation and an outstanding volunteer program. However, there was another level which was the involvement of parents in the actual education of their children. He would like to see this involvement increased. In regard to the statement on missions, Mr. Ewing suggested that they strengthen it by saying that the Board and superintendent had recognized there was a need to be more precise about the mission of the schools and their relationship with other county and state agencies and with parents. This was an issue they were now addressing and planned to wrestle with in the immediate future.

Mrs. Rafel stated that she was somewhat disappointed in the Commission's recommendations. They didn't take hold of what national educational trends were for the future. She also did not think the Commission looked at the unique character of Montgomery County as far as what its future was going to be and the character of education. Mrs. Praisner suggested that they also had to say that the school system as a state agency had roles and responsibilities that might at

times put it in conflict with other elements of government. She would agree with Mrs. Rafel about the overall recommendations. As far as the county's being unique, it did not look at the county's place in the greater Washington area and in the state. Dr. Shoenberg added that the Commission did not address the fact that MCPS was a very large school system with all of the possibilities that largeness suggested. Mrs. DiFonzo agreed that the Commission was making statements about education that would be applicable to a smaller school system.

Dr. Pitt asked Dr. Muir to refine the document and distribute it to Board members for their comments in the next week or so.

*Dr. Cronin left the meeting at this point.

Re: HALF-DAY KINDERGARTEN AND EXTENDED DAY
CHILD DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS

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

WHEREAS, On June 9, 1988, the Board of Education adopted a resolution on the day care pilots which included the following statements:

The roles of MCPS, including the Board's policy on day care, will be recognized in a final plan for the pilots, which is to be approved by the Board.

The Board wishes to review and approve an evaluation design for the program prior to the initiation of any pilots.

and

WHEREAS, On September 26, 1988, the Board of Education reviewed the report of the interagency group on half-day kindergarten and extended day child development programs, a proposed design for the pilots and a proposed design for the evaluation of the pilots; and

WHEREAS, The members of the Board of Education requested that the evaluation plan for the pilots include consideration of whether or not this is an appropriate way to address day care needs in the county, including cost implications, the kindergarten-only provision, space needs, and the potential for expansion of these pilots; and

WHEREAS, Staff members have prepared an evaluation design for the half-day kindergarten and extended day child development program; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education accepts the proposed design of the pilots and the proposed evaluation plan.

Mr. Goldensohn suggested adding "pilot" before "half-day" in the last

WHEREAS clause and "pilot" before "evaluation" in the Resolved clause. It was the consensus of the Board to accept these changes.

*Mr. Goldensohn left the meeting at this point.

RESOLUTION NO. 534-88 Re: AN AMENDMENT TO THE PROPOSED RESOLUTION
ON HALF-DAY KINDERGARTEN AND EXTENDED
DAY CHILD DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS

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

RESOLVED, That the proposed resolution on half-day kindergarten and extended day child development programs be amended by the following additional Resolved clause:

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education continue to be committed to the developmental and educational benefits of all-day kindergarten and the expansion of the availability of it to as many children as possible.

Mr. Ewing suggested adding "formative" to the last WHEREAS clause before "evaluation design" and "formative" to the first Resolved clause before "pilot evaluation plan." It was the consensus of the Board to make these changes.

RESOLUTION NO. 535-88 Re: HALF-DAY KINDERGARTEN AND EXTENDED DAY
CHILD DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

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

WHEREAS, On June 9, 1988, the Board of Education adopted a resolution on the day care pilots which included the following statements:

The roles of MCPS, including the Board's policy on day care, will be recognized in a final plan for the pilots, which is to be approved by the Board.

The Board wishes to review and approve an evaluation design for the program prior to the initiation of any pilots.

and

WHEREAS, On September 26, 1988, the Board of Education reviewed the report of the interagency group on half-day kindergarten and extended day child development programs, a proposed design for the pilots and a proposed design for the evaluation of the pilots; and

WHEREAS, The members of the Board of Education requested that the evaluation plan for the pilots include consideration of whether or not this is an appropriate way to address day care needs in the county, including cost implications, the kindergarten-only provision, space needs, and the potential for expansion of these pilots; and

WHEREAS, Staff members have prepared a formative evaluation design for the pilot half-day kindergarten and extended day child development program; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education accepts the proposed design of the pilots and the proposed formative pilot evaluation plan; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education continue to be committed to the developmental and educational benefits of all-day kindergarten and the expansion of the availability of it to as many children as possible.

Re: BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS

1. Mr. Ewing remarked that they had an ESOL program discussion scheduled for a future agenda. Last spring they had said that the ESOL enrollment at certain high schools was potentially an issue that ought to be addressed. He hoped it would be discussed during the Board discussion. Dr. Pitt said he did intend to discuss that in the CIP discussion in November. Mr. Ewing pointed out that this was more of a program than a facilities issue, and Dr. Pitt agreed to think through how he was going to deal with that issue.
2. In regard to Rolling Terrace, Mr. Ewing reported that they had heard about staffing issues there. He assumed that someone was addressing those and would provide additional staff, if necessary. Dr. Vance explained that this was the "rites of fall" not only for Rolling Terrace but for other schools. They were reviewing these situations and would resolve them shortly.
3. Mr. Ewing noted that in the minutes of the County Council education committee a concern was expressed about legality of the school system's undertaking the renovation of Northwood on behalf of the county. He asked if they had looked at that issue. Dr. Pitt assured Mr. Ewing that they had checked this out with two attorneys.
4. Mr. Ewing said that at the last meeting he had made comments about Broad Acres and had been able to visit the school. He wanted to clarify his view of the situation. It wasn't so much that he thought they had done anything illegal or even necessarily wrong in terms of the decision they made. However, he was worried about it in terms of how it would be perceived as a precedent. It was the first time in his experience on the Board that the Board had said there was really nothing they could do or wanted to do that would advance integration in this school. From discussions with Dr. Pitt and the principal, he recognized what was unique about that school and what the feasibility problems were in doing something more. The problem was the nation and maybe the county seemed to be far less interested in and far less committed to integrated education than used to be the case. He thought they had had more commitment to this in Montgomery County than any place else, but there was the possibility people would question why they were pairing certain schools and doing nothing about Broad Acres. He thought they had to have a better answer than "we didn't think there was anything they could do." He thought they had a better answer but had not articulated it.
5. Mrs. Praisner said the Board had received comments from Rolling Terrace and other schools about staffing. She hoped that in communicating back through the principal to the community they would review the "rites of fall" so they would understand it was not necessarily the result of calling Board members that one received

- extra staff, but that it was the annual review process and allocation based on enrollments. It was important for them to reaffirm the process that they used and the holding of staff in order to do that.
6. Mrs. Praisner noted that in a month the schools would be used for the election. Each election year she received complaints about a lack of air conditioning or a lack of heat or too much heat or too much air conditioning, depending on the time of the year. She knew it related to the master switch issue and some other things. She asked that that staff get back to her with a general statement of who had responsibility and what was the process vis-a-vis the local building service manager and the overall system for the maintenance of heat and electricity.
 7. Mrs. DiFonzo reported that the NSBA ITTE Network group had been in Montgomery County. There were 43 representatives from around the United States including Alaska. They were impressed with what Bev Sangston and her people showed them. Not only were they impressed with what Blair High School was doing with computers and technology in the educational program, they had made comments about the school itself. One made the remark that there was no reason in the world why Blair High School should work, but it did. They commented about the warmth between students and staff and about how committed staff members seemed to be to the youngsters. They talked about the very warm and caring relationships among youngsters. They were not referring strictly to what was going on in the magnet program, they were talking about "the" high school.
 8. Mrs. DiFonzo reported that she had been invited to Stewarttown to attend the first annual reunion of Stewarttown Elementary School of all classes between 1907 and 1957. People gathered from all around the country, and several hundred people attended. She said that it was interesting to hear their experiences in a segregated elementary school in Montgomery County. When the school was closed in 1957 Emory Grove and other segregated schools had also been closed, and all of those youngsters were sent to Longview. The history of these segregated schools came to a close in 1960.
 9. Mrs. DiFonzo said she and Mrs. Rafel had attended the groundbreaking at Luxmanor Elementary School. The community was very pleased. Afterwards, she had visited the Division of Construction at Woodward. Staff had spread out and were pleased with their bright and airy quarters.
 10. Mrs. DiFonzo stated that she was pleased to officiate at a commencement at Noyes last week for a class of one. The youngster had scored 91 points over what he needed to pass the G.E.D., and it was the highest score ever coming out of Noyes. Staff was checking to see how this compared with other Montgomery County and state scores. The student was talking about going on to college.

RESOLUTION NO. 536-88 Re: EXECUTIVE SESSION - OCTOBER 24, 1988

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Mrs. Praisner 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 October 24, 1988, at 7:30 p.m. to discuss, consider, deliberate, and/or otherwise decide the employment, assignment, appointment, promotion, demotion, compensation, discipline, removal, or resignation of employees, appointees, or officials over whom it has jurisdiction, or any other personnel matter affecting one or more particular individuals and to comply with a specific constitutional, statutory or judicially imposed requirement that prevents public disclosures about a particular proceeding or matter as permitted under the State Government Article, Section 10-508; and that such meeting shall continue in executive closed session until the completion of business.

RESOLUTION NO. 537-88 Re: SCHEDULING A DISCUSSION OF BUSINESS COMMUNITY PROGRAMS

On motion of Mrs. DiFonzo moved and seconded by Dr. Cronin (on September 26, 1988), the following resolution was adopted unanimously:

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education schedule a meeting to discuss efforts in cooperation and partnership with the business community with a possible eye to examining ways of doing a better job of publicizing and disseminating what is being done in that regard.

RESOLUTION NO. 538-88 Re: BOE APPEAL NO. 1988-22

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

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education adopt its Decision and Order in BOE Appeal No. 1988-22 (personnel matter).

RESOLUTION NO. 539-88 Re: BOARD APPEAL NO. 1988-24

On motion of Mrs. Praisner seconded by Mrs. Rafel, the following resolution was adopted with Mr. Ewing, (Mr. Park), Mrs. Praisner, Mrs. Rafel, and Dr. Shoenberg voting in the affirmative; Mrs. DiFonzo abstaining because she had recused herself from the decision):

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education adopt its Decision and Order in BOE Appeal No. 1988-24 (personnel matter).

Re: NEW BUSINESS

1. Mr. Ewing asked if the matter of severely emotionally disturbed students would come back to the Board. Dr. Pitt assured him that the committee report would come back to the Board for discussion.
2. Mr. Ewing moved and Mrs. Praisner seconded that the Board discuss the issue of dropouts and programs and efforts being made currently

to deal with that issue.

3. Mr. Ewing moved and Mrs. Praisner seconded that the Board review the MCPS Suspension Project with a view to both learning what needs to be done and discussing the suggestions for directions for future efforts. Mrs. Praisner added that it would be useful to talk about the whole project which started several years ago.

Re: ITEMS OF INFORMATION

Board members received the following items of information:

1. Items in Process
2. Construction Progress Report
3. Approval of Introduction to Computer Use Course for Inclusion in the PROGRAM OF STUDIES (for future consideration)
4. Quarterly Change Order Report Under \$25,000
5. Annual Report of 1987-88 Child Abuse and Neglect Referrals
6. Report on Dropout Data and Issues to be Considered in Defining Who is a Dropout
7. The MCPS Suspension Project: Report of Suspension Activity II

Re: ADJOURNMENT

The president adjourned the meeting at 5 p.m.

PRESIDENT

SECRETARY

HP:mlw