

smoother this year, and he commended the staff and the Board of Education for this. However, he believed there were some critical situations that might occur during the year where more portables might be needed.

Dr. Pitt reported that the first day enrollment was 93,373, or 1500 under their projections. He thought that by the thirtieth day they would be at or over projection. They had 1,000 more students at the secondary level and 400 fewer at the secondary level. They had hired 292 teachers and would hire another 100 to 200 by the end of the school year. Of the 292 teachers, 269 elected to take the extra training offered prior to the beginning of the school year.

Dr. Pitt recalled that the Board had put 52 additional elementary school teachers in the budget to reduce class size, but cuts had been made, and they had ended up with 25 additional teachers. If they ended up at their projections, they would not be able to reduce class size to the number they wanted. At the secondary levels they ended up with four additional J/I/M teachers and six additional senior high teachers, but here they were under projection. They were still holding some reserve of secondary teachers. He noted that last year they had 300 large classes at the senior high school level, and he did not believe that number would be reduced this year. Dr. Pitt commented that this was the best opening of all those he had been associated with over the years.

Dr. Cody thought the opening had gone well although they did have two "lost" children who had gotten off buses at the wrong bus stops. He said that the maintenance people had done an excellent job in moving so many portable classrooms which was not an easy task. He was pleased that almost all of the new teachers had taken advantage of the summer program. He said that having open contracts, providing staff training, and making early decisions had paid off.

Mr. Ewing commented that based on the number of calls he received each year about transportation this was a successful year because he had received only one call. He asked about whether they had enough bus drivers and substitutes. Mr. Leon Stafford, acting associate superintendent for supportiveservices, replied that he thought they had enough. They had about 20 open runs but these were being covered, and in addition they had about 90 drivers in training. He reported that this year they had a bidding process for drivers to select routes, and this had caused some delays in permanent assignments. Dr. Shoenberg asked about improvements in the Randolph Bus Depot. Mr. Stafford replied that they were scheduled to plant the trees in the fall, but the community wanted barriers erected as well. He hoped that when the new exits were built this would resolve a lot of the problems. Mr. William Wilder, director of School Facilities, added that the County Department of Transportation was reviewing plans for the exits, and they hoped an emergency supplemental would be provided this year.

Dr. Shoenberg remarked that the minority recruitment team had done an outstanding job, and he inquired about plans for the future. Dr.

Cody replied that they were continuing the same basic plan to secure highly qualified applicants. In the fall, winter and spring they would focus on recruitment, and later they would work with Personnel on placement. He said that one of the most productive strategies they employed was to focus on professors in colleges and universities to ask them to identify potential candidates. Dr. Shoenberg recalled that they had projected the need for about 600 teachers, and obviously they would not get to that number. He gathered that it was because of the lower turnover and Council cuts. He thought it would be interesting to do an analysis of this. Dr. Pitt replied that 71 teachers had been cut from the original budget. Dr. Cody thought they would hire close to 500 by the end of the year.

Dr. Shoenberg asked when they would get to a point where they would start reducing the number of portable classrooms. Dr. Phil Rohr, director of planning, replied that September 1987 would be the peak in the number of portables. After that they would start to open more schools, but some would have midyear openings.

Mr. Ewing asked that Dr. Cody convey the Board's appreciation to the minority recruitment team.

Re: FOREIGN LANGUAGE PROGRAM

Dr. Cody reported that he had been given a newspaper clipping which stated that business undergraduates at the University of Minnesota would be told this fall to take more foreign language and international relations courses. He said that this was a fairly common item in newspapers now of colleges and universities adding to foreign language requirements either for admission or for graduation. Dr. Cody stated that the Board had received a paper from him, a paper from the Department of Educational Accountability, and an options paper prepared by Dr. Mimi Met. He said that if they were to focus on improving foreign language instruction in the school system they could, and he thought they should, revise the curriculum, and do things to make the program more accessible to students such as expanding summer school and expanding opportunities at the elementary level.

Dr. Cody said it was time to address the question of whether students should be required to either develop a proficiency or at least engage in an introduction to a foreign language as part of their basic education. He noted that of 1985 graduates 76 percent had studied one or more years of a foreign language. The prior year it was 72 percent, and in 1986 the data indicated 77 percent of last year's seniors had studied one or more years of a foreign language. He reported that of the 23 or 24 percent of those other students they had information that about another 3 percent of the total student body were minority students from foreign countries who were bilingual. If the objective was for all students to study or be proficient in a second language, they were talking about 20 percent of the students who did not have at least a one year's introduction. He thought it was time to give serious consideration to having some requirement, but there were many issues that needed to be studied. The basic question to address first was whether or not an

introduction to or a level of proficiency should become a requirement.

Dr. Cody stated that worldwide communication continued to expand particularly relating to trade, and being able to communicate in a language other than English and knowing that one could learn a foreign language would expand career opportunities for some students. He said that foreign travel has been increasing, and he felt the trend would continue. He said that being able to speak the language of the country one visited enhanced that experience. He felt that foreign travel was a valuable educational experience. He said that major portions of the United States had been increasing in the number of new citizens from other countries. He believed that the ability to converse with these people in their native language enhanced the quality of life for those born in the United States. In addition, colleges were increasing their foreign language requirements, and 80 percent of the graduates of MCPS went on to college.

Dr. Cody commented that if one of their purposes was to teach students to learn how to learn various kinds of knowledge, learning a foreign language was a unique skill. It was different from most of the other things studied by students. He believed that they would enhance the learning capacity of every student by showing them how to learn a foreign language. This would show everyone that they were able to learn a foreign language. He had tried to avoid saying they ought to require a course in high school or a course in secondary school. He thought they should initially plan to structure it in such a way that it did encourage a larger number of younger children to begin the process of learning a foreign language earlier even if it was an outside-of-school opportunity through financial support.

Dr. Mimi Met, foreign language supervisor, reported that this summer they had done training with the foreign language resource teachers on teaching students to become foreign language learners. She said that one question was how to decide which language to require. She said that the answer was that learning any foreign language as a process gave students the skills for learning additional languages more easily. She said that several colleges and universities in Maryland required foreign languages for graduation, and those requirements could be met through high school foreign language. She noted that one in every six Americans owed his or her job to foreign trade, and one out of every three acres of American farmland prepared crops for export. She thought that if they wanted to maintain their status as a world leader in economics and international trade it would help if sales people could speak the language of the people to whom they were selling.

Dr. Cody remarked that long-range they would be at a point in time in the future whereby their goal should be second language proficiency of all students. The proposal before the Board was not that yet. He noted that the United States was the only developed country that did not have as part of its educational program the learning of a second language. He explained that he was not proposing at this time introducing either an elective or a required program for all

elementary schools during the school day. He felt that the research analysis done by DEA did not really make a convincing case one way or the other in terms of starting early other than the earlier the start the more time to learn. The other reason was that 77 percent of the students already were studying a foreign language, and to shift instruction down to the elementary level would be a very high cost item, and they had some other priorities that they hadn't finished yet.

Dr. Cody thought there was a way to encourage an early start which was to financially underwrite part or all of the students in the afterschool program provided by the MCCPTA. He said he had not had any discussion with MCCPTA and would welcome their comments. He said the program would be more accessible to students if they encouraged it by providing the tuition for at least the needy students or maybe all students. At the present time there were 2,000 students enrolled at \$66 a head. The goal of tripling that in a year's time would be real money in the budget but would be far more modest than starting on a during-the-day program for everyone.

Dr. Floyd said he had looked at the 1986 community survey and did not see anything about attitudes about increasing foreign language instruction. He asked if they had any knowledge of the views of parents. Dr. Met replied that they had no hard data. Mrs. Praisner recalled that there had been support for extended day programs and for special programs.

Mr. Ewing commented that he was enthusiastic about the superintendent's suggestions and recommendations and in agreement with the reasons listed. He thought there had to be an argument in a slightly different format. He said that people had raised the question that not everyone could learn a foreign language and this was something for the more gifted students. He thought they needed to be very clear that this was not true. It was a skill acquired in many other countries by all kinds of students who ranged from the gifted to the below average in intelligence and ability. He said that everyone who could learn and benefit from public school education could learn a language. The second question was the extent to which learning a foreign language was a practical skill for everyone. For example, a lot of students would not go to college or have the money for foreign travel. They had to argue that it was a potentially attractive skill which would be available to people as a skill which they could put to use if they needed to learn something else. The best arguments were arguments that had to do more with a skill being acquired and the contribution to making students better citizens in a democratic society. It broke down cultural barriers. Public education should force people to examine their assumptions and their theories about the rest of the world. He thought learning a foreign language was a good way to do this because as they taught a foreign language they also taught about other societies. Learning a foreign language also gave them some sense about how other people thought. He thought it was a critical and essential element of everyone's education. He suggested that they needed some kind of a statement that dealt with potential objections and some kind of

process for assessing how they were doing with this.

Dr. Shoenberg stated that he agreed with a great deal of what Mr. Ewing had said. He reported that at the University of Maryland they had been conducting discussions on having foreign language as an admissions requirement rather than a graduation requirement. He said that about 7/8ths of University of Maryland students had two years of a language, and about 55 percent had three years. He thought the University might be headed toward a three-years admissions requirement phased in over time; however, this was a preliminary discussion. He said that from the discussion some of the uncertainty about what the requirement ought to be stemmed from the uncertainty of what they wanted to emphasize in having the requirement. As Dr. Cody spoke, the emphasis was on skill development. Mr. Ewing had introduced the notion of cross-cultural awareness. He pointed out that there was so much in their curriculum which was simply skill development, and they were telling students they needed to learn this in order to go on and learn something else. If they were going to introduce a language requirement, and he favored the general notion of expanding instruction in foreign languages, they needed to convince students there was something in it for them other than having another skill to develop. The rationale provided left open a lot of questions about a universal requirement. While he found the argument of knowing that one could learn to be a persuasive argument, he did not think many students resistant to the process would find it persuasive. He said the college requirements would take care of themselves and the trade argument was difficult to sustain as a rationale. The increasing number of citizens speaking a second language would be an argument for Spanish or some Asian language.

Dr. Shoenberg thought the cross-cultural argument was the one likely to be persuasive to the largest number of people, and he would like to see them emphasizing that. This would say something about how they designed the course. On the elementary level, he understood the argument about resources and time in the school day. He suggested that they take another look at that including the availability of teachers and what they were going to expect of the elementary teachers they hired. He noted that they were in a situation now where there was likely to be some major changes in the undergraduate training of teachers. He thought they also needed to look at some additional immersion programs in other parts of the county.

Mrs. Praisner remarked that she agreed with Mr. Ewing and Dr. Shoenberg. She agreed that they needed to be very clear in developing a rationale for why they were proceeding with whatever option they finally adopted because of the financial implications and the reasons given to students and the community about the requirement. For her, exposure to and appreciation of another language was of fundamental importance for everyone.

Mrs. Praisner said she was not sure how one would require something for a diploma if it did not come in the 9-12 time period. Dr. Cody said that this was on a list of items to consider. It might be they would conclude that a person completing a program outside the school system or in summer school had fulfilled the requirements for a

secondary school course. He explained that at this time they were trying to deal with concepts and not concluding at this stage that they should offer a during-the-day elementary school program for any or all students, but they wanted a requirement to encourage students to start early and make the options available on an economic basis. It was not to encourage students to "get it out of the way" but to encourage students to start earlier especially if the content and form of the programs were carefully constructed.

Mrs. Praisner noted that the one issue missing from the paper was the J/I/M level foreign language program which did have an implication for where elementary school students came in. She recalled they had discussed the reason why originally it was two years to fulfill one year at the junior high level. Those factors were no longer relevant, and she asked if they were still pursuing this issue and whether it would still be level 1 over two years. Dr. Lois Martin, associate superintendent, said they had looked into this and had concluded that they would be operating both types of programs because schools had come to different conclusions about the capacities of their students to manage a full year in a year or not.

Mrs. Praisner recalled that one of her children had been told that if he did not begin a language in the seventh grade he could not begin a language until the ninth. More recently her daughter had the option of beginning the language in the eighth grade. Dr. Met commented that most of the J/I/M schools allowed for entry at any grade. If a school had the option for the A/B program, it also had the option for eighth graders to do the whole program in one year. She was finding that more and more schools were compressing the A/B program into one year at the J/I/M level. Mrs. Praisner said that she would not want to make a leap one way or the other until she had the pros and cons of doing those things. Dr. Met agreed that there were valid arguments on both sides of the issue and strong feelings among the resource teachers. She said that one way of facilitating this would be a revision of the PROGRAM OF STUDIES in terms of proficiency attained in covering level 1 in one year.

Mrs. Praisner said she was pleased to see that they would be dealing with the content of the program and instruction. Dr. Cody remarked that they had not looked at the curriculum content in a long time. He suspected that the A/B split was due to the fact that some students took longer, and he hoped that they would look at what they were doing in this program. He noted that there was evidence that in initial language learning students were not separated out by their background. Students started off being equal in the oral learning of a language. One of the issues they would face was whether the initial experience should emphasize the oral language development. He thought they might come up with an initial introductory course heavily weighted in oral communication that did not separate out students by virtue of their class background. He said this was more likely to be a successful experience for everyone. This might persuade a larger number of students to go on and study more. Dr. Martin noted that they had not talked about teaching people how to function in a foreign language environment when they were less

than fluent. They also needed to get data on trends in foreign business ownership and foreign tourism. For example, Americans were treated warmly when they travelled abroad, but that was not the experience of others coming to the United States. She suggested that students should learn to be of help to others and not to be in the position where other people could understand Americans, but Americans could not understand others.

Dr. Floyd cautioned them to be sure they kept a balanced eye on the value of the cross-cultural argument versus the value of the skill acquisition argument. He noted that demographic data about the 21st century which was only 15 years away showed they had not begun to realize the significant impact that the Spanish language was going to have on their way of life. To that they had to add the cross-cultural influence of industry and trade. Twenty years from now people competing in business might have to have the skill acquisition and cross-cultural awareness because their supervisors might be non-English speaking.

Dr. Floyd asked Mrs. Margaret Hammar, MCCPTA, if she had a comment. Mrs. Hammar stated that the Board was having lunch with ICB representatives, and the ICB charged room fees for FLES which caused the charges for that program to increase.

Re: EXECUTIVE SESSION

The Board of Education met in executive session from 11:40 to 1:40 on appeals. In addition, the Board held a discussion with its ICB representatives. *Mr. Steinberg joined the Board at this point.

Re: BOARD/PRESS/VISITOR CONFERENCE

Mrs. Charlotte Joseph, Montgomery County Ethnic Affairs Committee, appeared before the Board of Education.

RESOLUTION NO. 482-86 Re: PROCUREMENT CONTRACTS OVER \$25,000

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

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

WHEREAS, Bid No. 185-86, Lavatory Partitions, was rejected due to protests from two vendors and lack of competition and reissued as Bid No. 261-86; and

WHEREAS, Only one bid was received for the new Bid No. 261-86, Lavatory Partitions, and there is still lack of competition; and

WHEREAS, Bid No. 236-86, Personal Computers and Peripheral Equipment, was issued on the basis of individual components and with no provision for installation by the vendors since each of the

components would be supplied by different low bid vendors and no single vendor would be responsible for the warranty; and

WHEREAS, It is necessary to reissue Bid No. 251-86, Automotive Radiator Repair, due to vendor misinterpretation of bid specifications; and

WHEREAS, It is necessary to reissue Bid No. 254-86, Motor Vehicles, due to a nonresponse for 1986 and 1987 vehicles because manufacturers closed their production lines for 1986 vehicles in May 1986 and could make the prices for 1987 vehicles available in late August 1986; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That Bid No. 236-86, Bid No. 251-86, Bid No. 254-86, and Bid No. 261-86 be rejected; and be it further

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

	NAME OF VENDOR(S)	DOLLAR VALUE OF CONTRACTS
COG IFB No. Y-79949	Diesel Fuel Petron Trading Co., Inc.	\$ 264,321
131-86	Plumbing Supplies Apex Plumbing Supply, Inc. Capp, Inc. Central Wholesalers Creed Company Fraley Supply Company H & S Company Harrison Brothers, Inc. Lenz Supply Corporation McArdle & Walsh, Inc. Motion Specialities, Inc. Noland Company J. A. Sexauer Southern Utilities Company, Inc. Standard Supplies, Inc. H. M. Sweeny Company Trayco Tri Plumbing Supply, Inc. Woodward-Wanger Company	\$ 5,420 10,220 421 167 595 7,290 32,884 647 1,156 2,831 19,684 403 2,213 486 4,722 2,040 4,474 6,411 -----
	Total	\$ 102,064
174-86	Shade Material Crown Shade Company Rocky Mount Cord Company Window Moods, Inc.	\$ 8,751 3,977 26,057 -----
	Total	\$ 38,785

199-86	Building Materials	
	Allied Plywood Corporation	\$ 9,432
	Boyer & Cramer's, Inc.	6,357
	Lowe's of Manassas	9,932
	Metro Building Supply	18,653
	T. W. Perry, Inc.	10,621
	Potomac Valley Brick & Supply Co.	2,680

	Total	\$ 57,675
200-86	Glass and Glazing Materials	
	Almac Plastics, Inc.	\$ 20,439
	Hawkins Glass Co., Inc.	42,861
	Read Plastics	2,750

	Total	\$ 66,050
210-86	Industrial Education Cosmetology Supplies	
	Burmax Co.	\$ 24,008
	Henry Kayser and Fils, Inc.	7,512
	Fingerpaints Inc., Co.	384

	Total	\$ 31,904
252-86	IBM 4248 Line Printer, Model 1	
	IBM Corporation	\$ 63,750
258-86	Copying Machine and Copier Service Maintenance	
	Consolidated Photo Copy Co., Inc.	\$ 235,500
	Hi-Tech Industries, Inc.	10,000

	Total	\$ 245,550
5-87	Steel Lockers: Parts Replacement	
	Blaine Window Repair Service, Inc.	\$ 589
	W. A. Hamilton Co., Inc.	9,146
	Shiffler Equipment Sales, Inc.	299
	Steel Products	2,293
	Wholesale Replacement Hardware Co.	33,237
	Woodward-Wanger Co.	106

	Total	\$ 45,670
7-87	Driver Education Behind the Wheel Training	
	Ace Driving School, Inc.	\$ 12,240
	Easy Method, Inc.	189,216
	Friendly Driving Academy	29,376
	Polymethod Driving School	24,480
	Potomac Driving School	19,584

	Total	\$ 274,896
	GRAND TOTAL	\$1,190,665

RESOLUTION NO. 483-86 Re: TELECOMMUNICATIONS/CABLE TV NETWORK
INSTALLATION - RICHARD MONTGOMERY HIGH
SCHOOL, JULIUS WEST MIDDLE SCHOOL AND
BEALL ELEMENTARY

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

WHEREAS, Sealed bids were received on August 26, 1986, for
installation of a cable television/telecommunications network at
Richard Montgomery High School, Julius West Middle School and Beall
Elementary School, as indicated below:

BIDDER	LUMP SUM
1. B. & L. Services, Inc.	\$ 60,000
2. AT & T Network Systems	128,986
3. Beltway Cable Services, Inc.	No bid

and

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

RESOLVED, That a contract for \$60,000 be awarded to B. & L. Services,
Inc., for installation of a cable television/telecommunications
network at Richard Montgomery High School, Julius West Middle School
and Beall Elementary School in accordance with plans and
specifications prepared by Von Otto and Bilecky, Consulting
Engineers.

RESOLUTION NO. 484-86 Re: STADIUM LIGHTING - WINSTON CHURCHILL
HIGH SCHOOL (Area 2)

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

WHEREAS, Sealed bids were received on August 28, 1986, for furnishing
and installing stadium lighting at Winston Churchill High School, as
indicated below:

BIDDER	LUMP SUM
1. Paul J. Vignola Electric Co., Inc.	\$61,261
2. S. Rock Corporation	63,000
3. Jack Stone Electrical Construction, Inc.	68,100

and

WHEREAS, Stadium lighting has been accomplished at several other high
schools, and the community, study body, and administration have been
advocates for stadium lighting at Winston Churchill High School; and

County.

RESOLUTION NO. 486-86 Re: ARCHITECTURAL APPOINTMENTS - WHITE OAK
INTERMEDIATE/LUXMANOR ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS

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

WHEREAS, It is necessary to appoint architects to provide required design services and administration of the construction contracts; and

WHEREAS, Funds were approved in the FY 1987 Capital Budget for the projects listed below; and

WHEREAS, The architect/engineer selection procedures approved by the Board of Education on May 13, 1986, were employed in the following architectural appointments; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the Montgomery County Board of Education enter into a contractual agreement with each of the below-listed architects and architectural or engineer firms to provide required design services and construction supervision for the following indicated capital improvement projects included in the FY 1987 Capital Budget:

PROJECT	ARCHITECT/ENGINEER	FEE
White Oak IS Renovation	S H W C	\$370,000
Luxmanor ES Modernization/ Addition	Garrison-Babarsky	172,000

RESOLUTION NO. 487-86 Re: UTILIZATION OF FY 1987 FUTURE SUPPORTED
PROJECT FUNDS FOR THE COMPUTERIZED
ADAPTIVE TESTING SYSTEM PROGRAM

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

RESOLVED, That the superintendent of schools be authorized to receive and expend the \$10,000 grant award in the following categories within the FY 1987 Provision for Future Supported Projects from the Maryland State Department of Education to expand development of the computerized adaptive testing program:

CATEGORY	AMOUNT
01 Administration	\$ 9,541
10 Fixed Charges	459

TOTAL	\$10,000

and be it further

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

RESOLUTION NO. 488-86 Re: UTILIZATION OF FY 1987 FUTURE SUPPORTED
PROJECT FUNDS FOR FOREIGN LANGUAGE
FRAMEWORK WORKSHOP

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

RESOLVED, That the superintendent of schools be authorized to receive and expend, within the FY 10987 Provision for Future Supported Projects, a \$2,000 grant award from the Maryland State Department of Education in the following category:

CATEGORY	AMOUNT
01 Administration	\$2,000

and be it further

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

RESOLUTION NO. 489-86 Re: UTILIZATION OF FY 1987 FUTURE SUPPORTED
PROJECTS FUNDS FOR THE SCHOOL
IMPROVEMENT THROUGH INSTRUCTIONAL
PROCESSES (SITIP) LEARNING STYLES
PROJECT

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

RESOLVED, That the superintendent of schools be authorized to receive and expend, within the FY 1987 Provision for Future Supported Projects, a \$2,000 grant award from the Maryland State Department of Education School Improvement Through Instructional Processes Learning Styles Project:

CATEGORY	AMOUNT
01 Administration	\$1,905
10 Fixed Charges	95

TOTAL	\$2,000

and be it further

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

RESOLUTION NO. 490-86 Re: UTILIZATION OF FY 1987 FUTURE SUPPORTED

PROJECTS FUNDS FOR THE CAREER AWARENESS,
COMMUNITY-BASED MENTOR PROGRAM FOR
ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED YOUTH

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

RESOLVED, That the superintendent of schools be authorized to receive and expend, within the FY 1987 Provision for Future Supported Projects, a \$25,945 grant award from the Maryland State Department of Education under the Job Training Partnership Act for the career awareness, community-based mentor program for economically disadvantaged youth in the following categories:

CATEGORY	POSITIONS	AMOUNT
02 Instructional Salaries	.5*	\$19,378
10 Fixed Charges		6,567
	---	-----
TOTAL	.5	\$25,945

*Teacher (A-D) 10-month

and be it further

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

RESOLUTION NO. 491-86 Re: UTILIZATION OF FY 1987 FUTURE SUPPORTED PROJECTS FUNDS FOR THE JOB TRAINING PARTNERSHIP ACT GRANT TO PROVIDE A SUMMER VOCATIONAL ORIENTATION PROGRAM FOR ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED YOUTH

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

RESOLVED, That the superintendent of schools be authorized to receive and expend, within the FY 1987 Provision for Future Supported Projects, a \$5,600 grant award from the Service Delivery Agency under the Job Training Partnership Act for a summer vocational orientation program for economically disadvantaged youth:

CATEGORY	AMOUNT
03 Instructional Other	\$5,600

TOTAL	\$5,600

and be it further

RESOLVED, That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to the county

executive and the County Council.

RESOLUTION NO. 492-86 Re: MONTHLY PERSONNEL REPORT

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Mrs. Praisner seconded by Dr. Shoenberg, 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. 493-86 Re: EXTENSION OF SICK LEAVE

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Mrs. Praisner seconded by Dr. Shoenberg, 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
Ennis, Sue	Bus Operator Area 3 Transportation	30

RESOLUTION NO. 494-86 Re: DEATH OF MRS. BEVERLY L. PHILLIPS
BUS OPERATOR IN AREA 1
TRANSPORTATION OFFICE

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

WHEREAS, The death on August 22, 1986, of Mrs. Beverly L. Phillips, a bus operator in Area 1, has deeply saddened the staff and members of the Board of Education; and

WHEREAS, In the years Mrs. Phillips worked for Montgomery County Public Schools, she demonstrated competence as a school bus operator; and

WHEREAS, Mrs. Phillips' dedication to her 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 Mrs. Beverly L. Phillips and extend deepest sympathy to her family; and be it further

RESOLVED, That this resolution be made part of the minutes of this

meeting and a copy be forwarded to Mrs. Phillips' family.

RESOLUTION NO. 495-86 Re: DEATH OF MR. MACK D. SNELLGROVE
CLASSROOM TEACHER ON PERSONAL
ILLNESS LEAVE

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

WHEREAS, The death on August 30, 1986, of Mr. Mack D. Snellgrove, a classroom teacher on personal illness leave, has deeply saddened the staff and members of the Board of Education; and

WHEREAS, Mr. Snellgrove had been a loyal employee of Montgomery County Public Schools since November, 1980; and

WHEREAS, During the five years he taught, he demonstrated a dedication to the profession and made significant contributions to the school programs; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the members of the Board of Education express their sorrow at the death of Mr. Mack Snellgrove 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. Snellgrove's family.

RESOLUTION NO. 497-86 Re: PERSONNEL APPOINTMENTS

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

RESOLVED, That the following personnel appointments be approved:

APPOINTMENT	PRESENT POSITION	AS
David R. Bennett	Project Manager Div. of Systems Dev.	Supervisor, Student Data Systems Div. of Systems Dev. Dept. of Management Info and Computer Svs. Grade 0 Effective: 9-11-86
Yi Chen	Project Manager Div. of Systems Dev.	Supervisor, Human Resources/Payroll Sys. Div. of Systems Dev. Dept. of Management Info and Computer Svs. Grade 0 Effective: 9-11-86

Leland T. Coldren Project Manager
Div. of Systems Dev.
(also student and
per./payroll units)

Supervisor, Financial/
Business Systems
Div. of Systems Dev.
Dept. of Management
Info and Computer Svs.
Grade 0
Effective: 9-11-86

RESOLUTION NO. 497-86 Re: PRESENTATION OF PRELIMINARY PLANS
NEW HAMPSHIRE ESTATES ELEMENTARY
SCHOOL (AREA 1)

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

WHEREAS, On July 21 the Board approved a recommendation to revise the
building design for the New Hampshire Estates Elementary School
project; and

WHEREAS, The architects for the New Hampshire Estates Elementary
School, Abrash, Eddy & Eckhardt, have prepared a revised schematic
design in accordance with the educational specifications; and

WHEREAS, The New Hampshire Estates Elementary School Planning
Committee has approved the proposed schematic design; now therefore
be it

RESOLVED, That the Montgomery County Board of Education approve the
schematic design report prepared by Abrash, Eddy & Eckhardt.

Re: ELEMENTARY SCHOOL CAPACITIES

On August 12, 1986, the Board of Education tentatively adopted the
following:

WHEREAS, It is important that elementary school capacities reflect
current staffing ratios and programs; and

WHEREAS, Applying 90 percent of state-rated capacities of 30:1,
grades 1-6, and 50:1, kindergarten, in evaluation and planning of
facilities, does not adequately represent how our schools are
operating; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education adopt the following capacity
definitions, and that desired utilizations at the elementary level be
considered as 80 to 100 percent of the current program capacity.

CURRENT EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM CAPACITY - Represents, under the
approved operating budget staffing ratios and program
requirements, the number of regular and special education
students that can be accommodated using the total building for
this purpose. Current program capacity includes space in the
building that could be recovered for educational program from

joint occupants or other MCPS programs that could be located elsewhere.

CURRENT EDUCATIONAL USE CAPACITY - Same as current program capacity except that any room(s) in the building used by joint occupants or other MCPS programs are considered in use in the building and, therefore, that space is excluded in calculations of current use capacity.

RESOLUTION NO. 498-86 Re: AN AMENDMENT TO THE PROPOSED RESOLUTION ON ELEMENTARY SCHOOL CAPACITIES

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

RESOLVED, That the proposed resolution on elementary school capacities be amended by adding "It is calculated using ratios of 25:1 for grades 1-6, 44:1 for kindergarten (22:1 if all day), and actual staffing ratios for special and alternative education programs." to Current Educational Program Capacity.

RESOLUTION NO. 499-86 Re: ELEMENTARY SCHOOL CAPACITIES

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Mr. Ewing seconded by Mrs. Praisner, the following resolution was adopted unanimously by all voting members (Mr. Steinberg abstaining):

WHEREAS, It is important that elementary school capacities reflect current staffing ratios and programs; and

WHEREAS, Applying 90 percent of state-rated capacities of 30:1, grades 1-6, and 50:1, kindergarten, in evaluating and planning of facilities, does not adequately represent how our schools are operating; and

WHEREAS, On August 12, 1986, the Board of Education tentatively adopted the following resolution to obtain public, county executive, County Council, and Montgomery County Planning Board comments; and all comments received have been reviewed and considered; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education adopt the following capacity definitions, and that desired utilizations at the elementary level be considered as 80 to 100 percent of the current educational program capacity.

CURRENT EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM CAPACITY - Represents, under the approved operating budget staffing ratios and current MCPS program requirements, the number of regular and special education students that can be accommodated using the total building for this purpose. It is calculated using ratios of 25:1 for grades 1-6, 44:1 for kindergarten (22:1 if all day), and actual staffing ratios for special and alternative education programs. Current

program capacity includes space in the building that could be recovered for educational program from joint occupants or other MCPS programs that could be located elsewhere.

CURRENT USE CAPACITY - Same as current program capacity except that any room(s) in the building used by joint occupants or other MCPS programs are considered in use in the building and, therefore, that space is excluded in calculations of current use capacity.

Re: REPORT ON 1986 COMMUNITY SURVEY

Dr. Floyd recalled that the Board had received this at an earlier meeting but had not had a chance to read the survey. Dr. Cody stated that he had made his comments at the last meeting. Mrs. Sally Keeler, school/business relations coordinator, explained how the survey was administered. She noted that in addition to feeling good about the school system, the community as a whole indicated a willingness to spend more money for education.

Mrs. Praisner inquired about plans to disseminate the results of the survey and asked whether copies would be going to elected officials.

Mrs. Keeler replied that the results would be sent to all schools, business leaders, and elected officials. Dr. Cody asked that a cover letter be prepared for his signature and that of the Board president. The letter should contain several sentences explaining the methodology used in conducting the survey. Mr. Ewing asked staff to check and make sure that all questions asked when the survey was taken were included in the report on the results. He said that the improvement in public perceptions about the school system was a tribute to the school system and the quality of work in the system. Dr. Floyd thanked Mrs. Keeler for her work.

RESOLUTION NO. 500-86 Re: EXECUTIVE SESSION - SEPTEMBER 22, 1986

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

WHEREAS, The Board of Education of Montgomery County is authorized by Section 10-508, State Government Article of the ANNOTATED CODE OF MARYLAND to conduct certain of its meetings in executive closed session; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education of Montgomery County hereby conduct its meeting in executive closed session beginning on September 22, 1986, 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 that prevents public

disclosures about a particular proceeding or matter as permitted under the State Government Article, Section 10-508; and that such meeting shall continue in executive closed session until the completion of business.

RESOLUTION NO. 501-86 Re: MINUTES OF JUNE 12, 1986

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

RESOLVED, That the minutes of June 12, 1986, be approved.

RESOLUTION NO. 502-86 Re: MINUTES OF JUNE 23, 1986

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

RESOLVED, That the minutes of June 23, 1986, be approved.

RESOLUTION NO. 503-86 Re: MINUTES OF JULY 7, 1986

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

RESOLVED, That the minutes of July 7, 1986, be approved.

RESOLUTION NO. 504-86 Re: MINUTES OF JULY 21, 1986

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

RESOLVED, That the minutes of July 21, 1986, be approved.

RESOLUTION NO. 505-86 Re: BOE APPEAL NO. 1986-18 (STUDENT TRANSFER)

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

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education adopt its Decision and Order in BOE Appeal No. 1986-18.

RESOLUTION NO. 506-86 Re: BOE APPEAL NO. 1986-15 (STUDENT TRANSFER)

On motion of Mrs. Praisner seconded by Dr. Shoenberg, the following resolution was adopted unanimously by all voting members (Mr. Steinberg abstaining):

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education affirm the decision of the superintendent in BOE Appeal No. 1986-15 with a written Decision and

Order to follow.

Re: BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS

Mr. Ewing commented that the Board was scheduled to discuss a report on nonresident tuition on September 22. Some people had raised the issue of whether MCPS had checked with the State Department regarding the current status of visas. The assertion had been made the MCPS was in the position of making automatic waivers for anyone who is a student. Dr. Pitt replied that staff would check this out.

Re: ITEMS OF INFORMATION

Board members received the following items of information:

1. Items in Process
2. Construction Progress Report
3. Quarterly Report on Minority Procurement
4. Entrepreneurial Internship Program

Re: ADJOURNMENT

The vice president adjourned the meeting at 2:50 p.m.

VICE PRESIDENT

SECRETARY

WSC:mlw