



construction and renovations would be ready for occupancy by students for the first day of school. The exceptions were the auditorium at Watkins Mill High School, the gymnasium at Brooke Grove, and the core facility at Woodlin. Highland Elementary was a concern, and they were meeting weekly with contractors. However, they hoped to have occupancy by the first day of school. Mr. Hawes indicated the PEPCO was running behind because of their storm damage repairs, and the phone company strike might give them problems.

RESOLUTION NO. 467-89 Re: PROCUREMENT CONTRACTS OVER \$25,000

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

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

WHEREAS, It is recommended that Bid No. 163-89, Soft Pretzels, be rejected and rebid due to excess prices and lack of competition; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That Bid No. 163-89 be rejected; and be it further

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

88-13 Physical Examinations for School Bus Drivers  
The 1,100 bus drivers have the option of selecting anyone of the awardees and thus an exact amount for each is unknown. The average examination is \$40.00.)

AWARDEES

Dr. Hugo Arias  
Dr. Wilfred Ehrmantraut  
Dr. George Kenton  
Medical Access  
Dr. John S. Saia  
Secure Medical Care of Gaithersburg  
TOTAL \$ 44,000

89-09 Chapter I Instructional Services to Eligible Nonpublic School Students  
AWARDEE  
Educational In-Roads \$ 95,000

24-89 Scanning Forms and Scanning Machines - Extension  
AWARDEE  
National Computer Systems \$ 40,866

146-89 Snack Foods, Chips, and Popcorn  
AWARDEE

	Smelkinson Sysco	\$	92,312
147-89	Bread and Rolls AWARDEE Schmidt Baking Company, Inc.	\$	231,999
148-89	Fresh Donuts AWARDEE Montgomery Donut Company, Inc.	\$	69,536
155-89	Milk, Milk Shake Mixes, Cottage Cheese, Yogurt, and Fruit Juices AWARDEE Shenandoah's Pride Dairy		\$1,360,000
172-89	Elementary Mathematics Supplies AWARDEES Cuisenaire Company of America, Inc. Delta Education, Inc. Educational Teaching Aids J. L. Hammett Company Kaplan School Supply LaPine Scientific Learning Alternatives Nasco	\$	6,819 5,596 15,284 263 116 1,013 1,271 4,225
	TOTAL	\$	34,587
176-89	Plumbing Supplies AWARDEES Apex Plumbing Capp, Inc. Creed Company, Inc. D. S. Pipe and Supply Company, Inc. Industrial Controls Distributors, Inc. Noland Company J. A. Sexauer Southern Utilities H. M. Sweeney Company Trayco of S. C., Inc. Tri Plumbing Supply, Inc. Pier-Angeli Company	\$	3,799 7,911 1,505 6,411 9,098 27,891 4,465 547 1,211 4,196 7,659 82
	TOTAL	\$	74,775
186-89	Processed Cheese; Cheese Food AWARDEE Kraft/Feldman	\$	86,800
3-90	CD ROM Computer Drives for Watkins Mill High School and Other High Schools AWARDEE Online Products Corporation	\$	59,214

6-90	Copier Maintenance Service	
	AWARDEE	
	Waugh Enterprises, Inc.	\$ 250,020*
	TOTAL OVER \$25,000	\$2,439,109

\*Denotes MFD vendors

Re: A MOTION BY MR. EWING ON BID 189-89  
TELEVISION EQUIPMENT (FAILED)

A motion by Mr. Ewing that Bid 189-89, television equipment, be not approved failed with Mr. Ewing voting in the affirmative; Dr. Cronin, Mrs. DiFonzo, Mr. Goldensohn, Mrs. Hobbs, Mrs. Praisner, (Ms. Serino), and Dr. Shoenberg voting in the negative.

RESOLUTION NO. 468-89 Re: CABLE TV INSTALLATION AT DAMASCUS  
HIGH SCHOOL

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

WHEREAS, The following sealed bids were received on July 25, 1989, for the cable television network installation at Damascus High School:

BIDDER	BID
1. Halstead Communications Corporation	\$ 25,828.63
2. B & L Services, Inc.	27,000.00
3. Heller Electric Co., Inc.	74,000.00
4. Darwin Construction Co.	103,301.00

and

WHEREAS, The low bid is within the staff estimate of \$32,500, and sufficient funds are available to award the contract; and

WHEREAS, The low bidder is qualified for the work and has met all requirements of the specifications; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That a \$25,828.63 contract be awarded to Halstead Communications Corporation for installation of a cable TV network at Damascus High School.

RESOLUTION NO. 469-89 Re: AWARD OF CONTRACTS FOR VARIOUS  
MAINTENANCE PROJECTS

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Dr. Shoenberg seconded by Mr. Goldensohn, the following resolution was

adopted unanimously:

WHEREAS, Sealed bids were received on various dates for several maintenance projects in accordance with MCPS procurement practices; and

WHEREAS, Details of each bid activity are available in the Department of School Facilities; and

WHEREAS, All the low bids were within budget estimates, and 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 for the amounts listed below:

PROJECT	AMOUNT
1. Replacement of Electric Light Fixtures Garrett Park, Germantown, and Piney Branch elementary schools, Lynnbrook and Carl Sandburg centers, and Einstein and Kennedy high schools LOW BIDDERS	
H. Y. H. Electric Co. (Lynnbrook Center)	\$10,500.00
Pel-Bern Electric Co. (Garrett Park and Piney Branch elementary schools, Carl Sandburg Center and Einstein and Kennedy high schools)	54,436.00
Vignola Electric Co. (Germantown Elementary School)	2,314.00
	-----
TOTAL	\$67,250.00
2. Replacement of Plumbing Fixtures Garrett Park Elementary School LOW BIDDER:	
G. W. Mechanical Contractors, Inc.	\$27,899.00
3. Replacement of Stage Lighting Systems Ridgeview Junior High School and Einstein and Wootton high schools LOW BIDDERS:	
McManus Enterprises The Complete Theatrical Supplies, Inc. (Einstein High School)	\$23,505.00
A. E. Mitchell & Co., Inc. (Ridgeview Junior High School and Wootton High School)	26,645.40
	-----
TOTAL	\$50,150.40

Re: A MOTION BY MRS. DiFONZO TO AMEND  
THE AGENDA FOR AUGUST 8, 1989  
(FAILED)

A motion by Mrs. DiFonzo to amend the agenda for August 8, 1989, so that the student vote would not count on the proposed resolution on works of art because they were related to budget and contracts failed with Mrs. DiFonzo and Mrs. Praisner voting in the affirmative; Dr. Cronin, Mr. Ewing, Mr. Goldensohn, Mrs. Hobbs, (Ms. Serino), and Dr. Shoenberg voting in the negative.

RESOLUTION NO. 470-89 Re: WORKS OF ART FOR HIGHLAND ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Dr. Shoenberg seconded by Mr. Goldensohn, 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 artists; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education enter into the following contractual agreements for works of art at Highland Elementary School, subject to County Council approval:

ARTIST	WORK	COMMISSION
Irene and Azriel Awret	Mural	\$5,000
Maureen Melville	Stained Glass	5,000
Lilli Ann Rosenberg	Mosaic	7,000

and be it further

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

RESOLUTION NO. 471-89 Re: WORKS OF ART FOR LAYTONSVILLE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Dr. Shoenberg seconded by Mr. Goldensohn, 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



RESOLVED, That the president and secretary be authorized to execute a deed and separate easement agreement for the land required to construct Airpark Road.

RESOLUTION NO. 473-89 Re: ARCHITECTURAL ASSIGNMENT - JOHN F. KENNEDY HIGH SCHOOL

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

WHEREAS, The architectural firm for the John F. Kennedy High School addition has changed ownership and requested that the contract for architectural services be assigned to the new firm; and

WHEREAS, This assignment will not impact the project or increase the initial fee for architectural services; and

WHEREAS, Staff has reviewed this request and recommends its acceptance; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the architectural services contract for the John F. Kennedy High School addition be assigned from the Maguire Group, Inc., Architects, to The Lukmire Partnership, Inc., Architects.

RESOLUTION NO. 474-89 Re: WORK OF ART FOR THE PHOENIX II SCHOOL

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Dr. Shoenberg seconded by Mr. Goldensohn, the following resolution was adopted with Dr. Cronin, Mr. Ewing, Mr. Goldensohn, Mrs. Hobbs, Mrs. Praisner, and Dr. Shoenberg voting in the affirmative; Mrs. DiFonzo and Ms. Serino 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 artists; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education enter into the following contractual agreement for the work of art at the Phoenix II School,

subject to County Council approval:

ARTIST	WORK	COMMISSION
Y. David Chung	Mural	\$1,500

and be it further

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

RESOLUTION NO. 475-89 Re: UTILIZATION OF FY 1990 FUTURE SUPPORTED PROJECT FUNDS FOR THE CHAPTER 2 EDUCATIONAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM

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

RESOLVED, That the superintendent of schools be authorized to receive and expend an additional \$4,016 within the FY 1990 Provision for Future Supported Projects for the Chapter 2 Educational Improvement Program, Library and Learning Resources Project in Category 3 -- Instructional Other; and be it further

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

RESOLUTION NO. 476-89 Re: FY 1990 SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION FOR EXPANDING THE EXTENDED ELEMENTARY EDUCATION PROGRAM

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

RESOLVED, That the superintendent of schools be authorized, subject to County Council approval, to receive and expend an FY 1990 supplemental appropriation of \$152,065 from the Maryland State Department of Education to establish an expanded Extended Elementary Education Program in the following categories:

CATEGORY	POSITIONS*	AMOUNT
01 Administration		\$ 3,704
02 Instructional Salaries	4.7	108,323
03 Instructional Other		16,531
10 Fixed Charges		23,507

TOTAL

---  
4.7

-----  
\$152,065

\*2.5 Teachers, A-D (10 month)  
2.2 Instructional Assistants, grade 10 (10 month)

and be it further

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

RESOLUTION NO. 477-89 Re: MONTHLY PERSONNEL REPORT

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

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

RESOLUTION NO. 478-89 Re: EXTENSION OF SICK LEAVE

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

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

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

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education grant an extension of leave with three-fourths pay covering the number of days indicated.

NAME	POSITION AND LOCATION	NO. OF DAYS
Michel, Mary	Classroom Teacher on Personal Illness Leave from New Hampshire Estates ES	30

RESOLUTION NO. 479-89 Re: DEATH OF DR. ROBERT N. HUMBLER, JR.  
SUPERVISOR OF SECONDARY INSTRUCTION  
AREA II OFFICE

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

WHEREAS, The death on July 24, 1989, of Dr. Robert N. Humblers, Jr., the supervisor of secondary instruction in Area II, has deeply saddened the staff and members of the Board of Education; and

WHEREAS, In the nineteen years that Dr. Humbles had been a member of the staff of Montgomery County Public Schools, his calm manner, sound decision-making and leadership qualities earned him an enviable reputation among colleagues and students; and

WHEREAS, Dr. Humbles was respected by his peers who frequently sought him out for guidance and direction and by parents who saw him as a strong educational leader whose actions reflected the best interest of students; and

WHEREAS, Dr. Humbles was known for his sensitivity and compassion for those with whom he worked and particularly for children under his care; and

WHEREAS, The superintendent of schools recognized Dr. Humbles' superior performance by awarding him an ABCD certificate for his professionalism in the assistant principalship of Wheaton Woods and principalships of Forest Grove and Glenallan elementary schools and Julius West Middle School and for his development of a model middle school program; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the members of the Board of Education express their sorrow at the death of Dr. Robert N. Humbles Jr. and extend deepest sympathy to his family; and be it further

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

RESOLUTION NO. 480-89 Re: PERSONNEL APPOINTMENTS AND REASSIGNMENT

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

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

APPOINTMENT	PRESENT POSITION	AS
Sheila M. Dobbins	Assistant Principal Richard Montgomery HS	Principal Wood MS Effective: 8-9-89
Robert G. Domergue	Assistant Principal Redland MS	Principal Robert Frost IS Effective: 8-9-89
Gerard F. Consuegra	Area Admin. Asst. Area 3 Admin. Office	Coordinator of Elem. Science Dept. of Academic Skills Effective: 8-9-89
REASSIGNMENT	FROM	TO
Anitsa Cordon	A&S Counselor	Asst. Principal

Winston Churchill HS  
Effective: 8-9-89

RESOLUTION NO. 481-89 Re: AMENDMENT TO THE POSITION  
CLASSIFICATION AND PAY PLAN

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

WHEREAS, As part of the established procedure for reviewing and revising the position classification and pay plan, the superintendent has recommended the changes described; and

WHEREAS, It is desirable to establish and maintain positions at an equitable and competitive pay level; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the classification and pay plan revisions proposed as follows be approved:

OFFICE OF THE ASSOCIATE SUPERINTENDENT FOR HUMAN SERVICES

Establish a new classification of Coordinator of Volunteer and Community Liaison, pay grade 24 (\$36,400 minimum - \$57,678 maximum longevity). The current position of Coordinator of Volunteers, pay grade 22 (\$33,051 minimum - \$52,644 maximum longevity) will be assigned to the new classification.

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL FACILITIES PLANNING AND CAPITAL PROGRAMMING

Establish a new classification of Demographic Data Assistant, pay grade 19 (\$27,206 minimum - \$43,659 longevity maximum). The current classification of Facilities Planning Assistant, pay grade 15 (\$22,464 minimum - \$36,088 longevity maximum), will be assigned to the new classification.

DIVISION OF SUPPLY AND PROPERTY MANAGEMENT

Establish a new classification of Supply and Property Management Distribution Supervisor, pay grade 19 (\$27,206 minimum - \$43,659 longevity maximum). The current position of Supervising Supply Service Worker, pay grade 17 (\$24,688 minimum - \$39,832 longevity maximum), will be assigned to the new classification.

DIVISION OF FOOD SERVICES

Establish a new classification of Food Service Warehouse and Distribution Supervisor, pay grade 19 (\$27,206 minimum - \$43,659 longevity maximum). The current position of Supervising Supply Service Worker, pay grade 17 (\$24,688 minimum - \$39,832 longevity maximum), will be assigned to the new classification.

Re: REPORT OF THE COMMUNITY LEADERSHIP TASK  
FORCE ON ALCOHOL AND DRUG ABUSE  
PREVENTION

Mr. Edward Masood, director of the Department of Health and Physical Education, reported that he had served for 13 months on the 39-member

task force. The members of the task force represented community, school, government, and business people. They were appointed by Mr. Kramer on June 10, 1988 and were asked to present an interim report by September 30, 1988. In the first effort of the task force, they were divided into three subgroups on business, government, and community. They reviewed materials, police data, and the Rand Report on the drug abuse problem in the Washington metropolitan area. They came up with several recommendations which were included in their final report which had been submitted to Mr. Kramer this June. Mr. Masood said that after the interim report there were two significant recommendations. One was to appoint someone to coordinate all alcohol and drug abuse prevention activities within Montgomery County. Mr. Kramer appointed Dr. Maxine Counihan to fill this role. One other recommendation was to implement a policy for employees of the Montgomery County government so that the county government could take a leadership position. That came before the federal drug-free workplace act which went into effect in March of this year. This was then followed by the governor's executive order on April 7, 1989, for Maryland state employees. Montgomery County was the first to recognize issues on coordination and on policy development for employees.

Mr. Masood remarked that he appreciated the opportunity to serve on this committee because it gave him an additional insight to the many problems associated with alcohol and drug abuse. He had been dealing with this issue since 1978 and had found that there was more to learn about this subject. He indicated that Bill Jones, the chairman of the task force, had been called to a meeting at PEPCO this evening. Ms. Carol Giannini, the substance abuse prevention coordinator for the county executive's office and the Department of Family Resources, would be presenting the report. The other presenters were Dr. Counihan, Ms. Diane Ursano, MCCPTA; and Kim Utyro, a recent graduate of Walter Johnson High School.

Ms. Giannini explained that Mr. Jones regretted that he could not be here. He had made several presentations of this report and had asked her to bring out some key points. The first was that Montgomery County could consider itself very fortunate in that there was a tremendous strength and energy level in the community waiting to be tapped and empowered to do many things. Secondly, they saw a tremendous consensus in the preparation of the document. After much debate, the task force agreed that the county had a serious problem. By acknowledging this, they could gain momentum for solutions. Another issue was the partnership with government, schools, and the community. The partnership would help them in the long run rather than leaving the responsibility for solutions on any singular shoulders. Mr. Jones had also noted there was a recurrent theme that they must get over the denial of the problem.

Ms. Giannini reported that in addition to the membership the task force had additional resource representatives from a broad range of the community. They had had a minimum of one to two meetings per month. Their focus was on community, business, government, youth, and public information. There were numerous speakers, field trips,

and meetings. They studied the nature and the extent of the problem and deliberated over three months on the extent of the problem. The task force was going to go out into the community with the statement that Montgomery County had a severe and increasing substance abuse problem. While they had some holes in their data, she felt they still had the best collection of data on the problem. For example, they did not have all hospitals reporting data. They acknowledged that alcohol and crack were the most abused drugs. People of all ages abused alcohol and other drugs. Their data about juvenile use was based on a 1986 school survey. There was another survey in preparation, and it would be interesting to see those comparisons. The positive HIV tests among intravenous drug users were rapidly increasing. This could not be ignored. The economic cost to the county was \$276 million. They could use this base line now and could use it for several years.

Ms. Giannini stated that they recognized and acknowledged the links to child abuse, suicide, traffic accidents, and school truancy. The use of alcohol and other drugs by pregnant women affected future generations. The task force felt that there was a need to do a household survey to establish an attitudinal base line. The survey revealed that alcohol was considered as the main drug used. The information about self drug use was often underreported. A large percentage of people recognized that health and family problem were the main risks of drug use. This meant that health education was becoming effective. Half of the respondents did not view drug abuse as a problem. However, they felt that drug using, selling, and public drinking were more serious problems than violent crimes in their neighborhoods. Respondents supported residential treatment as an option in their neighborhoods by 58 percent. However, there was less than 50 percent support for halfway houses. There was excellent support for Alcoholics Anonymous and support group meetings within their neighborhoods. In some instances, people felt there should be more serious punishments and rapid punishments for drug dealing and distribution. On the other hand, they did not want any more jails. Ms. Giannini reported that also had to look carefully at what were agreed upon definitions of prevention. One was to address the denial and change the attitudes. Another was that elected officials played a strong leadership role, and the community looked to its elected leadership to demonstrate its commitment to the prevention effort. Another fact was that it would take a long-term commitment.

Ms. Giannini said that Dr. Counihan would explain the initiatives. The last phase of the action plan was to point out the focus over the next two years. The first target for prevention efforts was families with children. Youth needed good role models in adults and parents. Parents needed education to understand the problem and to start prevention education at home. The second target should be communities with a high incidence of drug-related crime activity.

Ms. Giannini pointed out that six goals had been identified in the plan of action, 24 objectives, and 120 action steps. The first goal was to empower the community to do prevention. The second goal was to provide outreach and direct services. They felt there should be

more county staff out in the community, especially in the high risk areas. They also talked about the importance and effectiveness of peer counseling programs. They felt that student support groups were very necessary to keep people from relapsing. Prevention education should occur in all schools, public and private.

Ms. Giannini explained that the third goal was to conduct a public information and awareness campaign. This would be a countywide campaign at multi levels to promote all the public information centers that were available such as the CARE Center. The fourth goal was to strengthen treatment and enforcement as prevention tools. They wanted to ensure swift and sure consequences for illegal alcohol and drug-related activities. The fifth goal was to assure on-going monitoring and evaluation of prevention efforts. The household survey would be done annually so they could see some movement in terms of community attitudes. The sixth goal was to seek creative funding for prevention.

Ms. Giannini stated that if each community leader and individual was not part of the solution, then he or she was a major part of the problem. There was no higher priority to which they could address their time and efforts in the years to come for the good of the county than to become involved in this war on drug abuse.

Ms. Utyro stated that the task force set a high priority on developing recommendations to strengthen prevention activities around youth. The first objective dealt with increasing the role and leadership of young people in prevention efforts by broadening youth involvement. For example, the Youth Speak Out should be expanded to public and nonpublic secondary schools. Another objective involved increasing peer counseling programs in the schools as well as in the community. Some county high schools now had student support programs that met weekly to discuss issues related to alcohol and other drug use. The final report outlined the need to provide a linkage to youth in nonpublic schools because they made up approximately 25 percent of county youth. The elementary and mid-level students were targeted for an increase in the amount of formal and informal prevention education. Early intervention through education could shape activities and might deter experimentation with alcohol and other drugs. Alternative activities were a key part of prevention because they enhanced self esteem and independence. Activities for latch key and out of school youth should incorporate prevention education. Youth in the county had expressed a desire to have a positive role model, and clear direction from adults could help youth remain secure from alcohol and drug abuse. The focus on youth by the task force outlined the need to keep people aware of the dangers of drug and alcohol abuse and to provide resistance skills and education.

Ms. Ursano stated that she had served on the youth committee, and they had spent a lot of time talking about parenting. Parenting was one of the toughest jobs in Montgomery County, and there was a wide variety of parents and families in the county. There were single parents, dual career families, white collar, and blue collar.

Children were academically gifted, learning disabled, artistically talented, well adjusted, emotionally disturbed, native speakers of English, and immigrants from all over the world. They attended public schools and nonpublic schools. They might be in a juvenile facility. They were athletes, scholars, and dropouts.

Ms. Ursano said the task force attempted to take all these factors into consideration during their deliberations. They heard from professionals, parents, and children and youth. They were aware of the varied needs of young people. Their recommendations also took into account the unique needs of racial, cultural, and language minority groups.

Ms. Ursano emphasized that parents were the single most important influence in their children's development. Parents who smoked raised children who smoked. Parents needing a pill gave children the message that if something was not right it could be changed by taking a substance. Parents who needed a drink to relax gave their children a message that it was okay to drink. The task force felt that parents must be educated about the problems of substance abuse. Parents were responsible for assuring that the appropriate messages about drugs and alcohol and tobacco were received and internalized by their children.

The task force acknowledged the competing demands on the time of families with children. They understood that families were undergoing many stresses and that there might not be the time or energy to attend another meeting. They needed to support having parents staying home and being with their children. If parents could not attend a PTA meeting, the task force was going to get the message out anyway. They would do public service announcements at the school play. They would get doctors and the dentists of Montgomery County to help spread the word. They would be at the day care center if the parents could not come to them for the education.

Ms. Ursano explained that another important element was the partnership between the parents and the schools. Through joint PTA and administration newsletters on substance abuse there might be some positive results. Children had told them that peer pressure was one of the most influential factors affecting their actions. In school children would learn how to deflect this negative peer pressure and to make wise choices for themselves. There would be peer support programs for them and a wealth of other programs and staff to help them. If their recommendations were followed, there would be more afterschool activities that would help build a child's self esteem and self confidence. All they asked for was parent support. Parents must become involved and educate themselves. They must become active partners with schools, churches, synagogues, and government. Whether people had children or not, they were parents to the next generation. By working together on substance abuse, they affirmed their commitment to the children and their future.

Dr. Counihan indicated that Mr. Kramer had received the report on June 28, and in his response he proposed a seven point program. The

report was a prevention document, and while they spent \$25 million in their war on alcohol and drug abuse, only 3 percent was spent on prevention. Mr. Kramer first reaffirmed her appointment as a special assistance on substance abuse for the next 18 months. Secondly, he established a new drug abuse prevention unit in the county, and the new unit would be housed in the Department of Family Resources. The third was the creation of a community implementation team which had already met once. The task force went out of business as of June 30, and there needed to be some continuity. The team had representatives from business, labor, family, civic, and religious organizations. They would be coordinating the 120 action steps. Point four was to direct there be a coordinating council on substance abuse which she chaired to begin implementing the recommendations. The fifth was the sponsorship of at least two prevention week campaigns per year. The purpose of the campaign was to enlist all the segments of the community not just government, the school system, and the police.

Dr. Counihan said the sixth was the neighborhood empowerment program. She had met with a group from Wheaton and the principals from Wheaton, Einstein, and Kennedy high schools would be involved. They were going after a \$2 million grant for this site. The seventh point was Mr. Kramer's report on implementation of the report, and this would occur every six months. Mr. Kramer had pointed out that this war was a major effort, and she thought it was one that was best addressed at the local level. She cited the report in the Washington POST about one six year old child and drug abuse. Children heard at school that they should not get into drugs, but what they saw was so overwhelming. The big business of drugs was so driving that they were hard pressed in the churches and schools to have anything that was as compelling.

Dr. Counihan emphasized that they had a job to do, and they could do it together. She said they had a charge and specific assignments and were generating an unbelievable amount of energy on the coordinating council. She was looking forward to the community congress that would be coming up in November. They had a number of activities that would bring in more than government and more than the school system. They were bringing in business and a number of agencies that wanted to help.

Dr. Counihan explained that there were a number of unanswered questions. They had to come to some real practical application of the consequences of illegal uses of drugs. The school system was wrestling with this. It was more than just saying no. It was admitting that you and your family were interacting with people who did not know what drug abuse was and who did know what addiction was. A reporter had asked her about the boot camp program in South Carolina; however, once a person left that setting they regressed. She thought they were looking at the wrong end of the problem. They were looking at someone after they were addicted, and she would rather put the money at the front end. For example, she would come down on keg parties and talk to parents about what they could do in their neighborhoods where they knew the keg parties were going on. This was where they hit prevention and this was where they were

talking about people dealing in illegal drugs. They were looking into what kind of fines could be imposed on parents.

Dr. Counihan had recently toured a neighborhood with crack houses. They looked at young people who were going into these crack houses and observed that they were not even 15. This was really happening in Montgomery County. It was in their neighborhoods, not someone else's.

Dr. Counihan said they had testified before the County Council and pointed out that this was the most important bipartisan issue facing the county. As a mother, she was not willing to turn her children over to drugs or wait for the big business of drugs to come in to her community. The problem was too many people were questioning whether drugs were really a problem. While there were open air drug markets, young people were telling them they could obtain drugs from baby sitters, from their friends, from their parents, from their neighbors, and down at the recreation center. Dr. Counihan pointed out that they had a lot of years of experience in dealing with the problem. She felt strongly that this battle was worth it and their children were worth it. They were in this for a long time, and prevention was their goal. She thought that they had a well organized, frontal attack coming. She thanked the Board for their support and indicated that she would be coming back to them and working with school people.

Dr. Cronin said that on behalf of the Board he wanted to assure the task force that they were part of the solution. They would be part of the partnership. He requested a response to the report from the superintendent including ways in which they could cooperate beyond what Mr. Masood and the principals were doing now. They needed some direction for the Board specifically so that Dr. Counihan could have direct statements from the Board about their commitment. Mr. Masood indicated that they could have a response by the all-day meeting in October. Dr. Cronin asked that Dr. Counihan and Ms. Giannini be invited to attend the meeting.

Re: MCPS ASSESSMENT CENTER

Dr. Carl Smith, associate superintendent for human services, introduced Dr. James Shinn, director of personnel, and Mrs. Karolyn Rohr, coordinator of administrative training. He said they would describe the process by which elementary principals and secondary assistant principals were recruited, selected, and trained and review the assessment center in terms of its place in the process. He noted that the assessment center was one element in the selection process although it was an important element. He pointed out that the assessment center model was not unique to Montgomery County. The National Association of Secondary School Principals had developed an assessment center model used throughout the country and adopted by the MSDE for use in Maryland. As of September, 1989, all counties with the exception of Montgomery and Anne Arundel would be participating in the MSDE assessment center. This spring, he had had the opportunity to attend one of the state centers as an observer.

Dr. Shinn stated that in developing their pool of candidates they encouraged mentoring in the process of recruiting. He met with the A&S staff of each of the areas at least once a year and asked administrators to be conscious of people whom they supervised to encourage those who they believed had the potential to be administrators and to make sure those people understood the steps to follow. They should steer them toward the leadership training program and encourage them to get career counseling from the Personnel Department or other administrators in the school system. Over the next few years they would have a great need for administrators and were constantly encouraging people to get into the program.

Mrs. Rohr explained that the leadership training program helped all aspiring teachers who might want to consider leadership positions as teacher leaders or as administrators. Phase one dealt with career development and was a noncredit series of six sessions for teachers. It included resume writing, interviewing skills, and information about promotional opportunities. Phase two was a survey course in which they taught about administration and leadership. It included conflict management, communications skills, and group process. In addition, there were teacher competency courses including an analysis of teaching and supervision which formed a good foundation for those seeking administration. They also made good use of university and community college courses and adult education courses on writing and oral presentations.

Dr. Shinn said that in addition to meeting with the A&S staff he also wrote to those identified by the area associates and Dr. Fountain as having potential. These people were invited to consider resource teaching or becoming teacher specialists. They ended up with a large cadre of people who wanted to consider administration. While people were in this activity they took university or college courses to get the necessary Maryland certificate to be appointed to an A&S position.

Dr. Shinn indicated that he would describe the elementary principal training program and then explain how it differed from the secondary program. In January they advertised for anyone with an interest in becoming an elementary principal to attend a meeting. Typically about 60 to 70 people attended the meeting where information was shared about administration and about the assessment center. They described what was going to happen in the center, the kinds of exercises, and how they could prepare themselves. Those applying were asked to provide materials describing their background and to speak directly to the qualifications of being a principal in Montgomery County and how their background and training prepared them for this. They submitted letters of recommendation from at least three people, all of whom must be their direct in-line supervisors and their evaluations for the past several years.

The applications were screened to decide who was going to be invited to the assessment center. The screening was done by a group of nine, principals and members of the central and area office staff. The

nine screened each candidate individually. The results were computed by Mr. Armando Gutierrez's staff and compiled without names. The scores were compiled, ranked, and taken to the appointments committee, the superintendent, and executive staff. They looked at the scores, without names, and then they made judgments based on future needs, the ability to handle a given number in the training program, and the ability to handle a number in the assessment center. They made some tentative decisions about how far down in the ranking they would go to invite people. Once this decision was made, they looked at names and backgrounds because of the superintendent's affirmative action goal to encourage women and minorities to enter administration. They wanted to be sure that the list contained a good representation by gender and race.

A final decision was made on invitees to the assessment center. Another meeting was held. In industry many assessment centers were designed to create a high stress situation. While there was stress involved in the MCPS center because it was a testing situation, their goal was to have the candidates know as much as possible about what was going to happen in the assessment center. They tried to minimize stress so that people could show their skills and demonstrate their knowledge of what it took to be a principal in MCPS. They told people how to get ready and had tapes available for viewing.

Participants were told about the kinds of exercises they were going to face. While Dr. Shinn was doing this, Mrs. Rohr was working with a group of administrative and supervisory staff who were going to be on the teams assessing the candidates. The teams consisted of three people and were balanced by gender and race.

Mrs. Rohr reported that each assessor received a three-day intensive residential program on assessing. They worked on each activity in the assessment center, practiced rating candidates by having live administrators there to perform tasks, discussed the ratings, and developed written comments. For each assessment center, a new group of assessors was chosen from the pool of trained people, and they received a full day of training on the current materials. As part of that training, they ran through the simulations with administrators. Dr. Shinn commented that this training had resulted in an extremely high level of reliability. A candidate was apt to get the same score from Team A, Team B, or Team C. Candidates were provided with an agenda for the assessment center so that they were not surprised when they attended. The assessment center was a day and a half program. Dr. Shinn said that for example there was a structured interview before three assessors. Candidates were asked hypothetical questions as if they were principals. This was to assess their ability to solve problems and their knowledge of MCPS policies and regulations.

Dr. Shinn explained that in an assessment center participants were asked to budget their time. While they were waiting for their interview, they were asked to write on two different pieces of information. Typically they were asked to write a memo to their staff and a letter to parents. The ability to put together sentences, the structure, the grammar, and the message was going to

be measured. They had to hand in the written task at the same time. The papers were assessed by a team who did not know whose paper they were reading, only the social security number. They judged the papers and made comments which were later shared with the candidates. There was another exercise where a group of five candidates took turns being a group leader and a group member. They were evaluated in both roles according to a set criteria.

Dr. Shinn said that supervision was one of the most important things done by principals. They had videotaped a teacher presenting a lesson. It was not the worst lesson or the best. The teacher demonstrated some strengths and some weaknesses. The assessors previewed the tape and watched it again with the assessees. The candidates were asked to make a written analysis of the lesson and to conduct a simulated conference as if he or she were talking to the teacher. They had people trained to behave as if they were that teacher. In addition, candidates made an oral presentation, an eight minute speech on a topic known to the candidate. At the end of that time, the assessors played the role of audience and asked questions. The candidates were rated on how they handled the stress of the situation and the quality of their answers.

After the completion of the assessment center, the scores of each individual assessor were tabulated on each individual. The scores were given to the appointments committee once again without names. The committee discussed the number of trainee positions they could support in a year and the number of needs anticipated. They then made a cutoff and selected people to participate in the elementary principal training program.

Mrs. Rohr stated that trainees were placed in schools with excellent trainers who had been preselected as outstanding principals. The year consisted of on-the-job experience. They also received training on as many as 43 topics relating to the principalship from the Department of Staff Development. It started with three intensive weeks in the summer and included supervision, management, community relations, etc. If people were successful in the trainee program, they then became principals and continued in a mandatory first year principal seminar series. There was a lot of mentoring, and they might also request outside consultant help. New principals met monthly in an evening session handled by a retired MCPS administrator. At this session there was a lot of problem solving and sharing. They might have in-house experts on various topics ranging from child custody issues to accountability. After their first year, they could attend the A&S institute for veteran administrators or other staff development courses.

It seemed to Mrs. Hobbs that a major key was how the assessees were evaluated. She requested a specific example of three people who might be assessors. Dr. Shinn replied that the associate superintendents served as chairs of each of the three teams. Other members might be principals, area, or central office staff. The

general rule was a person who had been a principal or who had supervised a principal. Mrs. Hobbs asked if they would have a teacher as one of the assessors, and Dr. Smith replied that they would not. They had always used administrators and supervisors. Mr. Ewing asked if a candidate was eliminated for at least that year if he or she failed the test of the assessment center. He asked if the assessment center was the sine qua non of the appointments process. Dr. Shinn replied that he could not agree because there were several steps which might keep someone from entering the training program. It might be that a person's references and evaluations did not support his or her attending the assessment center. The person might be thirteenth or fourteenth in the assessment center rankings when the cutoff was twelve. The person might be selected to be in the program but not finish it successfully.

Dr. Shoenberg said he would ask the question in another way. He asked whether a person had to have completed the assessment center in the top group to be selected as a principal trainee. Dr. Shinn replied that that was the case to be an elementary trainee. Mr. Ewing asked whether there was only one route to being a principal in MCPS aside from being hired from the outside, and Dr. Shinn replied that this was correct. Mr. Ewing pointed out that the route was through the assessment center, and Dr. Shinn agreed.

Dr. Cronin asked if there were principals who had not gone through the assessment center, and Dr. Smith replied that since they had established the center to his knowledge they had been pretty consistent about requiring the screening, the assessment center, and the successful completion of the training program. Mr. Ewing pointed out that a person could become a principal in MCPS if they were hired from the outside. Dr. Shinn explained that to be hired from the outside the person must be an experienced principal for at least two to three years. Dr. Cronin asked staff to go through the records and see whether there were principals who had not gone through the assessment center.

Mr. Ewing commented that one of the concerns that had been raised on a number of occasions in public was what proportion of those who applied for acceptance to the assessment center were minority and what number of those who completed the center successfully were minority. Dr. Shinn recalled that about 80 percent of those completing the program were majority and about 20 percent minority. Mr. Gary Levine, personnel specialist, reported that for the last four years about 75 percent had been white and about 25 percent had been minority. The success rate for the assessment center had been about 36 percent for minorities and about 41 percent for the non-minorities. The success rate was determined by looking at the number of candidates in the center and taking the number who were selected to be trainees. If there were five minority candidates and two were selected to be trainees, the success rate would be 40 percent.

Mr. Ewing commented that there were some in the community who saw the

assessment center as a kind of mystery which they could not see. He asked whether there was anything that could be done without violating the confidentiality of the process for the participants that would allow the community to understand more fully what went on in the assessment center. Dr. Smith replied that there wasn't anything in this discussion that could not be shared and discussed. The orientation sessions with the candidates were open sessions, and anyone could attend them. Dr. Vance pointed out that they had shared information on this topic with the MCCPTA Delegate Assembly. Dr. Shinn indicated that he would be glad to present information to the community. They had a brochure on the leadership training program, and there was no reason why they couldn't do a similar brochure on the assessment center. Dr. Smith reported that NASSP had a brochure on their assessment center which covered information similar to what went on in the MCPS model.

Ms. Serino noted that in the report it stated that data indicated that candidates who attend their third or fourth consecutive sessions usually ended up in the bottom half of the ratings for the assessment center. She asked the reason for this. Dr. Shinn replied that it was not unusual for people going through a second time to improve and get in the training program. It was more unusual for those going through a third time, and it might be that the first result of the assessment center was accurate. Mr. Levine added that it was very possible that the score someone received was an accurate assessment of their ability, and that ability did not necessarily improve by attending an assessment center.

Mrs. Praisner recalled that when they had talked about the principal selection process they had talked about the assessment center. They had talked about the assessment center as part of other issues as well. It might be useful for the Board to have a comparison of how the MCPS assessment center differed from the NASSP model now that the NASSP had such predominance within the state. In addition, there were several recommendations that came out of the commission on school-based administration that had gone to a committee on certification for principalships. It would be important for the Board to know the status of those recommendations and what the implications might be for the school system or for its personnel. Mrs. Praisner suggested that it would be useful for MCPS to explore and to participate in some NASSP assessment centers within the state to get individuals trained as assessors and to send people from MCPS into the NASSP model. Then they could do comparisons as to the results and the costs associated from the standpoint of the school system's expenditure of time and energy. They would be needing and would have a lot of people interested in the principalship. It seemed to her that the NASSP model had been validated as theirs had been, but she did not think they should be so rigid as to say that the Montgomery County model was the only one they would be looking at. Although Anne Arundel county was doing its own thing, it was doing its own thing with the NASSP model. Dr. Vance commented that the superintendent and the executive staff had had preliminary discussions on this, and Dr. Smith had received training. Mrs. Praisner recalled that Dr. Shaffner had been involved with the state



## TEACHERS

Dr. Shinn explained in the State of Maryland prior to the time they could hire an elementary teacher that teacher must demonstrate that they did hold standard or advanced professional certification or, when there was a demonstrated reason, provisional certification. For example, teachers from out of state might not have taken the National Teachers Examination and would get a year to do that. Also, they might not have specific course work required by Maryland, and they would get one or two years to complete that requirement.

Dr. Shinn reported that there were four ways to get professional certification. The first was to complete the teacher education program in the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education, an organization that actually examined programs, visited schools, and accredited their programs. If a person completed such a program after July 1, 1975, they would get certification. There was also the interstate contract agreement among several states and the District of Columbia. If a person attended a program approved by one of those states, Maryland would recognize the program. The third was to complete a program in any Maryland college or university approved by the Maryland State Department of Education. If a person was not covered by any of these, the fourth way was to do a credit count. This was done by the MCPS certification specialist who was trained and approved for this.

Dr. Shinn noted that the memorandum before the Board included a chart showing required courses at the University of Maryland. As Mrs. Praisner had pointed out, the optional mathematics course in the chart was part of the required program. In addition to completing an appropriate program, people must achieve a minimum set score on the National Teachers Examination to gain standard or advanced professional certification. Some universities including Maryland required minimum scores on the California Achievement Test to get into the program in the first place.

Dr. Shinn stated that there were always committees looking at certification. While they were hearing criticism from some quarters about too much professional education being required and not enough content, some states were adding professional education courses. On the other hand, a lot of states were going to more subject areas to the extent of including a fifth year in the program with increased hours in mathematics and science.

Dr. Shinn noted that in Montgomery County they had some additional requirements. Every teacher had to complete H.R. 17, which was by Board resolution. If a person had not completed a methods in reading course, they must take that. Montgomery County was one of the few school systems having a structured hiring procedure. They gave their own validated test in addition to the NTE. This test was one of four factors considered in the hiring process. The others were an analysis of the undergraduate transcript, the structured interview, and professional references.

Dr. Shinn said they believed Maryland certification was a good indicator of success in the classroom when they coupled it with all of the other things they considered. They had received comments from teachers that the new hires were among the best performers in the schools. He indicated that Staff Development did a lot for new teachers. They were fortunate in Montgomery County because people wanted to teach here. It was a good place to live, had a supportive community, and paid well. They were fortunate in that they had a large applicant pool and had been able to hire the best from that pool.

Dr. Shinn reported that they were going to start growing again which required more hiring. The people who came in during the last growth period in the 1960's were reaching retirement age. A few years ago when he joined MCPS, it was one of the few major school systems recruiting on college campuses. Now many of the larger school systems were out there. Up until the present the enrollment in elementary education had been down; however, it would take a few years for these new students to graduate.

Dr. Cronin asked about the effect of increasing MCPS requirements beyond Maryland certification on the applicant pool, the pool of minority applicants, and on hiring averages. Dr. Shinn replied that if they added requirements in mathematics, social studies, science, and English, it would not reduce the applicant pool because people tended to apply whether they were qualified or not. It would reduce their qualified applicant pool. They had done a sampling of six files, and none of them would qualify with 12 credits needed in all four areas. In regard to minority candidates, he felt they would have some difficulty in attracting them because they came from states with fewer numbers of content hours required.

Mr. Ewing commented that he had raised this issue because the evidence was fairly strong that MCPS and other systems were having some difficulty in elementary schools with science and math education. He was not confident that adding additional professional courses would solve the problem. He was not confident that adding more content courses would solve the problem either, but it seemed to him this had a better prospect of dealing with the situation. He thought that the pressure to add content courses would not come from the schools of education which had a vested interest in continuing to increase the numbers of professional courses.

Mr. Ewing thought that they needed to give serious consideration to insuring that elementary teachers really had good preparation in science and math. He worried that the big increase in professional education at Maryland and elsewhere would mean that teachers would not get that kind of preparation. If staff was saying they could not hire people if MCPS had higher requirements, this was further cause for alarm.

Dr. Shoenberg reported that he had been active in a group which was an association of the education schools of 100 major research universities. These universities were not the principal producers or

teachers; the state colleges and universities were. This group was interested in establishing five-year programs. The problem with this was that typically students spending five years in college ended up with a master's degree rather than a bachelor's degree. However, a five-year program could accommodate the increased subject matter hours and allow for the preparation of teachers who had professional knowledge about teaching as a research-based field that graduates of other kinds of professional programs had. He said that there was a strong national interest in a different kind of student teaching supervised by trained teachers and done in cooperation with the universities. The whole business of improving professional internship experiences was a major issue in the college of education and for the country nationally. The real concern was that students attending these five-year programs not be disadvantaged in terms of salary by spending five years getting a bachelor's degree as opposed to someone else's getting a master's after five years. For example, the special education program in Maryland was a five-year program but students ended up with 12 hours toward a 30-hour master's program. There was another program which took people with liberal arts degrees and give them a 15-month education program.

Mrs. Praisner said that while she was in Chicago participating in the forum on the National Professional Teachers Standards Board talking about experienced teachers and national board certification, there had been a great deal of discussion about beginning teaching. There were representatives of schools of education and universities attending, and they had talked about expanding practice teaching and content areas. The concern was that expansion in one area of specialization for a teacher would mean not having time to get much exposure to other areas of the curriculum. It was her impression that people were very focused in on the need to strengthen the content area. Dr. Cronin expressed his concern about the math and science skills of experienced teachers.

Mrs. DiFonzo asked if they had ever had to release any teachers who failed to pass the NTE. Dr. Shinn replied that they were currently working with seven teachers who had not passed the NTE. With the exception of two, they expected to work out assignments until the teachers passed the exam.

In regard to Benedict College, Mrs. DiFonzo said she would be interested in knowing if they had had to change their requirements for graduation or certification to fit the MCPS and Maryland requirements. Once they had the data, she would like to know how many Benedict students applied to MCPS, how many met requirements, and how many accepted a contract. At the meeting with Benedict College, the concern was expressed that students might not be inclined to come to Montgomery County because of the high cost of living.

Dr. Cronin asked when their recruiters were authorized to offer a contract. Dr. Shinn replied that they could start as early as December. The vast majority of contracts were offered in March through May. They had adopted a method whereby they gave candidates

a letter indicating this was an offer of employment contingent upon references, passing the test, etc. This took candidates off the market but did not bind MCPS unless they met qualifications. Dr. Cronin asked Mr. Ewing where he wanted to take this issue. Mr. Ewing replied that he did not want to sit and wait for the schools of education to make up their minds. He thought it was desirable to work in conjunction with other systems in the state, with the state, and with schools of education to move toward making teachers, both elementary and secondary, better prepared in content areas. He agreed to provide some proposals at a future meeting.

Dr. Shoenberg requested information on the number of brand new teachers they had hired, the institutions from which they received their certification, and the number of teachers having master's degrees as first year teachers. Dr. Shinn agreed to provide this information after this year's hiring period had ended. Dr. Cronin thanked staff for their presentation.

Re: BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS

1. Mrs. Praisner reported that the IAC had some new rules. She asked whether the school system had responded to those. If they had responded, she asked that the Board be provided with a copy of their response.
2. Mrs. Praisner asked if the school system had a major problem with the use of school grounds by trail bikes and whether they were doing anything about it.
3. Mrs. Praisner indicated that the state Board of Education had adopted some guidelines for pre-K, kindergarten, and first grade. She asked how MCPS compared to or how the guidelines were consistent or inconsistent with what MCPS had in place or planned to have in place.
4. Dr. Shoenberg said the Board had received some material from the Maryland State Department of Education about the declared competencies index. Mr. Goldensohn had written a memo on this subject, and he had similar questions. The declared competencies were not included. He had a concern about the way in which they were able to ascertain whether the competencies had been met, particularly the Maryland Citizenship Test. He would like to see something go from the Board about the nature of that examination. If the superintendent were considering sending something, the Board might wish to join in the letter.
5. Mr. Ewing recalled that he had raised the question of the pre-school autism program at the Board table a couple of times. He had met with Dr. Fountain and staff, and he was not satisfied that the resources were going to be available to ensure that the level of service given last year would be the same for the coming year.
6. Mr. Ewing said he had a couple of policy suggestions; however,

because of their length and complexity he would not raise them tonight under new business. One was a proposal that it be established as Board policy that experienced highly educated teachers be hired and that there be also a balancing with selected numbers of applicants new to teaching and that schools be staffed so that no elementary school would have an excessive number of new teachers. The second suggestion was that there be established as Board policy the proposition that principals were appointed to serve in a school for five years. In unusual circumstances this might be longer or shorter if proposed by the superintendent and approved by the Board.

7. Mr. Goldensohn recalled that Board policies came up for review every three years. He asked if he need a motion to review a specific policy. Dr. Cronin suggested that Mr. Goldensohn ask the superintendent about the status of that review.

RESOLUTION NO. 483-89 Re: EXECUTIVE SESSION - AUGUST 21, 1989

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Dr. Shoenberg seconded by Mrs. Praisner, 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 August 21, 1989, at 7:15 p.m. to discuss, consider, deliberate, and/or otherwise decide the employment, assignment, appointment, promotion, demotion, compensation, discipline, removal, or resignation of employees, appointees, or officials over whom it has jurisdiction, or any other personnel matter affecting one or more particular individuals and to comply with a specific constitutional, statutory or judicially imposed requirement that prevents public disclosures about a particular proceeding or matter as permitted under the State Government Article, Section 10-508; and that such meeting shall continue in executive closed session until the completion of business.

RESOLUTION NO. 484-89 Re: MINUTES OF JULY 11, 1989

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

RESOLVED, That the minutes of July 11, 1989, be approved.

Re: PROPOSED RESOLUTION TO CHANGE  
CONTRACTOR'S RETAINAGE SCHEDULE

This item was postponed to the evening meeting in September.

RESOLUTION NO. 485-89 Re: A SUBSTITUTE MOTION ON LANDSCAPING  
On recommendation of the superintendent and motion of Mrs. Hobbs  
seconded by Mr. Ewing, the following resolution was adopted  
unanimously#:

WHEREAS, On July 11, 1989, Mrs. Hobbs introduced a proposed  
resolution on coordination of landscaping projects; and

WHEREAS, The present policy on landscaping was adopted in 1961 and  
has not been reviewed recently; and

WHEREAS, The Board of Education supports the need for landscaping  
efforts at local schools; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education directs the superintendent to  
review the present policy on landscaping and recommend changes that  
would ensure a coordinated landscaping initiative for MCPS schools in  
cooperation with appropriate county agencies, community groups, and  
PTA representatives.

RESOLUTION NO. 486-89 Re: REVIEW OF INTERAGES ANNUAL REPORT

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

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education schedule a review of the annual  
report of Interages.

RESOLUTION NO. 487-89 Re: CEILING FANS

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

RESOLVED, That the superintendent be directed to develop an orderly  
process for the placement of ceiling fans in all MCPS classrooms  
which are not air conditioned or in those classrooms in which air  
conditioning is inadequate; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education continue working to win County  
Council funding in the CIP to include air conditioning in new,  
renovated, and modernized schools; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the implementation of the plan at the secondary  
schools would be contingent on the report that the Board received on  
how fans worked at Sherwood at Northwood.

Re: NEW BUSINESS

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

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education schedule a discussion on the  
subject of asking the Delegation to initiate an amendment which would  
require written parental permission for a student to drop out of a  
Maryland high school and that they encourage other Boards of

Education, the Maryland Association of Boards of Education, and the State Board of Education to join them in this effort.

Re: ITEMS OF INFORMATION

Board members received the following items of information:

1. Items in Process
2. Construction Progress Report
3. Minority-, Female-, or Disabled-owned Business (MFD) Procurement Report for the Fourth Quarter of FY 1989

Re: ADJOURNMENT

The president adjourned the meeting at 11:50 p.m. to an executive session.

-----  
PRESIDENT

-----  
SECRETARY

PLV:mlw