



effectiveness in teaching basic skills. They identified several conditions which made these schools unique. These conditions were high expectations, instructional leadership, an orderly environment, positive climate, consensus on academic goals, and monitoring individual student performance and providing feedback to the students. Dr. Cody explained that four of the six items he had mentioned presupposed some kind of determination about what was important.

Dr. Cody pointed out that they had a priority statement that said "increase organizational effectiveness and employee capabilities by developing instruments to measure school effectiveness." The priority focused on the development of instruments, which brought them back to the question of "instruments to measure what?" This really had to do with how wide they cast the net. This year they had focused on the Board's priorities. They had been focusing on the specific measures they wanted to use to determine success and effectiveness. In their minority achievement and participation efforts, they had a number of targets determined by student progress on the state functional tests, the California achievement tests, and Montgomery County criterion-referenced tests. In addition, they would look at data on student participation in gifted and talented programs, higher level courses, and extracurricular activities.

In regard to the first priority, Dr. Cody reported that discussion was going on with different staff groups about using the same measures and focus on language arts and writing, mathematics, science and technology, computer literacy, and higher order skills. They were planning to use the state tests, the California Achievement Tests, and their own criterion-referenced tests. They did not have anything yet on technology and higher order skills and would have to develop these.

Dr. Cody said that if they wanted to get into some plan that tied into getting information about effectiveness and recognizing schools for what they were doing they had to decide whether to focus on the first and second priorities or build in other things such as other curriculum areas. He noted that at this point in time social studies was not defined in their priorities as well as attendance, student attitude or climate, teacher attitudes and morale, and parent satisfaction. He asked whether they wanted to keep the effective school issue narrowly defined or expand it to include other parts of instruction. This raised the question of "if everything became a priority, is anything a priority?"

Dr. Cody said that the second issue was how they wanted to define success in Montgomery County. He said it could be in terms of school by school comparisons or in terms of individual school progress. The third area had to do with forms of recognition. He indicated that many schools using this idea took a composite score based on a number of different measures. If the school's total added up to a certain number, it was an effective school. There was another approach for a school system to recognize, acknowledge, and reward progress in each separate area that was considered

important. Recognition ranged from certificates to financial rewards to the schools. In some school districts, once a determination was made that a school was doing an outstanding job, the staff received salary increases. He stated that this was not part of the staff deliberations.

Dr. Cody emphasized that there were a couple of questions it was important for the Board and school system to think about. The first was whether they wanted such a formal system of recognition in place. He would maintain they already had one with minority achievement targets. The second question was did they want to draw the net broader, focus on the first two priorities or should it go broadly to other items. Then they had to look at forms of recognition and reward.

Mrs. Contrera reported that the committee had received twenty-four responses expressing many views. She said that after looking at the responses the committee had stated that "perhaps the best analogue would be that effective schools is to principals and staff as merit pay is to teachers." They tried to synthesize what really was coming out of the responses. One of the things was the feeling of overload, and the suggestion that it would be most appreciated if they could combine or integrate functions wherever possible. She liked the idea of integrating what they had done with the minority achievement program and the effective school idea. She thought that if they were adding something that there would be a lot more reaction from the folks in the schools. It was a matter of deciding which priority among a number of priorities that they could cope with. It was the feeling of the committee that a model measuring progress intraschool would be more acceptable than a model comparing schools. She explained that for some schools an increase of 10 or 15 percentile point could be a monumental achievement and for other schools it might not make a difference. They wanted to be sure that schools were being looked at in terms of what was realistic for them. For example, it would defy common sense to expect a school at the 95th percentile to increase 5 percent each year.

Mrs. Contrera said that the committee was concerned about the issue of fairness. If they did see acceptance, it would be based on the fact that people could buy into it and understand that this is best for children. She said that the committee agreed that outcome measures such as progress on achievement tests need to be in place since the major purpose of schooling was the acquisition of basic skills, and outcome measures provided some indication as to whether or not there is progress being made towards that goal. She thought that all school people accepted the fact that schools were basically charged with academic goals, and there was no other institutions held accountable for that. Therefore, they need some sort of measures to let people know that they accepted these as their goals. This would also reinforce Board Priorities 1A and 2A. She commented that beyond those indicators the committee suggested that the development of further indicators be left to schools who volunteered to pilot the program for no less than a two year period. She pointed out that in terms of getting things implemented

for a school, if they tried for anything less than two years, they would probably end up with a very superficial project. It would take six months to build a trust level to have coherent goals accepted by the total faculty. She felt that a two year project would be much more useful in trying to get baseline data. Mrs. Contrera said she was in the middle of a Madeline Hunter workshop in which it was stressed that they needed to look at the artistry of teaching and encourage teachers to do things and use things creativity. Mrs. Contrera said they had to take the goals and work on them with all the professionalism they had on tap in the schools. She thought they must have high expectations from staff as well as students. In looking at effective schools, she would suggest they start narrowly and expand as they learn.

Dr. Cody stated that they had state functional literacy tests and in MCPS their goal was to have all of the ninth graders pass the tests which were designed to be passed by high school seniors. They had the California Achievement Test, but its relationship to MCPS curriculum was not one on one. They did have criterion-referenced tests which were designed to help them measure achievement in the MCPS curriculum. Dr. Frankel reported that for a decade or so they had been developing criterion-reference tests in reading, language arts, and math. A year ago DEA was asked to work with Dr. Martin's group to take these tests which were designed to be classroom tests administered by an individual teacher and move these tests, norm them, and see if they would be useful on a system-wide basis. Dr. Martin's people were developing the tests, and Dr. Frankel's group was doing item statistics. The criterion-referenced tests in language arts was essentially a new test, but the test in math was different in that the items had been around for years and were being packaged in a new way. He explained that they knew the tests were good enough and the worst case would be that as of this coming spring the tests could be modified to gather baseline data. However, they might find the tests were good enough to use last year's data and start measuring progress this spring. These tests would 3-8 in math and 1-8 in reading.

Dr. Cronin commented that they were using the issue of the effective school as a wedge to look at something broader. It was almost a general feeling of a kind of malaise that they were doing things basically right and if they tooled up and got minority achievement up, the malaise would still stay there. For example, they had personnel evaluations and didn't know how to get to noneffective issues when these were not glaring. In terms of the effective school, they did have a model, but after they got all of this in place they would still have the same people evaluating and the same people running the system. Dr. Cody replied that in any kind of organization if they clarified the goals so that people had a better understanding of what they were and operated an incentive system, if the goals were clearer than they were before reinforcement would take place and the more they would accomplish. He explained that they had already made some choices as to priorities.

Dr. Cronin said that in college the Middle States evaluation was one

of the major driving forces for an internal examination of an institution. He asked whether this would be sufficient to give individual schools an opportunity to do that internal self-evaluation which perhaps would change the definition of the principal's role, the interaction with staff, and the interaction with students. He asked whether the principal might see himself as an administrator and redefine someone else as the educational leader. Mrs. Contrera replied that there were two ways to go. One had to do with staffing at the elementary level. The other had to do with goal-path clarity. If you had goal-path clarity, setting up the structure of the task was easier. They conserved staff energy and had reinforcement when they completed the task. She thought they had not had goal-path clarity in the past, and as they better defined what it was they were asking teachers to do and measured, there was a reinforcer in there. This satisfaction would alleviate most of the malaise. She thought that once they had action steps to get to the goal-path clarity this would help the situation.

Mrs. Peyser said that she was still concerned that other than the tests there were very few measurable indicators. She was glad to hear Mrs. Contrera say they were the primary institution for academic goals. She related that most specifically to the role of the principal as the instructional leader. They knew from studies that time-on-task was one of the most important things in student achievement, yet there was nothing in here on measuring time-on-task. One problem was interruptions to classes. She had recently read an article that many effective principals allowed no interruptions to classes. She would like to see something about this as an indicator. She said there had to be some way to challenge principals to be more innovative. For example, in a high school four days were taken away from English to register for classes, and yet it was not done this way in Fairfax County. Also, she had read that the single most reliable indicator of student achievement was homework, and yet there was nothing in the paper about homework. She also thought they should be looking at their products and how well they were doing at their job. Are these students getting the kinds of jobs they want, are they holding those jobs, how do employers evaluate them, and are students getting into the college they want and graduating from these colleges? She thought these were important indicators of effective schools. Mrs. Contrera said that Mrs. Peyser was using the diagnostic measures they probably would want to see implemented if they did not see a school scoring high initially. She thought that one of the things the Board had to decide was how much money they wanted to invest in this program because the degree of specificity mentioned by Mrs. Peyser would be very expensive for all schools.

Dr. Cody commented that when they use "effective schools" this did bring up a generic concept of what they meant by a school's being effective. He thought that most of the effective schools movement was probably mislabeled because they were making some decisions about basic skills, reading and math. He said that if they identified what they thought was important and built some incentive system into it, they would need to make the choices carefully

because that would be what they telegraphed to the school system as "most important."

Mrs. Shannon remarked that she did not view this as a separate program and as something that had to be implemented and piloted. To her if a school met the goals that they had set regarding Priorities 1 and 2, it was effective. If it did not, it was not. She thought that "effective schools" was built into everything they were doing. The only part of this that was a program was possibly the reward system. In her mind, effective schools came down to something as simple as given a body of students, why was it that one school could take students of the same characteristics and the students do well, and in another school they did not. She said that this was not a program. It was techniques to be shared. She would like them to say that they had Board and school system priorities which perhaps needed to be more clearly defined, and that a school was effective if it met these priorities. If they wanted to talk about a reward system, they would talk about rewarding schools that were effective. She was disturbed when they started talking about pilot programs for effective schools.

Mrs. Praisner thought that some of the negative reaction was to the models and the way in which they might be implemented or the message that might be communicated with those models. Part of the problem was being so caught up in the process rather than the end result. Mrs. Shannon thought it was up to the Board to clarify the goals. Dr. Cody stated that they had Priorities 1 and 2. They would come up with ways of measuring that in terms of student achievement, student participation, and in some instances programs being offered. They would draw this effort around the priorities and continue to work on specific ways to measure the accomplishment in terms of students. They would recognize that there were a lot of other variables, and they might want to generate information about schools such as morale and climate and use of homework, but those by themselves were not the primary purposes of education. He said that what they recognized and rewarded would be tied to Priorities 1 and 2. They would recognize and reward two types. The first one would be each school competing against its own record in previous years. In addition, they had a category of schools doing so well they could not measure how they could do any better. The rewards would be for each individual priority. A school like Takoma Park which made a lot of progress in math would get recognized. However, this was not a new program. It was a way to utilize recognition and rewards to bring consensus and clarity to the goals in Priorities 1 and 3. He said they could make it no more complicated than what he had described or they could go beyond that.

Mr. Ewing agreed very much with that kind of approach. He did think it was important for them to wrestle with the issue of progress as a measure versus another form of comparison across schools. He said that some schools on some measures would be at the very top consistently year after year. It seemed to him that argued more for taking it as a given that on some measures some schools would always do well and should receive some recognition. However, progress was

a more important measure and was the one of primary significance. He did not think they had to choose but had to be clear about how they were using both. In recognition, he said that was tied to the matter of direct comparison. He said that parents made judgments about schools based on annual reports, and it seemed to him they had to address that and be able to say to parents that they had adopted an approach to an assessment of schools. This approach could demonstrate that there were good scores where there were lower scores.

Mr. Ewing was concerned that they should be about the business of deciding what it was they were going to do very soon. He thought it was important that they be clear about the measures and have a clear cut process which said having measured they would go about the business of deciding what it was they wanted to correct. They also had to decide what it was that was transferable. He remarked that every big bureaucracy talked about sharing and learning from others. However, the occasions when that occurred were few in number. One of the things they had not done in the county was to pick up on good ideas and move them in any kind of systematic way. It seemed to him that if they didn't build something like this in they would have lost a good deal of the benefit of measurement. He said that the same was true of the minigrants. They had hundreds of good ideas, already documented, and a basis for judging effectiveness. He thought the process was moving along nicely, but there were some questions that needed to be settled.

Dr. Shoenberg was not sure that what they were really after was a formal program of a system of rewards. He was very much in agreement with Mrs. Shannon. What they were really about was to define their priorities clearly. He was not sure that the notion of effective schools was a good entering wedge to solve their problems. He thought they had provided the focus, and he thought they were finding the priorities they set were serviceable. There had been a lot of activity in support of those priorities. He said that Mrs. Contrera had made an important point about trying to move too fast and do too much at once. He agreed that they should be about the business of improving student performance in certain clearly defined areas. He agreed that having tests to test their own curriculum was long overdue. He did not think they needed a formal program of recognition. However, the advantage would be to get people off the notion of looking at just raw performance and start to look at progress. He did think that their own public relations might be better organized to make those points about the schools performing well for a variety of reasons. He would worry about what they were not going to do while they were doing this reward system. He asked who they were going to please by instituting some kind of formal program of rewards.

Dr. Cronin called attention to two points in Mrs. Contrera's letter. One was the outside nationally recognized consulting group, and the second was the coordination by a newly established office. Mrs. Contrera replied that there was a lot of research-based information that was available, and they did not see the need to

reinvent the wheel. She said they had to accept the fact that there was expertise outside of the school system. In regard to the second part, the committee felt that in order to prevent overloading the areas which had been stripped of personnel that a separate clearly disposable office be established. She believed that when they established an office they should have a timeline, evaluate it, continue it or end it.

Mrs. Praisner commented that she was probably closer to Dr. Shoenberg and Mrs. Shannon. She thought there was a Board member concern to take this and not run with it to the extent that it became the wheel and the driving force for all that they were doing. There was a desire on the part of Board members to use the material that had been developed, tie it to the priorities, and help schools assess where they are. The question would then become how they communicated what the school was doing. She thought Board members were saying that no matter what they did, reporting of information had to be done in a way that people understood. She was not sure they wanted rewards above and beyond the staff getting the resources to meet the goals. She did not know whether staff members wanted more rewards than that. This left them with a variety of opinions and suggestions focusing the effectiveness issue on the first two priorities.

Dr. Cody thought the discussion had been helpful. He said that the Board and senior staff would be meeting in mid-September to discuss priorities, and at that time he would try to have something more precise to present as part of a status report on this topic. He would avoid the term "effective schools" and think about a plan that would draw on the gains from the effective schools movement to accomplish those priorities. He commented that this was an organization of people who wanted to do well and the Board had been saying "this is what we want you to do better." He remarked that at heart all they were talking about was telling the staff they had done better. Mrs. Contrera said that one of the most precious commodities for teachers was time, and anything that they could do in terms of increasing the time teachers had to study, share, and communicate could only add to the progress that they could produce.

Dr. Shoenberg thanked the staff for the very sophisticated thinking that had gone into this whole process.

Re: Executive Session

The Board met in executive session from 12:15 to 1:30 to consult with legal counsel.

Re: Board/Press/Visitor Conference

The following individuals appeared before the Board of Education:

1. Nancy Dacek
2. Jesse Hill and Faye Calhoun, QUEST Parents
3. Eleanor Johnson, Maryland Religious Coalition for Abortion



Rights

4. Nancy Sabella, Planned Parenthood

Re: A Motion by Dr. Shoenberg to  
Approve Revised Curriculum -  
Modern World History A and B  
(FAILED)

A motion by Dr. Shoenberg to approve the following resolution failed with Dr. Cronin and Mrs. Praisner voting in the affirmative; Mrs. Peyser and Dr. Shoenberg voting in the negative; Mr. Ewing and Mrs. Shannon abstaining:

WHEREAS, The public school laws of Maryland specify that the county superintendent shall prepare courses of study and recommend them for adoption by the county Board (The Annotated Code of the Public General Laws of Maryland, Education Volume, Sec. 4-205); and  
WHEREAS, The public school laws of Maryland also state that the county Board, on the written recommendation of the county superintendent, shall establish courses of study for the schools under its jurisdiction (Ibid., Sec. 4-110); and

WHEREAS, Board of Education policy has resolved "that newly developed curriculum documents will be presented to the Board of Education for consideration approximately one month prior to the date on which approval will be sought, and the superintendent of schools may extend this period to allow further time for citizen reaction to curriculum documents dealing with sensitive topics...." (from Board Resolution No. 400-73, June, 1973); and

WHEREAS, The Program of Studies is the document which contains the prescribed curriculum elements, including instructional objectives, of all MCPS curriculum programs and courses (MCPS Regulation 345-1: Development and Approval of Curriculum and Supporting Materials); and

WHEREAS, Excellence in curriculum can be maintained only by continuing attention to the need for curriculum change; and

WHEREAS, The Council on Instruction, charged by the superintendent with considering recommendations for curriculum change, has recommended approval of the revised curriculum for Modern World History A and B; and

WHEREAS, The superintendent recommends that the Board approve the course revisions; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Board of Education approve the revisions of Modern World History A and B presented to the Board of Education on July 10, 1984, for publication in the Program of Studies as part of the MCPS curriculum to become effective in the school year 1984-85.

Re: A Motion by Mrs. Shannon to  
Approve the Revised Curriculum -

Modern World History A and B

Mrs. Shannon moved and Dr. Shoenberg seconded that the Revised Curriculum - Modern World History A and B be approved with a modification of the objectives to reflect active verbs.

Re: A Substitute Motion by Mrs. Peyser  
to Approve the Revised Curriculum  
- Modern World History A and B  
(FAILED)

The following substitute motion by Mrs. Peyser failed for lack of a second:

Resolved, That in addition to Mrs. Shannon's substitute motion they include the three major objectives in World History B as follows:

1. Fourth bullet - differentiate between socialism, communism, Marxism, and liberalism in explaining economic development of the Far East, Middle East, South Asia, Africa, and Latin America.
2. Fifth bullet - compare the doctrines of communism with those of Western democracies in terms of economic development, social and cultural life, and foreign affairs.
3. Eighth bullet - identify and explain similarities and differences between Western and Eastern societies.
4. From Modern World History A - discuss the ideas on which individual liberty and the development of democratic principles were founded.

Mr. Ewing suggested that the following be added to Mrs. Shannon's motion: "to take a look at the description in terms of some of the ways in which we could better describe the course consistent with what the Board had been told orally." Mrs. Shannon agreed. Mrs. Shannon restated that the verbs should reflect higher order intellectual skills.

Resolution No. 410-84

Re: Approval of Revised Curriculum -  
Modern World History A and B (as  
amended)

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

WHEREAS, The public school laws of Maryland specify that the county superintendent shall prepare courses of study and recommend them for adoption by the county Board (The Annotated Code of the Public General Laws of Maryland, Education Volume, Sec. 4-205); and









Storm Drainage Easement (Area 1)

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

WHEREAS, Montgomery County Department of Transportation has requested a right-of-way and storm water drainage easement across the Highland View Elementary School site for the purpose of installing storm drainage; and

WHEREAS, The proposed storm drainage improvements will benefit both the site and community and will not affect any land now planned for school programming and recreational activities; and

WHEREAS, Montgomery County will assume all liability for damages or injury resulting from the installation and future maintenance of the subject improvements; and

WHEREAS, All construction, full restoration and any future repair activities will be performed at no cost to the Board of Education; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the president and secretary be authorized to execute a permanent right-of-way and temporary access easement for Montgomery County Department of Transportation at the Highland View Elementary School site for the purpose of installing storm drainage.

Resolution No. 416-84                      Re: Stephen Knolls School - Property Easement (Area 1)

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

WHEREAS, The Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission has requested a right-of-way and temporary construction easement across the Stephen Knolls School site for the purpose of installing water mains; and

WHEREAS, The proposed water improvements will benefit the school community and will not affect any land now utilized for school programming and recreational activities; and

WHEREAS, The WSSC will assume all liability for damages or injury resulting from the installation and future maintenance of the subject utility; and

WHEREAS, All construction, full restoration and any future repair activities will be performed at no cost to the Board of Education and will result in a negotiated payment to the school system in return for the subject property rights; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the president and secretary be authorized to execute a permanent right-of-way and temporary access easement for the Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission at the Stephen Knolls School

site, for the purpose of installing new water main services for the surrounding community; and be it further

Resolved, That a negotiated fee be paid by the WSSC for the subject right-of-way and easement, said funds to be deposited to the Rental of Property Account #32-108-1-13.

Resolution No. 417-84                      Re: Authorization to Transfer Funds  
for Various Capital Projects

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

WHEREAS, The State Interagency Committee for Public School Construction transferred state funds for various capital projects to recognize approved capital project funds adjustments, thereby necessitating an amendment to the FY 1974 through FY 1985 Capital Improvements Programs; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the superintendent, subject to approval of the County Council, be authorized to effect two state supplemental appropriations and seven state fund reductions as listed below:

State Supplemental Appropriation		
School No.	To	From
Amount		
968-04	Portable Classrooms	State Unliquidated Surplus
\$16,910.00		
968-04	Portable Classrooms	State Unliquidated Surplus
40,000.00		
State Fund Reductions		
782-08	Portable Classrooms	State Unliquidated Surplus
25,738.64		
105-03	Portable Classrooms	State Unliquidated
Surplus	144.44	
557-03	Portable Classrooms	State Unliquidated Surplus
3,801.16		
424-12	Walter Johnson High	State Unliquidated
Surplus	942.87	
701-09	Damascus High	State Unliquidated Surplus
2,432.02		
701-11	Damascus High	State Unliquidated Surplus
5,079.92		
769-12	Oakland Terrace Elem.	State Unliquidated Surplus
4,455.00		

and be it further

Resolved, That the county executive be requested to recommend approval of these actions to the County Council.

Resolution No. 418-84                      Re: Proposed Area 3 High School Site  
East of I-270



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

WHEREAS, On November 5, 1981, the Board of Education, as a part of its Long-range Educational Facilities Planning Policy, surplusd several future school sites including the Seneca Senior High School (Watkins Mill) site; and

WHEREAS, On June 28, 1984, the Board of Education chose the former future Seneca High School (Watkins Mill) site as the location for the new Area 3 high school East of I-270, thereby necessitating a change in its previous action; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Board of Education rescinds a portion of its November 5, 1981, resolution #881-81 deleting the future Seneca High School (Watkins Mill) site; and be it further

Resolved, That the County Council, county executive, Montgomery County Planning Board, and the State Interagency Committee be made aware of these actions.

Resolution No. 419-84                      Re: Change in Administrative Area Designation

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

WHEREAS, The Board of Education in Resolution 63-81, dated January 13, 1981, established three administrative areas, each containing the high school attendance areas, feeder junior high, middle, and elementary schools; and

WHEREAS, Upon the closing of Peary High, an Area 2 school, a number of its feeder schools were reassigned to Wheaton High School, an Area 1 school; and

WHEREAS, All Wheaton High School feeder schools should be in the same administrative area; now therefore be it

Resolved, That Parkland Junior High School, Brookhaven Elementary School, Harmony Hills Elementary School, and Wheaton Woods Elementary School be designated as Area 1 schools.

Resolution No. 420-84                      Re: Monthly Personnel Report

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

Resolved, That the following appointments, resignations, and leaves of absence for professional and supporting services personnel be





WHEREAS, This unit would:

- o Coordinate the identification of problems or issues that MCPS must or may choose to deal with in the future, and manage a regular process for assessing the priority of each problem or issue;
- o Provide technical assistance to various MCPS units in developing long-range plans for improving services and programs;
- o Help the senior staff and superintendent ensure coordination among various long-range plans, with system-wide priorities, and with related functions such as budget planning;
- o Assist the senior staff and superintendent in reviewing implementation of various plans that are designed to achieve MCPS priorities and other major objectives; and
- o Maintain an awareness of federal, state, and local legislation that may impact on MCPS long-range planning;

now therefore be it

Resolved, That a Department of Long-range Planning Coordination is hereby created as a unit within the Office of the Superintendent of Schools, directly responsible to the superintendent for the functions enumerated in this resolution; and be it further

Resolved, That the Board authorizes the creation of three positions to staff this department -- director, Department of Long-range Planning Coordination; coordinator of long-range planning; and administrative secretary II (Grade 12); and be it further

Resolved, That the Department of Long-range Planning Coordination is to be established without an increase in the total of the Fiscal 1985 Operating Budget; and be it further

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

Re: A Substitute Motion by Mrs. Peyser  
(FAILED)

A substitute motion by Mrs. Peyser that the superintendent of schools appoint a citizens' advisory committee on long-range planning to carry out these functions failed for lack of a second.

Resolution No. 424-84

Re: Central Office Organization Change  
Long-Range Planning

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

WHEREAS, Montgomery County Public Schools' efforts to plan and achieve more effective educational opportunities for students

require the creation of a small unit, directly responsible to the superintendent, which can facilitate and monitor a comprehensive, long-range planning process; and

WHEREAS, This unit would:

- o Coordinate the identification of problems or issues that MCPS must or may choose to deal with in the future, and manage a regular process for assessing the priority of each problem or issue;
- o Provide technical assistance to various MCPS units in developing long-range plans for improving services and programs;
- o Help the senior staff and superintendent ensure coordination among various long-range plans, with system-wide priorities, and with related functions such as budget planning;
- o Assist the senior staff and superintendent in reviewing implementation of various plans that are designed to achieve MCPS priorities and other major objectives; and
- o Maintain an awareness of federal, state, and local legislation that may impact on MCPS long-range planning;

now therefore be it

Resolved, That a Department of Long-range Planning Coordination is hereby created as a unit within the Office of the Superintendent of Schools, directly responsible to the superintendent for the functions enumerated in this resolution; and be it further

Resolved, That the Board authorizes the creation of three positions to staff this department -- director, Department of Long-range Planning Coordination; coordinator of long-range planning; and administrative secretary II (Grade 12); and be it further

Resolved, That the Department of Long-range Planning Coordination is to be established without an increase in the total of the Fiscal 1985 Operating Budget; and be it further

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

Re: Proposed Policy on Policysetting

Dr. Shoenberg moved the following which was seconded by Dr. Cronin:

WHEREAS, The Board of Education is empowered by state law (Public School Laws, .4-107, and Article 76A, Public General Laws of Maryland) and Board resolutions to set policy; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Board of Education adopt the following as its policy on policysetting:

A. PURPOSE

1. Establish a definition of "policy"
2. Establish a uniform format for policy development and implementation

B. PROCESS AND CONTENT

1. Policy is defined as principles recommended by the superintendent and adopted by resolution of the Board of Education to serve as the basis for development and implementation of educational programs and/or for management of the school system. (Policy includes what is required and may include the reasons for the policy and the impact. State laws, bylaws of the State Board of Education, and federal guidelines are, in effect, mandated policies.)

2. Format for Policy Development and Implementation

- a) Superintendent/Board recognize the need for a policy and how this relates to Board goals and objectives
- b) Board requests or receives information from the superintendent and staff on the need for a new policy or revisions to or rescissions of policy including:
  - (1) Relationship to other policies
  - (2) Legal aspects
  - (3) Cost implications
  - (4) Effect on school system operation
  - (5) Research on similar policies adopted by other school systems
  - (6) Alternative ways of addressing the issue
- c) Superintendent presents a proposed policy with a timeline for adoption including the following:
  - (1) Any resolution introduced by a member that involves a matter of policy shall lie on the table for at least one week before being voted upon, provided, however, that if an emergency exists which indicates the necessity for Board action within a shorter period of time than one week, this provision may be waived by the unanimous consent of the members present at the meeting at which the resolution is first introduced. The presiding officer shall rule as to whether any proposed resolution involves a matter of policy, provided, however, that such ruling may be set aside by a vote of the Board.
  - (2) Opportunity for citizen and staff comment
  - (3) Opportunity for public hearing (if the Board desires)
- d) Board adopts a policy within a standard format which includes:
  - A. Purpose
  - B. Process and Content
  - C. Feedback Indicators (including ongoing review and evaluation of policy)
- e) After adoption, superintendent follows up with:
  - (1) Regulation for implementation
  - (2) Publication of policy and regulation in handbook and/or distribution to affected parties
  - (3) Continuous monitoring of policy and implementation and reporting to the Board as required under feedback

indicators

C. FEEDBACK INDICATORS

The implementation and monitoring of this policy shall be evidenced by the following indicators:

1. Each policy action shall contain a statement that the Board's Policy Format has been followed.
2. All regulations developed in support of this policy shall be sent to the Board as items of information.
3. The Board and superintendent shall review this policy on a biennial basis (every even-numbered year).

It was agreed that the words "recommended by the superintendent and" be deleted from B. 1, that "or Board member" be added after "Superintendent in B. 2. c)", and that "opportunity for the superintendent to provide advice and recommendations" be added as B. 2. c) (4).

Resolution No. 425-84                      Re: Policy on Policysetting

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

WHEREAS, The Board of Education is empowered by state law (Public School Laws, .4-107, and Article 76A, Public General Laws of Maryland) and Board resolutions to set policy; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Board of Education adopt the following as its policy on policysetting:

A. PURPOSE

1. Establish a definition of "policy"
2. Establish a uniform format for policy development and implementation

B. PROCESS AND CONTENT

1. Policy is defined as principles adopted by resolution of the Board of Education to serve as the basis for development and implementation of educational programs and/or for management of the school system. (Policy includes what is required and may include the reasons for the policy and the impact. State laws, bylaws of the State Board of Education, and federal guidelines are, in effect, mandated policies.)
2. Format for Policy Development and Implementation
  - a) Superintendent/Board recognize the need for a policy and how this relates to Board goals and objectives
  - b) Board requests or receives information from the superintendent and staff on the need for a new policy or revisions to or rescissions of policy including:
    - (1) Relationship to other policies
    - (2) Legal aspects

- (3) Cost implications
- (4) Effect on school system operation
- (5) Research on similar policies adopted by other school systems
- (6) Alternative ways of addressing the issue
- c) Superintendent or Board member presents a proposed policy with a timeline for adoption including the following:
  - (1) Any resolution introduced by a member that involves a matter of policy shall lie on the table for at least one week before being voted upon, provided, however, that if an emergency exists which indicates the necessity for Board action within a shorter period of time than one week, this provision may be waived by the unanimous consent of the members present at the meeting at which the resolution is first introduced. The presiding officer shall rule as to whether any proposed resolution involves a matter of policy, provided, however, that such ruling may be set aside by a vote of the Board.
  - (2) Opportunity for citizen and staff comment
  - (3) Opportunity for public hearing (if the Board desires)
  - (4) Opportunity for superintendent to provide advice and recommendations
- d) Board adopts a policy within a standard format which includes:
  - A. Purpose
  - B. Process and Content
  - C. Feedback Indicators (including ongoing review and evaluation of policy)
- e) After adoption, superintendent follows up with:
  - (1) Regulation for implementation
  - (2) Publication of policy and regulation in handbook and/or distribution to affected parties
  - (3) Continuous monitoring of policy and implementation and reporting to the Board as required under feedback indicators

#### C. FEEDBACK INDICATORS

The implementation and monitoring of this policy shall be evidenced by the following indicators:

- 1. Each policy action shall contain a statement that the Board's Policy Format has been followed.
- 2. All regulations developed in support of this policy shall be sent to the Board as items of information.
- 3. The Board and superintendent shall review this policy on a biennial basis (every even-numbered year).

Re: Status Report on MORE Studies --  
Review of Procurement Practices



Mr. Richard Fazakerley, associate superintendent for supportive services, explained that the study on procurement practices in MCPS was performed under contract by DEA with Touche Ross. He noted that the study was completed in October, 1982, and since that time they had been working away at trying to pick up and utilize some of the efforts of the recommendations. He said that during all these years they had relied on a procurement manual completed in 1979 or 1980 which had generally withstood the test of operational experiences. They believed they had become more effective with the manager personnel throughout the school system. He believed they were making slow and steady progress in terms of the modernization of the procurement office.

Mr. Rettakudi Nagarajan, director of the Division of Procurement, explained that in a five year period they had gone from 21 to 16 people but had been able to maintain a good procurement operation. He said that the report dealt with six major areas. The first was procurement of supplies and equipment. In this area they were in the throes of automation and in another year they would have bid analysis information and financial system. This would help them present minority procurement statistics to assess whether they were providing enough support to minority businesses. At present they had a manual system dealing with 25,000 to 30,000 purchase orders. The second recommendation dealt with contract administration, and with the cooperation of the Department of Accounting they had been able to increase their involvement in contractual matters.

Mr. Nagarajan stated that they had been able to implement all of the recommendations in the area of operating performance. They had reduced the degree of purchase order checking and completed a data processing requirements analysis. The fourth item related to organization and staffing. This depended upon the automation and might permit them to consolidate many of the requirements of the schools and provide better service. The fifth recommendation referred to financial management. They were involved in cash management; however, they did not go into the interest aspect of it. He said that purchase order limits had also been clarified, and the Board of Education had increased their approval limits to \$25,000. The state had increased this to \$7,500. The final item dealt with management control. They had started submitting monthly reports to the associate superintendent. He stressed that they were trying to have good cooperation with staff and have a good procurement operation.

Dr. Shoenberg said that staff comments suggested that item increases in contracts were so frequent that they could only monitor increases more than 15 percent. Mr. Nagarajan explained that they had three measures in procurement. One was the formal bid approved by the Board, and only some of these bids had a place for economic price adjustment. These prices were kept for a certain number of days, and thereafter had to be approved by Procurement as to whether the price increase was justified. In other cases they obtained telephone quotes for a very short period of 30 to 40 days so there was

very little price increase. He said that most price increases related to orders from outdated catalogues which were placed by the schools. There were about 20,000 purchase orders for items less than \$100, but it was difficult to have an up-to-date purchase order or catalogue. Therefore, they allowed the schools to submit without the latest prices and freight.

Mr. Ewing asked when in FY 1985 they expected to have the procurement information system and the minority procurement information system up and running. Mr. Nagarajan replied that the minority procurement information would come in two steps. The first step would involve the major procurement contracts. By December they would complete the survey of vendors to find out which ones were minority. They would probably have information for the Board in March, 1985. The information on actual purchase orders would take another year or so. Mr. Ewing asked whether this system would permit them to know the amounts of dollars and percentages of total business which went to minority firms, and Mr. Nagarajan replied that it would.

Mr. Ewing recalled that the issue was whether or not MCPS was able to make use of funds appropriated for purchases prior to the time needed to obligate the money in ways that the money would earn interest. Mr. Nagarajan replied that the county earned the interest and funds were released as needed. Mr. Ewing asked when the reorganization would go into effect, and Mr. Fazakerley replied that FY 1986 would be the earliest.

Mrs. Shannon commented that in the past budget discussions she had had opportunity to know the progress that had been made in this area in spite of fairly severe cuts. She expressed Board appreciation for those efforts. Dr. Cronin inquired about purchase order approval. Mr. Nagarajan explained that the MORE report mentioned that the signature of the principal should be accepted up to \$250. Secondary and primary account managers would also have limits. He said that the primary account managers such as Dr. Pitt and Dr. Shaffner decided how they wanted to control the funds and might decide that the secondary account manager could sign all the purchase orders or the principal could sign up to a certain limit. The primary account managers watched the funds before the funds came to Procurement.

Dr. Cronin noted articles in the Washington Post on procurement problems in other school systems and asked how MCPS avoided companies competing against themselves. Mr. Nagarajan replied that in many cases they insisted on going to more than three vendors which would eliminate collusion between two vendors. In the cases mentioned in the Post article, they were able to avoid that problem by increasing their vendors to 10 or 12.

Mrs. Praisner thanked staff for an excellent presentation and noted that this report concluded the Board's review of MORE studies.

Re: Publications Guidelines

Dr. Cronin moved and Mrs. Shannon seconded the following:

WHEREAS, On April 28, 1975 the Board of Education adopted guidelines for student publications as part of the Student Rights and Responsibilities Handbook; and

WHEREAS, On March 1, 1984 the Board of Education directed that these guidelines be reviewed and modified; and

WHEREAS, The Board has discussed revisions on May 21 and June 25, two committees have also reviewed and revised these guidelines, and the community has had an opportunity to comment; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Board of Education adopts the following amendment to the Student Rights and Responsibilities Handbook dealing with student publications.

#### IV.C. Publications

##### 1. School-sponsored Publications

- a. School-sponsored publications such as newspapers, yearbooks, and literary magazines shall be encouraged.
- b. Students have the right to decide on the content of school-sponsored publications subject to the requirements of these guidelines. The teacher-advisor shall provide direction and guidance on grammar, format, suitability of materials and literary taste and shall counsel students against the use of any material which is derogatory to any individuals solely on the basis of age, sex, race, creed, national origin, religion or handicapping condition.
- c. School newspapers must provide an opportunity for members of the school community to express a variety of viewpoints.
- d. All advertisements are subject to the following criteria which shall be applied by the teacher-advisor in determining whether to permit inclusion of such advertisements in school-sponsored publications:
  - 1) Use of advertisements containing the names and pictures of persons who are not public figures<sup>1</sup> or containing company trademarks must be authorized.
  - 2) Advertising must be identifiable or be labeled as an "advertisement" and must be submitted under the name(s) of the individual(s), the name of the corporation or, in the case of unincorporated associations or organizations, the names of the officers sponsoring the advertisement; and
  - 3) When practicable, as where advertisements appear in a separate section of the publication, the section shall be preceded with a statement

indicating that the advertising does not reflect the viewpoint or policies of the editors, the school, or the Board of Education.

2. Publications Produced Without School Sponsorship
  - a. Students may distribute in school, during the school day, publications that are not school-sponsored provided:
    - 1) They bear the name of the sponsoring organization or individual.
    - 2) Publications that are sold are published by students enrolled in Montgomery County Public Schools.
    - 3) The time, place and manner of distribution have been agreed upon by students and administration in advance of distribution.
  - b. The students have a right to be informed by the principal or his/her designee of any policy or procedure regarding distribution of publications which are not school-sponsored.
3. All Publications
  - a. Materials, including advertisements submitted for a school-sponsored publication, shall be rejected or distribution of publications by any student shall be halted by the principal if:
    - 1) The materials, as a whole or in significant part, through depiction or description, encourage actions that endanger the health or safety of students, including, but not limited to, the unlawful or excessive use of alcohol or drugs; provided, however, that this guideline shall not preclude publication or distribution of materials containing responsible debate or discussion.
    - 2) The material is obscene, in that it depicts or describes sexual conduct and meets all three of the following criteria:
      - a) An average person applying contemporary community standards would find that the material, taken as a whole, appeals to the prurient interest in sex.
      - b) The material depicts or describes in a patently offensive way actual or simulated sexual intercourse, deviate sexual intercourse, sexual bestiality, masturbation, sado-masochistic abuse, excretory functions or lewd exhibition of the genitals.
      - c) The material, taken as a whole, lacks serious literary, artistic, political, or scientific value.
    - 3) The material is libelous, in that it includes any unprivileged, false, and malicious material which by printing, writing, signs, or pictures tends to expose an individual to public scorn, hatred, or ridicule, done knowingly and/or recklessly and/or negligently. A false statement

about a public official, one who holds an elected or appointed public office, or a public figure, one who either seeks the public attention or is well known because of his/her achievement is considered libel if published with actual malice; that is, the writer knew the statement was false or published it with reckless disregard for the truth. A false statement about a private individual is considered libel if it is published willfully or negligently in that the writer knew it was false or failed to exercise the care a reasonably prudent person would exercise to verify its truthfulness.

- 4) The material causes or may be reasonably expected to cause substantial disruption<sup>4</sup> of school activities.
- b. If the distribution is halted, the principal shall meet with the students involved and issue his/her decision in writing within two (2) school days stating his/her reasons. A copy shall be provided to the students making the distribution and to the area associate superintendent. Such a decision is subject to appeal.
- c. If any material is rejected for publication by the teacher/ advisor, an appeal may be taken immediately to the principal who shall meet with the students involved and issue a decision in writing, within two (2) school days, providing a copy to the students bringing the appeal and a copy to the area associate superintendent. Such a decision is subject to further appeal in accordance with Section XIII of the implementation guidelines.

1 Public figures, in general terms, can be defined as those persons who by reason of the notoriety of their achievements, or the vigor and success with which they seek the public's action, are properly classified as public figures. The term also encompasses those persons who hold governmental office. In some instances, individuals may voluntarily inject themselves or be drawn into a particular public controversy and thereby become public figures for a limited range of issues. Some individuals may achieve such pervasive fame or notoriety that they become a public figure for all purposes and in all contexts.

2 Distribution means dissemination of publications to students at a time and place of normal activity or immediately prior or subsequent thereto, by means of handing out free copies, selling or offering copies for sale, accepting donations for copies of the publication, or displaying the publication in areas of the school which are normally frequented by students.

3 The following factors, among others, may be considered in determining whether there is a reasonable expectation of substantial disruption to school activities: the frequency, severity, and

proximity in time of previous disruptions; previous incidents at the school or among students related to the same or similar subject matter; and number of reports and credibility of reports concerning possible or planned future disruptions.

4 Substantial disruption is defined as interference with important school functions or disorderly conduct involving a significant number of students and includes but is not limited to student rioting, unlawful seizure of property, destruction of property, school boycotts, sit-ins and walk-outs.

Re: A Motion by Mr. Ewing to Amend the  
Proposed Publications Guidelines

Mr. Ewing moved and Mrs. Shannon seconded that the publication guidelines be amended in IV.C. I. b. to state "The teacher-advisor shall provide direction on grammar and format, guidance on suitability of materials and literary taste and shall counsel...."

Re: A Substitute Motion by Dr. Cronin  
on the Proposed Publications  
Guidelines (FAILED)

A substitute motion by Dr. Cronin that the publications guidelines be amended in IV.C. 1. b. to state "The teacher-advisor shall provide guidance on grammar...." failed with Dr. Cronin, Mr. Ewing, and Mrs. Shannon voting in the affirmative; Mrs. Peyser, Mrs. Praisner, and Dr. Shoenberg voting in the negative.

Re: A Motion by Mr. Ewing to Amend the  
Publications Guidelines (FAILED)

A motion by Mr. Ewing to amend the publications guidelines in IV.C. I. b. to state "The teacher-advisor shall provide direction on grammar and format, guidance on suitability of materials and literary taste and shall counsel...." failed with Mr. Ewing and Mrs. Shannon voting in the affirmative; Mrs. Peyser, Mrs. Praisner, and Dr. Shoenberg voting in the negative; Dr. Cronin abstaining.

Resolution No. 426-84                      Re: Publications Guidelines

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

WHEREAS, On April 28, 1975 the Board of Education adopted guidelines for student publications as part of the Student Rights and Responsibilities Handbook; and

WHEREAS, On March 1, 1984 the Board of Education directed that these guidelines be reviewed and modified; and

WHEREAS, The Board has discussed revisions on May 21 and June 25, two committees have also reviewed and revised these guidelines, and the community has had an opportunity to comment; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Board of Education adopts the following amendment to the Student Rights and Responsibilities Handbook dealing with student publications.

#### IV.C. Publications

1. School-sponsored Publications
  - a. School-sponsored publications such as newspapers, yearbooks, and literary magazines shall be encouraged.
  - b. Students have the right to decide on the content of school-sponsored publications subject to the requirements of these guidelines. The teacher-advisor shall provide direction and guidance on grammar, format, suitability of materials and literary taste and shall counsel students against the use of any material which is derogatory to any individuals solely on the basis of age, sex, race, creed, national origin, religion or handicapping condition.
  - c. School newspapers must provide an opportunity for members of the school community to express a variety of viewpoints.
  - d. All advertisements are subject to the following criteria which shall be applied by the teacher-advisor in determining whether to permit inclusion of such advertisements in school-sponsored publications:
    - 1) Use of advertisements containing the names and pictures of persons who are not public figures<sup>1</sup> or containing company trademarks must be authorized.
    - 2) Advertising must be identifiable or be labeled as an "advertisement" and must be submitted under the name(s) of the individual(s), the name of the corporation or, in the case of unincorporated associations or organizations, the names of the officers sponsoring the advertisement; and
    - 3) When practicable, as where advertisements appear in a separate section of the publication, the section shall be preceded with a statement indicating that the advertising does not reflect the viewpoint or policies of the editors, the school, or the Board of Education.
2. Publications Produced Without School Sponsorship
  - a. Students may distribute in school, during the school day, publications that are not school-sponsored provided:
    - 1) They bear the name of the sponsoring organization or individual.
    - 2) Publications that are sold are published by

students enrolled in Montgomery County Public Schools.

- 3) The time, place and manner of distribution have been agreed upon by students and administration in advance of distribution.
  - b. The students have a right to be informed by the principal or his/her designee of any policy or procedure regarding distribution of publications which are not school-sponsored.
3. All Publications
- a. Materials, including advertisements submitted for a school-sponsored publication, shall be rejected or distribution<sup>2</sup> of publications by any student shall be halted by the principal if:
    - 1) The materials, as a whole or in significant part, through depiction or description, encourage actions that endanger the health or safety of students, including, but not limited to, the unlawful or excessive use of alcohol or drugs; provided, however, that this guideline shall not preclude publication or distribution of materials containing responsible debate or discussion.
    - 2) The material is obscene, in that it depicts or describes sexual conduct and meets all three of the following criteria:
      - a) An average person applying contemporary community standards would find that the material, taken as a whole, appeals to the prurient interest in sex.
      - b) The material depicts or describes in a patently offensive way actual or simulated sexual intercourse, deviate sexual intercourse, sexual bestiality, masturbation, sado-masochistic abuse, excretory functions or lewd exhibition of the genitals.
      - c) The material, taken as a whole, lacks serious literary, artistic, political, or scientific value.
    - 3) The material is libelous, in that it includes any unprivileged, false, and malicious material which by printing, writing, signs, or pictures tends to expose an individual to public scorn, hatred, or ridicule, done knowingly and/or recklessly and/or negligently. A false statement about a public official, one who holds an elected or appointed public office, or a public figure, one who either seeks the public attention or is well known because of his/her achievement is considered libel if published with actual malice; that is, the writer knew the statement was false or published it with reckless disregard for the truth. A false statement about a private individual is considered libel if it is published willfully or negligently in that the writer



knew it was false or failed to exercise the care a reasonably prudent person would exercise to verify its truthfulness.

- 4) The material causes or may be reasonably expected to cause<sup>3</sup> substantial disruption<sup>4</sup> of school activities.
- b. If the distribution is halted, the principal shall meet with the students involved and issue his/her decision in writing within two (2) school days stating his/her reasons. A copy shall be provided to the students making the distribution and to the area associate superintendent. Such a decision is subject to appeal.
- c. If any material is rejected for publication by the teacher/ advisor, an appeal may be taken immediately to the principal who shall meet with the students involved and issue a decision in writing, within two (2) school days, providing a copy to the students bringing the appeal and a copy to the area associate superintendent. Such a decision is subject to further appeal in accordance with Section XIII of the implementation guidelines.

1 Public figures, in general terms, can be defined as those persons who by reason of the notoriety of their achievements, or the vigor and success with which they seek the public's action, are properly classified as public figures. The term also encompasses those persons who hold governmental office. In some instances, individuals may voluntarily inject themselves or be drawn into a particular public controversy and thereby become public figures for a limited range of issues. Some individuals may achieve such pervasive fame or notoriety that they become a public figure for all purposes and in all contexts.

2 Distribution means dissemination of publications to students at a time and place of normal activity or immediately prior or subsequent thereto, by means of handing out free copies, selling or offering copies for sale, accepting donations for copies of the publication, or displaying the publication in areas of the school which are normally frequented by students.

3 The following factors, among others, may be considered in determining whether there is a reasonable expectation of substantial disruption to school activities: the frequency, severity, and proximity in time of previous disruptions; previous incidents at the school or among students related to the same or similar subject matter; and number of reports and credibility of reports concerning possible or planned future disruptions.

4 Substantial disruption is defined as interference with important school functions or disorderly conduct involving a significant number of students and includes but is not limited to student rioting, unlawful seizure of property, destruction of property, school boycotts, sit-ins and walk-outs.

Re: Board Member Comments

1. Mrs. Peyser recalled that the Board had adopted guidelines for the reuse of closed schools, and this had been interpreted to mean that the superintendent and not the Board applies these criteria. As she had reread the resolution, the only reference was to the "Board." She thought that if it were the intent of the Board to turn over this responsibility to the superintendent, it should be clearly stated in the resolution. She believed this should be the function of the Board and these matters should be discussed in public because the public was involved. She asked for response as to how the Board interpreted this as being the role of the superintendent to select the categories.
2. Mrs. Peyser asked what was going to be provided for youngsters whose parents did not want them to take the sex education course, not specifically the unit on contraception. She asked what would be provided if there were one student in a class, five students, or 15 students.
3. Mr. Ewing said the Board had received a letter from MCARC on preschool issues, and he was assuming that a response was being prepared. He wondered what they were doing with regard to the legal issues and how they expected to get answers to these, given that the legal responses from Board counsel had not changed.
4. Mr. Ewing said the Board had talked earlier about the notion of what they did once they learned about an effective practice in a school. He thought it was important that they have mechanisms to capture what was going on both in relationship to effective schools and the minigrants. He had written a memo on that subject, and he would hope that the superintendent would give thought to encouraging staff to learn from one another.
5. Mrs. Praisner reported that the Board had received information on the honors program which would be scheduled in September. She asked that Board members submit their questions in writing prior to that discussion.
6. Dr. Cronin called attention to several items of information which he felt the Board should discuss and asked whether there would be a way to indicate when an item was being provided for future discussion. Staff explained that the agenda was in error and should have listed certain items "for future consideration."

Resolution No. 427-84

Re: Executive Session - August 13,  
1984

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

WHEREAS, The Board of Education of Montgomery County is authorized by Article 76A, Section 11(a) 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 13, 1984, at 8 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 protecting particular proceedings or matters from public disclosure as permitted under Article 76A, Section 11(a) and that such meeting shall continue in executive closed session until the completion of business.

Resolution No. 428-84                      Re: Executive Session - September 11,  
1984

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

WHEREAS, The Board of Education of Montgomery County is authorized by Article 76A, Section 11(a) 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 September 11, 1984, at 9 a.m. to discuss, consider, deliberate, and/or otherwise decide the employment, assignment, appointment, promotion, demotion, compensation, discipline, removal, or resignation of employees, appointees, or officials over whom it has jurisdiction, or any other personnel matter affecting one or more particular individuals and to comply with a specific constitutional, statutory or judicially imposed requirement protecting particular proceedings or matters from public disclosure as permitted under Article 76A, Section 11(a) and that such meeting shall continue in executive closed session until the completion of business; and be it further

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

Resolution No. 429-84                      Re: Academic Letters

On motion of Mrs. Shannon seconded by Dr. Greenblatt (on August 7, 1984), the following resolution was adopted with Dr. Cronin, Mr. Ewing, Mrs. Peyser, Mrs. Praisner, and Mrs. Shannon voting in the affirmative; Dr. Shoenberg voting in the negative:

WHEREAS, Excellence in education and the recognition of excellence take many forms; and

WHEREAS, One form of recognition, to reemphasize academics, is by awarding academic letters; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Board of Education requests the superintendent to establish a committee to review the concept of awarding academic letters; and be it further

Resolved, That this committee be composed of both secondary principals, appropriate area and central office staff, teachers, and students; and be it further

Resolved, That the committee consider criteria for process and implementation as well as timing and feedback indicators; and be it further

Resolved, That the committee also review the awarding of athletic letters for the criteria used and possible relationship to academic letters; and be it further

Resolved, That the superintendent report back to the Board of Education his own and the committee's recommendations on the subject of awarding academic letters.

Resolution No. 430-84                      Re: BOE Appeal 1984-14

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

Resolved, That oral arguments in BOE Appeal 1984-14 be done in closed session.

Resolution No. 431-84                      Re: Memorandum of Understanding

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

WHEREAS, The County Council and county executive have reached an agreement to terminate, without prejudice, Charles W. Gilchrist, et al. v. Montgomery County Council, et al., Law No. 67224, on July 30, 1984; and

WHEREAS, The Board of Education is a party to that law suit; and

WHEREAS, The Board of Education has reviewed the contents of the Memorandum of Understanding; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Board of Education authorizes the president of the Board of Education to sign the Memorandum of Understanding.

MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING

THIS MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING is entered into this        day of        , 1984, by and between County Executive Charles W. Gilchrist, (Executive), the Montgomery County Council, (Council) and the Board of Education of Montgomery County, (Board).

WHEREAS, the Council on May 15, 1984, adopted Resolution No. 10-718 titled "Board of Education Operating Budget Approval Resolution Fiscal Year 1985"; Resolution No. 10-721 titled "Fiscal Year 1985 Approval of the Aggregate Operating Budget Excluding Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission, Washington Suburban Transit Commission and the Bi-County Portion of the Maryland National Capital Park and Planning Commission"; and Resolution No. 10-722 titled "Appropriation Resolution Fiscal Year 1984-85"; and

WHEREAS, the above-referenced Resolutions included \$2,488,036 relating to cable-related research and development, and an Arts and Technology Center at Peary High School which were not formally requested by the Board in its recommended FY 1985 budget as transmitted to the Executive and Council on March 12, 1984; and

WHEREAS, the Council-approved fiscal year 1985 operating budget for the public school system was \$726,464 below the amount requested by the School Board and included a net addition of \$1,150,000 to State Category 1 (Administration) and a net addition of \$38,000 to State Category 3 (Other Instructional Costs); and

WHEREAS, the Executive and the Council disagree as to whether the Council may increase a State budget category above the amount originally requested by the Board in its recommended budget and subsequent to the Executive's review of the recommended budget; and

WHEREAS, the Executive, the Council and the Board believe that the public interest is best served by reaching an amicable resolution of this disagreement.

NOW, THEREFORE, the parties hereto agree as follows:

1. For future school budgets in the remainder of this term of office, it is the intent of the parties that any proposals by either Council member(s) or the Executive to increase a State budget category beyond the amount requested by the Board of Education or to add funds for major new programs not requested by the Board, will be referred to the Board for consideration for inclusion in the budget.

2. Funds added for an Arts and Technology Center in the School Board's FY 1985 budget may be expended for that purpose only if requested by the School Board and approved by the Council after public hearing on at least one week's notice and after recommendation from the Executive.

3. \$150,000 for cable-related research, and \$400,000 for subsequent implementation, will be approved in the pending fiscal year 1985 Cable Plan, funded by the cable company. The research will be conducted by a 5-member committee representing the School board, Montgomery College, University of Maryland, Johns Hopkins University, and a high-tech employers group. The funds that were added to the School Board's Fiscal Year 1985 budget may be expended for that purpose only if requested by the School Board and approved by the Council after public hearing on at least one week's notice and after recommendation from the Executive.

4. The Executive agrees to dismiss, without prejudice, Charles W. Gilchrist, et al. v. Montgomery County Council, et al., Law No. 67224.

ESTHER P. GELMAN  
President, County Council  
of Montgomery County, Maryland

CHARLES W. GILCHRIST  
County Executive

MARILYN J. PRAISNER,  
President  
Board of Education of  
Montgomery County, Maryland

Re: New Business

1. Mr. Ewing moved and Dr. Cronin seconded the following:

Resolved, That the Board of Education place on its agenda early in the fall of 1984 a discussion of a proposal for special junior high and senior high programs which would serve the up-county area and would include a major focus on math, science, computers and high technology, to be instituted as soon as possible, perhaps beginning in the fall of 1985 in an up-county junior high school and in the fall of 1986 in an up-county high school.

2. Mrs. Shannon moved and Dr. Cronin seconded the following:

WHEREAS, MCPS has long been recognized as innovators in both short-range and long-range planning; and

WHEREAS, MCPS has a long-range comprehensive master plan for educational facilities; and

WHEREAS, There exists a need for such a comprehensive master plan for curricula; and

WHEREAS, The purpose of such a plan would be that the system would be able to see the total picture and how revisions and add-ons would affect this total plan which would incorporate all curricula in all grade levels; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the superintendent be directed to establish such a long-range (5-year) comprehensive master plan for curricula and to

report on this plan to the Board of Education for their action and approval.

3. Dr. Shoenberg moved and Mrs. Shannon seconded the following:

Resolved, That the item on "Reading Study: First Year Report" be scheduled at an appropriate time for Board discussion and in sufficient time that the report's implications for budget can be considered.

4. Mr. Ewing moved and Mrs. Shannon seconded the following:

Resolved, That the item on "Report on Status of Blair/B-CC Clusters" be scheduled for Board discussion.

Dr. Shoenberg assumed the chair.

5. Mrs. Praisner moved and Dr. Cronin seconded the following:

WHEREAS, The Board of Education has never defined the term "magnet" but has in the past established and maintained magnet programs in grades K-12 including all-day kindergarten, foreign language immersion, and science and technology centers primarily to assist the school system's integration efforts; and

WHEREAS, The Board of Education has established "special" programs for the gifted and talented and high school vocational students; and

WHEREAS, The Board of Education is receiving more and more requests from individual communities to provide programs above and beyond the regular Program of Studies in individual school communities; and

WHEREAS, The Board of Education is interested in improving the education program and opportunities for students within MCPS; and

WHEREAS, The Board of Education also recognizes that the placement of these programs has budgetary implications; and

WHEREAS, These programs also have an impact on long-range planning, staff development and training, curriculum development and possibly the program at nearby schools; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Board of Education directs the superintendent to develop a policy and/or process for the development and establishment of special programs; and be it further

Resolved, That such policy and/or process shall address but not be limited to the issues raised above; and be it further

Resolved, That the Board of Education will discuss and adopt a policy and/or process prior to the further expansion of special programs; and be it further

Resolved, That the community will be given an opportunity to

comment.

Mrs. Praisner assumed the chair.

Re: Executive Session

The Board of Education met in executive session from 4 p.m. to 6:15 p.m. on legal issues and appeals.

Resolution No. 432-84 Re: BOE Appeal 1984-11

On motion of Dr. Shoenberg seconded by Dr. Cronin, the following resolution was adopted with Dr. Cronin, Mr. Ewing, Mrs. Praisner, Mrs. Shannon, and Dr. Shoenberg voting in the affirmative; Mrs. Peyser voting in the negative because she would have granted one appeal but not the other:

Resolved, That the Board of Education deny BOE Appeal 1984-11, student transfers.

Resolution No. 433-84 Re: BOE Appeal 1984-13

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education deny BOE Appeal 1984-13, student transfer.

Resolution No. 434-84 Re: BOE Appeal 1984-14

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education deny BOE Appeal 1984-14, student transfer.

Resolution No. 435-84 Re: BOE Appeal 1984-15

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education deny BOE Appeal 1984-15, student transfer.

Resolution No. 436-84 Re: BOE Appeal 1984-17

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



Resolved, That the Board of Education deny BOE Appeal 1984-17, student transfer.

Resolution No. 437-84                      Re: BOE Appeal 1984-19

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education deny BOE Appeal 1984-19, student transfer.

Re: Items of Information

Board members received the following items of information:

1. Items in Process
2. Construction Progress Report
3. Honors Program Study
4. Report on Minigrants
5. Reading Study: First Year Report
6. Follow-up Evaluation of Mark Twain Students Phase II
7. Report on Status of Blair/B-CC Clusters
8. Staff Response to Task Force on Discipline
9. A Review of Programs and Strategies Used in Other School Systems for Improving Student Achievement
10. Educational Specifications for the New High School East of I270
11. Suspension Data for 1983-84

Resolution No. 438-84                      Re: Adjournment

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education adjourn its meeting at 6:20 p.m.

President

Secretary

WSC:mlw