

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

WHEREAS, The Internal Revenue Code of 1986 by Section 414(h)(2) authorizes the state or governmental unit including local boards of education to pick up employee contributions to retirement plans causing employee contributions to be tax deferred; and

WHEREAS, The Maryland State Legislature has adopted H.B. 561 which has been enacted into law and amends Article 73B of the Annotated Code of Maryland, related to employees' contribution to various retirement plans; and

WHEREAS, The Internal Revenue Service has issued a private letter ruling dated March 13, 1989, to the Montgomery County Board of Education approving the pick up under Section 414(h)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986; and

WHEREAS, The Board hereby determines that it is in the best interest of the Montgomery County Public Schools to implement the provisions of this new law; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That beginning July 1, 1989, or such later date that may be required by the state and the Montgomery County Public Schools to implement this resolution (hereinafter referred to as effective date), the Montgomery County Public Schools shall pick up the member/employee contributions required under Section 73(a)(1) of the Annotated Code of Maryland and such other provisions for the retirement plans that require employee contributions for service rendered by the member/employee from the effective date as may be applicable; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the contributions picked up as described under the above paragraph, shall be treated as employer contributions in determining tax treatment under Section 414(h)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986; that they shall be implemented by reduction, equal to the amount of the pick up, of the compensation of each member/employee required to make contributions to the Annuity Savings Fund under Section 73B of the Maryland Annotated Code or employee contributions required by such other retirement plans; that they may not be included as gross income of the member/employee until the pick up amounts are distributed or made available to the member/employee and such amounts shall be paid by the Montgomery County Public Schools, state or other employer from the same source of funds used in paying compensation to the member/employee and be treated for all purposes of Article 73(a)(1) of the Annotated Code of Maryland in the same manner and to the same extent as contributions made by a member/employee prior to the effective date of this resolution; and be it further

RESOLVED, That this resolution is contingent upon the Internal Revenue Service maintaining its present ruling, dated March 13, 1989,

that held that the Montgomery County Public Schools, is approved under the Employer Pick Up Program authorized by Section 414(h)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986; and be it further

RESOLVED, That an employee may not be given the option of choosing to receive the contributed amounts directly instead of having them paid by the employer to the pension plan, and employee contributions must be paid by the employer in lieu of contributions by the employee; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the superintendent is directed to take appropriate action to notify the employees and to implement this program effective July 1, 1989.

RESOLUTION NO. 180-89 Re: AWARD OF CONTRACTS FOR VARIOUS MAINTENANCE PROJECTS

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

WHEREAS, Sealed bids were received on February 17 and 24, 1989, from qualified vendors for various maintenance projects in accordance with MCPS procurement practices; and

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

RESOLVED, That contracts be awarded to the low bidders for the projects and amounts listed below:

BIDDERS	AMOUNT
1. Basketball Backstop Safety Catchers for Various Schools LOW BIDDER: AALCO Manufacturing Co.	\$10,332.00
2. Metal Doors, Frames, Concrete Steps for Damascus High School LOW BIDDER: Montan, Inc.	24,857.00
3. Gymnasium Floor and Refinishing for Various Schools LOW BIDDER: Weyer's Floor Service, Inc.	38,031.25
4. Replacement of Cooling Towers at Winston Churchill High School LOW BIDDER: Arey, Inc.	35,125.00

RESOLUTION NO. 181-89 Re: CHANGE ORDER OVER \$25,000 - STONE MILL ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

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

WHEREAS, A change order exceeding \$25,000 for additional topsoil at Stone Mill Elementary School has been received by the Department of School Facilities; and

WHEREAS, The project architect, Grimm and Parker, 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. 18 in the amount of \$41,988 for additional site topsoil at Stone Mill Elementary School.

RESOLUTION NO. 182-89 Re: ARCHITECTURAL APPOINTMENT - HANDICAPPED
ELEVATOR ADDITION GAITHERSBURG HIGH
SCHOOL

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

WHEREAS, The addition of two elevators is required to improve handicap accessibility at Gaithersburg High School; and

WHEREAS, Detailed design work must begin as soon as possible for the elevator additions to be available for use during the 1989-90 school year; and

WHEREAS, The firm of Thomas Clark Associates, Architects, possesses specific qualifications for this project; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the firm of Thomas Clark Associates, Architects, be appointed to provide architectural services for the elevator services for the elevator additions at Gaithersburg High School for a fee of \$32,000.

RESOLUTION NO. 183-89 Re: WORK OF ART FOR RICHARD MONTGOMERY
HIGH SCHOOL

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

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
Norman Greene	Sculpture	\$15,000

and be it further

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

RESOLUTION NO. 184-89 Re: SUBMISSION OF AN FY 1990 GRANT
PROPOSAL FOR MAGNET SCHOOLS

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

RESOLVED, That the superintendent of schools be authorized to submit an FY 1990 grant proposal for \$1,968,674 to the U.S. Department of Education under Title III Magnet School Assistance of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (P.L. 100-297); and be it further

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

RESOLUTION NO. 185-89 Re: RECONSIDERATION OF BID NO. 111-89,
COMPUTER CARTS

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

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education reconsider Bid No. 111-89, computer carts.

RESOLUTION NO. 186-89 Re: PRESENTATION OF PRELIMINARY PLANS
CRESTHAVEN ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

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

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

WHEREAS, The Cresthaven 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 Cresthaven Elementary School developed by James Soyejima, Architect.

RESOLUTION NO. 187-89 Re: PRESENTATION OF PRELIMINARY PLANS
VIERS MILL ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

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

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

WHEREAS, The Viers Mill 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 Viers Mill Elementary School developed by Celentano-Esposito, Incorporated, Architects.

RESOLUTION NO. 188-89 Re: PRESENTATION OF PRELIMINARY PLANS
BOWIE MILL ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

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

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

WHEREAS, The Bowie Mill 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 Bowie Mill Elementary School developed by Eugene A. Delmar, Architect.

RESOLUTION NO. 189-89 Re: PRESENTATION OF PRELIMINARY PLANS
KENTLANDS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

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

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

WHEREAS, The Kentlands 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 Kentlands Elementary School developed by Duane, Elliott, Cahill, Mullineaux & Mullineaux, Architects.

In regard to the possibility that the City of Gaithersburg would provide for extra space and bleachers in the gymnasium, Mrs. Praisner made the following remarks for the record:

"I personally would not be in support of making that kind of adjustment or accommodation for one school and one situation. I have some concerns about legal implications and elementary students with that bleacher kind of setting. If we haven't done that in the past for any other schools, I would have a concern about that here."

Dr. Cronin asked staff to report at the next Board meeting about the status of the increased size of the gymnasium and the bleachers. For the record, Mrs. DiFonzo and Dr. Cronin stated that they would have voted to approve the plans for Bowie Mill Elementary School if they had been present.

RESOLUTION NO. 190-89 Re: PERSONNEL TRANSFER

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

RESOLVED, That the following personnel transfer be approved:

TRANSFER	FROM	TO
Margery Auerbach	Principal Rock View ES	Principal Stonegate ES Effective: 3-29-89

RESOLUTION NO. 191-89 Re: PERSONNEL TRANSFER

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 transfer be approved:

TRANSFER	FROM	TO
----------	------	----

Karen Fulton Principal Principal
 Olney ES Clarksburg ES
 Effective: 3-29-89

RESOLUTION NO. 192-89 Re: PERSONNEL TRANSFER

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

RESOLVED, That the following personnel transfer be approved:

TRANSFER	FROM	TO
Anthony Paul	Principal RICA	Principal Piney Branch ES Effective: 3-29-89

Re: PROPOSED AIDS CURRICULUM

Mr. Edward Masood, director of the Department of Health and Physical Education, introduced Mrs. Betty Takahashi, coordinator of health education, and Lenora Sherrard and Jean Cross of the Montgomery County Health Department. They were members of the conference team attending the Centers for Disease Control conference in San Francisco along with Mrs. DiFonzo. Dr. Pitt added that the training program was paid for by the Centers for Disease Control and not the MCPS.

Mr. Masood reported that they had appeared before the Board on September 26, 1988, to present the instructional objectives for the AIDS education program which were consistent with those recommended by the Interagency Committee on AIDS education and followed the format of the proposed Comprehensive Health Education for AIDS as set by the Maryland State Department of Education and the State Bylaw for AIDS education. At that time, they recommended that Grade 5 be the designated grade for Grades 3-6, Grade 8 for Grades 6-9, and Grade 10 for Grades 9-12. They also brought forward the instructional materials that had been reviewed and approved by the Citizens Advisory Committee for Family Life and Human Development which also served as the AIDS review committee. One of the main issues in addressing the entire proposal was to keep the instruction age appropriate and to keep the objectives geared toward the learning level of the students within the correct grade spans. They had to provide resources that were current and accurate given the fact that the entire issue of HIV infection and AIDS was changing with each date. Since August of 1985 when this became an issue for MCPS, the modes of transmission had remained consistent. All new cases had fallen into the identified modes of transmission. It was important to keep in front of them the issues of abstinence. The three main categories for the modes of transmission were blood, sex, and birth.

One of the most serious issues facing them as a society right now was IV drug abuse.

Mr. Masood noted that in the Grade 5 they recommended the use of a film. He explained that many materials of instruction had similar titles. It was not their intent to have any one film try to fit the range of Grades 5-12. They also looked at the issue of trying to list things that young people could do to prevent AIDS. One of those was to not have sex until they were old enough to marry and then marry someone who did not have HIV infection/AIDS. This was a commonly stated objective in many programs, but it was not meant to say that at 18 it was ok. They were trying to get across the point that sexual activity prior to marriage is not appropriate and that people needed to be extremely cautious about their sexual activity and their partners.

Mr. Masood said they had listed the objectives and had given sample lessons. The presentation of these lessons could vary with the structure of the school. For example, in the elementary school a teacher might want to take 20 minutes a day or three or four days or cover the material in one day. At the secondary level, teachers were more restricted by class periods. They were averaging about two days on the instructional unit on AIDS.

In regard to teacher training and materials, Mr. Masood explained that they had not started any teacher training. The intent of the Board was to have the opportunity to review materials before the program was implemented. They would begin teacher training and the purchase of materials after the Board's review. Teachers would be designated by the principal to provide instruction, and they must be volunteers. Many of those people were already teaching the Grade 5 unit on family life and human development. However, they did not propose to have AIDS a part of the family life program. It was a separate unit in the context of communicable diseases, and this was in accord with the State Bylaw. In the senior high schools, teachers of family life and child development would receive training. They would use the science resource teachers as trainers. Physical education teachers did receive training at the Grade 8 level because they provided the instructional program.

Mr. Masood said he was very confident that the program reflected the work of the Interagency Committee on AIDS Education and the Citizens Committee. It had passed the test of the Health Evaluation and Selection Committee and the AIDS Service Unit of the Montgomery County Health Department. The members of the training team attending the San Francisco conference had also provided their comments. Dr. Cronin noted that they were going to talk about AIDS in the context of disease rather than in family life, and they did have to discuss the use of condoms in terms of sexually transmitted diseases. He asked about parental permissions which were needed for contraception issues. Mr. Masood replied that the unit on AIDS was under its own bylaw. They had the responsibility to let parents know that the information would be taught. Parents would have the

opportunity to review materials and remove their children from instruction. It would be exclusionary rather than informed consent where they must get permission for everyone to participate.

Mrs. Takahashi commented that they had very few parents who did not sign consent forms for their children to take the family life program. Over 98 percent gave permission. They did not anticipate that many parents would opt their children out of AIDS instruction. In regard to sample answers to the fifth grade unit, Dr. Cronin said one response stated, "Marry someone who does not have HIV." However, there were people who would marry persons with HIV. They did not want to create a pariah of someone with AIDS and to deny them human affection and a possibility of marrying someone. He suggested including information about protection in a sexual relationship rather than saying, "Don't marry people with AIDS."

Mrs. Hobbs asked if any fifth graders would receive instruction during this current school year. Mr. Masood replied that following approval, they could do the training. They would not be able to do all teachers by the end of the school year, but some would be trained. Mrs. Hobbs asked if they would be violating any Maryland State Board of Education directive if they did not teach the unit. Mr. Masood replied that the bylaw said they had to certify that their program was in place by a certain date. If they began implementing the program, there were some ways they would be in compliance. The Grades 8 and 10 program had been going on for a number of years. Mrs. Hobbs asked if they would be training additional teachers during the summer to have all the teachers trained by the next school year. Mr. Masood replied that by the end of next school year every fifth grader would receive AIDS instruction. The training might not occur in the summer, but the units were usually taught until February or March.

Dr. Shoenberg asked about plans for children who were absent when the unit was taught. Mr. Masood indicated that they had not addressed this; however, they could probably provide a make-up time. Dr. Shoenberg commented that there were very few things that they wanted to catch every student on, and AIDS instruction was one of them. In addition, there would be a certain number of students who did not understand the material. He wondered what they could do to reach these children. Mr. Masood replied that he was a member of the State Interagency Committee. They had built into all of the state materials a provision for addressing the range of students that they had. There would be some alternative programs for students who were below level. They would have to take this into consideration when they did the teacher training. He thought that the elementary teachers had a better ability to make those adjustments.

Mr. Goldensohn reported that teachers of family life had to adjust the curriculum up and down for the various children. He did not think they would have to train every fifth grade teacher. Usually in family life, one or two teachers enjoyed doing this and the classes rotated through that teacher. If someone was absent, they could take the class when the teacher presented the material on the next day or

the next week.

Dr. Pitt asked if the Board had to take action before the unit could be implemented. Mr. Masood explained that the Board had already approved the objectives; therefore, after this discussion, they would go ahead with implementation of the curriculum. He thanked the superintendent, the executive staff, and the Board of Education for the assistance they had given him and Mrs. Takahashi on this issue since 1985. Dr. Cronin thanked Mr. Masood for his professionalism in handling an extremely sensitive issue.

Mrs. DiFonzo stated that she had enjoyed the two days she had attended the conference because it provided an opportunity to work with Mr. Masood and Mrs. Takahashi and to cooperate with the county government and see things from their perspective. She was struck by how tremendously frightened the citizens of San Francisco were on this issue. In Montgomery County they were in many respects afraid to admit they had AIDS cases here. If they did not educate people, they were going to have a growing problem in Montgomery County.

Dr. Pitt commended the Board of Education for being out front on this issue. The Board had held public meetings to develop an AIDS policy before any other jurisdiction in the area.

Re: SECONDARY ALTERNATIVE PROGRAMS

Dr. Pitt stated that they had provided the Board with a memo to describe the various programs. They had difficulty in getting people to the meeting because it was vacation time.

Dr. Richard Towers, director of the Department of Alternative and Supplementary Education, reported that they had contacted representatives from each of the programs, and they were excited that the Board was reviewing these programs. Unfortunately, a lot of people were on spring break.

Dr. Towers stated that in Montgomery County they had a wide variety of alternative programs, and they had programs for students with drug and alcohol involvement, for abused and neglected youngsters, for youngsters who were delinquent and truant, and for students who were not living up to their potential. They had an eclectic and decentralized approach which meant they had a variety of ways to deliver these services. They would even see a variety of pupil/teacher ratios. Some of the interagency programs had additional help from the other agencies which might include therapeutic, counseling, and instructional assistant help.

Dr. Pitt commented that a few years ago they had done some research and agreed that rather than go with more separate alternative programs at the mid level, they should do with teachers for alternative programs at the local school level. At the time it was a good idea. He thought they needed to look at this again. They now had children with more severe problems; therefore, it was appropriate

to relook at this issue and see if they needed more alternative separate programs outside of the local school for this level child. He planned to have a group work on this issue during the summer with the idea of focusing on the next budget.

Dr. Towers indicated that they now had 16 off-site programs, six administered through the areas and ten by his program. In addition, ten J/I/M schools had been allocated special needs positions to provide school-based programs. They had to work with the youngster in the school before they took any steps to work with that youngster outside of the school. The younger the child, the more important it was to try to make the difference inside of the school.

Dr. Towers said that the 2,000 youngsters in alternative programs were less than 2 percent of the MCPS population. They were also talking about programs that were relatively cost effective. The average per pupil cost was about \$6,200 which compared to \$5,960 for the regular per pupil cost or half of what they spent per pupil at RICA or Twain. They had a dedicated, talented, and caring staff which made these programs work. The programs had low pupil/teacher ratios, individualization of instruction, and the affective element of the adults' communicating to the children to let them know they cared about them.

For the purposes of discussion, Dr. Towers had not included programs for handicapped youngsters. They could have included ESOL, METS, and programs for the disadvantaged. Dr. Cronin noted that they did have an entire other set of programs for the handicapped which also included the potential for children who were difficult and might be dropping out.

Dr. Towers reported that staff had expressed a continuing need for more programs for youngsters at the J/I/M level. They also wanted more programs for youngsters who were drug and alcohol involved, particularly up-county. Dr. Pitt had authorized the redeployment of one staff position from the Lynnbrook Center to The Other Way to begin a junior high school class. This summer they would move another position by consolidating all the Boys and Girls Homes programs to make better use of the staff they did have. This would free up a position to create an additional class at Phoenix II to deal with the waiting list up-county for drug and alcohol involved youngsters. Dr. Pitt pointed out that this did involve cooperation with the county government. Dr. Towers added that the The Other Way would not have been possible without the county's providing a therapist position.

Mrs. DiFonzo asked if the Phoenix II site would be large enough for an additional class. Dr. Towers replied that it was. When it was built, there was room for another class. However, with the additional class, the school would be at full capacity.

Dr. Towers commented that in pre-Board calls, Board members had raised some questions. A question had been raised about the

relocation of QUEST which was now at Burnt Mills. Dr. Arnold Rosenberg, supervisor of secondary education in Area 1, reported that they were looking at the possibility of locating the program at Key. They would like to see the program located in a recreation center, but there was no space available in Area 1.

Dr. Towers said there was a similar question with regard to The New School. They were investigating a site for this program. Dr. Pitt added that they were working hard to find a place for that school, and a couple of Board members had recommended possible sites. Dr. Towers commented that it was true that some youngsters did move in and out of alternative programs. Some of the youngsters from Julius West were now at The Other Way. Some had been moved to programs with therapeutic components. He explained that there was a continuum of resources and alternative programs. Youngsters who had been at a group home would sometimes show up having come from Noyes. A youngster might go from a day program to a residential program.

Dr. Towers indicated that parent involvement was a significant part of many of the programs. Some programs such as Phoenix had parent components, and without the parental involvement Phoenix would not have the success it had. There were other programs that did not have parent components. For example, in group homes there was almost no parent involvement which was part of these students' problems.

Mr. Jay Headman, principal of Julius West Middle School, stated that the middle school was a very critical time for students. After his experience at the high school, he was able to look back and see that the unsuccessful students exhibited signs at the middle level. The special needs position was very helpful to the local school because it gave them options. He would be meeting with the other J/I/M schools to see how they used this position. At present he had a number of students in the special needs program who were not being successful. The only off-site location available to him was The Other Way. He hoped they would continue having the special needs person at the school and also look at alternatives at the J/I/M level. Dr. Pitt explained that he was committed to the idea of alternative teachers in the schools, but he agreed that they might need additional support beyond what they now had.

Dr. Towers commented that there were pluses and minuses in operating with other agencies. They provided some of the resources and some of the locations, but on the other hand to some extent they controlled who got into the program and how long they stayed. When MCPS ran a program, they would be more responsive to the needs of the individual principal. They had to weigh this when they looked at an interagency approach versus an MCPS alternative program.

Mrs. Hobbs requested a response to her pre-Board questions. Dr. Towers reported that the Tahoma program was located at the Lynnbrook Elementary School annex in Bethesda. Whittier Woods was located at the Whittier Woods School, and Journey was at Poolesville High School. Lynnbrook originally had a capacity of 20, but that had been reduced to 16 because they had moved a position to The Other Way.

The age range at Noyes depended on the assignments made by the judges. Mr. Charles D'Aiutolo, supervisor of the Division of Interagency and Alternative Programs, added that the age was usually 13 to 18, but they had been as young as 9 and 10. Dr. Pitt pointed out that Noyes was a county facility, and MCPS provided the teachers. Dr. Towers said that they did not always have access to these students all day at that program. There were security needs, and there was a quick turnover of youngsters. They had two teachers there. One was paid by MCPS and the other by a grant from the state supplemented by MCPS funds. Sometimes they were able to use Chapter 1 money which was allocated for neglected and delinquent children. Sometimes Noyes itself would make a person available.

Dr. Towers reported that the Journey program in Area 3 was Grades 9-12. In regard to Noyes, Mrs. DiFonzo pointed out that 35 was capacity, and there were not always 35 students there. They were not in a classroom situation at the same time. There were always state security guards in the classroom with the teacher and the aides. Dr. Towers explained that almost every one of these students needed to be dealt with individually. Therefore, they could not deal with a very large group even with two teachers. Dr. Pitt added that the child might be in there from two days, five days, twenty days, etc. Mrs. DiFonzo said she had seen the teachers work with everything including French, German, Spanish, and Latin and elementary math up to calculus. They were an extraordinarily dedicated staff.

Dr. Towers asked Mr. Joseph Sernak, coordinator of the Quest Program, to respond to why there were only seven students in the program. Mr. Sernak explained that referrals were down because of the in-school programs at the J/I/M level schools in Area 1. He said that the problem with high risk students was a lot bigger than the county wanted to acknowledge. There was a high cost if these youngsters became offenders when they became older. The longer they waited, the more it would cost. He felt that this population was getting bigger every year. He thought it was better to have more programs than a larger Quest Program. For example, he might be better off going to these students rather than having them come to Quest.

Mrs. Praisner commented that the questions had dealt with the programs as they existed. Some questions had related to the needs and where they were going with these programs. MCPS had tried a variety of ways of dealing with the needs of the students. The needs of the students had not stood still as they had tried to develop programs to meet their needs. They had developed an elaborate array of well-managed and different programs with a variety of numbers and staff associated with them. When she had raised this issue as an item of new business, she also wanted to address issues of expansion, assessment, and development. She asked where they were with the issue of development and identification of the need. She asked if they had the means to assess and evaluate in a meaningful way the criteria that made these programs successful. She asked if they had a relationship to what they saw as far as students' developmental changes that they could then transfer to establish new programs.

This was beyond low class ratios and perhaps a setting that might or might not be outside of the regular school. She was not sure where they went from here.

Dr. Hiawatha Fountain, associate superintendent for special and alternative education, stated that they needed to look to training. At the J/I/M level and the upper elementary school level, the child was changing faster than the teacher's ability to adjust to the change. Therefore, the child was being disruptive in school. The other issue was a look at other J/I/M off-site possibilities. He had a group looking at categories of students that they had not had success with. The student might have been identified as handicapped and might have to be put out of school, but then the law came into play and they did not have a place for that youngster. They needed some kind of alternative program with special education certified people to work with these youngsters. The group would involve principals, alternative program staff, and county staff. He had been talking to the county people and pointing out that some of what they were dealing with might not be educational in nature. Therefore, they needed some assistance from other county agencies. He hoped to be able to put a package together and bring it to the superintendent.

Mrs. Praisner asked if a piece of the program was getting students into appropriate programs or if it was a process problem. Dr. Pitt replied that they had some very successful programs. They did have some criteria they could look at, and there were some common threads in working with some of these young people. They had learned a lot from the in-school programs. He believed they needed to train teachers. Here they were really talking about students needing off-site programs. They could be identified as having rather severe problems, and these students were readily identified. They had a number of senior high school programs, and these programs worked. He was amazed to see the numbers of students graduating out of these programs. He agreed that they needed to focus on that mid-level student. There were a number of middle-level students who were not succeeding in the in-school alternative programs. He believed that they needed some creative programs at the middle level. He had not put a group together to take a good look at that. The group that Dr. Fountain was talking about was a different group of young people. They had a SED group looking at some of those needs, too.

In regard to the questions raised by Mrs. Hobbs, Dr. Towers said there were three programs with only one teacher. The question was what was done when a teacher was absent. In Muncaster and Second Genesis, they got a substitute when the teacher was absent. In Quest, they did not use a substitute because it was a half-day program and the youngsters could stay in the regular school. If a youngster was older than 18, there were programs if they were still a senior. They would not turn anyone down who happened to be over 18. In regard to continuity between J/I/M and senior high school alternative programs, Dr. Towers asked Mr. Wayne Whigham, principal of Martin Luther King Intermediate School to respond. Mr. Whigham reported that he worked with Ms. Fox, the principal of Seneca Valley High School. They discussed students who were at risk and looked at

possibilities for helping those students. His program dealt with students who were failing. Some of those students might be 16 going into high school. If they were in ninth grade and 16, it was difficult to be successful with these students. He and Ms. Fox were looking at changes for programs next year. Counselors met and talked with students who were at risk and tried to match them with programs at the high school level. They did have a choice of programs including WOC and CEWE.

Dr. Towers said Mrs. Hobbs had asked if students in one administrative area could attend an alternative program in another area. This varied from administrative area to administrative area. Mrs. Audrey Leslie, supervisor of secondary instruction in Area 2, explained that generally students did not cross areas. It happened occasionally by accident. They did not do this because they had waiting lists of their own students for their area programs.

Dr. Towers said the next question was the average time from the initiation of an action to a placement in an alternative program. This varied. Most placements did not take too long if they had an opening. Mr. D'Aiutolo added that it took about a week if it were a program controlled by MCPS. If it were a county program, MCPS could do its work very quickly, but they had no control over the procedures at the county end. Mrs. Leslie commented that in Area 2 they could move very rapidly. The PPW would work up the case, there would be an EMT at the school, and the parents and the students would meet with the coordinator. The student had to choose to go to that school and understand the conditions imposed by the school. One way of judging success was the number of students going back to the regular school and graduating.

Mrs. Hobbs asked if a PPW was allotted only so many spaces in alternative programs. Mrs. Leslie said that this might be true for countywide programs, but in Area 2 they did not have allotments. They had 25 slots at Tahoma, and it was on a need basis. Mr. D'Aiutolo added that this was true of the interagency programs. There were no allocations for different pupil personnel workers.

Mr. Ewing commented that one of the things that emerged from the paper and the discussion was that there was a wide variety of programs. They seemed to have a substantial degree of success with large numbers of students, but the pattern of programming across the county was uneven in terms of coverage, availability, and procedures. He said that as time passed they should make sure that they learned from what they were doing about what it was that was effective with students and replicate those lessons. He said they should establish a continuum of services and programs which existed to some extent now, but not comprehensively. At some point they should have a program which said that "for students with these characteristics, they might best be served by this kind of program." They also needed to direct some of their energies toward being inventive about meeting needs in new ways as those emerged.

Mr. Ewing was concerned that for some parents the maze of programs

was a source of confusion. Some parents gave up as a result of this. He urged staff to focus on making parental understanding greater and making clearer where they were succeeding and applying those lessons. Dr. Pitt reported that they had started out with a few countywide programs. Then they asked areas to use their initiatives and do some creative things. Now the question was where they went from here. Dr. Cronin thought that Dr. Pitt might want to ask his group for recommendations in this area.

Dr. Shoenberg said that without meaning to minimize the considerable success of these programs, they had added programs as they went along. This gave the impression of a special program boutique with individual programs designed for all different kinds of students.

Mr. Sernak had made a point about the numbers of students who needed to be served. He noted that here was another area of educational expenditure in which the possibility for adding funds and adding programs was almost endless. He agreed that they needed to look at a narrowing of the norm. Beyond that, they should decide how they were going to address the expanding need in some sort of patterned way. While they might have to run these programs in small units, there needed to be some kind of pattern and expansion of successful models. They needed economies of scale, or they were never going to reach the population that needed to be served.

Dr. Fountain commented that he had come to that conclusion five years ago. The more programs they developed, the more they filled up. There had to be a different way of attacking the problem. Training was one of the ways. He agreed that they did have some excellent programs. He was said they could tell the Board what kind of student was in each of the programs. Once they had taken a look at the J/I/M issue, they should look at the individual programs and ones that were individually run.

Dr. Shoenberg suggested that when the Board returned to this topic, they needed to have some recommendations for action on the policy issues involved. They had a lot of useful information here, but they needed to focus on the policies.

Mrs. Leslie commented that when they had one or two teachers in a program, their personalities had a lot to do with the kind of program they had. As long as they had a few students and one or two teachers, they would have a lot of diversity. She agreed that they should be able to transfer these programs.

Mrs. Hobbs asked about the number of students on the waiting list for the Phoenix programs. Mr. D'Aiutolo replied that there might be three to five students each month on a waiting list. When there were no openings available, parents and pupil personnel workers tried to find other services. They did feel there were enough students in the up-county area to fill the additional class at Phoenix II. The other part was if they had a class and let the principals and pupil personnel workers know, the class would be filled. Mrs. Hobbs said that for most of the off-site programs transportation had to be

provided by the student or parent. Mr. D'Aiutolo replied that this was correct for most of the programs.

Dr. Cronin thanked staff for their report.

Re: REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON DANGEROUS
WEAPONS AND SUBSTANCE ABUSE

Dr. Pitt said he had sent a paper to the Board in which he reported on steps he was taking. The committee's first recommendation had to do with strengthening the law. The Board was on record as supporting drug-free zones. In regard to the second recommendation, he had already asked principals to recommend expulsion for possession of dangerous weapons. Their policy already allowed for this. He wanted to make clear that all a principal could do was recommend. The student had to be given due process. The superintendent or his designee had the final say on whether expulsion took place or not.

Dr. Pitt stated that in regard to sales and distribution of drugs, they already had a regulation in effect. On beepers, he agreed that they should be prohibited on school grounds. He believed they had the right to do this except for a reason that could be determined. For example, a child might have a life threatening disease. The committee had recommended they look at the possibility of metal detectors and dogs for sniffing drugs. He did not agree with this. He had a problem with their moving that way. He thought they should have a small group of expert people to take a look at security devices. He had already received letters from people offering free consulting help. They had to ask the Montgomery County Police Department, MCPS security people, and some principals to serve on this group. They would look at reasonable and rational ways of improving school security. He believed there were good ideas that they could follow to make schools more secure.

Dr. Pitt reported that there would be additional training for hall monitors. That would not be police training but rather confrontation training and information on how to detect drugs and intoxicants. He also thought these personnel needed to have identification. He said they were continuing to maintain rapport with the Police Department.

Dr. Pitt said that the ninth recommendation was that parents be involved when the child was referred to a rehabilitation program. While he supported the recommendation, he did not think MCPS could do this by law. He thought there had to be some way of putting pressure on parents to be part of this process. He felt that youngsters were successful when their parents were involved.

Mr. Leslie Holdsworth, assistant principal of Poolesville High School, explained that the committee tried to meet the needs of the principals and their concerns. The final report represented the needs of the group that served on the committee.

Dr. Cronin called attention to the superintendent's final paragraph in his transmittal memo of March 28. It listed a few things that the

Board wanted to get across and support. They were concerned that weapons were appearing in schools, and they would take this seriously and not tolerate this. They were concerned about the issues of alcohol and drug abuse and possession and use at school. They would take that seriously and would support the superintendent in that area. They would attempt to find alternative programs for these students. The Board would support its principals in dealing with this. The Board was on record as stating they did not want this abuse going on.

Mr. Ewing noted that there was a very large number of legal issues here. Some of them had to do with Constitutional questions and some had to do with the interpretation of the extent of the authority of the school. It would be important for them to make sure they had good legal advice not only from their own counsel but also from the county government. He would not want them to start adopting what appeared to be good ideas and then find themselves engaged in a lengthy law suit.

Mr. Ewing said that Dr. Pitt had commented about the need to strike a reasonable balance between the safety and security of students and staff and the conditions under which free inquiry which was essential to education could proceed. He was not suggesting that these recommendations moved them off balance. However, it was extremely important for them not to create a circumstance under which students thought of school as an armed camp or a police state.

Mr. Ewing commented that Dr. Pitt had mentioned that it was important to explore other ideas people had. He reported that on May 10 in the evening the Metropolitan Areas Boards of Education and the Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments would sponsor a forum on this subject. They would look at what school districts and government might do separately and collectively to improve security in the schools. They planned to invite prosecutors, chiefs of police, Board members, elected officials, superintendents, and school staff. They were going to collect all the policies of all the metropolitan area boards on these subjects and make those available as well.

Dr. Pitt agreed that this would be useful and that he would send staff. He noted that he had already said he would enforce with due process rights the idea of expulsion for weapons and for selling drugs. In regard to school security, he was not saying they might not end up using metal detectors or dogs. However, before he moved to this, he thought they should get some experts in. He would be very willing to hear what other school systems were doing and found successful. There might be some very good things they could do to improve security within schools. He remarked that from his perspective a school was a lot more secure than a shopping center or a neighborhood.

Dr. Cronin commented that in the press they might see a level of violence in the area. He did not want to give the impression that anything of that sort was occurring in this county within the school system.

Dr. Vance stated that the level of interagency cooperation around the many issues impacted by substance abuse and dangerous weapons had been remarkable. They had established an interagency coordinating council on substance abuse. One of their attorneys had looked at their revised suspension and expulsion guidelines. It was a consequence of the state Board's revising the guidelines to assure continuity throughout the state. In the spring the area superintendents and principals would be reviewing the guidelines and those procedures. They had had to make some minor changes on assuring due process. Dr. Vance indicated that Mr. Masood and staff had made one presentation on programs and practices in this area. On April 10, there would be a second presentation. Chief Brooks and Mr. Sonner were present at these meetings. He would ask Mr. Sonner to have one of his staff look at these issues.

In regard to school security, Dr. Vance reported that he had discussed this on two occasions with Chief Brooks. His staff would be working with MCPS security and safety assistants. Mrs. Barbara Contrera was in the process of contacting the metropolitan school districts for copies of their plans for use of security assistants. They had also contacted Baltimore City. He planned to pull the group back together with some of the external consultants suggested by Dr. Pitt and come up with a plan for training.

Mrs. Praisner thought that all of the things they were talking about were very appropriate. She thought it was appropriate to address this issue in a similar way as the Board addressed the AIDS policy issue from the standpoint of the alarm that might be raised within communities as they addressed it. On the other hand, the people who knew best about the issues they needed to address were the people who were in the schools daily. If these people saw an issue that needed to be addressed, she thought this was something the Board needed to give serious attention to.

Mrs. Praisner asked about training needs for staff other than security people. She wondered whether they had identified training for principals and teachers. Dr. Dianne Mero, principal of Einstein High School, replied that about a year ago the senior high school principals met with Dr. Vance and Dr. Pitt to discuss this issue. They had a series of recommendations including an updating for principals. Years ago people would not hesitate to confront people in a hall, but the last time one of her teachers did that with an outsider he had been beaten. The principals had talked about working some things out with the police department regarding training. They needed people in the halls, and those people needed to be able to handle situations.

Mr. Michael Glascoe, principal of Frost Intermediate School, commented that some of his staff members had voiced concerns. They

wanted to know what to look for, and he hoped they would consider training needs in that area. Mrs. Praisner inquired about plans.

Dr. Vance replied that they had not made plans to address this in the near future. The focus for training was on the safety and security assistants. Mr. Masood said that about three years ago they had training sessions with the police and leadership staff. They did plan to revisit the whole issue under the Drug Free Schools Program. He thought they would get back to that cycle within a year. Leadership staff were trained in drug recognition, cooperation with the police department, confrontation intervention, and use of supports within the community.

Mrs. Hobbs expressed a concern about parent notification in light of the recent incident at Parkland. Dr. Mero replied that school administrators would continue to follow the guidelines which required them to contact the parent as soon as possible. Dr. Pitt stressed that the principal at Parkland acted responsibly and did everything that was appropriate. Mr. Glascoe thought that principals did a good job of contacting parents. Dr. Pitt added that many times when a principal suspended a youngster the principal would hold that youngster until the end of the school day because the parents had not been contacted.

Mr. Glascoe stated that the relationship between the school system and the police department could serve as a model for other school systems. The precinct captains had attended area A&S meetings and discussed current issues. He hoped that they would build on that and put together some training models.

Dr. Cronin reported that they had the superintendent's intentions here, and pending no further comments to the Board they could allow those to proceed. Dr. Pitt commented that he would get back to the Board and the principals on the safety and security issues before the end of the semester.

Re: BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS

1. Mr. Goldensohn asked that staff look at the calendar for next year so that they did not have a regular business meeting during the middle of the spring break. He thought it was inappropriate to have staff come in to the Board meeting from vacation.

2. Mr. Ewing made the following statement for the record:

"The Board got an inquiry about an FOIA decision having to do with Oak View. I don't agree in this decision or with the letter sent to the Oak View community that defended that decision. I believe that the materials requested should have been released. It seems to me that at some juncture, and I am not prepared to raise it as a new business item now, the FOIA requirements ought to be reviewed by the Board. They are not after all mere legal strictures which give absolute guidance. The superintendent has a good deal of latitude in making judgments and that latitude is

one that affects, I think, policy making at the Board level. The Board has an interest therefore."

Dr. Cronin said he signed the letter because he believed the law gave the superintendent the discretion in this instance and does not give the Board the right to review. He said that before they put this on the table he would ask that the superintendent provide the Board with a legal opinion. Dr. Pitt agreed to respond to the Board in writing. The Board might want to review these comments and react accordingly.

RESOLUTION NO. 193-89 Re: EXECUTIVE SESSION - APRIL 11, 1989

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Dr. Shoenberg seconded by Mr. Goldensohn, 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 April 11, 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. 194-89 Re: MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 14 AND 21, 1989

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

RESOLVED, That the minutes of February 14 and 21, 1989, be approved.

RESOLUTION NO. 195-89 Re: BOE APPEAL NO. 1989-3

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. 1989-3, a school discipline matter.

Re: NEW BUSINESS

1. Mr. Ewing moved and Mr. Goldensohn seconded that the Board review the proposal to allow graduate credit equivalency for summer institutes.

RESOLUTION NO. 196-89 Re: COUNTY HEALTH DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDATIONS

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

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education take time in a timely way this spring to review the recommendations of the county executive with regard to health assistants and other health support in the public schools with a view to making an endorsement of either those or other resource recommendations.

Re: NEW BUSINESS (CONTINUED)

2. Mr. Ewing reported that the Board had received a report from the committee on evaluation. It seemed to him that this issue was one that the Board ought to address. He asked if this issue was now ready for Board discussion or should wait. Dr. Pitt replied that he intended to give the Board his reaction in a confidential memo within the next two weeks.

Re: ITEMS OF INFORMATION

Board members received the following items of information:

1. Staff Response to the 1988 Annual Report to the Citizens' Advisory Committee for Career and Vocational Education
2. Staff Response to the 1988 Annual Report to the Montgomery County Advisory Council for Vocational-Technical Education

Re: ADJOURNMENT

The president adjourned the meeting at 11:50 p.m.

PRESIDENT

SECRETARY

HP:mlw