



WHEREAS, During her term of office, an unprecedented number of new schools were constructed and existing schools were expanded; and

WHEREAS, During this same period Montgomery College, then under the jurisdiction of the Board of Education, received full accreditation as a junior college; and

WHEREAS, While on the Board of Education, Mrs. Wilson supported efforts to gain Social Security coverage for all employees of the public schools and the college, was instrumental in supporting a study to centralize cafeteria operations for the school system, and was an advocate of legislation to require developers to donate future school sites to the Board of Education; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the members of the Board of Education and the superintendent of schools express their sorrow at the death of Lillian Earnest Wilson and extend deepest sympathy to her family; and be it further

RESOLVED, That this resolution be made part of the minutes of this meeting and a copy be forwarded to Mrs. Wilson's family.

RESOLUTION NO. 113-89 Re: HB 1184 - PUBLIC SCHOOLS - TARGETED AID

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

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education take no position on HB 1184 - Public Schools - Targeted Aid.

RESOLUTION NO. 114-89 Re: HB 1207 - SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION - STATE REIMBURSEMENT TO COUNTIES

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

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education support HB 1207 - School Construction - State Reimbursement to Counties provided substantial funding is identified.

RESOLUTION NO. 115-89 Re: HB 1244 - VEHICLE LAWS - DRIVER'S LICENSE - HIGH SCHOOL DROPOUTS

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

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education oppose HB 1244 - Vehicle Laws - Driver's License - High School Dropouts.

RESOLUTION NO. 116-89 Re: HB 1315 - WORKERS' COMPENSATION - HANDICAPPED STUDENTS

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

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education support HB 1315 - Workers' Compensation - Handicapped Students.

RESOLUTION NO. 117-89 Re: HB 1002 - STUDENT FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE  
- EDUCATION OF PHYSICAL AND OCCUPATIONAL  
THERAPISTS

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

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education oppose HB 1002 - Student Financial Assistance - Education of Physical and Occupational Therapists.

Re: SUCCESSFUL PRACTICES REPORT

Dr. Pitt stated that he was very pleased with this significant step in their efforts to improve the achievement of all students with a special emphasis on minority students. They were going to have an even more sophisticated approach when they looked at secondary school practices. He thought that this report would allow teachers and principals to benefit from the expertise of their colleagues. He said that this project was anchored in their efforts to improve minority achievement, but at the same time he believed these practices would help other youngsters who might be achieving at a comparatively low level.

Dr. Vance said that the successful practices project had the potential of being not only a landmark project force in Montgomery County but could well hasten the day at which they could turn the corner in improving the achievement and participation of all students in Montgomery County. He introduced Dr. Joy Frechtling, Mrs. Marie Heck, Dr. Rene Brimfield, and Dr. Paul Scott. The effort used the broad involvement of a 21-member steering committee. The schools, the areas, and the central offices all worked very closely in identifying this project and the contents of the binder. They felt that the process and the document were designed to be organic in nature because they would grow and continue to evolve. The write-ups had been placed in a notebook because they would be adding additional practices. This year the process had been modified to reinforce what they did last year and to authenticate what they did last year. They would continue the process in the elementary schools while at the same time looking at the intermediate schools. The focus of the effort was not to identify new programs but to identify those that were working and working with measurable success with a cross section of student populations. The area associate superintendents were now involved with this and were in the process of working with their staffs and the principals. They had added to the model to include

training and other staff development support.

Dr. Scott commented that he was excited about the completion of this initial phase because the identification of programs to make a difference for young people was a significant step. He called attention to the membership of the steering committee and noted that it was through this group that all decisions were processed.

Dr. Scott pointed out the methodology section in the report which provided a detailed account of the process and the specific criteria they used in identifying programs, practices, and strategies. They used a combination of quantitative requirements and professional judgment. They used the California Achievement Test, migrant proposals, special programs, school profiles, and individual student achievement data. Once schools were identified, there was a preliminary visit by two people from DEA and one retired principal. This was followed by a site visit of a much larger group. Of the ten schools where practices were identified, five were magnet schools and five were not. They chose ten schools because this was the number they felt they could handle. The focus was not on identifying effective schools but on identifying successful practices, strategies, and programs that could be replicated and used in other places.

Dr. Scott reported that the process was a blend of action research and professional judgment. When they began to examine the practices in this initial phase, they reflected many of the correlates of effective schools including strong leadership, instruction, and focus on school climate.

In regard to next steps, Dr. Scott reported that they would disseminate the existing practices and identify additional ones. Dr. Brimfield was responsible for coordinating the overall effort from this point on. Associate superintendents had identified schools in their areas that would be implementing the practices that were before the Board. Mrs. Kitty Blumsack, staff development specialist, had provided a training plan. Some of the identified practices had very specific training plans associated with them. The schools participating in the program would begin in March. Additional training would be made available as they identified additional practices.

Dr. Frechtling said that based on last year's experience they wanted to broaden the process. They wanted to move away from identifying schools based on CAT data to looking at schools with successful practices in a variety of areas. The model last year was very resource intensive and would not work as well with a broader base. They were now adapting some models that had been used elsewhere. They were looking at what had been used in the federal government as part of the program effectiveness panel and had been adopted in the state of New York. Schools or programs that feel they are successful provide a proposal to a group of professionals who are knowledgeable in education. The school would volunteer and then be given technical assistance from DEA to develop the argument and the evidence for

their program. The proposal would then be presented to a panel of professional educators from within and outside of Montgomery County. The panel would weigh the evidence and judge whether enough evidence had been submitted to say that the practice was successful. The MCPS draft plan had been reviewed by the federal government and was now being circulated among principals and area staff.

Dr. Pitt commented that they were moving from a focus with a lot of emphasis on the CAT to a broader focus; however, they would not be ignoring the CAT or other achievement test data. It seemed to Mr. Ewing that it was a good idea to do what they could to identify successful practices. He had developed a long list of questions which he would like staff to address. The question he would ask now had to do with the validation process. He did not have any quarrel with the way in which they had gone about identifying successful practices. The basic idea was that where students were achieving well, something good must have been happening, and therefore they would look at what that was and document it. Then the question became whether the practice worked well for those students under particular circumstance or did it have more general validity and application. He asked what staff was proposing to do with what was before the Board. He asked if they were saying that these were demonstrated and documented practices that everyone could pick up on and use, or if they were saying that these were candidates for further examination and testing and some method would be employed to determine whether these practices worked in other settings. If they were doing the latter, he was very happy with what they were doing. If not, he was very uncomfortable.

Dr. Pitt replied that any school might determine that they could try some of these things, but they were focusing in on schools where a similar group of youngsters were not achieving as well and suggesting that the practices be tried there. The question was whether the practices would work there. Obviously, they would have to look at this. He said that Dr. Frechtling would have to react to whether they were setting up a scientific experiment. If the practice were to work where they had similar youngsters, they could draw some conclusions.

Dr. Frechtling remarked that one of the important next steps would be to follow the process through. They would look and see where and under what conditions the practices succeeded. She pointed out that most of these practices had not been invented in MCPS; they had been successful elsewhere. They had to look at the context of where they succeeded, and if they did not, why not.

Mr. Ewing commented that he had done this type of thing himself, and he knew very well that it was not a scientific experiment. It was one thing to do what Dr. Frechtling was talking about and quite another to publish a book and say, "go at it, world, have fun, these work." He did not think it was clear enough that they were giving people cautions. He thought that they wanted to say that these things were successful in these schools in that year. For example,

there was a parental position that one of these successful practices did not work at all this year. It was important to give people cautions at the same time they were encouraged to take on some ideas that others had suggested.

Knowing the process they had gone through to identify the practices, Mrs. Praisner said that someone might say that this was familiar and they were doing it in their school. She asked about the process for including schools doing similar practices. For example, could they nominate themselves to be included? Dr. Frechtling replied that other schools could come in with similar practices and their own evidence. She would guess that the program would not be identical anyway to what had already taken place in one of the schools. Mrs. Heck added that PADI was a good example of that because many other schools were implementing PADI. Mrs. Praisner noted that she would not want anyone to think that these were the only schools doing X, Y, or Z.

Dr. Pitt explained that he was concerned because they did have youngsters who were not achieving based on the measures they used. He wanted them to identify those groups of youngsters and with training and orientation try some of these practices. He was interested in seeing whether these could be duplicated so they could pursue this where achievement was not at the level it should be.

Mrs. Praisner said her other question had to do with the characteristics of the school in order to say they had a similar situation. She was not sure they had identified the characteristics of the school enough to alert someone that it was a similar school. She asked about the staff training component.

Mrs. Blumsack replied that she had called principals to find out what kind of training had been provided their staffs. Many of the programs had formal training, and many did not. The training they designed contained leadership training for principals to identify where the practices could best fit into programs already existing in their buildings. The second piece would involve working with leadership staff including opinion leaders and strong teachers. These people would be visiting schools and see how this fit with their population. The third component would be to identify the formal training programs. In some cases this had been done because schools had requested PADI and SAGE. They were going to try and get some planning time for these people during the summer. In addition, these schools would be monitored for the next two or three years. Dr. Shoenberg commented that in reading through these successful practices he was struck by the way in which they reflected the purposes of the local school flexibility models. They had a lot of teacher input and opportunities for schools to do things that were uniquely theirs and without the interference of anyone telling them what to do or what not to do. A lot of these programs were done with minigrants. Secondly, he noted that several of these models related to student progress in the ISM. As they had been reading reports from the various associations dealing with mathematics education, the reports seemed to be suggesting that the style of teaching

mathematics that the ISM incorporated was not in line with what appeared to be the best thinking that was going on now.

Dr. Pitt commented that the whole concept of mathematics and science education was undergoing some change. ISM in itself could be flexible. There was no question that people were looking at the integration of mathematics and science education. For example, youngsters would start doing geometry at a very young age. MCPS was already doing some of that and was aware of the major changes. He agreed that ISM needed to be looked at in terms of modifying it. Dr. Shoenberg remarked that he was thinking about the way it encouraged thinking of mathematics as set of isolated skills.

Dr. Shoenberg said they had the MAGIC program at Chevy Chase Elementary and a program called "promoting learning" at Cresthaven. He thought that both of them were fantastic euphemisms for what they really were. A point arose in the discussion of the assertive discipline issue and that was he did not know the criteria according to which these schools distributed their reinforcements. He did not know the degree to which they were encouraging students to conduct themselves during the school day in ways that adults would not stand for. This made him wonder about what they were trying to achieve with their discipline policies that they did not impose on themselves in their work places. Dr. Pitt remarked that in a classroom situation there had to be some kinds of behavior that did not impede the learning process, but there was also a place for flexibility. This was a fine line.

Mrs. DiFonzo called attention to the comprehensive school mathematics program which talked about using colored chalk and pencils. Two of her sons were color blind, and there were instances where her children were failing because they were color blind. She hoped that teachers would take into consideration the fact that some students were color blind.

In terms of the replication and the process, Mr. John Burley reported that the associate superintendent had worked carefully with principals when the document was handed out at area meetings. Principals were told that these were some successful strategies that might be replicated if the conditions were right. Principals were always looking for more time to talk about what was going on in their respective schools. This could be a catalyst to allow principals to do that. Principals could work together to fine tune things and adapt existing programs. Principals and staffs could get together with the principals and staffs of other schools who might be interested in some of these strategies.

Dr. Cronin pointed out that Mr. Ewing had further questions. If other Board members had questions, they should submit them to the superintendent. He thanked staff for their presentation.

Re: ANNUAL REPORT OF THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
ON COUNSELING AND GUIDANCE, 1987-88

Ms. A. Diane Graham, chairperson, thanked the Board for their support of the concerns that were important to the committee. She indicated that they had an additional recommendation which was not in their report.

Ms. Graham said their first recommendation was to establish a coordinated pupil services program which had a chance to be successful. The committee was gratified that the Board had been concerned about this effort for some time. This issue had been a recommendation of the committee for several years. They had recently read about a study that was publicized by Councilman Subin which raised similar concerns and gave them the feeling that the time might be right for doing a comprehensive program beyond the naming of a coordinator. Dr. Pitt reported that the executive staff had met with the division chief for Children and Youth to look at how MCPS could cooperate with the county. He said that if all of the focus was going to be on the schools for the services needed by children, this would not work. They had already started to work on cooperation with the county. Dr. Cronin reported that two weeks ago he had met with a group chaired by Mrs. Shannon to talk about ways of coordinating all county services with what the school system did. He had been requested to work with the county executive and the County Council to get their support.

Ms. Graham said that while she was pleased to hear that, she had been pleased several other years. She hoped that they did not have to come to the table again on the issue of coordination of services. Ms. Graham said their second recommendation was that they provide resource counselors with a differentiated caseload so that they could be resources to their departments. The resource counselor could then manage the major task of delivering guidance and counseling. The committee saw a disparity in the student caseload given to resource counselors when they compared that with the teaching load of subject resource teachers. Their third recommendation was the need to consider other factors such as mobility rate and special needs populations along with the numbers of students in determining the allocation of counselor resources. At some schools they had mobility rates of 40 and 50 percent, that said something more than the fact that there were 300 students at that school.

Ms. Graham said their fourth recommendation was to examine the need for increased support for the elementary counselor specialists in the Central Guidance Unit. As the number of elementary schools with counselors increased and the counselor positions increased, program management and personnel training would become issues of even greater concern and more increased responsibilities for the Central Guidance Unit.

Ms. Graham explained that part of their focus last year and this year had been the Edison Career Center. If transportation were provided to Area 3 high schools, the Edison Center would have higher utilization. Their fifth recommendation was for the county to provide transportation to the Area 3 high schools so that the Edison

Center would be available to all county students. Their sixth recommendation was clerical support for the mid-level schools' peak-time needs. The committee appreciated the 12-month secretarial support given to those mid-level schools that were without such assistance. Their seventh recommendation was to encourage counselors to learn a second language for use on the job. They had heard there was a Spanish-speaking counselor at a school where there was not a Spanish-speaking population. They believed there should be an incentive to all counselors to learn a second language.

Ms. Graham said their added recommendation was the elimination of split-time counselors as quickly as possible. The addition of 15 elementary school counselors in FY 1989 and the 20 proposed for FY 1990 could go a long way to relieve this situation at the elementary school level; however, it continued to be a concern of the committee at both the elementary and secondary school levels.

Mrs. Praisner commented that they would be getting a staff response to the report, but she had some requests for additional information. It would be useful for the Board to know the status of the workload of resource counselors. In regard to split-time counselors, she asked where they would be if they received the budget they had requested.

In regard to the third recommendation, Mrs. Praisner asked if they were referring to both elementary and secondary. Ms. Graham replied that they were. Mrs. Praisner asked if the committee had a definition and range of what they were talking about regarding high mobility rates and high special needs. Ms. Graham replied that she did not have a bottom number, but they were concerned when they heard about mobility rates of 40 and 50 percent. Mrs. Praisner said they had their own definition of mobility rate, but she was not certain that they really understood or had a common knowledge of what they meant by mobility rate. There were an awful lot of schools with a 40 percent mobility rate, and she was not sure this became a reasonable criteria if they were talking about a significant number of schools rather than an exception. Ms. Graham explained that they were saying this needed to be factored in when they were considering workload. They were hearing from counselors that school populations turned over significantly within one school year which was a very different kind of situation from schools where the population was pretty much set by the second month of school.

Mrs. Praisner said there were two issues. One was preparing the student for the experience in that school which might mean verifying information from another school, and it was also where there was movement out and preparing that student for the movement out as well. To the extent mobility was within their own county, it was a much simpler mechanism as contrasted to schools near county lines where there might be students moving in and out from other counties. She was trying to get a sense of the committee's definition of mobility. Mrs. Praisner said she had other questions about identified needs.

She assumed that this was a compilation of what was identified which was then tabulated by the committee, and Ms. Graham replied that she was correct. Mrs. Praisner was curious about the way in which they were using Myers Briggs at the senior high school level. She wondered whether it was being used for students and for what purpose. She noted that elementary schools had requested a listing of speakers on parenting issues, and given the work done with MCCPTA and MCPS, she was a little concerned that they did not have a list.

Mrs. Praisner said that in regard to the seventh recommendation she would be interested in knowing what other jobs might need language skills. She knew of federal agencies that were providing incentive programs once staff members had mastered languages. She asked if they had looked into this at all and what would be involved. Dr. Pitt replied that they had had discussions in this area, and Mr. Goldensohn had also raised this issue about school office staff. Mrs. Praisner asked that the response include information about other positions.

Dr. Cronin commented that one issue that had come up in the county meeting was referrals. They were concerned that school staff know how to get to outside resources so that MCPS was not being responsible for the entire process.

Mr. Ewing asked whether they had money now for transportation for Area 3 students to Edison. Dr. Pitt replied that they were looking into the possibility of providing transportation for some schools in Area 3. He had some concerns because there were some programs in Area 3 that they did not want to lose. He suggested that they needed to encourage students to attend some programs in Area 3.

Mr. Goldensohn requested a sample of the elementary school handbooks listed under item 15. He also asked for samples of the brochures developed for counseling departments at the mid-level.

Mrs. Hobbs noted that they had referred to a fall workshop focusing on the status of vocational education. She asked if they were referring to the fall of 1988, and Ms. Graham replied that they were. They had held their fall workshop in November at the Edison Center. They had had a wonderful exploration of the Edison Center with Edison Center students. What had come through to them was the pride that students had in Edison.

Mrs. Hobbs said that in the report it was stated that five high school clusters had implemented that comprehensive guidance and counseling program. Somewhere else she had read that Wootton, Damascus, Richard Montgomery, Rockville, and Wheaton High School had the program, but she thought that two new high school clusters were going to be added annually with full implementation in FY 90. Mr. Goodloe replied that they would meet the goal. The remaining clusters were Blair and Watkins Mill. Mrs. Hobbs asked if every secondary school had a guidance advisory committee, and Ms. Graham replied they did, and a lot of elementary schools were doing this as well.

Dr. Cronin thanked the committee for their report.

Re: ANNUAL REPORT OF THE MEDICAL ADVISORY  
COMMITTEE

Ms. Mary Lee Phelps, chairperson, stated that their report was self explanatory covering a period from September 1987 to June 1988.

Dr. Pitt commented that they had heard a great deal of concern about the use of steroids by athletes. Mr. Edward Masood, director of the Department of Health and Physical Education, said as the advisory committee indicated in its report, there was no real hard data. They had tried to make the physical education instructional staff and the coaching staff aware of the problem. They had provided a series of video tapes, and they required that one preseason practice season deal with the issue of steroids. Dr. Pitt asked if any thought had been given to testing high school youngsters, and Mr. Masood replied that it had not been discussed at the local or state level.

Mrs. Praisner asked if this had been done for all sports. Mr. Masood replied that it was done for all sports and included 1,100 coaches and 22,000 students at the J/I/M and high school levels. Mrs. Praisner asked if there had been an increase in inquiries from doctors and parents. Mr. Masood replied that he was not aware of any increase. Mrs. Praisner asked about brochures that could be made available, and Mr. Masood replied that each school had its own policy and standards from the student handbook. Steroids were included among other drugs. This issue came to their attention by students not involved in sports but in body building. Mrs. Praisner suggested a brochure or a question and answer sheet. They could put something in the Montgomery County monthly newspaper and refer parents to sources for additional information. Dr. Steven Tuck replied that there was published information which he would supply for review.

Mrs. Praisner thought it was useful to do it in connection with athletics, but the other issue was greater because students were not in MCPS programs.

Mr. Ewing was pleased to see their recommendation dealing with school health services because it was consistent with positions the Board had taken in the past. He asked if anyone knew what the county executive would be recommending for school health services. Ms. Carol Matthews replied that his recommendations would be out on Wednesday. She reported that last year they had added three people, and in January there was an emergency appropriation to add 15 more staff. She hoped that next year's budget would continue this phasing. Mr. Ewing thought this was something the Board would want to endorse and support.

In regard to the Mental Health Subcommittee, Mr. Ewing was a little unsure about the last paragraph in the report. It seemed to him it would be very helpful to have the advice of the mental health

subcommittee on issues related to MCPS programs for emotionally disturbed students. The Board and staff had been concerned about this issue, and Dr. Lee Haller was serving on a committee on that subject. Dr. Haller replied that he was serving on Dr. Fountain's committee. It seemed to Mr. Ewing that the subcommittee might be a useful forum for the discussion of some of those issues. Dr. Haller replied that when the subcommittee was first formed they had spent a good deal of time familiarizing themselves with the various SED programs. They had also made some recommendations and would like to continue to be involved. Several of them had concerns about Mark Twain and other programs. However, they were uncertain about what to do with their thoughts. They were somewhat hesitant to put forward a lot of ideas without being asked. They would like to expand the committee to include administrators from schools with Level 4 to 6 students. They were also concerned about issues dealing with runaways, child abuse, pregnancy, dropouts, and underachievement. This was the only committee he knew of that had the whole range of mental health professionals involved.

Mr. Ewing observed that they had underutilized this committee. There might be value to Board and the school system in encouraging them to take on some of these issues and offer advice. Mrs. Praisner requested a copy of the current membership of the subcommittee. Dr. Cronin noted that the committee was requesting that the student smoking ban be extended to staff. He pointed out that this was subject to bargaining. Ms. Phelps replied that they were aware of this, but the medical professionals felt the need to have that recommendation included. Dr. Tuck added that teachers and staff set examples for students, and Dr. Pitt commented that many staffs were working on this on a volunteer basis.

Dr. Cronin thanked the committee for their report.

Re: LOCAL SCHOOL FLEXIBILITY PILOTS -  
UPDATE

Dr. Pitt recalled that he and the Board had agreed that this committee would make the judgments on the flexibility pilots. They also indicated that if there were a need to suspend a Board policy or a negotiated contractual agreement, this would have to come back to the Board. He had met with Seth Goldberg and members of the committee. The purpose of the meeting tonight was to update the Board on where the committee was in working with the pilots and where they saw the possibility of policy changes.

Mr. Goldberg reported that the committee members had been working hard and long on what had turned out to be an unusually time-consuming endeavor. He thanked Dr. Pitt and Dr. Vance for the help they had given the group. At this point, they were not asking the Board to take action on anything, but they did see the possibility of that happening in the next few months.

Mr. Goldberg said that during late September and October the

committee was involved in disseminating information about the pilots in the schools and in the community. Working with an inadequately short time line, 26 schools submitted 25 pilots by mid-November. Very few of the pilots were in completed form. All of the pilots talked about how local school autonomy could be applied and how shared decision making could be used to look at the aspects of the program. Most pilots proposed to use the second semester to flesh out the pilots and decide on some of the specifics. This semester would be for setting up their shared decision-making structures involving all members of the school's community. Most of the pilots proposed that implementation would begin in September of the next school year.

Mr. Goldberg said that when they received the pilots in November they gave themselves a couple of weeks for each member to study the pilots. In early December the committee began its deliberations on the 25 proposals. They tried to assess the pilots in three global areas. The first revolved around the educational impact that the pilot was proposing. This included what they were doing and whether or not the solutions to the problems seemed to make sense. The second issue was the shared decision-making structure itself. They looked at this in regard to what the process had been to generate the pilots, and from the standpoint of the opportunity a particular pilot would provide to try out the shared decision-making concepts over the rest of the year and a half period. The third general category had to do with the implementation plan. They looked at the feasibility of what was being talked about, the cost, and whether or not the pilot had some general applicability to other school situations.

Mr. Goldberg said they also looked at the criteria set down for the pilots in the memo approved by the Board. The decision-making process used by the committee had two stages. Initially in an all-day session, they went through the 25 proposals and eliminated 12 of the pilots from further consideration. These pilots were eliminated for reasons having to do with shared decision making and implementation criteria. Practically all of the pilots seemed to have merit, but they were not necessarily good flexibility pilots. In the second stage, they communicated issues they had generated about the 13 remaining pilots to the schools. The schools were asked to come in for an interview. They then took the additional data and made their final decisions which involved the selection of nine schools. They did not apply any of the usual kind of demographic criteria and try to spread out the pilots among the three areas. They did want all levels of schools, but unfortunately only one J/I/M level school applied. They selected six elementary schools and three high schools. They felt that the nine schools chosen presented them with enough diversity and range so that at the end of the process they would yield the best possible data for the committee to bring to the Board for future directions.

Mrs. DiFonzo noted that there was no school from Area 3. She wondered if they had a representative sampling of pilot suggestions from Area 3 and whether Area 3 submitted as many applications as did schools in Areas 1 and 2. Mr. Goldberg agreed to provide the Board

with that breakdown. He thought that at least three applications came from Area 3 out of the 24.

Mrs. Praisner said that another question on the selection process was the selection of schools for piloting and the relationship of some members of the committee to those schools. Mr. Goldberg replied that in other systems they had a top-down process, and before they asked for proposals, they had training sessions. MCPS did not do this. If they looked at the original 25 proposals, there was not widespread understanding of what the whole effort was about. What ended up happening was that those schools submitting pilots who had people providing leadership because of their experience with the Commission or work groups had the jump on other schools in terms of understanding what the flexibility concepts were.

Dr. Pitt commented that they could have taken another whole year to publicize this across the school system. He was concerned that they not lose the momentum, and he hoped they would get some concepts operational before they lost that momentum. In most school systems, it took three years to implement flexibility pilots.

Mr. Goldberg reported that in the schools now they were choosing the people who would be involved in the shared decision-making processes. They were beginning to pare down the concept in terms of what they were actually going to work on. This phase was a very time-consuming process. It involved changing attitudes and expectancies and different roles. Questions for which there were no pat answers were emerging from this process. They were going to have to work things out on an on-going basis. All of the schools were asking for training in shared decision-making concepts, group problem solving, and conflict resolution. At the same time the committee had asked each school to submit a more detailed budget so that money could be made available to them. A subcommittee headed by Dr. Richard Towers was helping schools do this. Essentially they had decided to allocate \$10,000 to each school as they requested it. The major costs involved were costs associated with freeing people up to do the considerable amount of work necessary. He said it was apparent that they were going to have to ask the school system to display a good deal of flexibility with those budgets so that they would be able to move some of that money around and across categories. They hoped to have funds available to the schools by the first week in March.

Mr. Goldberg reported that the committee would retain the last \$10,000 to help defray the costs of training needs. They had asked a group composed of representatives of Staff Development, MCEA, and a foundation to propose and implement the initial training. They recognized that training was one of the largest needs that they were going to be involved in. They also recognized that nothing had been done to get key MCPS decision makers on board and running on the same track as the pilots. The training group was recommending that the training extend beyond people in the schools to people in the system and on the Board of Education. So far the bureaucracy of the school system had shown good faith and motivation to try to understand what the pilots were about. They were planning a day and a half training

session in April and a two-day training session in May. There might be a request for supplemental funds if the \$10,000 did not cover their training needs.

Mrs. Praisner asked about the process of choosing people who would be involved at the local schools. Mr. Goldberg replied that the people engaged in the shared decision-making process at the local school level would be chosen by their constituencies. It was straight forward in regard to teachers, supporting services, and administrators, but it was less straight forward in regards to parents. Each school was handling it differently. At Twinbrook, a general mailing was sent to every parent in the community, and at Whitman their 70-member executive council was working on this.

Mrs. Praisner said she was concerned about a disconnect between the people involved in the development of the proposal perhaps not being part of the next steps. Mr. Goldberg thought this would not happen in any of the schools. Mrs. Praisner said that he had indicated that Staff Development, MCEA, and the Matsushita Foundation were working on the training. She asked if the group would decide what the training should be. Mr. Goldberg replied that the committee decided what the training should be and charged a group of trainers with putting together a training package and making a proposal. Mrs. Praisner asked for more information about the specific training being provided. For example, if they had a program on conflict resolution, what the program was, for what groups, and who provides the training. This was in reference to the basic training that everyone was going through and not training for the individual pilots.

Mr. Goldberg stated that there were some issues arising out of the pilots. Glen Haven and Twinbrook were Chapter I schools, and they might be looking at variations from the MCPS model in terms of delivery of Chapter I services. They would have to work with the school system to delineate what their alternative model might be and include it in the MCPS application for federal funds. There were issues around the school calendar to facilitate community outreach through home visits. This was specifically at Rosemary Hills. Several schools were exploring shared decision making that would extend or change the working hours of staff members. This impacted negotiated agreements and the Fair Labor Standards Act. At Longview, there were questions about extending the working hours of instructional aides. Kennedy and Somerset were exploring reassignment patterns for teachers, specialists, and instructional assistants. This affected class size, job descriptions, certification, etc. Three schools were considering modifications to the PROGRAM OF STUDIES. Kennedy was looking at the English program, Rosemary Hills in regards to ISM, and Somerset in regards to ISM and the social studies curriculum. The committee had been looking at a variety of approaches to safeguard the curriculum development and approval process.

Dr. Pitt explained that normally the Board was not involved when there was a pilot program in the schools. However, given the uniqueness of what they were talking about here, he thought it was

imperative to involve the Board.

Mr. Goldberg reported that Somerset was looking at modifying existing in-service training, induction, and mentoring programs. Several schools had raised the issue of compensating parents for their participation in shared decision making committees. The committee was going to recommend to schools a small payment similar to that made to parents on the Head Start Advisory Committee.

Dr. Cronin noted that training was going on and budgets were being established. Somewhere down the line the issue of a policy might come to the Board, and he wondered about the flexibility of the Board at that point. Mr. Goldberg replied that the process was going to be an on-going one. It would be the committee's responsibility to communicate to the schools. All aspects of the school system would have to be communicating. He hoped that they would not reach situations where the schools would be so dependent on the Board's saying yes to something that the Board's saying no would end the pilot. Dr. Cronin asked when the Board would receive the first of these, and Mr. Goldberg thought it might be in April.

Mrs. Praisner thought they were well on a road that would be very difficult for the Board to reverse. She pointed out that the Board had supported the framework presented by Dr. Pitt. She was almost prepared to go out on a limb and support whatever came to them if the parameters and guidelines were followed. They had said all along that this was an opportunity they did not want to lose. She felt they had a better chance to have successful pilots because of the process they had used to develop them in addition to continued support from all elements of the school system. She said there were a couple of things that were key. One was that they continued to communicate with the school system and the greater community about expectations, status, and process. It was important for them to make sure that everyone's expectations were appropriate and realistic.

The second element was to start to develop the evaluation and monitoring criteria they were going to use to assess the effectiveness of these pilots. They had to know how they were measuring the success of those pilots, and satisfaction was not going to be the only element. They had to develop monitoring and evaluation strategies. The two key elements for her were judgments about why they went into this process in the first place. It was an improvement to the professional atmosphere within the school for all involved, and it was a better way of meeting the needs of those students in that school. She suggested they keep those two points in front of them at all times.

Dr. Shoenberg commented that this was as clear, well-organized, and economical presentation as he had heard this evening. It seemed to him that many of the programs were not so much responses to the unique circumstances of the particular school as they arose out of a feeling among the people in that school that there was another way of doing things that they would like to explore. They reflected a conclusion that any school might have come to regardless of their

population. Mr. Goldberg thought that the pilots varied around that continuum. In the case of Rosemary Hills, this was one where the impetus came from differences in their population that staff thought could be better met. The same was true of Longview. He thought that Dr. Shoenberg was right in the case of the other pilots.

Dr. Pitt stated that in regard to evaluation, the committee would be involved in developing criteria. However, there might have to be some independent look in terms of evaluation either outside or within the school system. Dr. Cronin commented that the support the committee was receiving was indicative of the strength of the committee and the leadership of the committee.

RESOLUTION NO. 118-89 Re: PROCUREMENT CONTRACTS OVER \$25,000

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

WHEREAS, Funds have been budgeted for the purchase of equipment, supplies, and contractual services; now therefore be it RESOLVED, That having been duly advertised, the contracts be awarded to the low bidders meeting specifications as shown for the bids as follows:

AWARDEE(S)		
56-89	Electrical Supplies and Equipment	
	Baltimore Cable Supply, Inc.	\$ 1,726*
	Capitol Radio Wholesalers, Inc.	1,235
	Consolidated Electrical Distributors, Inc.	2,085
	Albert G. Fraley Enterprises, Inc.	
	T/A Fraley Supply Company	414*
	General Electric Supply Company	26,203
	Industrial Controls Distributors, Inc.	1,647
	Marine Air Supply	4,951
	Maurice Electrical Supply Company, Inc.	12,170
	Noland Company	23,046
	C. N. Robinson Lighting Supply	3,701
	Tri-County Electrical Supply Company, Inc.	76,944
	U. S. Electric Supply, Inc.	1,347
	Vair Corporation	36,033
		-----
	TOTAL	\$ 191,502
70-89	Office and School Supplies	
	Alperstein Brothers, Inc.	\$ 30,523
	Antietam Paper Company	7,501
	Baltimore Stationery Company	1,382
	Boise Cascade Office Products	41,332
	Chaselle, Inc.	149,438
	Double Envelope Corporation	33,477
	Elgin School Supply Company, Inc.	15,808
	M. S. Ginn Company	35,150

	J. L. Hammett Company	10,128
	Interstate Office Supply Company	167,941*
	John G. Kyles, Inc.	27,963
	Monumental Paper Company	37,210
	National Office and School Supplies	64,567
	The Paper People	13,857
	Purcell Office Products	932*
	Repeat-O-Type Mfg. Company	11
	West Coast Wholesale Distributors, Inc.	2,736*
	Westvaco Envelope Division	64,860
	TOTAL	\$ 704,816
90-89	Industrial Arts Automotive Equipment	
	Clayton Associates, Inc.	\$ 43,500*
	The Cope Company	539
	Ferguson Corporation	472
	Graves-Humphreys Company	619
	Harrington's Ltd.	692
	Transportation Supplies, Inc.	3,025
	TOTAL	\$ 48,847
96-89	Automated Sign Making and Router System	
	Visual Systems Company, Inc.	\$ 50,145*
89-214	Telephone Equipment	
	North Supply Company	\$ 81,768
	TOTAL OVER \$25,000	\$1,077,078

\*Denotes MFD vendors

RESOLUTION NO. 119-89 Re: TRANSFER OF CAPITAL FUNDS - VARIOUS  
CAPITAL PROJECTS

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

WHEREAS, Surplus construction funds have been identified in three capital projects that have been completed; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That excess funds in the following projects be transferred to the Local Unliquidated Surplus Account:

1.	Greencastle Elementary School	\$ 20,000
2.	Strawberry Knoll Elementary School	40,000
3.	Blair Cluster	110,000
	TOTAL	\$170,000

and be it further

RESOLVED, That funds from the Unliquidated Surplus Account be

transferred to the following projects:

1. Quince Orchard High School	\$ 40,000
2. Briggs Chaney Middle School	130,000
	-----
TOTAL	\$170,000

and be it further

RESOLVED, That the county executive be requested to recommend that the County Council approve these transfers.

RESOLUTION NO. 120-89 Re: BRIGGS CHANEY MIDDLE SCHOOL

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

WHEREAS, The following sealed bids were received on February 9, 1989, for the Briggs Chaney Middle School:

BIDDER	BID
1. Kimmel & Kimmel, Inc.	\$ 9,915,000
2. Kettler Brothers Construction Company, Inc.	10,001,100
3. Cahaba Construction Company	10,206,000
4. E. H. Glover, Inc.	10,212,400
5. Dustin Construction, Inc.	10,289,600
6. The Gassman Corporation	10,447,000
7. Henley Construction Co., Inc.	11,154,118
8. Prism Construction Company	11,157,000

and

WHEREAS, Kimmel & Kimmel, Inc., has satisfactorily completed numerous capital projects for Montgomery County Public Schools; and

WHEREAS, The low bid is within the project architect, SHWC, Inc., and staff's estimate of \$10,540,000; and

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

WHEREAS, A transfer from the Local Unliquidated Surplus Account of \$130,000 to the Briggs Chaney Middle School would provide the additional funding necessary for project award; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That a \$9,915,000 contract be awarded to Kimmel & Kimmel, Inc., for the Briggs Chaney Middle School in accordance with the plans and specifications prepared by SHWC, Inc., Architects, contingent upon County Council's approval of a \$130,000 transfer from the Local Unliquidated Surplus Account; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the county executive be requested to recommend to the

County Council approval of this transfer.

RESOLUTION NO. 121-89 Re: CANDLEWOOD ELEMENTARY SCHOOL - PARTIAL  
REROOFING

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

WHEREAS, The following sealed bids were received on February 14, 1989, for the partial reroofing of Candlewood Elementary School:

BIDDER	BASE BID
1. R. D. Bean, Inc.	\$116,695
2. Orndorff & Spaid, Inc.	120,918
3. Roofers, Incorporated	133,925
4. J. E. Wood & Sons Co., Inc.	145,800
5. Colbert Roofing Corp.	148,476
6. J & R Roofing Co., Inc.	156,986
7. Raintree Industries, Inc.	158,200

and

WHEREAS, The low bidder, R. D. Bean, Inc., has performed satisfactorily for Montgomery County Public Schools; and

WHEREAS, The low bid is within staff's estimate of \$130,000; and

WHEREAS, The State Interagency Committee for Public School Construction has agreed to fund 50 percent of the approved contract as part of its systemic renovation program; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That a contract for \$116,695 be awarded to R. D. Bean, Inc., for the partial reroofing of Candlewood Elementary School in accordance with plans and specifications prepared by the Department of School Facilities.

RESOLUTION NO. 122-89 Re: CHANGE ORDER OVER \$25,000 - CLOVERLY  
ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

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

WHEREAS, A change order exceeding \$25,000 to install a fire pump at Cloverly Elementary School has been received by the Department of School Facilities; and

WHEREAS, The project architect, William H. Doggett, has reviewed this change order and found the cost to be equitable; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education approve change order No. 13 in the amount of \$56,320 to install a fire pump at Cloverly Elementary

School.

RESOLUTION NO. 123-89 Re: WORK OF ART FOR WOODLIN ELEMENTARY  
SCHOOL

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

WHEREAS, Authorization for the selection of artists to receive commissions to produce works of art is delineated in Article V, Section 1, Chapter 8, "Buildings," of the MONTGOMERY COUNTY CODE; and

WHEREAS, Staff has employed the established selection procedures; and

WHEREAS, The Montgomery County Arts Council has participated in the selection as required by law; and

WHEREAS, Funds have been appropriated for this purpose in the FY 1989 Capital Improvements Program; and

WHEREAS, The law also requires County Council approval before the Board of Education can enter into contracts with the artist; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education enter into the following contractual agreement subject to County Council approval:

ARTIST	WORK	COMMISSION
Julio Teichberg	Ceramic Tile Mural	\$8,000

and be it further

RESOLVED, That the County Council be requested to approve the above commission to the indicated artist.

RESOLUTION NO. 124-89 Re: WORKS OF ART FOR MIDDLEBROOK  
ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

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

WHEREAS, Authorization for the selection of artists to receive commissions to produce works of art is delineated in Article V, Section 1, Chapter 8, "Buildings," of the MONTGOMERY COUNTY CODE; and

WHEREAS, Staff has employed the established selection procedures; and

WHEREAS, The Montgomery County Arts Council has participated in the selection as required by law; and

WHEREAS, Funds have been appropriated for this purpose in the FY 1988

Capital Improvements Program; and

WHEREAS, The law also requires County Council approval before the Board of Education can enter into contracts with the artists; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education enter into the following contractual agreements subject to County Council approval:

ARTIST	WORK	COMMISSION
Azriel & Irene Awret	Ceramic Tile Mural	\$15,000
Lisa Kaslow	Sculpture	\$20,000
Rick Michael	Stained Glass	\$ 5,000
Hazel Rebold	Stained Glass	\$ 5,000
Julio Teichberg	Stabile	\$10,000

and be it further

RESOLVED, That the County Council be requested to approve the above commissions to the indicated artists.

RESOLUTION NO. 125-89 Re: WORK OF ART FOR THOMAS S. WOOTTON  
HIGH SCHOOL

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

WHEREAS, Authorization for the selection of artists to receive commissions to produce works of art is delineated in Article V, Section 1, Chapter 8, "Buildings," of the MONTGOMERY COUNTY CODE; and

WHEREAS, Staff has employed the established selection procedures; and

WHEREAS, The Montgomery County Arts Council has participated in the selection as required by law; and

WHEREAS, Funds have been appropriated for this purpose in the FY 1987 Capital Improvements Program; and

WHEREAS, The law also requires County Council approval before the Board of Education can enter into contracts with the artists; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education enter into the following contractual agreement subject to County Council approval:

ARTIST	WORK	COMMISSION
Guy Fairlamb	Mural	\$7,000

and be it further

RESOLVED, That the County Council be requested to approve the above commission to the indicated artist.

RESOLUTION NO. 126-89 Re: BROAD ACRES ELEMENTARY SCHOOL ADDITION AND RENOVATION

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

WHEREAS, On February 21, 1989, the following bids were received for the Broad Acres Elementary School addition and renovation project:

BIDDER	BID
1. Caldwell & Santmyer	\$2,765,800
2. Kettler Brothers, Inc.	2,830,900
3. Ronald Hsu Construction Co., Inc.	2,869,694
4. Northwood Contractors, Inc.	2,879,700
5. Patrick Quinn, Inc.	2,885,000
6. Hess Construction Company, Inc.	2,961,540
7. E. A. Baker Company, Inc.	3,012,500

and

WHEREAS, This represents excellent bid activity and the low bid is within the project architect and staff's estimate of \$2,910,000; and

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

RESOLVED, That a \$2,765,800 contract be awarded to Caldwell & Santmyer for the Broad Acres Elementary School addition and renovation in accordance with the plans and specifications prepared by Turner and Associates, Architects.

RESOLUTION NO. 127-89 Re: UTILIZATION OF FY 1989 SUPPORTED PROJECT FUNDS FOR THE MARYLAND EDUCATION TECHNOLOGY NETWORK (METN) PROJECT

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Mrs. Praisner seconded by Mrs. DiFonzo, 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 \$2,000 from the MSDE for the development of an in-service English language arts and computers course for the grades 4-6 classroom in the following categories:

CATEGORY	AMOUNT
----------	--------

01 Administration	\$1,957
10 Fixed Charges	43
	-----
TOTAL	\$2,000

and be it further

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

RESOLUTION NO. 128-89 Re: PRESENTATION OF PRELIMINARY PLANS  
HOPKINS ROAD ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

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

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

WHEREAS, The Hopkins Road 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 Hopkins Road Elementary School, Thomas Clark Associates Architects.

RESOLUTION NO. 129-89 Re: PERSONNEL APPOINTMENT

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

RESOLVED, That the following personnel appointment be approved:

APPOINTMENT	PRESENT POSITION	AS
Patricia L. Janus	Evaluator of Special Education Programs MSDE Div. of Spec. Ed. Baltimore, MD	Supervisor Services for Physically Handicapped Students Effective: 2-28-89

Re: BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS

1. Dr. Pitt commented that a Board member had requested they look at concerns regarding dangerous weapons. The committee was about ready to report, and he would make their report public within the next few days and bring it to the Board for discussion. However, he was making two commitments right now. The first was that students found to be in possession of firearms or other illegal weapons would be recommended for expulsion by principals without exception. Students engaged in the sale or distribution of drugs would be recommended for

expulsion by the principal without exception. This would become effective after he had distributed this to principals. Mrs. DiFonzo hoped that they would have in place a careful process for notifying youngsters and parents. Dr. Cronin suggested that the superintendent issue a press release as well.

2. Mr. Park introduced Lisa Cortland, a student at Gaithersburg High School, who was running for the student on the Board seat.

3. Mr. Goldensohn asked staff to provide him with a copy of the sex equity resource guide. He reported that the company he worked for had a program in Fairfax to involve female high school students in higher mathematics.

4. Mr. Ewing said that in reference to the successful practices document it was important for the Board to know where that was headed over time in the next year or two. He asked that he be provided with a copy that was circulating.

5. Mr. Ewing reported that he had attended the Educational Extravaganza Night at Eastern which was a very impressive demonstration of what was going on in the school. Dr. Egan was there and was back at the school part-time.

6. Mr. Ewing hoped that the superintendent and the Board would think about ways to make full use of the mental health subcommittee and also to consider the expansion of that group. This would permit a real interchange between professionals in the school system dealing with the severely emotionally disturbed and professionals in the community who could give some advice.

7. Mrs. DiFonzo remarked that she would be leaving Thursday for AASA. During that time two MCPS schools would be recognized by the AIA. They knew about Strawberry Knoll, but Quince Orchard had received honorable mention by the AIA. This was a feather in their cap and put Montgomery County in the forefront of systems building schools for tomorrow.

8. Mrs. Praisner said that on March 10, 11, and 12, she would be in Boston for the Northeast Region meeting of the National School Boards Association. They would be discussing the Chelsea Plan, and she asked if Board members had questions they wanted to raise about the plan. In addition they would be discussing what was going on in Rochester.

9. Mr. Goldensohn said that the Magruder High School Drama Club was going to participate in a festival in Muncie, Indiana. They needed resources to help get the club there because part of the problem was getting the scenery out there.

RESOLUTION NO. 130-89 Re: EXECUTIVE SESSION - MARCH 14, 1989

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

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

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education of Montgomery County hereby conduct its meeting in executive closed session beginning on March 14, 1989, at 9 a.m. to discuss, consider, deliberate, and/or otherwise decide the employment, assignment, appointment, promotion, demotion, compensation, discipline, removal, or resignation of employees, appointees, or officials over whom it has jurisdiction, or any other personnel matter affecting one or more particular individuals and to comply with a specific constitutional, statutory or judicially imposed requirement that prevents public disclosures about a particular proceeding or matter as permitted under the State Government Article, Section 10-508; and that such meeting shall continue in executive closed session until the completion of business; and be it further

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

RESOLUTION NO. 131-89 Re: MINUTES OF JANUARY 23, FEBRUARY 7, 8, and 9, 1989

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

RESOLVED, That the minutes of January 23 and February 7, 8, and 9, 1989, be approved.

RESOLUTION NO. 132-89 Re: BOE APPEAL NO. 1988-39

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

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education adopt its Decision and Order in BOE Appeal No. 1988-39.

RESOLUTION NO. 133-89 Re: BOE APPEAL NO. 1988-40

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

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education adopt its Decision and Order in BOE Appeal No. 1988-40.

Re: NEW BUSINESS

1. Mrs. Praisner moved and Mrs. DiFonzo seconded the following:  
RESOLVED, That the Board schedule a discussion of the budget process prior to or no later than early this fall, and in preparation for this discussion, staff is directed to review procedures in other school districts and to solicit community comments on the budget process.
2. Mr. Ewing moved and Mr. Goldensohn seconded the following:  
RESOLVED, That the Board schedule a time to discuss the setting of a multiyear goal for the expansion of all-day kindergarten.
3. Mr. Ewing asked the superintendent to give the Board an analysis of what was proposed in the county executive's budget with regard to school health services so that the Board could determine what position to take. Dr. Pitt agreed to do this.
4. Mr. Ewing asked the superintendent to give the Board a staff analysis of Maryland School Performance Plan with a view to taking a position as a Board. Dr. Vance indicated that they were preparing a paper for executive staff review and would share this with the Board.
5. Mrs. DiFonzo moved and Mrs. Praisner seconded the following:  
RESOLVED, That the superintendent be directed to develop a plan to make the Board Room and the auditorium suitable for cable telecasting of Board of Education meetings.
6. Mr. Fess expressed the Board's appreciation to Mr. Mason Nelson for the Montgomery County flags for the Board Room and the auditorium.

Re: ITEM OF INFORMATION

Board members received the Response to the Title IX Annual Report.

Re: ADJOURNMENT

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

-----  
PRESIDENT

-----  
SECRETARY

HP:mlw