

APPROVED
30-1985

Rockville, Maryland
June 12, 1985

The Board of Education of Montgomery County met in regular session at the Carver Educational Services Center, Rockville, Maryland, on Wednesday, June 12, 1985, at 9 a.m.

ROLL CALL Present: Dr. Robert E. Shoenberg, President
in the Chair
Dr. James E. Cronin
Mrs. Sharon DiFonzo
Miss Jacquie Duby
Mr. Blair G. Ewing*
Dr. Jeremiah Floyd
Mrs. Marilyn J. Praisner

Absent: Mrs. Mary Margaret Slye

Others Present: Dr. Wilmer S. Cody, Superintendent of Schools
Dr. Harry Pitt, Deputy Superintendent
Dr. Robert S. Shaffner, Executive Assistant
Mr. Thomas S. Fess, Parliamentarian
Mr. John D. Foubert, Board Member-elect

Re: ANNOUNCEMENT

Dr. Shoenberg announced that Mr. Ewing would be joining the Board in the afternoon. Mrs. Slye would be absent for personal reasons.

RESOLUTION NO. 277-85 Re: BOARD AGENDA - JUNE 12, 1985

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

Resolved, That the agenda for June 12, 1985, be approved.

RESOLUTION NO. 278-85 Re: RETIREMENT OF MONTGOMERY COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS PERSONNEL

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

WHEREAS, The persons listed below are retiring from Montgomery County Public Schools; and

WHEREAS, Each person, through outstanding performance of duties and dedication to the education of our youth, has made a significant contribution to the school system which is worthy of special commendation; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the members of the Board of Education express their sincere appreciation to each person for faithful service to the

school system and to the children of the county and also extend to each one best wishes for the future; and be it further

Resolved, That this resolution be made part of the minutes of the meeting and a copy be forwarded to each retiree (TO BE APPENDED TO THESE MINUTES).

Re: SCHOOLS AND THE ADEQUATE PUBLIC
FACILITIES ORDINANCE

Dr. Cody suggested that they review three general issues. One was to get a better understanding of the particular proposal prepared by the two staffs, another was for the Board to ask questions and make alternative proposals, and the third was to discuss the timing of the adoption of the methodology.

Dr. George Fisher, director of educational facilities planning, explained the planning process for subdivisions which spanned about a three-year period of time. Therefore, when they received a preliminary plan to respond to, they should look to realizing students from that development three years later. They started with the 1984-85 school year and did their assessments against school year 1987. He showed the Board maps with areas colored to indicate where subdivisions would be deferred or denied. He explained that very little of the CIP activity did anything to help this situation in 1987; however, the CIP did help the area in 1988. He reported that staff had provided the Board with specific simulations and called attention to the situation in the Cedar Grove area.

Dr. Shoenberg noted that while they might not have a problem with Cedar Grove in 1987, they had projected problems for 1988 or 1989. This presumably was on the basis of subdivisions that had already been approved. He asked whether the subdivision in the simulation was a part of that 1988 and beyond enrollment estimate and was allowable until they got to their limit. Dr. Fisher replied that this one was not in a stage of approval where they would have included it in any of the estimates for Cedar Grove. This subdivision would add to the estimates for Cedar Grove. Dr. Shoenberg said they knew there were other subdivisions coming in behind it, and he asked whether there was something in the process being proposed which would allow this subdivision to come in ahead of the others. Dr. Fisher said that if Cedar Grove showed room they could approve this subdivision, but their projections might show 100 percent capacity in 1989. The assumption was that they would have time in the process through the CIP to get solutions by 1988. They would approve every subdivision coming into the Cedar Grove area in 1984 once they had the CIP approved because in 1987 where they were making that assessment they had space.

Mr. Bruce Crispell stated that the first, second, and third year forecasts were going to be based on actual approved subdivisions at various stages in that time line. For the one year forecast they

would look at building permits, the second year it would be record plats, and the third year would be based on sewer authorizations. They needed to think about how to project the "out" year forecasts. He thought that about three years was as accurately as they could portray real subdivisions. Dr. Fisher explained that the school system staff would be generating input to Park and Planning Commission staff who would be generating input in the Planning Board's ultimate decisions.

Mrs. Praisner asked Dr. Fisher to go through the process. In regard to Cedar Grove, Dr. Fisher explained that there would not be a denial or deferral at the elementary school level or at the intermediate school level through 1987. However, Damascus High School was over 90 percent; therefore, they would see whether they would recommend deferral because of that high school. The subdivision was on the periphery of the Damascus High School attendance area, and they had to decide whether to look to the next adjacent high school. In this case the next adjacent high schools did not have room. In this case they would recommend deferral because they had no high school space in 1987. Mrs. Praisner asked whether they would look at the elementary school feeding the adjacent junior high and high school. Dr. Fisher replied that as of right now they were only looking at the level where there was a problem.

Dr. Cronin asked if they were developing educational TDRs. Would they have one builder with a commitment to build with educational space but not able to build trading off with a builder who was able to build but did not have educational space. Dr. Fisher asked Mr. Art Drea of Park and Planning whether that was happening with transportation and the APFO. Mr. Drea explained that there were no vested rights at any of these stages. There was no analogy to TDRs where there were at some point vested rights. The transportation analysis system was far more fully developed, and there were too many differences between the two systems to really compare them. He said that the major difference was flexibility in school board policy. Dr. Fisher said that in the second simulation they had a subdivision application in the Westover area. They did not have space at Westover and then they looked at the cluster and found they did not have space. Because the development was on the periphery of the cluster they looked to the nearest adjacent elementary school, did not find space, and recommended deferral. Mrs. Praisner asked where they would look at Argyle if there had been space at the adjacent elementary school, and Dr. Fisher replied that they only looked at existing schools. In response to Mrs. Praisner's question about a junior high school in another cluster being closer than the adjacent elementary school, Mr. Crispell indicated that this was another issue that would have to be clarified.

Dr. Cronin asked whether it would be legally supportable to do straight line distances. Mr. Drea replied that there were not any legal guidelines; however, he thought that what they ultimately did needed to be reasonable and as defensible as possible. Dr. Fisher welcomed Mr. Richard Tustian who had just joined the meeting. Dr. Fisher said that the third example was a subdivision

application in the Burtonsville Elementary School area. When they looked at facilities plan actions, in 1987 they had a solution because of the reopening of a school. However, at the secondary level they did not have space until they had the Paint Branch addition. He said they would question whether they should look to an adjacent area because the subdivision was not on the periphery. Dr. Cody stated that two circumstances came to mind. One was the subdivision request on the borderline. The second was to tie it to an ultimate solution which would shift the zone. Dr. Fisher said that when they first started they said they would go to an adjacent area. Now they had cut back from looking at all adjacent areas just to the closest one.

Dr. Fisher said that the next item was the question of deferral and what deferral meant. For example, did they defer a subdivision for three years when next year in their CIP they had space at the secondary level. He noted that if someone came in next year they would not get a deferral. It had been suggested that the person might reapply in 1985 and get into next year's review process. Mrs. Praisner asked whether there was a timetable or whether this was an ongoing process as far as Park and Planning Commission was concerned. The Board made capital budget decisions and facility planning decisions at a specific time point based on information. The staff would have to make decisions prior to that time based on last year's actions and after that time period based on the most recent actions. She could see a problem with when a building permit came in. For example, an application might be denied in September and be granted in January based on Board actions. She asked whether they could have a certain time period for making all the building permit decisions. Mr. Tustian replied that this was something they would have to fine tune. They were attempting to run the system so that they were forecasting a future event that the housing would become occupied and generate the school children at the same time the school facility would be available. He thought they would freeze the capital program for a year which was what they did for roads. They used the budget adopted on May 15 until the next adoption. He thought they were looking at a sequential updating process which would be held constant for a period of a year. In regard to the question of denial/deferral, he said they had reasons as to why they thought deferral was the right way to go. In deferral, they were trying to look at what would bring a project on line at the same time as the school. Mrs. Praisner thought that their staff would have to wait until after the Council's final action on May 15. She pointed out that they had some suggestions and modifications to their facilities plan calendar and issues of budget. She also recalled a Council proposal for a two or three-year capital budget cycle which would add another problem to the three-year deferral question. She said that she had some problem with three years because she did not think it was a long enough time from the perspective of the school system. She could see them coming in to the Council with changes in the capital budget for the fourth or the fifth year; however, some zoning changes might make them want to make earlier changes. However, the Council might object to this because of the bond process. She wondered why it could not be a five-year deferral. Mr. Tustian

felt they could work out some time lines. He explained that if the Planning Board approved a project on the condition that no record plat could be received for one year, this meant the housing probably would not be ready for four years. With a two-year delay of record plat, there would be a five-year period.

D

r. Shoenberg stated that the first question they needed to answer for themselves was whether this particular geographical area method of analysis was one that they wanted to continue to pursue. Dr. Cronin said it was conceivable that they could end up with a housing subdivision island which would be bused out of the feeder pattern. Mr. Crispell replied that this would not come about because of the subdivision review process. This would happen three or four years down the road as a solution to the growth. This method tried to avoid that. He explained that the Board could make boundary changes if it wished or use other methods such as portables. He felt that the new system would give them more control because they could have a delay in the growth process. Dr. Fisher thought it went along with how tightly they went with the idea of looking to the adjacent area. If they just looked to areas right on the boundary, it would just mean changing a line.

Dr. Shoenberg asked if they were agreed that they wanted to pursue this particular mode of analysis. Dr. Cody said he had a question about aggregate data including sewer authorizations, record plats, and building permits and using this to forecast enrollment three years out. He asked what was the percentage of units completed against preliminary plans approved three years before. Mr. Tustian replied that it was in the vicinity of 75 percent. Dr. Cody asked whether consideration was given to a much more simpler calculation and analysis. For example, at the time the request was made the schools were either above or below capacity. If they were above, the answer would be no unless there was in the pipeline some construction relief planned. He pointed out that the new method would involve a lot more staff time. He said that the denial would be temporary and up for reconsideration a year later. Mr. Tustian said that one could do that, but the implications would be that they had ignored all of the permits in the pipeline that have already been approved but have not yet been constructed. Dr. Cody said that if the school were overcrowded and there was nothing in the plans to relieve it, it would not make any difference as to how many houses were in the pipeline. He said he was leading up to some kind of system where they would do the analyses at one time for all schools after the CIP was approved. Mr. Drea commented that this was essentially what they had been doing for the last decade or so. However, this gave them concern from a legal standpoint. He cited the Shapiro and Rosenberg cases to support his point of view.

It seemed to Dr. Shoenberg they had the need of a school system to operate what it considered to be an effective system of schools with the myriad of considerations that must be made versus the property rights of an individual developer. They needed some way of adjudicating those two sets of considerations. Park and Planning had told them they could not do that without indulging in some elaborate and

sophisticated set of procedures that had some kind of legislative approval. They were being told this on the basis of one case that had been adjudicated. He wanted to know how the one adjudicated case applied or took into consideration the school system's need to run an effective set of schools versus the property rights of particular individuals. He asked why it was necessary in order to assert the schools' rights to object to particular developments and have Park and Planning take that into consideration they needed to indulge in this elaborate, time-consuming, and expensive set of calculations. Mr. Drea thought the answer to both of those questions was the same. The Planning Board had the legal responsibility to approve or disapprove subdivision plans. They could only exercise that authority when they reasonably believed that what they were doing was sustainable in court. It was their professional judgment that they needed this kind of support in order to deny or defer subdivision cases for the sole reason that school capacity had been exceeded. He agreed that very few cases were based on a single issue. He did not think it was an issue of the school board's rights versus property rights. Dr. Shoenberg commented that, courts aside, it did not in fact come down to that. He did not see why it was necessary to impose so elaborate a plan on the system and an additional overlay of conditions on a school board that was already faced with an elaborate set of considerations in making its decisions. He would like to see some support for their professional judgment that went beyond the single case cited. Mr. Drea replied that there was one other case which was decided in Montgomery County against the Planning Board by a judge who was now on the Court of Appeals. It seemed to him the alternative to what they were talking about was even less desirable. That would be a Planning Board which felt that it was hamstrung for whatever reason and could not deny these subdivisions and approved them.

Dr. Cronin commented that the reality was that development would occur. When the Board saw transfer cases, they were able to make an approval or an denial based on the capacity in a school. They sometimes got into a problem regarding the definition of capacity. If they built in the numbers for a subdivision to be built three years out, those students were not real yet in the system. There was a possibility the subdivision might not be built. It appeared to him they were building a double set of numbers, one set of real numbers with real projections of actual students living in real houses and another set of approved subdivisions that might appear. When someone came in with a new subdivision request, their argument would be that the Board had given the capacity to something that was nonexistent and they could finish in two years and be in there. He asked how the Board was helping Planning give a legally viable defense to that. Mr. Tustian replied that they had the same kind of problem with regard to traffic. He said that the shield against court challenge was in the legislative act of saying that this was the way they were going to do it. This was the formula and method they were going to use. As long as the formula was reasonable and the system took into account the inability to be precisely correct, then they would be defended by that legislative action.

Dr. Cronin noted that they had one independent body of a state agency versus another independent body, the County Council. They were saying their policy would be legislatively approved by the Council. This limited them in any future changes in their policy because it was County law. He asked how they maintained an independence of policy while there was a legislative decision made that this policy would be the law of the County. Mr. Tustian replied that he was correct in that a legislative action to approve a Board of Education policy created a connection that was not there before. There was a method of bringing the legislative area into their policy in the least degree possible. However, he agreed that the bringing together of agencies having separate functional missions under different legislative mandates in order to effectuate a comprehensive growth management policy involved some closeness that was not there if everyone was free to do their own thing. It seemed to him that essentially the Council's approval of this formula primarily had its bearing on the Planning Board which would be required to approve or deny subdivisions based on this formula. He supposed theoretically they could have the Planning Board exercising this formula alone and the Board of Education not participating in it at all. Dr. Cronin asked how the yield factor and agreement on utilization fit in the relationship of the school system to a legislative statement by the Council and also the county executive. Mr. Tustian replied that they would assume this would be in the formula. Any of the elements affecting the actual measuring of the number of children the school could hold would be in a statement of how this would be calculated. There would also have to be a statement made about portables. Dr. Cronin asked whether all these separate but independent groups were ready to sign off so that this would become part of the CIP and operating budget. Mr. Tustian guessed that the Planning Board would accept reasonable criteria with respect to these questions. He would guess this would be true for the county executive. The formula would be the subject of a public hearing by the County Council. He explained that the formula would be for the purpose of deciding when to deny subdivisions. It would not be a formula that would require the Board of Education to do anything specifically in the way it administered the schools.

Dr. Cody noted that the Board of Education was a legislative body which might remedy the situation by providing comment to the Planning Board on the basis of its own policies. Mr. Tustian replied that as he understood it, the legislative power in question was not the power to legislate school services. It was the power to deny a property owner of a presumed right. Dr. Cody commented that there might be a problem if the Council decided to change the Board's guidelines that decision could not have a legal bearing on the way the school system commented on such proposals. The Council could direct the Planning Board to follow whatever policies the school system developed.

Mrs. Praisner said that now they had a situation where the commissioners felt there were reasonable alternatives available, and the Board was dealing with issues where they had little control. She thought it was important for them to develop some kind of a process. She had concerns about which junior high school they looked at, and

she believed they had to get back to these issues. She could see some other body like the Park and Planning Commission determining what the appropriate yield rate was in certain areas, but she had serious problems with another body determining the appropriate utilization rate for schools. She thought this was a Board of Education decision. Her support for a process would depend on what the County Council had as a responsibility and what the Board of Education had as a responsibility in this area. She had problems with the three-year period because of the process for school construction, and she had problems with subdivisions being added constantly. She did not think the educational communities were saying they would expect always to think there would be that kind of stability in schools, but there did need to be some kind of rationale for why something was happening and a timeframe to allow them to plan appropriately.

Dr. Shoenberg thought there was sufficient feeling on the part of the Board for proceeding with this process, but there was a lingering doubt about the legislative relationship with the County Council. He agreed that the Board would discuss this again when the staff had further suggestions.

Re: POLICY ON LEGAL SERVICES

Dr. Cronin moved and Mrs. Praisner seconded the following:
Resolved, That the Board of Education adopt the following policy on legal services:

POLICY ON LEGAL SERVICES

I. Purpose

This policy has two purposes. The first is to state that the Board of Education shall retain attorneys for advice and representation in legal matters that affect the school system. The second purpose is to direct the superintendent to implement a plan for the management of legal services that will facilitate both cost control and accountability and that will promote a high quality of service.

II. Process and Content

A. Retention and Selection

1. The Board of Education retains counsel as needed to assist it and the superintendent in carrying out their duties. Counsel retained by the Board fulfill three primary functions: (i) representation in litigation in which the Board is a party; (ii) counsel regarding Board policy or action in which highly specialized legal expertise is required or counsel on general legal issues that arise in the ongoing operation of the school system; and (iii) counsel to the Board as it carries out its quasi-judicial responsibilities in appeals and hearings.

2. The factors to be considered in the selection or retention of an attorney include the quality of background and experience, legal skills, responsiveness and sensitivity to the client's needs, style and presence, freedom from conflict of interest, and management skills.

3. With the advice of the superintendent the Board will

identify attorneys or firms that meet its criteria and will invite them to express their interest in providing services to the Board. Those interested will be screened and interviewed by the Board and the superintendent.

4. The Board will contract with the attorney or firm selected for a term of one year, subject to annual renewal.

B. Management of Legal Services

1. The Board directs the superintendent to implement a legal services management plan for the purpose of coordinating and controlling the legal services provided to the school system.

2. A legal services management plan should provide at least the following elements: (a) maintenance of written agreements with counsel; (b) standardization of billing practices; (c) control of costs and staff access to attorneys; and (d) an annual appraisal of the quality of legal services, for use by the Board and the superintendent.

3. The superintendent will develop regulations implementing this policy.

4. The direct use of attorneys by the Board of Education or by the ombudsman/staff assistant on behalf of the Board shall not be subject to or limited by regulations issued under this policy.

III. Feedback Indicators

The superintendent will provide annual reports to the Board of Education on the costs and effectiveness of legal services.

RESOLUTION NO. 280-85 Re: AN AMENDMENT TO THE PROPOSED POLICY ON LEGAL SERVICES

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

Resolved, That the proposed policy on legal services be amended by the following:

Add under Purpose as the fourth sentence: "This policy and regulations issued under this policy shall not apply to the direct use of attorneys by the Board of Education or the ombudsman/staff assistant to the Board."

Delete B. 4.

At Miss Duby's suggestion, it was the consensus of the Board to substitute "the school system's use of legal services" for "the legal services provided to the school system" under B. 1.

Re: A MOTION BY DR. CRONIN TO AMEND THE PROPOSED POLICY ON LEGAL SERVICES

Dr. Cronin moved that the third sentence under Purpose read: "The second purpose is to direct the superintendent to present to the Board for its approval a plan for the management of legal services that will facilitate both cost control and accountability and that will promote a high quality of service," that the sentence under B. 1. read: "The Board directs the superintendent to submit to the Board

for its approval a legal services management plan." and add a second sentence "After approval of the plan by the Board of Education, the superintendent will implement this legal services management plan...."

Dr. Floyd suggested that the second part of Dr. Cronin's motion be changed to read: "The Board directs the superintendent to implement the Board-approved legal...." Dr. Cronin and Mrs. Praisner accepted the change.

RESOLUTION NO. 281-85 Re: AN AMENDMENT TO THE PROPOSED POLICY
ON LEGAL SERVICES

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

Resolved, That the proposed policy on legal services be amended by the following:

The third sentence under Purpose to read: "The second purpose is to direct the superintendent to present to the Board for its approval a plan for the management of legal services that will facilitate both cost control and accountability and that will promote a high quality of service."

Under B. 1. "The Board directs the superintendent to implement the Board-approved legal...."

Dr. Shoenberg noted that the second sentence under Purpose should read: "The first is to state that the Board of Education retains attorneys...."

For the record, Dr. Shoenberg stated A.4. did not imply formal annual evaluations.

It was the consensus of the Board to eliminate the first sentence under I. Purpose, and to restate the second sentence as "This policy reaffirms the right of the Board of Education to retain attorneys for advice and representation in legal matters that affect the school system and directs the superintendent...."

It was the consensus of the Board to substitute "management of costs" for "control of costs" under B. 2. (c).

RESOLUTION NO. 282-85 Re: POLICY ON LEGAL SERVICES

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education adopt the following policy on legal services:

POLICY ON LEGAL SERVICES

I. Purpose

This policy reaffirms the right of the Board of Education to retain attorneys for advice and representation in legal matters that affect the school system and directs the superintendent to present to the Board for its approval a plan for the management of legal services that will facilitate both cost control and accountability and that will promote a high quality of service. This policy and regulations issued under this policy shall not apply to the direct use of attorneys by the Board of Education or the ombudsman/staff assistant to the Board.

II. Process and Content

A. Retention and Selection

1. The Board of Education retains counsel as needed to assist it and the superintendent in carrying out their duties. Counsel retained by the Board fulfill three primary functions: (i) representation in litigation in which the Board is a party; (ii) counsel regarding Board policy or action in which highly specialized legal expertise is required or counsel on general legal issues that arise in the ongoing operation of the school system; and (iii) counsel to the Board as it carries out its quasi-judicial responsibilities in appeals and hearings.

2. The factors to be considered in the selection or retention of an attorney include the quality of background and experience, legal skills, responsiveness and sensitivity to the client's needs, style and presence, freedom from conflict of interest, and management skills.

3. With the advice of the superintendent the Board will identify attorneys or firms that meet its criteria and will invite them to express their interest in providing services to the Board. Those interested will be screened and interviewed by the Board and the superintendent.

4. The Board will contract with the attorney or firm selected for a term of one year, subject to annual renewal.

B. Management of Legal Services

1. The Board directs the superintendent to implement the Board-approved legal services management plan for the purpose of coordinating and controlling the school system's use of legal services.

2. A legal services management plan should provide at least the following elements: (a) maintenance of written agreements with counsel; (b) standardization of billing practices; (c) management of costs and staff access to attorneys; and (d) an annual appraisal of the quality of legal services, for use by the Board and the superintendent.

3. The superintendent will develop regulations implementing this policy.

III. Feedback Indicators

The superintendent will provide annual reports to the Board of Education on the costs and effectiveness of legal services.

Re: EXECUTIVE SESSION

The Board met in executive session from 12:10 to 3:15 p.m. to discuss personnel issues and to consult with legal counsel. Mr. Ewing joined

the meeting during executive session.

Re: BOARD/PRESS/VISITOR CONFERENCE

The following individuals appeared before the Board of Education:

1. Cordie Goldstein and Mary Ann Bowen, MCCPTA
2. Clarence Steinberg, Eastern Intermediate School PTSA

RESOLUTION NO. 283-85 Re: PROCUREMENT CONTRACTS OVER \$25,000

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

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

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

	NAME OF VENDOR(S)	DOLLAR VALUE OF CONTRACTS
102-85	Ceiling Board and Grid System Material K-Line Supply, Inc.	\$ 31,093
112-85	Microcomputer Equipment Apple Computer, Inc. Custom Computer, Inc. Clinton Computer	\$1,090,287 63,488 3,550
	TOTAL	----- \$1,157,325
119-85	Printing Adult Education Course Bulletin Record Composition Co.	\$ 45,197
129-85	Driver Education Behind the Wheel Training Ace Driving School, Inc. Easy Method, Inc.	\$ 4,896 42,048
	TOTAL	----- \$ 46,944
132-85	Plumbing Supplies Creed Company Albert Fraley Enterprises T/A Fraley Supply Frederick Trading Co. H & S Co. Harrison Brothers, Inc. Market Sales Corp. Noland Co. Trayco, Inc. Tri Plumbing Supply, Inc. Woodward-Wanger Co.	\$ 135 12,410 6,192 3,858 50,544 248 20,940 17,352 12,270 10,380
	TOTAL	----- \$ 134,329
136-85	Paperback and Prebound Books Bookworm	41.2% discount
139-85	Computer Upgrade and Channel Switches Information Processing Systems, Inc.	\$ 52,800

140-85	Spices and Condiments	
	Carroll County Foods	\$ 4,673
	Frederick Produce Co., Inc.	1,525
	Mazo-Lerch Co., Inc.	43,717
	Stanley Food and Equip. Co., Inc.	8,525
	Wechsler Coffee Corporation	1,749

	TOTAL	\$ 60,189
143-85	Canned Fruits, Vegetables, Juice, and Soups	
	Carroll County Foods	\$ 18,058
	Embassy Grocery Corporation	6,359
	Frederick Produce Company, Inc.	48,216
	Smelkinson Brothers Corporation	11,776

	TOTAL	\$ 84,409
144-85	Chicken Nuggets	
	Manassas Frozen Foods	\$ 203,000
146-85	Frozen Fruits, Vegetables, and Other Frozen Foods	
	Edward Boker Foods, Inc.	\$ 11,178
	Carroll County Foods	3,018
	Frederick Produce Co., Inc.	11,269
	Smelkinson Brothers Corp.	11,684

	TOTAL	\$ 37,149
148-85	Saltine Crackers and Taco Shells	
	Carroll County Foods	\$ 21,221
	Institutional & Industrial Food Specialists	16,140
	Kraft Foodservice	27,720

	TOTAL	\$ 65,081
150-85	Groceries and Staples	
	Carroll County Foods	\$ 22,408
	Frederick Produce Co., Inc.	91,982
	Mazo-Lerch Co., Inc.	5,107
	Smelkinson Brothers Corp.	38,751
	Stanley Food & Equipment Co., Inc.	2,377
	Wechsler Coffee Corp.	400

	TOTAL	\$ 161,025
151-85	Cafeteria Disposables	
	Acme Paper & Supply Co., Inc.	\$ 66,109
	Fonda Group	6,003
	Kahn Paper Company, Inc.	15,050
	Leonard Paper Company	28,992
	Monumental Paper Company	94,483

	TOTAL	\$ 210,637
159-85	Physics Equipment for Blair Magnet	
	Central Scientific Company	\$ 1,789
	Daedalon Corporation	12,934
	Fisher Scientific Company	7,345
	Pasco Scientific	41,975
	Science Kit	388

TOTAL	\$ 64,431
GRAND TOTAL	\$2,253,609

RESOLUTION NO. 284-85 Re: REDUCTION OF RETAINAGE - WOODFIELD
ELEMENTARY SCHOOL (AREA 3)

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

WHEREAS, Deneau Construction, Inc., general contractor for the modernization and addition at Woodfield Elementary School, has completed 75 percent of all specified requirements as of May 31, 1985, and has requested that the 10 percent retainage amount, which is based on the completed work to date, be reduced to 5 percent retainage; and

WHEREAS, The project bonding company, Insurance Company of North America by letter dated May 7, 1985, consented to this reduction; and

WHEREAS, The project architect, Soyejima/Dindlebeck Joint Venture Architects, recommended that this request for reduction in retainage be approved; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the contract's specified 10 percent retainage withheld from periodic construction contract payments to Deneau Construction, Inc., general contractor for the modernization and addition at Woodfield Elementary School, currently amounting to 10 percent of the contractor's request for payment to date, now be reduced to 5 percent with remaining 5 percent to become due and payable after formal acceptance of the completed project and total completion of all remaining contract requirements.

RESOLUTION NO. 285-85 Re: RELOCATION OF PORTABLE CLASSROOM
BUILDINGS

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

WHEREAS, A sealed bid, as indicated below, was received on June 6, 1985, to relocate state-owned portable classroom buildings from their present locations to other school sites:

BIDDER	BASE BID
H & H Enterprises	\$104,450

and

WHEREAS, Several prospective bidders were solicited; however, only one bid was received; and

WHEREAS, Staff has reviewed the bid and has determined it to be

reasonable, within the budget, and in strict accordance with the specifications; and

WHEREAS, Sufficient funds are available to award this contract; now therefore be it

Resolved, That a contract for \$104,450 be awarded to H & H Enterprises, to relocate state-owned portable classroom buildings from Brunswick High (Frederick County) to Darnestown Elementary; Fox Chapel Elementary to Paint Branch High; Fox Chapel Elementary to Burtonsville Elementary; and Rockville High to Travilah Elementary Schools, in accordance with plans and specifications entitled, "Relocation of State-owned Portable Classroom Buildings," dated May 23, 1985, prepared by the Department of School Facilities.

RESOLUTION NO. 286-85 Re: ELECTRICAL SERVICE FOR PORTABLE CLASS-ROOM BUILDINGS - REJECTION OF BIDS

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

WHEREAS, Sealed bids were received on June 3, 1985, for electrical service for portable classroom buildings as follows:

BIDDER	BASE BID
1. Cabrera Electric	\$ 97,527
2. Paul J. Vignola Electric Co., Inc.	\$137,731

and

WHEREAS, The appropriate low bidder's submission contained numerous omissions including bid security; and

WHEREAS, School facilities staff will immediately rebid the project; now therefore be it

Resolved, That all bids received on June 3, 1985, for electrical service for portable classroom buildings be rejected and that the project be readvertised.

RESOLUTION NO. 287-85 Re: REPAIRS TO BOILERS - KENNEDY HIGH, REDLAND MIDDLE, AND E. B. WOOD JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOLS (AREAS 1, 3, and 2)

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

WHEREAS, Sealed bids were received on May 30, 1985, for repairs to boilers at Kennedy High, Redland Middle, and E. B. Wood Junior High Schools, as follows:

PROPOSAL A PROPOSAL B PROPOSAL C

BIDDER	KENNEDY	REDLAND	WOOD
1. M&M Welding & Fabric.	\$14,690	\$14,690	\$12,290
2. J.E.Hurley Machine	17,940	17,940	17,940
2. Capitol Boiler Works	20,950	19,900	20,950

and

WHEREAS, The low bidder, M & M Welding and Fabricators, Inc., has performed satisfactorily on other boiler projects for MCPS; and

WHEREAS, The low bid is within staff estimate and sufficient funds are available to effect award; now therefore be it

Resolved, That a contract for \$41,670 be awarded to M & M Welding and Fabricators, Inc., to accomplish repairs to boilers at Kennedy High (Proposal A), Redland Middle (Proposal B), and E. B. Wood Junior High Schools (Proposal C), in accordance with plans and specifications covering this work dated May 13, 1985, prepared by the Department of School Facilities in conjunction with Morton Wood, Jr., engineer.

RESOLUTION NO. 288-85 Re: IRRIGATION OF FOOTBALL FIELDS

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

WHEREAS, Sealed bids were received on June 6, 1985, for irrigation of football fields at four high schools, as indicated below:

1. Precipitation, Inc.: Proposal A Richard Montgomery \$19,321, Proposal B Poolesville \$18,492, Proposal C Springbrook \$19,088, Proposal D Woodward \$19,463, and Proposal E - TOTAL \$76,364*
2. Pickens & Sons, Inc.: Proposal A Richard Montgomery \$35,000, Proposal B Poolesville \$39,500, Proposal C Springbrook \$33,500, Proposal D Woodward \$37,000, and Proposal E - TOTAL \$141,000.

* Indicates acceptance of Proposals A through D inclusive.

and

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

Resolved, That the low bidder, Precipitation, Inc., be awarded a contract in the amount of \$76,364, for the irrigation of football fields at Richard Montgomery High (Proposal A); Poolesville High (Proposal B); Springbrook High (Proposal C); and Woodward High Schools (Proposal D), in accordance with plans and specifications entitled, "Irrigation of Football Fields at Richard Montgomery, Woodward, Poolesville, and Springbrook High Schools, " dated May 6, 1985, prepared by the Department of School Facilities.

RESOLUTION NO. 289-85 Re: UTILIZATION OF FY 1986 FUTURE SUPPORTED PROJECTS FUNDS FOR A RICA II AND BRIDGE SCHOOL SUMMER WORK EXPERIENCE

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Mrs.

Praisner seconded by Mrs. DiFonzo, the following resolution was adopted unanimously:

Resolved, That the superintendent of schools be authorized to receive and expend, within the FY 1986 Provision for Future Supported Projects, a \$45,315 grant award from the Montgomery County Department of Facilities and Services for a RICA II and Bridge School Summer Work Experience in the following categories:

CATEGORY	AMOUNT
04 Special Education	\$41,475
10 Fixed Charges	3,840

TOTAL	\$45,315

and be it further

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

RESOLUTION NO. 290-85 Re: MONTHLY PERSONNEL REPORT

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

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

RESOLUTION NO. 291-85 Re: PERSONNEL REASSIGNMENTS

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

Resolved, That the following personnel reassignments be approved:

NAME	FROM	TO
John Baroni	Classroom Teacher R. Montgomery H.S. MEQ-L3	Instructional Asst. School to be determined Effective July 1, 1985 Will maintain salary status and retire 7-1-86
Edythe Cariski	Classroom Teacher Wood Acres Elem. MEQ-L3	Instructional Asst. School to be determined Effective July 1, 1985 Will maintain salary status and retire 7-1-86
James Courtney	Classroom Teacher Magruder High MEQ-L3	Instructional Asst. School to be determined Effective July 1, 1985 Will maintain salary status and retire 7-1-86

William Dudley	Classroom Teacher Montgomery Vill. JHS MEQ-L2	Instructional Asst. School to be determined Effective July 1, 1985 Will maintain salary status and retire 7-1-86
Joyce Fitz	Classroom Teacher Eastern Intermediate MEQ-L2	Instructional Asst. School to be determined Effective July 1, 1985 Will maintain salary status and retire 7-1-86
Lucia Marsh	Classroom Teacher Rock View Elementary MEQ+30-L3	Instructional Asst. School to be determined Effective July 1, 1985 Will maintain salary status and retire 7-1-86
James Pilgrim	Classroom Teacher Damascus High MEQ-L3	Instructional Asst. School to be determined Effective July 1, 1985 Will maintain salary status and retire 7-1-86
John Ridgway	Classroom Teacher On Personal Illness Leave MEQ-L3	Instructional Asst. School to be determined Effective July 1, 1985 Will maintain salary status and retire 7-1-86
Laura Steele	Classroom Teacher On Personal Illness Leave MEQ-L3	Instructional Asst. School to be determined Effective July 1, 1985 Will maintain salary status and retire 7-1-87
Evelyn Sweet	Classroom Teacher Harmony Hills Elem. MEQ+30-L3	Instructional Asst. School to be determined Effective July 1, 1985 Will maintain salary status and retire 7-1-87
Blanche Wilson	Classroom Teacher Rolling Terr. Elem. M-L1	Instructional Asst. School to be determined Effective July 1, 1985 Will maintain salary status and retire 7-1-87
Frances Yee	Classroom Teacher Farmland Elementary MEQ-L3	Instructional Asst. School to be determined Effective July 1, 1985 Will maintain salary status and retire 7-1-86
Daniel Vodzak	Classroom Teacher Banneker Jr. H. S. M+30-L3	Instructional Asst. School to be determined Effective July 1, 1985 Will maintain salary status and retire 7-1-86

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

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

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education grant an extension of sick leave with three-fourths pay covering the number of days indicated:

NAME	POSITION AND LOCATION	NO. OF DAYS
Lutsky, Steven J.	Maintenance Carpenter I Division of Maintenance	30

RESOLUTION NO. 293-85 Re: DEATH OF MR. DONALD L. POWELL, BUS OPERATOR IN AREA 3 TRANSPORTATION OFFICE

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

WHEREAS, The death on May 29, 1985, of Mr. Donald L. Powell, a bus operator in Area 3, has deeply saddened the staff and members of the Board of Education; and

WHEREAS, Mr. Powell had been a loyal employee of the Montgomery County Public Schools for almost ten years; and

WHEREAS, Mr. Powell's dedication to his job was recognized by students, staff, and the community; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the members of the Board of Education express their sorrow at the death of Mr. Donald L. Powell and extend deepest sympathy to his family; and be it further

Resolved, That this resolution be made part of the minutes of this meeting and a copy be forwarded to Mr. Powell's family.

RESOLUTION NO. 294-85 Re: MR. CLARENCE S. HENSON (ADDENDUM TO PERSONNEL REPORT)

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

WHEREAS, Mr. Clarence S. Henson is a teacher in Montgomery County Public Schools assigned to Piney Branch Elementary School; and

WHEREAS, Mr. Henson has been absent from his teaching position since March 3, 1985, without providing any reason therefore; and

WHEREAS, Mr. Henson has been requested, both orally and in writing, by his principal and the director of the Department of Personnel Services to submit the appropriate leave forms for review and approval for his absence from his teaching assignment but has failed to do so; and

WHEREAS, Mr. Henson has in fact abandoned his teaching position by being absent from his teaching assignment without approved leave and is, therefore, in breach of his teaching contract; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Board of Education declares that Mr. Henson abandoned his teaching assignment at Piney Branch Elementary School without approved leave and is in breach of his teaching contract; and be it further

Resolved, That the Board of Education directs the superintendent of schools to notify Mr. Henson of the Board's action and to take the appropriate steps to terminate Mr. Henson's employment with Montgomery County Public Schools.

RESOLUTION NO. 295-85 Re: PERSONNEL APPOINTMENTS, TRANSFERS AND REASSIGNMENTS

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

Resolved, That the following personnel appointments, transfers and reassignments be approved:

APPOINTMENT	PRESENT POSITION	AS
John M. Burley	Admin. Asst. to the Associate Supt. Office of Instruction and Program Development	Principal Viers Mill Elementary Effective July 1, 1985
Kathleen Lasinski	Counselor Travilah Elementary	Principal Wood Acres Elementary Effective July 1, 1985
Lorelei Summerville	Teacher Specialist Science Dept. of Academic Skills	Coordinator of Secondary Science Dept. of Academic Skills Grade N Effective July 1, 1985
Sheila Stewart	Supervisor of Guidance Howard County Public Schools	Assistant Principal King Junior High School Effective July 1, 1985
Gary Levine	Operations Research Analyst Dept. of Defense	Personnel Specialist Div. of Salary Admin. Cert. and Records

Office of Asst. Insp. Grade G
Gen. for Auditing Effective July 1, 1985

REASSIGNMENT FROM TO
Patricia Newby Supervisor, Elem. Supervisor, Elementary
Instruction Instruction
Academic Leave Area Admin. Office
Effective July 1, 1985

TRANSFER FROM TO
James Hetrick Asst. Principal Asst. Principal
Northwood H.S. Blair High School
Effective Aug. 1, 1985

TEMPORARY REASSIGNMENT FOR THE 1985-1986 SCHOOL YEAR

NAME AND PRESENT POSITION	POSITION EFFECTIVE July 1, 1985	POSITION EFFECTIVE July 1, 1986
J. Joseph McIntyre Asst. Principal Wood Junior High	A&S Counselor	Asst. Principal
TRANSFER Kenneth Huff	FROM Asst. Principal Sligo Middle	TO Asst. Principal Wood Junior Effective July 1, 1985
REASSIGNMENT Leon Clay	FROM Principal temporarily reassigned to asst. principalship at Julius West Middle	TO Asst. Principal Julius West Middle Effective July 1, 1985 Retirement effective July 1, 1986

RESOLUTION NO. 296-85 Re: ACADEMIC LEAVE

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

Resolved, That the following personnel be granted academic leave for the period indicated:

Bainbridge, Kathleen
Teacher, Resource Room
DuFief Elementary School
Years of Service in Montgomery County -- 7
Period of Leave -- August 27, 1985 through June 19, 1986
Attend Hood College to complete master's degree in counseling and certification as a pupil personnel worker

Caldwell, Carl
Teacher, Grade 6
Pine Crest Elementary School
Years of Service in Montgomery County -- 10
Period of Leave - August 27, 1985 through June 19, 1986
Attend University of North Carolina at Greensboro to pursue master of

education program in special education

DiJulio, Marian

Teacher, Interrelated ARTS

Connecticut Park Center

Years of Service in Montgomery County -- 10

Period of Leave - August 27, 1985 through June 19, 1986 (half-time basis)

Attend George Washington University to complete MFA in acting

Figert, Linda

Teacher, Mathematics

Northwood High School

Years of Service in Montgomery County -- 7

Period of Leave - August 27, 1985 through June 19, 1986

Attend the Johns Hopkins University to work toward master of science (technology for educators)

Frey, Jim

Teacher

Currently on Professional Leave

Years of Service in Montgomery County - 23

Period of Leave - August 27, 1985 through January 27, 1986

Attend Salisbury State College to pursue certification in guidance and psychology

Holliday, Kathleen

Principal

Lakewood Elementary School

Years of Service in Montgomery County -- 11

Period of Leave - July 1, 1985 through June 30, 1986

To complete executive intern program through the National Association of Elementary School Principals

Jones, Keith

Teacher, Grade 4

Burning Tree Elementary

Years of Service in Montgomery County -- 7

Period of Leave - August 27, 1985 through June 19, 1986

Attend Middlebury College to pursue master of arts in Spanish

Kravitz, Michael

Teacher, Lab Science

Charles W. Woodward High School

Years of Service in Montgomery County -- 13

Period of Leave - August 27, 1985 through June 19, 1986

Attend Montgomery College to take coursework in physics and related math for certification in math

Kupperman, Barbara

Teacher Specialist, Gifted and Talented

Gifted unit, OIPD

Years of Service in Montgomery County -- 13

Period of Leave - August 27, 1985 through June 19, 1986

Attend American University to pursue master's degree in supervision and teacher education

McEleney, Darlyne

Teacher, Grade 2

Gaithersburg Elementary School

Years of Service in Montgomery County -- 9

Period of Leave - August 27, 1985 through June 19, 1986

Attend Hood College to complete coursework for certification in guidance and counseling

Mills, Ghislaine

Teacher, French and Spanish

Cabin John Junior High School

Years of Service in Montgomery County -- 13

Period of Leave - August 27, 1985 through June 19, 1986

Attend University of Maryland to earn certification in Latin

Petrone, Joseph

Teacher, Computer Coordinator

Pine Crest Elementary School

Years of Service in Montgomery County -- 9

Period of Leave - August 27, 1985 through June 19, 1986

To attend University of Maryland to work toward doctorate in education policy planning and administration

Poe, Berlyeen

Teacher, Mathematics

Ridgeview Junior High School

Years of Service in Montgomery County -- 7

Period of Leave - August 27, 1985 through June 19, 1986

Attend George Washington University to complete master's program in vocational/special education

Redler, Lenore

Teacher, Grade 4

Diamond Elementary School

Years of Service in Montgomery County -- 17

Period of Leave - August 27, 1985 through June 19, 1986

Attend Trinity College to earn master's degree in guidance and counseling

Ribar, Mary

Teacher

Currently on Academic Leave for One Semester

Years of Service in Montgomery County - - 15

Period of Leave - August 27, 1985 through January 27, 1986

Smith, Mary Helen

Supervisor of Secondary Instruction

Area 1 Administrative Office

Years of Service in Montgomery County -- 15

Period of Leave - July 1, 1985 through June 30, 1986

Attend George Washington University to work on doctorate in human

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

WHEREAS, As part of the established procedure for maintaining a continuous review of the position classification and pay plan, the superintendent has recommended establishment of a new position classification; and

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

Resolved, That a new classification title of Maintenance Services Specialist be established at pay grade 19 (\$20,883 minimum -- \$35,526 maximum longevity) and that the vacant Maintenance Painter II position, pay grade 14, be reconstituted to the new title, effective 6/15/85.

Miss Duby left the meeting at this point.

RESOLUTION NO. 298-85 Re: BOARD ALTERNATIVE FOR NEW HAMPSHIRE
ESTATES/ROLLING TERRACE

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education adopt the following alternative for capital projects in the Blair area:

...provide for larger building at New Hampshire Estates and Rolling Terrace in order to provide for (1) day care and/or county service space and (2) additional space in the schools for non-service area students so that students from outside the service area could be recruited to attend the two schools because of the attractiveness of the magnet program. Describe efforts that would be made to recruit those students from outside the cluster.

Dr. Cronin assumed the chair.

Re: A MOTION BY DR. SHOENBERG FOR A
BLAIR AREA ALTERNATIVE (FAILED)

A motion by Dr. Shoenberg to ask the staff to present the Board with an option which would show the effects of including all the Fox Hall Apartments in Rolling Terrace failed with Mrs. DiFonzo and Dr. Floyd voting in the affirmative; Dr. Cronin, Mr. Ewing, Mrs. Praisner, and Dr. Shoenberg voting in the negative.

Dr. Shoenberg assumed the chair.

Re: MAGNET FOR EASTERN INTERMEDIATE SCHOOL

There was agreement to add a statement that students would commute to their high school for geometry unless there were 15 students eligible to take geometry. There was agreement to put in the program

description that staff would explore the possibility of working with the university, public agencies, and the private sector to provide assistance to the school in carrying out its enriched and magnet programs.

RESOLUTION NO. 299-85 Re: AN EXPANDED EASTERN INTERMEDIATE SCHOOL MAGNET PROGRAM

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

WHEREAS, The Board of Education is committed to the provision of quality integrated education with the Blair Cluster through strengthened magnet programs; now therefore be it

Resolved, That Eastern Intermediate School's Multilanguage Magnet program be expanded to include accelerated language courses, media/communication arts courses, and enriched interdisciplinary program opportunities.

Re: BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS

1. Mr. Ewing reported that he had attended a number of graduations during the years he had been on the Board of Education, but the best speech he had heard was delivered yesterday by a teacher at Wheaton High School who was selected by the Washington POST as one of the outstanding teachers in the area. The teacher focused on the most important thing that students learned in high school was to learn how to learn.
2. Mrs. Praisner called attention to the June 10 issue of PEOPLE MAGAZINE and excellent article on the ESOL program in Montgomery County and the METS program at Takoma Park.
3. Mrs. Praisner said the Board had received an item of information on the honors program to be acted upon in the future. She was concerned that they seemed to continue to add courses, but she had not seen any deletions. She was concerned that junior high school students passing geometry would not be getting honors credit for Algebra II, but students repeating geometry would be getting honors credit. She asked that staff address the issue of when students took courses ahead of schedule they were deemed to be honors courses.
4. Mrs. Praisner hoped that staff would be responding to the letter from the Montrose Civic Association about space for the community.
5. Mrs. Praisner hoped that the Board would be taking action on responding to the proposed state bylaw on school closures. She indicated that she would provide a copy of the response prepared by the Maryland Association of Boards of Education.
6. Mr. Ewing asked where they were with Mrs. Slye's proposed resolution on commitments in the way of future growth areas in the budget. Dr. Shoenberg replied that this was scheduled for the August all-day meeting.

RESOLUTION NO. 330-85 Re: EXECUTIVE SESSION - JUNE 24, 1985

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

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 June 24, 1985, at 7:30 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.

Re: COMMISSION ON EXCELLENCE IN TEACHING

Dr. Cronin moved and Dr. Floyd seconded the following:

WHEREAS, On April 9, 1985, the Board of Education created an advisory committee of distinguished citizens of the county, to be known as the Commission on Excellence in Teaching; and

WHEREAS, The Board has selected eleven persons who live or work in the county and who are neither current members of the Board of Education nor current employees of the Montgomery County Public Schools to serve on the Commission; and

WHEREAS, The Commission is asked to address the issues which arise in connection with the following question:

How shall the Montgomery County Board of Education and the county public school system meet the challenges posed by the need to find, recruit, hire, train, and retain, and retain the excellent teachers the county schools need to assure that teaching excellence remains a hallmark of the Montgomery County Public Schools

and

WHEREAS, That, in considering these issues, the Commission will take cognizance of agreements the Board has negotiated with its three employee organizations and avoid conflicts related to these agreements by consulting with the Board on collective bargaining matters before it begins its work and at any point where contract issues might arise or be involved with Commission consideration; now

therefore be it

Resolved, That the Board of Education appoint the following individuals to the Commission on Excellence in Teaching:

DeRosette Blunt	David Li
James Culp	Thomas McFee
Linda Darling-Hammond	Michael O'Keefe
John Diggs	David Tatel
Laura Dittman	Nancy Wiecking
Pam Farr	

and be it further

Resolved, That Mr. Michael O'Keefe be designated as the Commission's chairperson; and be it further

Resolved, That when the Board of Education meets with the Commission at its initial organizational meeting, the superintendent will present the staff liaison person who will discuss providing the Commission with reasonable clerical and research services; and be it further

Resolved, That the Commission will submit an interim report and recommendations by October 1, 1985, and a final report one year after it begins its work.

Re: A MOTION BY DR. CRONIN TO AMEND THE
RESOLUTION ON THE COMMISSION ON
EXCELLENCE IN TEACHING

Dr. Cronin moved that the commission submit an interim report by January 1, 1986, with the final report by January 1, 1987.

Re: A SUBSTITUTE MOTION BY MR. EWING TO
AMEND DR. CRONIN'S MOTION (FAILED)

A substitute motion by Mr. Ewing to amend Dr. Cronin's motion by asking for a final report by October 1, 1986 failed with Mr. Ewing, Dr. Floyd, and Dr. Shoenberg voting in the affirmative; Dr. Cronin, Mrs. DiFonzo, and Mrs. Praisner voting in the negative.

RESOLUTION NO. 301-85 Re: AN AMENDMENT TO THE PROPOSED RESOLUTION
ON A COMMISSION ON EXCELLENCE IN
TEACHING

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

Resolved, That the proposed resolution on a Commission on Excellence in Teaching be amended in the last Resolved for an interim report by January 1, 1986 with a final report by January 1, 1987.

RESOLUTION NO. 302-85 Re: COMMISSION ON EXCELLENCE IN TEACHING

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

WHEREAS, On April 9, 1985, the Board of Education created an advisory committee of distinguished citizens of the county, to be known as the Commission on Excellence in Teaching; and

WHEREAS, The Board has selected eleven persons who live or work in the county and who are neither current members of the Board of Education nor current employees of the Montgomery County Public Schools to serve on the Commission; and

WHEREAS, The Commission is asked to address the issues which arise in connection with the following question:

How shall the Montgomery County Board of Education and the county public school system meet the challenges posed by the need to find, recruit, hire, train, and retain, and retain the excellent teachers the county schools need to assure that teaching excellence remains a hallmark of the Montgomery County Public Schools

and

WHEREAS, That, in considering these issues, the Commission will take cognizance of agreements the Board has negotiated with its three employee organizations and avoid conflicts related to these agreements by consulting with the Board on collective bargaining matters before it begins its work and at any point where contract issues might arise or be involved with Commission consideration; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Board of Education appoint the following individuals to the Commission on Excellence in Teaching:

DeRosette Blunt	David Li
James Culp	Thomas McFee
Linda Darling-Hammond	Michael O'Keefe
John Diggs	David Tatel
Laura Dittman	Nancy Wiecking
Pam Farr	

and be it further

Resolved, That Mr. Michael O'Keefe be designated as the Commission's chairperson; and be it further

Resolved, That when the Board of Education meets with the Commission at its initial organizational meeting, the superintendent will

present the staff liaison person who will discuss providing the Commission with reasonable clerical and research services; and be it further

Resolved, That the Commission will submit an interim report and recommendations by January 1, 1986, and a final report by January 1, 1987.

Re: ITEMS OF INFORMATION

Board members received the following items of information:

1. Items in Process
2. Construction Progress Report
3. Honors Program (for future consideration)
4. PROGRAM OF STUDIES Revision for Courses Meeting Fine Arts Requirement (for future consideration)

Re: ADJOURNMENT

The president adjourned the meeting at 5:45 p.m.

President

Secretary

WSC:mlw