

APPROVED  
43-1993

Rockville, Maryland  
September 27, 1993

The Board of Education of Montgomery County met in regular session at the Carver Educational Services Center, Rockville, Maryland, on Monday, September 27, 1993, at 7:30 p.m.

ROLL CALL           Present:   Dr. Alan Cheung, President  
  in the Chair  
  Mr. Stephen Abrams  
  Ms. Carrie Baker  
  Mrs. Frances Brenneman  
  Mr. Blair G. Ewing  
  Mrs. Carol Fanconi  
  Mrs. Beatrice Gordon  
  Ms. Ana Sol Gutierrez

Absent:   None

Others Present:   Dr. Paul L. Vance, Superintendent  
  Mrs. Katheryn W. Gemberling, Deputy  
  Dr. H. Philip Rohr, Deputy  
  Mr. Thomas S. Fess, Parliamentarian

Re:   ANNOUNCEMENT

Dr. Cheung announced that the Board had been meeting in closed session on appeals.

RESOLUTION NO. 691-93       Re:   BOARD AGENDA - SEPTEMBER 27, 1993

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Ms. Gutierrez seconded by Mr. Abrams, the following resolution was adopted unanimously:

Resolved, That the Board of Education approve its agenda for September 27, 1993.

RESOLUTION NO. 692-93       Re:   COMMENDATION OF ACT-SO WINNERS

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

WHEREAS, The National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) has sponsored, on a national basis since 1976, a youth-development program called ACT-SO, an acronym for Afro-Academic, Cultural, Technological, and Scientific Olympics, that provides opportunities for African-American youth to compete and achieve in 24 academically-related fields; and

WHEREAS, The superintendent and the members of the Board of Education have supported ACT-SO activities by disseminating information on the program throughout the school system; and

WHEREAS, The Montgomery County Chapter of the NAACP and MCPS staff members are to be commended for their efforts in promoting and sponsoring ACT-SO activities; and

WHEREAS, The superintendent and members of the Board of Education were delighted to learn that there were two national gold medal winners from the Montgomery County Public Schools this year; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the superintendent of schools and the members of the Board of Education extend congratulations to the following national ACT-SO gold medal winners:

Andre Leonard, Seneca Valley High School -  
music composition

Jessica Pittman, Montgomery Blair High School -  
instrumental music - classical

Dr. Cheung left the meeting at this point to testify before the Delegation. Mrs. Fanconi assumed the chair.

Re: PUBLIC COMMENTS

The following individuals appeared before the Board:

1. Laura Steinberg, Blair Cluster
2. Jorge Ribas, Citizens for a Better Blair

RESOLUTION NO. 693-93      Re: RECOMMENDED FY 1994 SUPPLEMENTAL  
APPROPRIATION FOR THE PROVISION FOR  
FUTURE SUPPORTED PROJECTS

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Mr. Abrams seconded by Mrs. Brenneman, the following resolution was adopted unanimously by members present:

WHEREAS, The FY 1994 Operating Budget adopted by the Board of Education on June 10, 1993, included \$750,000 for the Provision for Future Supported Projects; and

WHEREAS, On September 14, 1993, the County Council took action to revise the conditions for the use of the Provision for Future Supported Projects in an effort to streamline procedures; and

WHEREAS, This action will increase the number of projects that are eligible for funding through the Provision for Future Supported Projects during FY 1994; and

WHEREAS, This action also will require that two projects, Javits Multiple Intelligences Model Program and the Extended Elementary

Education Program, previously received as supplemental appropriations be rescinded as supplemental appropriations and received through the Provision for Future Supported Projects; and

WHEREAS, This action also will require that two projects, Javits Multiple Intelligences Model Program and the Extended Elementary Education Program, previously received as supplemental appropriations be rescinded as supplemental appropriations and received through the Provision for Future Supported Projects; and

WHEREAS, The Board of Education will receive a number of additional projects that are eligible for funding through the Provision for Future supported Projects during FY 1994; and

WHEREAS, A supplemental appropriation to increase the Provision for Future Supported Projects will yield the most effective way to process additional eligible projects; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the superintendent of schools be authorized to receive and expend an FY 1994 supplemental appropriation of \$4,000,000 from the County Council to increase the Provision for Future Supported Projects, in the following categories:

	<u>Category</u>	<u>Amount</u>
1	Administration	\$ 18,103
2	Instructional Salaries	1,649,911
3	Other Instructional Costs	1,644,376
4	Special Education	187,684
10	Fixed Charges	332,969
41	Adult Education & Summer School Fund	167,230
	TOTAL	<u>\$4,000,000</u>

and be it further

Resolved, That the Board's previous request for supplemental appropriations for two projects, the Javits Multiple Intelligences Model Program and Extended Elementary Education Program, be rescinded as supplemental appropriations; and be it further

Resolved, That the superintendent of schools be authorized to receive and expend within the FY 1994 Provision for Future Supported Projects a grant award of \$218,045 for the Javits Multiple Intelligences Model Program, in the following categories:

	<u>Category</u>	<u>Positions*</u>	<u>Amount</u>
1	Administration		\$ 327
2	Instructional Salaries	2.5	138,560
3	Other Instructional Costs		37,473
10	Fixed Charges	---	<u>41,685</u>
	TOTAL	2.5	\$218,045

\* .5 Project coordinator (E)  
1.0 Teacher A-D (10 month) - trainer/curriculum developer  
.8 Instructional assistant (10 month)  
.2 Secretary

and be it further

Resolved, That the superintendent of schools be authorized to receive and expend within the FY 1994 Provision for Future Supported Projects a grant award of \$227,000 for the Extended Elementary Education Program, in the following categories:

	<u>Category</u>	<u>Positions*</u>	<u>Amount</u>
1	Administration		\$ 715
2	Instructional Salaries	6.1	137,377
3	Other Instructional Costs		33,114
10	Fixed Charges	---	<u>55,794</u>
	TOTAL for EEEP	6.1	<u>\$227,000</u>

\* 3.5 Teachers A-D (10 month)  
2.6 Instructional Assistants (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. 694-93      Re:    UTILIZATION OF FY 1994 FUTURE SUPPORTED PROJECT FUNDS FOR THE INTENSIVE ENGLISH LANGUAGE PROGRAM

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Mr. Abrams seconded by Mrs. Brenneman, the following resolution was adopted unanimously by members present:

Resolved, That the superintendent of schools be authorized to receive and expend within the FY 1994 Provision for Future Supported Projects a grant award of \$227,418 from the Maryland

September 27, 1993

Department of Human Resources, Community Services Administration, Office of Refugee Affairs, under the Refugee Act of 1980, for the Intensive English Language program, in the following categories:

	<u>Category</u>	<u>Amount</u>
1	Administration	\$ 230
2	Instructional Salaries	205,544
3	Other Instruction Costs	5,200
10	Fixed Charges	<u>16,444</u>
	TOTAL	<u>\$227,418</u>

and be it further

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

RESOLUTION NO. 695-93      Re:    UTILIZATION OF FY 1994 FUTURE  
SUPPORTED PROJECT FUNDS FOR THE  
HEAD START TRANSITION DEMONSTRATION  
PROGRAM

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Mr. Abrams seconded by Mrs. Brenneman, the following resolution was adopted unanimously by members present:

Resolved, That the superintendent of schools be authorized to receive and expend within the FY 1994 Provision for Future Supported Projects a grant award of \$622,000 from the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families, through the Montgomery County Department of Family Resources, Community Action Agency, for the Head Start Transition Demonstration program, in the following categories:

	<u>Category</u>	<u>Positions*</u>	<u>Amount</u>
2	Instruction Salaries	8.5	\$361,012
3	Other Instructional Costs		150,000
10	Fixed Charges	—	<u>110,988</u>
	TOTAL	8.5	\$622,000

1.0 Project Specialist, Grade E\*  
1.0 Social Worker, Grade E  
5.0 Parent/Community Coordinator (10 month), Grade 17  
1.0 Data Control Technician, Grade 13  
0.5 Fiscal Assistant I, Grade 13

and be it further

September 27, 1993

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

RESOLUTION NO. 696-93      Re:    UTILIZATION OF FY 1994 FUTURE  
SUPPORTED PROJECTED FUNDS FOR THE  
HOMELESS CHILDREN AND YOUTH PROGRAM

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Mr. Abrams seconded by Mrs. Brenneman, the following resolution was adopted unanimously by members present:

Resolved, That the superintendent of schools be authorized to receive and expend within the FY 1994 Provision for Future Supported Projects a grant award of \$72,195 from the Maryland State Department of Education (MSDE), under the federal Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Act, for the Homeless Children and Youth program, in the following categories:

	<u>Category</u>	<u>Amount</u>
2	Instructional Salaries	\$37,488
3	other Instructional Costs	19,002
7	Student Transportation	11,905
10	Fixed Charges	<u>3,800</u>
	TOTAL	<u>\$72,195</u>

and be it further

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

RESOLUTION NO. 697-93      Re:    UTILIZATION OF FY 1994 FUTURE  
SUPPORTED PROJECT FUNDS FOR THE ICB  
CHILD CARE SERVICES PROGRAM

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Mr. Abrams seconded by Mrs. Brenneman, the following resolution was adopted unanimously by members present:

Resolved, That the superintendent of schools be authorized to receive and expend within the FY 1994 Provision for Future Supported Projects, a grant award for \$40,000 from the Maryland State Department of Education (MDSE) , under the federal dependent care block grant program, for the Interagency Coordinating Board (ICB) Child Care Services program, in the following categories:

	<u>Category</u>	<u>Amount</u>
3	Other Instructional Costs	\$40,000

and be it further

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

RESOLUTION NO. 698-93      Re:    RECOMMENDATION TO SUBMIT AN FY 1994  
GRANT PROPOSAL FOR THE YOUTH  
SUICIDE PREVENTION SCHOOL PROGRAM

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Mr. Abrams seconded by Mrs. Brenneman, the following resolution was adopted unanimously by members present:

Resolved, That the superintendent of schools be authorized to submit an FY 1994 grant proposal for \$7,500 to the Maryland State Department of Education for a Youth Suicide Prevention School program; and be it further

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

RESOLUTION NO. 699-93      Re:    REDUCTION OF RETAINAGE - ASHBURTON  
ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Mrs. Brenneman seconded by Mrs. Gordon, the following resolution was adopted unanimously by members present:

WHEREAS, Bildon, Inc., general contractor for Ashburton Elementary School, has completed 99 percent of all specified requirements, and has requested that the 10 percent retainage, which is based on the completed work to date, be reduced 5 percent; and

WHEREAS, The project bonding company, Great American Insurance Co., has consented to this reduction; and

WHEREAS, The project architect, Duane, Cahill, Mullineaux & Mullineaux, P.A., recommends approval of the reduction; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the 10 percent retainage withheld from periodic payments to Bildon, Inc., general contractor for Ashburton Elementary School, be reduced to 5 percent, with the remaining 5 percent to become due and payable after completion of all remaining requirements and formal acceptance of the completed project.

September 27, 1993

RESOLUTION NO. 700-93      Re:    AWARD OF CONTRACT - DAMASCUS HIGH SCHOOL

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Mrs. Brenneman seconded by Mrs. Gordon, the following resolution was adopted unanimously by members present:

WHEREAS, The following bids were received on September 17, 1993, for the modernization and addition project at Damascus High School, with work to be completed by December 1, 1994:

	<u>Bidder</u>	<u>Amount</u>
1.	Kimmel & Kimmel, Inc.	\$6,019,800
2.	Hess Construction Co., Inc.	6,045,088
3.	Henley Construction Co., Inc.	6,067,500
4.	Northwood Contractors, Inc.	6,525,000

and

WHEREAS, Kimmel & Kimmel, Inc., has completed similar work successfully for Montgomery County Public Schools, including Ronald McNair Elementary School; and

WHEREAS, The low bid is below the architect's estimate of \$6,075,000; now therefore be it

Resolved, That a \$6,019,800 contract be awarded to Kimmel & Kimmel, Inc., for the modernization and addition project at Damascus High School, in accordance with plans and specifications prepared by Grimm and Parker, Architects.

Re:    INSPECTION OF PYLE MIDDLE SCHOOL

The inspection of Pyle Middle School was set for Tuesday, October 5. Mrs. Brenneman will attend at a time to be determined.

Re:    SEPTEMBER 1993 ENROLLMENTS

Dr. Vance noted that the current planning policy directed the superintendent to hold a work session in the fall to discuss the new school year enrollments and trends. Ms. Ann Briggs, director of the Department of Educational Facilities Planning and Capital Programming, introduced Mr. Bruce Crispell, demographic planner, and Ms. Deanna Newman, facilities planner.

Mr. Crispell reported that they had projected 113,570 students, and on the tenth day they had 114,258; however, they were predicting that the September 30 enrollment would end up about 200 over projection. Kindergarten would be about 400 below projection and first grade about 120 over the forecast. He



thought that last year the kindergarten numbers might have reflected the loss of full-day kindergarten but private school numbers had remained constant. He said the numbers for this year and last were probably the result of the all-day kindergarten situation and people leaving the county because of the economic situation. He explained they looked at kindergarten ratios compared to births, and in the growth years the kindergarten enrollment exceeded the births because of the tremendous in-migration of families. In recent years that ratio had been dropping, and last year it was .77. This year they were at .72, which was the lowest it had ever been. He indicated that other counties were experiencing the same drop, and Fairfax was also at .72.

Dr. Cheung rejoined the meeting at this point and assumed the chair.

Mr. Crispell noted that this year they had picked up 627 students in the first grade, and all numbers with the exception of the tenth grade were larger than they were last year. This added up to about 800 students for in-migration out of a total increase of 3,500 this year. At the elementary school level they had reached the peak in enrollment and some schools might have space within the next six years. At the middle school level, they were in the middle of the growth curve with about 5,000 more students expected in the next six years. The problem was at the high school with a projected increase of 7,900 students in the next six years.

Ms. Briggs indicated that at the November worksession they would have updated figures for the Board with hard copies of the data.

Re: CLUSTER ISSUES

Ms. Briggs commented that for the last several years, the clusters had sent their comments to the superintendent on the facilities issues they would like to see addressed. This year, staff had conducted a forum in the spring and had broadened staff involvement to include construction, maintenance, and technology. Discussion groups were held to talk about the issues which eventually resulted in their letters to the superintendent and Board.

Ms. Newman stated that this year the cluster comments sent a clear message. They wanted a technology plan that addressed the needs throughout the county. Several clusters commented about delays in needed modernizations because contemporary facilities were important to the quality of the program. She cited the history of the four-year technology plan which started in FY 1990 with \$2.5 million funded by the Council and decreased to \$159,000 in FY 1994. The community wanted upgraded computers and media centers, and the Council had indicated its willingness to look at

this again. MCPS had to have a technology plan for the FY 1995 capital budget.

Ms. Newman said that some clusters were frustrated by the modernization schedule and the fact that no schools had been added to that program. This would be the first year an elementary gymnasium would be in the CIP in a while. Another area of concern was elementary school additions because all additions were cut from the CIP except for Gaithersburg ES. They were planning another look at the elementary school capacity needs.

Ms. Newman indicated that the Board would have no boundary decisions for this fall's facilities process. Mrs. Brenneman suggested that staff might want to share their criteria on fans and outdoor lighting with the clusters. She had found this information to be useful. Ms. Briggs replied that this year's budget would emphasize lighting, but they had installed fans in all schools where asbestos was not a significant factor.

Ms. Gutierrez asked why the clusters had not put an emphasis on overcrowding as they had in previous years. Ms. Newman replied that there was still crowding at the elementary school level, but they were seeing a lot of that enrollment moving into the middle level and on to the high school level where they were now planning for new facilities.

Re: FEASIBILITY STUDY FOR THE  
MONTGOMERY BLAIR HIGH SCHOOL

Dr. Vance stated the County Council had adopted a \$24 million budget for the modernization of Blair with certain restrictions. An architectural study had been commissioned to determine whether these dollars would achieve the MCPS objectives and meet Council's actions. He reported that a school for 2,000 students was within the parameters set by Council, a school for 2,400 students would require \$1.3 million more and did meet the other restrictions, and a school for 2,800 students could not be constructed at Wayne Avenue without increasing the lot coverage or adding more height and approximately \$3 million more.

Ms. Briggs introduced Mr. Blanton and Mr. Garcia of the SHW Group, the architectural firm which prepared the feasibility study. She explained that the feasibility study was the development of a conceptual site and layout plan showing the associated construction costs. It showed one way in which the objectives of enrollment could be handled on the Wayne Avenue site and what they would cost. It was not the design for the modernization of Blair High School. It was not a finished architectural plan or an instructional delivery plan. These would be developed in consultation with the community and a

planning advisory group. The feasibility study was not intended as a review of layout or even elevations.

Mr. Blanton reported that his firm had gone to the school to meet with the principal, staff, and students to try to understand the facility and how it was operating today and to come to some understanding of what the needs were. After this review of the facility, they decided that they would like to try to create a main entrance to the building and a central corridor or main street through the building. Then they turned to the architectural solution, and the first step was to look at the existing buildings and decide what should be kept and what should be razed. Their charge was to look at the school from the point of view of the three capacities, the available funding, program issues, and security concerns.

Mr. Blanton explained that they were recommending the demolition of D, E, A, and B. Once they decided to keep the auditorium, C, and the gymnasium, they looked at the most efficient use of the site with the understanding they could not go out of the footprint. They selected a two-level compact design which would provide flexible space. They created a central corridor which would encourage the congregation of students in a positive way and improve the administration of the facility during changes in classes. He reiterated that the feasibility study was not a design. It showed how blocks of space could be used for the educational program. The actual design would be an on-site design with participation by members of the community. Mr. Blanton showed the Board some broad-brush examples of what the school might look like at the three capacity levels.

Ms. Gutierrez asked about the projected growth in the current Blair cluster without boundary changes. Ms. Briggs replied that they anticipated the ultimate enrollment at Blair High School would be 2800. The growth was coming from the cluster itself rather than the two special programs in the school. This year's enrollment was 2300, and they expected to be at 2800 by the year 2005.

Mrs. Fanconi stated that she was concerned about all the block space shown in the drawings. Now they had 2200 students on site with portable classrooms, but there were more open spaces in the existing buildings. In the sketches of the proposed building, there would be no open spaces and some rooms would not have windows. Mr. Blanton replied that a feasibility study was not a good example of his firm's expertise for bringing natural light into a building. They were going to create a top-of-the-line facility which brought in natural light and a good circulation pattern. Mr. Garcia added that the block design was a two-level solution. When they got to the actual plans for the school, they would work with the staff and community on what actual spaces would look like and what the lighting would be. The main focus

of their study was not to get into this detail but to determine the feasibility of providing a facility with various capacities on this site.

Mrs. Fanconi said she would be interested in seeing some pictures from some other school done this way. She asked if there were fire codes about having windows in spaces where children were. Mr. Blanton explained that the feasibility study assumed full compliance with all codes. Mrs. Fanconi asked about their taking down the facade, and Mr. Blanton explained that after meeting with students they would try to create a Blair identity which would take into consideration long-standing Blair traditions as well as a positive perception of an all new school.

Mr. Ewing commented that the feasibility study made it difficult to make decisions about size based on that study, and yet the Board was going to have to make that decision rather quickly. He hoped the Board would take the time to sort through the advantages and disadvantages of each of the options. He said his initial reaction would be to have a school housing 2800 students to keep the community together. This had some drawbacks including the likelihood that a large school would be less attractive. He was not clear about what happened to classroom spaces when one put 2400 or 2800 students there. It bothered him that they did not have a clearer idea of that.

Mr. Ewing said they needed to know whether there were options other than the ones they saw in front of them including greater height, more depth, further use of the basement, retaining D building, etc. Some schools used the top of buildings for athletic courts. He was concerned about the consequences of building a school of 2000 or 2400, not only to the Blair community, but to the surrounding communities. They would have to sort out their legal obligations as well as obligations to the community. If they constructed a school and did not pay attention to whether or not they were in fact engaging in de facto segregation, they could create a very serious problem. The courts had not backed away from that. They might face the situation of busing out minority children and busing in majority children. These children would probably travel a long distance, in both cases. In the past the Board had rejected long distance busing for elementary children. The consequences of this decision fell not only on the high school and the Blair community but also on elementary school children in and outside the Blair community. He was concerned that the Board get good legal advice. They had to make it clear to adjacent clusters that the consequences of building anything else than 2800 would be substantial for those adjacent clusters. The Eastern Area Boundary Committee could not proceed until the Board had made this decision. Because of the time frames, the Board might find itself forced to make a decision fairly quickly and on the basis of not as much information as it would prefer to have.

Mr. Ewing pointed out that all of these options except for the smallest cost more than the Council had appropriated. He did not know whether the forecasts of costs were in 1993 dollars, but if they delayed the costs would escalate. He thought that the Council expected a school of 2400. He would argue that the best option was the larger school from the point of view of community, legal complexities, and impact on elementary children. Nevertheless, the size of the building on that site was of concern. He wondered about problems with Park and Planning or environmental issues. He asked what they knew about the legal implications of building a school of less than 2800. He asked about other options that were explored, put aside, and why. He also wondered about what the interior of the school would look like.

Dr. Vance commented that attorneys Maree Sneed and Judy Bresler were present and had participated in executive staff discussions of the feasibility study. He said the Board now knew the serious implications of the decision made last spring about Blair. Without exception, the executive staff had considered the issues raised by the Board this evening.

Ms. Sneed stated that she and Ms. Bresler had begun to gather information on where the enrollment was coming in this year. Last week they learned that one of the schools in the upper part of the county was under projection and Blair was over projection. Those factors would all play into this, and they did not have those numbers. She was interested in comparing school by school capacity with enrollment. Last week they looked at options that had originally been explored two years ago.

Mr. Abrams asked about the implications of this in a unitary school system. Ms. Sneed replied that they would be judged by whether or not they were intentionally discriminating. If MCPS were sued, the courts would look at whether MCPS followed its own policies. A unitary school district also had to be careful when it took race into account because of some of the recent Supreme Court decisions. For this reason, they had worked very carefully on the quality integrated education policy. They were not only looking at race and ethnicity now in MCPS, but they were looking at SES. Mr. Abrams asked if they could equalize between schools in a unitary system. Ms. Sneed agreed, and Mr. Abrams felt that they had a whole range of options they could examine. Ms. Sneed said that when they were thinking about drawing attendance boundaries, they had to look whether it improved or did not improve racial balance. Now MCPS looked at how it affected SES/educational load.

Mr. Ewing commented that if they drew boundaries in a way that reduced the size of the school and thereby were forced to exclude X-number of students in that attendance area, they would exclude elementary students who would eventually attend the high school.

If they moved minority students out, they could not easily make a determination that those students were the only students to move. They had to have some way of balancing minority and white students so that the burden did not fall on one group. Ms. Sneed agreed and said it was possible there would be a case because of the burden factor. If they moved a minority neighborhood, they would have to look at majority neighborhoods. This was difficult because in Montgomery County they tended not to change service areas at the elementary level very much. They had tended to keep elementary attendance areas intact within the clusters.

Ms. Gutierrez said there would need to be a lot more analyses, and she wondered about the timeline on this. For example, would it take two weeks or two months? Ms. Briggs replied that the Board would receive recommendations from the superintendent early in February. Those recommendations would be a full package including results from the boundary advisory committee, cost evaluations, housing information, and an analysis from legal counsel. The Board would take action in time to amend the capital budget by March 15.

Ms. Gutierrez asked whether the decision on which size to use was not essential at this point in time. Would they continue doing the eastern boundary work with three possible options? Ms. Briggs explained that their thinking based on the feasibility study was that they would not be proceeding actively with the 2800 capacity building. The options summarized on page 35 of the report showed they had no option for a 2800 capacity school did not exceed both of the restrictions of the Council. The fourth option looked at the maximum enrollment that could be housed at Wayne Avenue within the budget. The only way to house 2400 within the budget was to modernize all the existing buildings and do an addition of 18 classrooms. They felt they were moving in that 2000 to 2400 capacity range as being the only solution now within the guidelines.

Ms. Gutierrez said that this was her concern. They were looking at those two parameters as their primary guidance on coming up with a solution when they had a series of other factors they had consider as a Board. Ms. Briggs explained that anything that would come forward to the Board would have to go through the filter of legal counsel. For example, it might be that 2400 might not meet the qualifications, and the only way to meet it would be 2800.

Mrs. Fanconi thought that the superintendent needed to give the Board a recommendation on the timing issues and when the Board had to make the decision on size. She asked when they were going to let the Council know that in the eastern area they were probably going to have some problems with money. She did not see this as just a Blair issue. If they selected 2000 as the size, they would have to have housing in other parts of the eastern

area for those students. They now knew it would cost over \$1 million to house the students, and the Council had not figured that in. At some point they needed to alert the Council that, depending on the option, MCPS still had a large number of students that needed housing and was going to need some amount of dollars for some configuration of that in the eastern area.

Mrs. Fanconi recalled that she had joined the Board in December, 1990, and the first decision they dealt with was the Blair issue. She thought that the Board under two different superintendents had made the decision that programmatically it is extremely important to keep this cluster together. It is clear that, given the constraints, they were really at a point where they were having to look at some other options. She could see some advantages in going ahead in working out the boundary issues. She thought that people would not understand what the Board had understood since 1990 what the issues were in terms of affecting other areas until they actually see it. She asked for the superintendent's recommendation on these issues.

Dr. Rohr said that Mrs. Fanconi had outlined the concerns that had already been expressed to the Council at the time the Board's CIP was submitted. The Board approved a 2800-student school on the Kay tract, and the Board was now seeing the ramifications of the Council's not approving that. The Council did give the Board additional funds beyond the \$24 million for Blair. He noted that there were very few appropriations for all of the eastern area. They had a \$1 million appropriation for Blair, and \$24 million programmed in the six-year CIP. The Council also programmed \$11 million for middle and high school additions to be determined within the six-year period and \$12.5 million for middle and high school additions to be determined beyond the six-year CIP which went through FY 1999. At the time MCPS had identified concerns about the total amount of money available for secondary school capacity in these nine clusters and whether there were sufficient funds for these through the year 2005. Since 1989, Boards had considered this and voted to keep Blair at 2800. Now they had to look at how they could move 400 youngsters and where they could move them to. He believed these were the most complex facility issues and program issues for any Board to deal with. In recognition of the multiple moves and additions, the boundary advisory committee was established. Their first meeting was scheduled next week. The committee would be working in the fall and winter to make recommendations to the superintendent.

Mrs. Fanconi stated that this was not her question. She asked whether they had to decide as a Board whether it was 2000 or 2400 and when they had to make that decision so the boundary committee could move forward. Dr. Rohr explained that the staff was working under the assumption that the maximum would be 2400 given the program over the six years they had received from the Council. The boundary committee should consider how to make

boundary changes to move at least 400 youngsters out of Blair, and the school could be less than 2400. Mrs. Fanconi pointed out that the only option that fit within the parameters was 2000. Dr. Rohr indicated that there was a 2400 capacity solution that was possible but not within all parameters.

Dr. Rohr said they would transmit this to the Council and the county executive tomorrow. It has been shared with their staff. He thought that people had to get into the specifics of what would be involved in moving youngsters and the potential ripple effect. This would be a two-year planning project with the construction of the school to begin in the summer of 1995 over a two-year period. The potential implications for boundary changes could be done in the next few months.

Mrs. Brenneman said that when the eastern area committee was formed she asked how this could be separated from the Blair issue. The eastern area boundary committee would be meeting next week and would be committing huge amounts of time to this. The staff might have decided it would be 2400, but that was not necessarily where the Board might come out. The Board might say 2800 or 2000, and in February they might have to tell the boundary committee to go back to the drawing board because they had another 400 or 800 students to deal with. She did not understand how they could put people through a lot of time when the Board had not made decisions. The Board had to decide on the size of Blair HS, and after that decision the eastern area would have an idea of what they were dealing with. It seemed to her the process was backwards, and she wondered what the charge would be to the eastern area group next week.

Dr. Vance replied that this conversation was reminiscent of conversations of staff. They had a number of processes going at the same time. One process related to the selection of the eastern area boundary study group, and at the same time they were waiting for the development of the feasibility study. After staff received the study, they discussed a number of possibilities. He had decided they would wait until they had this discussion this evening to get the sense of the Board. Mrs. Brenneman's point of view was expressed during staff sessions. The eastern area group did not have to meet next week. If the Board wanted to hold off on that meeting and deliver a commission to that group, it would be possible to wait until the Board went on record as to the size it favored. They would have to make sure Council was informed of the Board's decision to fit into whatever process they had to determine whether additional funding would be available. He explained that they had considered all the options, and they wanted to keep both processes in place at least until the conclusion of the discussion this evening.

Mrs. Gordon stated that she was going to ask the same questions that Mrs. Brenneman asked. She was concerned that they had the



eastern area group and maybe they did not have to meet next week, but one of the initial concerns when they were established over a year and a half ago was that they were given a task and a very short timeframe to do it. As they talked through this, they heard about all the legal implications. They were looking at a shorter timeframe because the Board had not made a decision and had not been asked to make a decision about the size. The staff was going with 2400, but whether 800 or 400 students were moved was a significant difference. This would have an impact on all of the other nine schools in the northeast study group. She sympathized where staff was coming from but felt it did not answer the question about the direction that would be given to the task force whenever it met. She asked whether Blair was going to be a part of that. The Board had to make that determination of whether or not there were going to be boundary changes with Blair. She did not want to ask community people to give of their time to advise the system, and then they turned around and did something else. She felt that at some point the Board had to make a decision and say what that number was before communities went about the task of drawing boundaries.

Dr. Vance commented that the options that staff would work on would be appropriate from that decision. Those options would address directly the changes in boundaries and attendance areas.

Mr. Abrams said he had been receiving calls about rumors in the community. He got the sense as they were going through this process that they were fiddling here on different ways to convince the Council to give the Board more money for a solution to Blair at the same time the Council was going to be telling the Board there was less money for construction in the county. Since he had been on the Board, he had heard a lot of arguments on equity in facilities. His own child had attended school in the Blair cluster, and the equity concerns were real. Yet all he sensed they seemed to be doing was trying to play tennis with the Council and lobbing the ball back in their court to see if the ante could be raised.

Mr. Abrams stated that in reviewing the options that came forward, there might be a technical non-compliance with the fourth option in terms of the use of an existing footprint as opposed to a smaller footprint. He asked the architects about the fourth option which would accommodate 2400 students with the existing facility modernized and an 18-room addition and whether it would be comparable to other facilities being provided elsewhere in Montgomery County. Mr. Garcia replied that it would.

It seemed to Mr. Ewing that the decision about the size of the facility was a decision for the Board to make. If they used the option which the architect preferred, demolition of the central part of the facility, the option cost more than \$24 million.

Unless they went with the least preferred option, they would have to ask for more money. He did not think this would be a surprise to the Council. He thought it was easier to argue that a larger facility on the Blair site was likely to be more economical than housing the additional students elsewhere. He would guess this would be more than \$3 million so that when they finished they would end up with a larger expense. He believed that 2800 was a real option that the Board should consider, and the Board should say to the Council that it was more economical and ask them to program the additional money. The Council might not agree with that, but he thought the Board had an obligation to pursue that as an option. This was a Board decision that needed to be made on the basis of as much good information as they could have and as quickly as they could have it. He did not think they should put the eastern area group to work on any issues that were impacted by this decision.

Mrs. Fanconi did not think they could delay. She had sent a request in to ask for the superintendent's recommendation, and she still did not have a response. They had students in overcrowded facilities, and more students were coming in. They had to have a place to house these students, and they had to begin now. She asked the superintendent whether he was asking for a Board decision this evening on the size and, if not, when would he ask for a Board decision. She thought it was important for the Council to know as much as the Board knew and to be kept informed of where the Board was. She knew the Council would be interested in the work of the boundary committee. She was still unclear as to when the Board would be asked to make a decision.

Dr. Vance replied that he would not disagree with Mrs. Fanconi. The complexities of the decision referring to the size of Blair not only involved cost, site, and location, but there was also the legal issue. Staff was not in a position to give the Board its best educational recommendation. He thought he had made that clear to the Board. Mrs. Fanconi asked whether his recommendation was to go forward with all three sizes. Dr. Vance said that given the discussion this evening, he would get back to the Board. With the Board officers, he would establish a special evening meeting, if they had to, for them to have all of this information with the architects, the planners, and the attorneys. They would look at each of the options and all of the implications. Based on that, he would give the Board the superintendent's recommendation.

It seemed to Dr. Cheung that they had had these discussions before. They had considered over a dozen options for the Blair site, and these had been analyzed for their implications at the time. Then they came up with the best solution which was proposed to the Council. The Council acted based on their own consideration and sent the ball back to the Board. They had discussed size and site, and he was also concerned about

programs. He hoped that the eastern area would take program into consideration, and that the Board could discuss the consortium. This was a very important decision, and he agreed that they needed to schedule a special meeting and proceed with next steps. Dr. Vance asked for the sense of the Board on how the superintendent should proceed. Dr. Cheung stated that the superintendent and Board officers would schedule a meeting as soon as possible to address issues raised by Board members. The superintendent would make a recommendation, and then the Board would act on it. The boundary committee would not start its work.

RESOLUTION NO. 701-93      Re:    POSTPONEMENT OF FINAL ACTION ON  
LONG-RANGE FACILITIES POLICY

On motion of Ms. Baker seconded by Mr. Abrams, the following resolution was adopted with Mr. Abrams, Ms. Baker, Ms. Brenneman, Dr. Cheung, Mr. Ewing, Mrs. Fanconi, and Mrs. Gordon voting in the affirmative; Ms. Gutierrez voting in the negative:

Resolved, That the Board of Education postpone final action on the long-range facilities policy.

Re:    BOARD/SUPERINTENDENT COMMENTS

1. Mr. Ewing stated that there had been a number of questions about the status of the proposal for the development of comprehensive health clinics in schools. The Board had a memo on this subject, and he thought it would be useful for the superintendent to describe this. Dr. Vance said he would take a few minutes to review the status of the state's application for school-based health centers. The Robert Wood Johnson Foundation had a grant program for state and local partnerships to establish school-based health centers. The Montgomery County Health Department submitted an application package to the Maryland Office of Children, Youth, and Families on August 13, 1993. The state's application was submitted on September 9, 1993. He had been told that Montgomery County's application was not incorporated in the state's proposal. In January the foundation would select the 12 states to receive the planning grants. These states would have eight months to prepare their applications for operating grants. Ten of the 12 applications would be approved. If Maryland were one of the 12 states selected, the Office of Children, Youth, and Families would have to select two jurisdictions from the seven submitting applications to the state. He assumed that if Maryland were selected there would be a formal process to review the applications and select the jurisdictions. He had provided the Board with an attachment which described the services a health center would provide, and this could be made available to the public. Mrs. Fanconi said it was important to clarify for people that these services offered by the Health Department at a school site for families and

children. Mr. Ewing agreed that it should be made clear to the public that the application was submitted by the Montgomery County Health Department and not by the Board of Education.

2. Mr. Ewing commented that the Board had an upcoming discussion on October 12 on an issue related to class rank. The Board had received an information paper, and he was confused by it. He said the paper was inconsistent with what he thought was the case with respect to the University of Maryland and of other universities and colleges. Mrs. Gemberling replied that they had followed up with the University of Maryland. They went directly to the director of admissions who assured them that MCPS students would not be penalized about class rank. The University was prepared to accept them in terms of admissions. Once the admission was complete, MCPS had a process with the University for students who were applying for scholarships or honors programs so that the confidential class rank would be provided to the University. Mr. Abrams said he had reread the initial July memo. With regard to accessing confidential class rank, there was a form identified that students were to fill out. A second part of the form went to the university. What wasn't clear from that instruction was whether the student could indicate to his or her home school of the need for the confidential class rank to be submitted to that college. It was his interpretation that the student could do that, and this was all that was necessary to trigger the process. This seemed to deviate from what Mr. Gorman's understanding was in terms of waiting for the college to come back and make the request for the confidential class rank. Dr. Vance suggested that Mrs. Gemberling poll each member of the Board to see what unanswered questions they had so these could be incorporated into the October presentation. Mrs. Gordon said she would like to know what each high school had done in terms of notifying students and parents about what the process was.

3. Mrs. Fanconi congratulated Mrs. Gordon for being elected to serve on the executive committee of the Maryland Association of Boards of Education.

4. Dr. Cheung reported that he had gone to the County Council building to testify before the Montgomery County Delegation. This was the first time the Delegation had received input from the community concerning funding and economic issues about education. The Board had received copies of his testimony, but he had added a few comments. This afternoon he had watched a Senate debate on the appropriation for labor, human resources, and education. A Republican senator from Vermont had introduced an amendment supported by a Democratic senator from Connecticut. The amendment was that 10 percent of the federal budget should support education because the cold war had ended. He recognized that the amendment would not pass, but the important issue was the change in attitude and commitment to education.

5. Ms. Baker stated that during the MABE conference the student Board members throughout the state formed a new organization, Student Member on the Board of Education Organization. They would be meeting once a month.

RESOLUTION NO. 702-93 Re: CLOSED MEETING - OCTOBER 12, 1993

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Mrs. Fanconi seconded by Ms. Gutierrez, the following resolution was adopted unanimously:

WHEREAS, The Board of Education of Montgomery County is authorized by the Education Article of the Annotated Code of Maryland and Title 10 of the State Government Article to conduct certain meetings or portions of its meetings in closed session; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Board of Education of Montgomery County hereby conduct a portion of its meeting on October 12, 1993, at 9 a.m. and at noon to discuss personnel matters, matters protected from public disclosure by law, and other issues including consultation with counsel to obtain legal advice; and be it further

Resolved, That these meetings be conducted in Room 120 of the Carver Educational Services Center, Rockville, Maryland, as permitted under Section 4-106, Education Article of the Annotated Code of Maryland and State Government Article 10-501; and be it further

Resolved, That such meetings shall continue in closed session until the completion of business.

Re: REPORT ON CLOSED SESSIONS -  
SEPTEMBER 12, 14, AND 20, 1993

On August 30, 1993, by the unanimous vote of members present, the Board of Education voted to conduct a closed session on September 12, 1993, as permitted under Section 4-106, Education Article of the Annotated Code of Maryland and State Government Article 10-501.

The Montgomery County Board of Education met in closed session on Sunday, September 12, 1993, from 8:30 a.m. to 7:05 p.m. The meeting took place in the Hilton Hotel, Gaithersburg, Maryland.

The Board met to discuss upcoming contract negotiations involving MCEA.

In attendance at the closed session were Stephen Abrams, Melissa Bahr, Carrie Baker, Larry Bowers, Fran Brenneman, Carole Burger, Alan Cheung, Pat Clancy, Blair Ewing, Carol Fanconi, Thomas Fess, Phinnize Fisher, Hiawatha Fountain, Katheryn Gemberling,

Wes Girling, Bea Gordon, Ana Sol Gutierrez, Marie Heck, Elfreda Massie, Brian Porter, Thomas Reinert, Philip Rohr, Paul Vance, Joseph Villani, Bud Westall, and Mary Lou Wood.

On August 30, 1993, by the unanimous vote of members present, the Board of Education voted to conduct a closed session on September 14, 1993, as permitted under Section 4-106, Education Article of the Annotated Code of Maryland and State Government Article 10-501.

The Montgomery County Board of Education met in closed session on Tuesday, September 14, 1993, from 9 a.m. to 10:15 a.m, from 1 p.m. to 2:35 p.m., and from 6:30 p.m. to 6:40 p.m. The meetings took place in room 120 of the Carver Educational Services Center, Rockville, Maryland.

The Board met to discuss the monthly personnel report, the teacher application process, the principalship of Einstein High School, and the position of chief financial officer. The Board also discussed the Sligo Middle School arbitration. The Board met with its attorney to discuss the special education appeals process. The Board reviewed decisions and orders in transfer and other appeals and adjudicated other appeals. Actions taken in closed session were confirmed in open session.

In attendance at the closed session were Stephen Abrams, Melissa Bahr, Carrie Baker, Fran Brenneman, Alan Cheung, Blair Ewing, Carol Fanconi, Thomas Fess, Phinnize Fisher, Hiawatha Fountain, Katheryn Gemberling, Bea Gordon, Zvi Greismann, Ana Sol Gutierrez, Dick Hawes, Marie Heck, Jeff Krew, Sandra Lebowitz, Elfreda Massie, Brian Porter, Phil Rohr, Paul Vance, Joseph Villani, William Wilder, and Mary Lou Wood.

On September 14, 1993, by the unanimous vote of members present, the Board of Education voted to conduct a closed session on September 21, 1993, (later amended to September 20) as permitted under Section 4-106, Education Article of the Annotated Code of Maryland and State Government Article 10-501.

The Montgomery County Board of Education met in closed session on Monday, September 20, 1993, from 8:15 p.m. to 10:35 p.m. The meeting took place in Room 120, Carver Educational Services Center, Rockville, Maryland.

The Board met to discuss the superintendent's objectives for 1993-94 and to review a decision and order.

In attendance at the closed session were Stephen Abrams, Melissa Bahr, Carrie Baker, Fran Brenneman, Alan Cheung, Blair Ewing, Carol Fanconi, Thomas Fess, Bea Gordon, Ana Sol Gutierrez, Paul Vance, and Mary Lou Wood.

RESOLUTION NO. 703-93      Re:    COMPENSATION FOR SPECIAL EDUCATION  
HEARING OFFICERS

On motion of Mr. Abrams seconded by Mrs. Fanconi, the following resolution was adopted unanimously:

WHEREAS, The Board of Education is required by law to have special education hearing officers; and

WHEREAS, The State of Maryland has recently increased its compensation to hearing officers; and

WHEREAS, Montgomery County has not increased its compensation of hearing officers since 1989 and in order to maintain comparability with the state needs to increase its compensation package; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the compensation for special education hearing officers be as follows:

REGULAR HEARING FEE

\$600 per 14 hours including preparation, conduct of hearing, review of briefs, preparation and delivery of decision.

COMPENSATION BEYOND 14 HOURS

\$50 per hour up to five hours

COMPENSATION FOR TELECONFERENCES

\$50 per hour up to one hour per case

CANCELLATION FEE

A \$300 cancellation fee will be paid if the cancellation occurs 72 hours or less prior to the hearing

The ombudsman/staff assistant is authorized to exercise his discretion as to payment of other billable expense items.

Re:    A MOTION BY MRS. FANCONI ON SPECIAL  
EDUCATION STUDENT SUSPENSIONS  
(FAILED)

The following motion by Mrs. Fanconi failed of adoption with Dr. Cheung, Mr. Ewing, Mrs. Fanconi, and Ms. Gutierrez voting in the affirmative; Mr. Abrams, Ms. Baker, Mrs. Brenneman, and Mrs. Gordon voting in the negative:

WHEREAS, The agenda item on student suspensions did not include information specifically on special education students; and

WHEREAS, The special education intensity 4 and 5 was one of the factors that increased the risk for suspensions and that special schools have a very high rate of suspensions; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Board of Education schedule a discussion of the analysis and interventions for special education students that are suspended both in regular education and special education schools.

RESOLUTION NO. 704-93 Re: COMMUNITY LEADERSHIP AWARD PROGRAM

On motion of Mrs. Brenneman seconded by Mr. Abrams, the following resolution was adopted unanimously:

Resolved, That the Board of Education schedule a discussion of the item the superintendent presented on a Board of Education community leadership award program.

RESOLUTION NO. 705-93 Re: ANNUAL REPORT ON SITE-BASED MANAGEMENT

On motion of Mrs. Brenneman seconded by Ms. Gutierrez, the following resolution was adopted unanimously:

Resolved, That the Board of Education schedule a discussion of the annual report on site-based management including a discussion of how well the present schools were doing, the training program, how the training program was received, and any policy changes that might have to be made if an organization chose not to participate.

RESOLUTION NO. 706-93 Re: POLICY BLC - SPECIAL EDUCATION DUE PROCESS

On motion of Ms. Gutierrez seconded by Mr. Abrams, the following resolution was adopted with Mr. Abrams, Ms. Baker, Mrs. Brenneman, Dr. Cheung, Mr. Ewing, and Ms. Gutierrez voting in the affirmative; Mrs. Gordon voting in the negative; Mrs. Fanconi abstaining:

Resolved, That the Board of Education request the superintendent and staff to review Policy BLC with regard to possible changes that would increase the use of mediation to resolve differences between parents and MCPS and make recommendations to the Board for necessary changes.

RESOLUTION NO. 707-93 Re: NATIONAL, STATE, AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT COURSE

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



Resolved, That the Board of Education schedule time to review the content of the first semester of the national, state, and local government course with a view to the possibility of changing it by (a) increasing local and state government content, (b) including data from survey research, public opinion polls, and mechanisms that produce them, and (c) including additional content on the role of interest groups and lobbyists in state and local government.

Re: A MOTION BY MR. ABRAMS ON STUDENT TRANSFERS (FAILED)

The following motion by Mr. Abrams failed of adoption with Mr. Abrams, Ms. Baker, and Dr. Cheung voting in the affirmative; Mrs. Brenneman, Mr. Ewing, Mrs. Fanconi, Mrs. Gordon, and Ms. Gutierrez voting in the negative:

Resolved, That the Board of Education schedule time to discuss giving preference to MCPS personnel in student transfer decisions.

RESOLUTION NO. 708-93 Re: DECISION AND ORDER - BOE APPEAL NO. T-1993-17

On motion of Mrs. Brenneman seconded by Mrs. Fanconi, the following resolution was adopted with Ms. Baker, Mrs. Brenneman, Dr. Cheung, Mrs. Fanconi, and Mrs. Gordon voting in the affirmative; Mr. Abrams, Mr. Ewing, and Ms. Gutierrez voting in the negative:

Resolved, That the Board of Education adopt its Decision and Order in BOE Appeal No. T-1993-17, a transfer matter.

RESOLUTION NO. 709-93 Re: DECISION AND ORDER - BOE APPEAL NO. T-1993-20

On motion of Mrs. Brenneman seconded by Mrs. Gordon, the following resolution was adopted with Ms. Baker, Mrs. Brenneman, Dr. Cheung, Mr. Ewing, Mrs. Fanconi, Mrs. Gordon, and Ms. Gutierrez voting in the affirmative; Mr. Abrams voting in the negative:

Resolved, That the Board of Education adopt its Decision and Order in BOE Appeal No. T-1993-20, a transfer matter.

RESOLUTION NO. 710-93 Re: DECISION AND ORDER - BOE APPEAL NO. T-1993-21

On motion of Mrs. Brenneman seconded by Ms. Gutierrez, the following resolution was adopted with Ms. Baker, Mrs. Brenneman, Mr. Ewing, Mrs. Fanconi, and Mrs. Gordon voting in the

affirmative; Mr. Abrams, Dr. Cheung, and Ms. Gutierrez voting in the negative:

Resolved, That the Board of Education adopt its Decision and Order in BOE Appeal No. T-1993-21, a transfer matter.

RESOLUTION NO. 711-93      Re:    DECISION AND ORDER - BOE APPEAL NO. 1993-23

On motion of Mrs. Brenneman seconded by Mrs. Fanconi, the following resolution was adopted with Ms. Baker, Mrs. Brenneman, Dr. Cheung, Mr. Ewing, Mrs. Fanconi, and Mrs. Gordon voting in the affirmative; Mr. Abrams and Ms. Gutierrez voting in the negative:

Resolved, That the Board of Education adopt its Decision and Order in BOE Appeal No. 1993-23.

RESOLUTION NO. 712-93      Re:    DECISION AND ORDER - BOE APPEAL NO. T-1993-23

On motion of Mr. Abrams seconded by Ms. Gutierrez, the following resolution was adopted with Mr. Abrams, Ms. Baker, Dr. Cheung, Mr. Ewing, and Ms. Gutierrez voting in the affirmative; Mrs. Brenneman, Mrs. Fanconi, and Mrs. Gordon voting in the negative:

Resolved, That the Board of Education adopt its Decision and Order in BOE Appeal No. T-1993-12, a transfer matter.

Re:    NEW BUSINESS

Board members introduced the following items of new business:

1.    Mrs. Brenneman moved and Mr. Abrams seconded the following:

Resolved, That the Board of Education discuss the community service graduation requirement and how it is being implemented.

2.    Mr. Abrams moved and Mrs. Fanconi seconded the following:

Resolved, That the Board of Education ask the legislature to repeal Annotated Code of Maryland Section 5-110 (c) (3) which permitted Montgomery County to reject products grown, mined, or manufactured in the Republic of South Africa.

RESOLUTION NO. 713-93      Re:    COMMENDATION OF MARJORIE MARRA

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

WHEREAS, Marjorie Marra, a playground aide at Luxmanor Elementary School, donated \$10,000 to the school to purchase playground equipment; and

WHEREAS, She has dedicated the new equipment to her husband, her step daughter, and her step daughter's mother, all of whom have died; and

WHEREAS, This equipment will be of enormous benefit to the students of the school; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Board of Education commend Marjorie Marra for her extraordinary and generous gift to Luxmanor Elementary School; and be it further

Resolved, That the Board of Education send Marjorie Marra a copy of this resolution.

Re: ITEMS OF INFORMATION

Board members received the following items of information:

1. Annual Report on Middle School Policy
2. Report on Class Rank Notification

RESOLUTION NO. 714-93 Re: ADJOURNMENT

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Ms. Baker seconded by Mr. Abrams, the following resolution was adopted unanimously:

Resolved, That the Board of Education adjourn its meeting at 11:25 p.m.

---

PRESIDENT

---

SECRETARY

PLV:mlw