

APPROVED
37-1987

Rockville, Maryland
September 8, 1987

The Board of Education of Montgomery County met in regular session at the Carver Educational Services Center, Rockville, Maryland, on Tuesday, September 8, 1987, at 4 p.m.

ROLL CALL Present: Mrs. Marilyn J. Praisner, President
in the Chair
Dr. James E. Cronin
Mrs. Sharon DiFonzo*
Mr. Blair G. Ewing
Mr. Bruce A. Goldensohn
Mr. Andrew Herscowitz
Dr. Robert E. Shoenberg

Absent: Mrs. Mary Margaret Slye

Others Present: Dr. Harry Pitt, Superintendent of Schools
Dr. Paul L. Vance, Deputy Superintendent
Mr. Thomas S. Fess, Parliamentarian

RESOLUTION NO. 432-87 Re: BOARD AGENDA - SEPTEMBER 8, 1987

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

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education approve its agenda for September 8, 1987.

Re: ANNOUNCEMENT

Mrs. Praisner announced that the Board had been meeting in executive session on appeals, legal issues, and personnel matters.

*Mrs. DiFonzo joined the meeting at this point.

RESOLUTION NO. 433-87 Re: BICENTENNIAL OF THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES

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

WHEREAS, The Constitution of the United States is the supreme law of the land and the cornerstone of the American democracy; and

WHEREAS, The Constitution of the United States is held up as a model throughout the world for government by the people; and

WHEREAS, The Constitution of the United States symbolizes human freedom, individual rights and responsibilities, and justice; and

WHEREAS, The Constitution of the United States has guided the development of our country for almost two hundred years; and

WHEREAS, Montgomery County has been designated a Bicentennial Community by the National Bicentennial Commission; and

WHEREAS, Americans throughout the country will celebrate the Bicentennial of the Constitution of the United States during ceremonies on September 16, 1987; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education encourage all teachers and administrators to support the celebration of the Bicentennial of the Constitution of the United States in the schools of Montgomery County and to conduct appropriate activities in observance of this historic event; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education encourage all schools to plan for a year-long focus on the Constitution of the United States and recognize that this celebration will continue through 1991 when the Bill of Rights will be honored.

Re: BOARD/PRESS/VISITOR CONFERENCE

The following individuals appeared before the Board of Education:

1. Cathy Hobbs
2. Bill Beane, Ridgeview PTSA

RESOLUTION NO. 434-87 Re: FY 1988 SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION FOR THE INTENSIVE ENGLISH LANGUAGE PROGRAM

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

RESOLVED, That the superintendent of schools be authorized, subject to County Council approval, to receive and expend an FY 1988 supplemental appropriation of \$134,118 from the Montgomery County Department of Social Services, Division of Family Resources, under the Refugee Act of 1980, (P.L. 96-212) Title IV - Refugee Assistance for the Intensive English Language Program in the following categories:

CATEGORY	AMOUNT
01 Administration	\$ 134
02 Instructional Salaries	120,987
03 Other Instructional Costs	2,600
08 Operation of Plant and Equipment	720
10 Fixed Charges	9,677

TOTAL	\$134,118

and be it further

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

RESOLUTION NO. 435-87 Re: PROCUREMENT CONTRACTS OVER \$25,000

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Mr. Ewing 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 responsive bidders meeting specifications as shown for the bids as follows:

BID	AWARDEE	
Quote 108	Computer-assisted Bus Routing MSI	\$ 44,050
Quote 111	Running Track The American Asphalt Paving Co., Inc.	\$ 74,523
COG 410200	Gasoline Petron Oil Corporation	\$ 200,572
	Steuart Petroleum	458,887
	General Transport	5,055*
	Alpine Fuel, Inc.	22,286*
	TOTAL	----- \$ 686,800
258-86	Copying Machine Maintenance Contract Extension	
	Consolidated Photocopy	\$ 192,100
	Hi-Tech	18,000
	TOTAL	----- \$ 210,100
4-88	Continuous Form Stock Tab Moore Business Forms	\$ 50,915
8-88	Custodial Supplies Monumental Paper Co.	\$ 86,350
	TOTAL CONTRACTS OVER \$25,000	\$1,152,738

*Asterisk denotes MFD vendors

RESOLUTION NO. 436-87 Re: PRICE INCREASES IN THE FOOD SERVICE PROGRAM

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

unanimously:

WHEREAS, Breakfast and lunch prices to MCPS students and adults have not been increased since September 1981; and

WHEREAS, A series of highly effective cost containment investments and management initiatives made by MCPS between 1982 and 1987 precluded the need for increases during this period; and

WHEREAS, FY 1988 labor and fixed charges will cost an additional \$794,000 over FY 1987, and food contracts will cost an additional \$85,000; and

WHEREAS, To maintain a financially solvent MCPS food service operation, it is necessary to generate in FY 1988 an additional \$879,000 in revenue; and

WHEREAS, Even with an increase, MCPS prices continue to be among the lowest charged to students and adults within the area school systems; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the price of student breakfast be increased from \$.50 to \$.55; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the price of elementary lunch be increased from \$.80 to \$.85 and secondary lunch from \$.85 to \$.95; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the price of adult lunch be increased from \$1.15 to \$1.30; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the price increases be effective October 1, 1987; and be it further

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

RESOLUTION NO. 437-87 Re: WATKINS MILL ELEMENTARY SCHOOL - REROOF

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

WHEREAS, Sealed bids were received on August 25, 1987, for reroofing Watkins Mill Elementary School as follows:

BIDDER	LUMP SUM
1. Orndorff & Spaid, Inc.	\$145,088
2. J. E. Wood & Sons Co., Inc.	145,358
3. Raintree Industries, Inc.	154,800

and

WHEREAS, The low bidder, Orndorff & Spaid, Inc., has performed

similar projects satisfactorily for MCPS; and

WHEREAS, Low bid is within staff estimate and sufficient funds are available in Account 999-42 to effect award; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That a contract for \$145,088 be awarded to Orndorff & Spaid, Inc., for reroofing Watkins Mill Elementary School in accordance with plans and specifications prepared by the Department of School Facilities.

RESOLUTION NO. 438-87 Re: GRANT OF STORM DRAIN EASEMENT AND
RIGHT-OF-WAY TO THE MONTGOMERY COUNTY
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION AT ROCK
CREEK FOREST ELEMENTARY SCHOOL (AREA 2)

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

WHEREAS, The Montgomery County Department of Transportation has requested a grant of storm drain easement and right-of-way at the Rock Creek Forest Elementary School, located at 8830 Grubb Road, Chevy Chase, Maryland, which will require a public dedication of 252 square feet of land from the Board's property; and

WHEREAS, The proposed storm drain improvement will benefit both the school and community by providing a connection to an existing outfall pipe to further convey storm water off the school site; and

WHEREAS, The proposed storm drain improvement will not affect any land now utilized for school programming and recreational activities; and

WHEREAS, All construction, restoration, and future maintenance will be performed at no cost to the Board of Education, with the Montgomery County government and contractors assuming liability for all damages or injury; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the president and secretary be authorized to execute a grant of Storm Drain Easement and Right-of-Way at the Rock Creek Forest Elementary School.

RESOLUTION NO. 439-87 Re: GRANT OF RIGHT-OF-WAY TO THE WASHINGTON
SUBURBAN SANITARY COMMISSION AT
GERMANTOWN ELEMENTARY SCHOOL (AREA 3)

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

WHEREAS, The Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission has requested a grant of right-of-way and temporary construction strip across a portion of the Germantown Elementary School site frontage located at 19110 Germantown-Darnestown Road, Germantown, Maryland, for the

installation of a sewer line; and

WHEREAS, All construction, restoration, and future maintenance will be performed at no cost to the Board of Education, with the Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission and contractors assuming liability for all damages or injury; and

WHEREAS, This right-of-way dedication of 4,535 square feet for installation of a sewer line and an adjacent 10-foot temporary construction strip will not affect any land now planned for school programming and recreational activities and will benefit the surrounding community and the Germantown Elementary School; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the president and secretary be authorized to execute a right-of-way for the additional land required to install a sewer line at the Germantown Elementary School; and be it further

RESOLVED, That a negotiated fee be paid by the Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission for the subject right-of-way and easement, said funds to be deposited to the Rental of Property Account No. 32-108-1-13.

RESOLUTION NO. 440-87 Re: GRANT OF PERMIT TO THE WILLIAMSBURG
VILLAGE CIVIC ASSOCIATION AT OLNEY
ELEMENTARY SCHOOL (AREA 1)

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

WHEREAS, The Williamsburg Village Civic Association has requested permission to construct a monument on school property at the northwest corner of Georgia Avenue (MD 97) and Queen Mary Drive; and

WHEREAS, The proposed monument consists of a brick entryway sign with the words "Williamsburg Village" printed thereon, which will occupy a strip of land measuring six feet wide by fourteen feet long, or 84 square feet to include landscaping; and

WHEREAS, All construction, restoration, and future maintenance will be performed at no cost to the Board of Education, with the Williamsburg Village Civic Association and contractors assuming liability for all damages or injury; and

WHEREAS, This permit may be rescinded at any time with a minimum written notice of six months to the Williamsburg Village Civic Association, and it will not affect any land currently programmed for school or recreational activities; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the president and secretary be authorized to execute a permit allowing the Williamsburg Village Civic Association to construct a monument at the Olney Elementary School.

RESOLUTION NO. 441-87 Re: BUILDING PLAN FOR PHOENIX II

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

WHEREAS, The Board approved the construction of a new facility for the Phoenix II program to be located on the proposed Hadley Farms site; and

WHEREAS, Staff in conjunction with the project architect has developed a suitable building and location plan for this facility; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the Board approve the building plan and site location for the Phoenix II program developed by Thomas Clark Associates Architects.

For the record, Dr. Pitt stated that he would look into the need to build separate bathrooms for staff.

RESOLUTION NO. 442-87 Re: PERSONNEL MONTHLY REPORT

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

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

RESOLUTION NO. 443-87 Re: PERSONNEL APPOINTMENT

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

RESOLVED, That the following personnel appointment be approved:

APPOINTMENT	PRESENT POSITION	AS
Barbara S. Contrera	Supervisor of Elem. Instruction Area 1 Admin. Office	Admin. Assistant Office of the Deputy Supt. Effective: 9-9-87

Re: SUSPENSION REPORT - FISCAL YEAR 1987

Dr. Pitt commented that he was pleased with the suspension report because they had reduced the level of suspensions of black youngsters. However, this did not mean that they could not improve on this number. Since 1982 the suspension rate for all students had dropped from 7.4 to 5.4 percent. During that period the suspension rates of black youngsters dropped from 15.2 to 10.7 percent. In the high school, the rate for black youngsters went from 17 percent to

9.5 percent. In the high schools the rate for all students declined from 8.1 percent in 1982-83 to 5 percent in 1986-87. He congratulated staff who had worked on this effort during this period. He said that student behavior was improved, and principals and staff had done an outstanding job.

Re: REPORT ON THE OPENING OF SCHOOL

Dr. Pitt reported that the opening of school was outstanding. He was amazed that he had managed to construct and open two new up-county elementary schools in 12-months. He had visited these schools on the first day and they were in full operation. He commended their facilities staff, supply management, maintenance, and the principals, staff, and teachers. He said that he had visited ten schools in the first two days, and at Bells Mill he actually taught in two classes. Dr. Robert Shekletski, area associate superintendent, commented that he was pleased and proud to be part of the school system. On opening day, teachers and students were on task, and the buildings looked immaculate. He indicated that Rosemary Hills, Walter Johnson, Hoover, and Paint Branch were ready to go. Other than some minor problems in transportation and electrical connections in relocatable classrooms, he thought the opening was outstanding. He thought that getting together with maintenance and facilities staff during the summer had made the difference.

Dr. David Thomas, associate superintendent for supportive services, commented that this was his first opening with MCPS. He complimented staff for the excellent work they had done in keeping to schedule. In particular, he cited Ed Heck and Dick Hawes for their coordination of contractors and subcontractors. He thanked Leon Stafford and Herman Lipford for the efforts of their staff. For example, 700 hours of overtime had gone into Paint Branch to get that school open on time. He said that Mason Nelson had done an excellent job of getting chairs and desks for the new schools. He noted that three or four kitchens were not ready to operate, but no one was worried because Joanne Styer and Scotty Brown were on top of the situation and meals were being served. In Transportation, they had hired and trained 100 new drivers this summer and changed routes for 65,000 students. He noted that they were now transporting the entire student body of Gaithersburg Junior to Woodward. He commented that they had an excellent staff, and he was pleased to work with them.

Dr. Vance asked Dr. Lois Martin and Dr. Hiawatha Fountain to comment on their visits to schools. Dr. Martin commented that she had had the most interesting week in seven years. She said it was interesting to reflect on the change in schools. She thought the quality of education was getting better and better, and she was inspired by the superb teaching and the quality and interests of students. Dr. Fountain remarked that the best comment he could make was that the first week of school was uneventful. He had visited 20 schools on the first day. They had a place for every child, and he was pleased that the teachers were on task.

Dr. Vance said this was not to say they did not have some unresolved

issues and problems out there with class size. On behalf of the Board, Mrs. Praisner thanked the staff members for the smooth opening of school. Dr. Pitt reported that he had requested that all executive staff members visit schools on a monthly basis.

Re: FIVE-YEAR PLAN FOR INSTRUCTIONAL
USE OF COMPUTERS

Dr. Pitt stated that they had set up a plan for the instructional use of computers and had modified it as they went along. This was one case where they had met all of their instructional goals. Dr. Martin added that in seven years they had gone from not having an organized program for the use of computers to an organized program. For example, at Westland Intermediate School they had an interdisciplinary use of the computer. The English resource teachers, the computer coordinator, and the curriculum coordinator delighted in showing the multiple uses of the computer lab. In view of a lot of national studies which said they should get rid of curriculum specialists, she pointed out that this was one example of what a small group of people working with teachers could accomplish to put MCPS in the forefront in terms of computer use and computer science.

Ms. Beverly Sangston, director of the Department of Computer-Related Instruction, reported that they were now using the computer as a tool across all disciplines. They would like to share where they were and where they saw the program going in the early 1990's. She said that the program was large, complex, and visible in all schools. She noted that any student who had been in the county for three years would have had some opportunity to use the computer in an academic setting.

Ms. Sangston stated that in the fall of 1983 when they put their first plan together she thought the plan was very aggressive, and she was not sure they would be able to accomplish all the goals they had set. However, over the last four years they had reached those goals. They went quickly through the first stage of computer literacy and computer science into the second phase of using the computer as a tool. This was the focus of where they would like to be in 1992. She said that during the last four years they had developed a comprehensive K-12 computer education curriculum. At the high school level they had seven elected semester hours of coursework, and three of those were included in the PROGRAM OF STUDIES and others were in pilot phase. Over the past four years, about 30,000 students had registered in the computer science elective courses. Now they were seeing a trend away from computer science electives to freeing the lab up for English classes and social studies classes.

Ms. Sangston reported that they had had a large-scale and effective teacher training program. They had started with one in-service course in 1983 and had now developed 25 in-service courses and had 3,600 completions of these courses. In addition, they had provided about 13,000 hours of noncredit training. While they had had some cooperation with universities, she hoped there would be more

cooperation in the future in offering off-campus courses. She said that as the state of Maryland looked at certification for computer science, they were going to have to bring in university facilities for teachers.

Ms. Sangston commented that the computer education program was dependent on equipment and facilities. They had put together a support structure for purchasing, installing, and maintaining microcomputers in the school system. She thanked every one for helping make this program work. Each high school had at least two computer labs with 15 computers in each as well as machines that moved from department to department. The standard for a high school was a minimum of 47 computers. At the J/I/M level, all schools had one lab with 15 computers and mobile computers which brought the standard to 26. She noted that they had emphasized programs at the J/I/M level and over the next five years hoped to catch up with program and equipment in the elementary schools. At present, 63 of their elementary schools had at least 12 computers, but 42 elementary schools had only six computers. This year they had added writing labs to six high schools. They also had three networked computer labs which shared resources between computer science and business education.

Ms. Sangston said they had supported magnet programs and special education programs. They felt that they had made a lot progress across the school system and had teachers coming forward with very creative ways to use computers in the instructional program. In the future they hoped to accomplish the continuing initiatives they had in the report and to look at some new activities. For example, this year they were working on guidance and had a pilot in six schools.

Dr. Shoenberg said that last year when they went to the Council and had their budget cut, one reason given by Mr. Hanna was that they needed some kind of evaluation of what they were doing before they received additional funds. He wondered how they were coming with the process of evaluation. Ms. Sangston replied that there were two studies underway by the Department of Educational Accountability. One was a look at the senior high school elective courses and would be available in late October. Another area was the use of computers in writing, but this study had been postponed to the 88-89 budget cycle. She recalled that Mr. Hanna had requested they get someone in from the outside, and she would be making arrangements to get three people in to look at the program. Dr. Pitt agreed that they needed to do that. He noted that they were moving from teaching people how to use computers to using the computer as a tool in programs. He thought Mr. Hanna's concern had to do with spending time on just learning how to use computers, but MCPS was well beyond that stage. Dr. Shoenberg indicated that there were some school systems in the United States, probably smaller than MCPS, who had gone all out in this area and put a great deal of money into this and might be doing more programmatically. He asked how MCPS compared with those systems in what they were able to do and, secondly, with these systems similar in size to MCPS. He knew that they had been in touch with people in the other school systems in the National Federation of

Urban-Suburban School Districts.

Mr. Chuck Philipp, instructional computer analyst, replied that the high school computer science elective courses were the most visible. Originally they had taken the posture it was not the role to teach about hardware in high school, and the courses should not focus on computer language. They felt their central focus ought to be to teach the kinds of problem-solving skills for which there was transferability across languages and for which they had a lot of evidence that the higher quality undergraduate programs in the country at the university level required. This was their distinct qualitative difference in terms of curriculum design and the way they went about training teachers. At present they had a project with the University of Maryland Science Teaching Center for the eighth grade science program. Dr. John Layman was helping them focus on using the computer as a tool to teach concepts and analytical thinking. Originally MCPS had had a grant from the National Science Foundation to prepare a curriculum document for school systems across the nation. Mr. Philipp said they were large, and it was true that small systems could get things done very quickly. However, MCPS had a conservative posture about where they put their resources, and he would characterize the program as being very well thought-out. He added that in terms of payoff to students, they were doing a really good job.

Ms. Sangston mentioned that there were programs in neighboring school system that required special hardware. MCPS had not gone that route. They had tried to standardize on what they were doing and to provide something to all schools. Mrs. Praisner noted that there were jurisdictions that had gone out and just purchased their whole curriculum system just as they purchased textbooks which was another difference.

Dr. Shoenberg stated that folks did not realize the advantage that accrued to Montgomery County in being able to design their own curriculum. They were able to design their curriculum for their students which paid enormous dividends and gave teachers great flexibility. Dr. Pitt observed that once teachers learned the basic components of using the computer, there was a lot of opportunity for teachers to be very creative.

Dr. Shoenberg said they had mentioned the state moving toward certification for the teaching of computer instruction. He asked whether there was a recognition that a number of teachers had built up competency outside of a course situation. Ms. Sangston observed that initially they were not represented on the certification committee, but Mr. Philipp did serve for a year. They were concerned about this because teachers had put in hours of work on their own and in in-service courses to teach MCPS courses. Mr. Philipp said that the report would be presented to the Professional Standards Board in the near future. It stated that 24 semester hours were needed for credit count certification. They also recommended a 15 credit approach to grandfathering in teachers who had learned on their own. However, the reaction from representatives of the Maryland State

Department of Education was not favorable because it would set a precedent in other areas. The university people were, however, sympathetic to this. He felt that the issue was not resolved and that teachers would fight for some kind of grandfathering.

Dr. Shoenberg asked if the Board would have an opportunity to comment on the certification requirements. Mr. Philipp thought that the Board probably could comment, and Dr. Martin agreed to check out the Board's role in this.

Dr. Cronin asked about the number of people working on this. Ms. Sangston replied that they had eight teacher specialists, Mr. Philipp, one programmer, one secretary, and a clerk typist. Dr. Cronin asked Ms. Sangston to repeat the statistics on in-service training and workshops. He said that as he heard comments from the Council about the way the operation was run, this was based on ignorance and suppositions. He thought that if they looked at the reality they would be astonished at what was produced by these people. He wondered about the effect on the teacher in the classroom if they cut back on these people as administrative overhead. Ms. Sangston replied that they would not have a program because these people provided the leadership, did the curriculum development, and went into the classrooms. She hoped that in October they would get the Council to visit because October was "Computer Learning Month." Dr. Cronin asked staff to provide the Board with some idea of what this credit and noncredit training would cost in the market out there. He would like to know the cost of buying a package for elementary schools rather than developing it themselves. He thought it would be useful to see what administrators saved them were they to purchase the services outside.

Mrs. DiFonzo asked about whether their expectations for the future were reasonable and realistic. Ms. Sangston replied that their goals for the future were where they needed to go. However, the plan for the future was very conservative and did not bring in a lot of new technologies. For example, putting a writing lab in every secondary school would be conservative once English teachers started looking at word processing. In the CIP last year they had requested \$1.7 million and were funded at \$1.1 million. The funding would be at \$1.1 million for the next six years. Mrs. DiFonzo asked what would happen to the goals if the budget were cut by a half or a third. Ms. Sangston replied that it would spread out their plan over many, many years. She explained that they would train teachers and lose momentum when they had to say that teachers would get access to a computer in four years. She felt that they really should have a goal of having a computer on the desk of every teacher.

Mrs. DiFonzo inquired about the effect of budget cuts on the educational program. She noted that they were constantly being compared with other school systems, and she assumed that while MCPS was marching along, the other school systems were also marching along. She asked where they were in regard to other school systems and what would be the effect of continued budget cuts. Mr. Philipp replied that in a recent NSBA meeting in Annapolis he had asked how other school systems selected the appropriate technology because they

all had goals of education and did not want to waste resources. However, no one had an answer. He said they had thought about the purpose served by the MCPS K-12 program. He felt that they had a role to support the liberal arts, and he felt that while they should look at other school systems they had to speak for themselves about what they wanted in a school system. He said that it was easy to get to the point where they bought hardware for the sake of buying hardware and did a machine count, which was about the mentality of a lot of programs today. He reported that they had received informal feedback from college students that they did, indeed, get a great deal out of the MCPS program. He thought that the question was answered best by people within the school system and that they not pay a lot of attention to what other school systems were doing. Mrs. DiFonzo added that unfortunately they were often forced to defend their budget vis a vis other school systems.

Mrs. Praisner thought they should talk about the purpose when they articulated how many of what they had. They needed to qualify responses by adding quality as well as quantity. She asked for additional information on how one determined the innovative practices if one had the money associated with that element. She requested information on how they defined the larger secondary schools that would be in need of additional labs. She said that they had raised some major questions about the future, and she wondered how the superintendent would go about answering these questions. She thanked staff for another excellent document and discussion on a very important topic.

Re: STATE SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

Mrs. Praisner understood that the county government wanted to testify at the September 16 hearing on this subject. She hoped that they could get a Board of Education perspective on this issue so that they could share this and help to develop some testimony. She said they had a copy of the document which included the preliminary recommendations to the governor and included a new formula for limited funds for school construction.

Dr. Shoenberg reported that Baltimore had a proposal that would double the difference between 50 percent and the basic current expense formula. He assumed that were that to be adopted this would mean not less for those counties that were at 50 percent but simply that the program would be that much more expensive. Mrs. Praisner replied that this was not clear, but it was the assumption on which it was presented.

Dr. Shoenberg said it showed a five-year contribution to Montgomery County from the state of \$60.7 million which represented 50 percent of their Code A requests, and he asked if this included all they had forward funded. Dr. Phil Rohr, director of the Department of Educational Facilities Planning and Development, replied that it did not. In theory, this would include their entire six-year year program. The FY 1988 CIP program for six years totalled about \$235 million, and the county had forward funded about \$140 million. The

\$120 defined as Code A was only about half of the MCPS CIP request. In addition, it was not clear as to what Code A was.

Mrs. Praisner reported that in September of 1985 when the James Commission met on school construction, all projects submitted to the IAC were classified as Code A, B, or C. Code A projects were those more likely to get state approval, Code B projects had some questions associated with them, and Code C projects had more questions and tended to be projects in the out-years of the CIP program. She recalled that the addition to Paint Branch had been listed as a Code B project, and Dr. Rohr added that Watkins Mill High School was also a Code B. She explained that the categorization was based on the views of the IAC and not those of the school system making the request.

Mr. Ewing thought they should make clear that there were a number of projects they felt should be included in Code A because they were essential if the school system was going to function effectively. They should make clear what their current program had been, what it was, and what it needed to be. He suggested that they take some issue with the idea of counties' assuming greater responsibility. For example, Montgomery County had been doing about 80 to 90 percent of its own funding for a number of years when the promise was that the state would assume 100 percent. He thought that Montgomery County was already making a massive contribution far beyond what any other jurisdiction was doing. He said that whatever was done, the proposed recommendations would still be inadequate for their needs. He asked if they had alternative suggestions. However, if they suggested more money for the plan, it would mean that more tax money from Montgomery County would go into the plan.

Mrs. Praisner explained that the task force had accepted the recommendation of the James Commission from 1985 that \$40 to \$60 million should be spent each year. They recognized that \$60 million would not cover the needs, but at least this would be better than what had been allocated in recent years. In addition, the governor had stated that he would like the total amount of funds associated with school construction to be reduced significantly. It seemed to Mr. Ewing that the state was suggesting that they would be contributing 50 percent; however, this was 50 percent of a number that was not realistic when they looked at total construction needs. Dr. Shoenberg asked if specific dollars of state allocations continue to be associated with specific projects. Mrs. Praisner replied that it would. The process would still be an IAC review and approval on the projects. Dr. Shoenberg asked if anything could be done to change that to have a recognition that projects were approvable if IAC funds were available. Mrs. Praisner said this might speak to the slowness with which the IAC in the past has granted planning approval. Schools had not received planning approval because of a concern about funding to follow the year after. Dr. Shoenberg commented that people were angered by the fiction of not granting planning approval to a school already completed and filled to overflowing. Mrs. Praisner explained that this was the problem the last time she appeared before the Board of Public Works. She had

asked for planning approval and construction funds for schools that were already open. The governor was irritated with that request; however, she could not ask for anything else because MCPS did not have planning approval on anything else. She agreed it might be well to comment on the planning approval process.

Dr. Cronin noted that the text referred to shifting the burden from the counties to the state. This did not come in by the back door. This was state law at the request of the state. Mrs. Praisner thought they should have reviewed this state program when there was declining enrollment around the state. In most jurisdictions there would be a demand for more construction at a time when the state was pulling back from the program. Dr. Cronin remarked that they would take back the responsibility for school construction if the state would return Montgomery County taxes to them.

Re: BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS

1. Mr. Goldensohn said he had been getting a number of requests on what they were doing in the area of vocational education. He asked for a status report on the 2+2 program and the status of other vocational programs. The concern was that vocational education was declining as a percentage of their overall effort.
2. Mr. Goldensohn recalled that they had received a proposal from Chere Katz regarding the enrollment pattern at Frost and Wootton. He asked for a quick outline of what her proposal would have done to the timing of change of the flow of students through West and Richard Montgomery.
3. Mr. Goldensohn asked staff to look at the question of the agricultural program at Poolesville High School. The suggestion had been made that if Poolesville High School itself could not support a program on its own that this could be an upper county program pulling students from Damascus High School. He was interested in the cost of this program. Dr. Pitt stated that they needed to look at agriculture in terms of what might be appropriate for the 21st century. He had asked staff to get together to discuss the possibility of a pilot next year. Mr. Goldensohn asked that staff provide him with the cost of the program for next year. He felt that there was also a need for the people in Poolesville to know staff thinking on this issue.
4. Dr. Cronin reported that he had visited Lake Seneca Elementary School and had walked the route the students were using. Mrs. Praisner pointed out that there was an appeal before the Board of Education. Dr. Cronin noted that the area in question was used by the community itself, and he wondered about the possibility of the community itself clarifying the route.
5. In regard to staff efforts to deal with issues of concern in the Rolling Terrace community, Mr. Ewing noted that the staff had responded effectively. He said that Dr. David Thomas had done an extraordinarily fine job in dealing with community concerns.
6. Mrs. Praisner requested the following information about the Falls Road interchange: (1) how close will parts of the cloverleaf come to the entrance of Julius West and (2) what was the county doing about cross walks and crossing guards.

7. Mrs. Praisner reported that the Board and senior staff did participate in a retreat. The retreat focused on familiarizing themselves with some of the demographic, economic, and social challenges that will be facing the county and the school system as they moved toward the year 2000. On behalf of the Board, she thanked the following facilitators from the county government: Richard Ferrara of the Department of Housing and Community Development, Glenn Orling of the Department of Transportation, Lt. Daniel King of the Police Youth Division, Trudye Johnson and Charlie Steinbraker of the Department of Recreation, Dr. Martin Wasserman of the Health Department, Drew Dedrick of the Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission and Mr. Duc Duong of the Department of Economic Development. She also thanked George Grier who provided demographic information and the staff members who were involved in putting together the retreat.

RESOLUTION NO. 444-87 Re: EXECUTIVE SESSION - SEPTEMBER 21, 1987

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Mrs. DiFonzo seconded by Dr. Cronin, 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 21, 1987, 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. 445-87 Re: MINUTES OF JULY 14, 1987

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

RESOLVED, That the minutes of July 14, 1987, be approved as amended.

Re: REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE
RESEARCH AND EVALUATION COMMITTEE

Mr. Ewing commented that with respect to the report, the Board's

committee recommended that the plan developed under the direction of the superintendent by DEA for its efforts over this coming year be endorsed. On page 2 of the report, there were concerns that there ought to be some involvement by DEA in reviewing plans for successful practices and for validation of this review. This had happened subsequently. He said that the committee took the view that research and evaluation could be a valuable tool for the school system and that this ought to be made very clear. This was brought to the committee's attention by Dr. Fountain who noted that he had worked closely with DEA on studies of special education programs which had been helpful to him in explaining and justifying the purposes of the programs of his office. This impressed committee members with the utility that could be there if DEA studies were done in conjunction with associate superintendents and in support of programs of the public schools. He noted that the committee was not requesting Board action on any part of the report.

In regard to the studies in #9, Dr. Shoenberg thought they should consider the audience for those studies. He did not know whether the County Council was the right audience. He would agree with #11 about the value of the work of DEA. He remarked that it was not the statistical information but the qualitative information that was so extraordinary.

Dr. Shoenberg said that this report with the exception of #11 read as though the primary role of DEA was response to the Board. He did not know if this was intended or if this was the way DEA ought to be understood. Mr. Ewing replied that they wanted to be clear that while what DEA was planning to do would be supportive of the Board's needs for information, the superintendent needed to exercise discretion in the allocation of staff time in the selection of projects to meet urgent needs of the moment and this is a critical part of the DEA agenda. He thought the committee agreed that the key role of DEA was to support the superintendent and staff in understanding what the results were from implementation of various kinds of programs. The Board had a role in reviewing its plans to see whether the Board's needs were also being met. The committee did discuss this.

Dr. Cronin commented that he had recommended a diminished role for the committee. Originally in voting for the committee and in serving on it, he saw the role of the committee in being sure that DEA understood the intentions of the Board in particular items that the Board wished DEA to consider. He thought to have it appear that a Board subcommittee was approving the DEA work plan and setting out a major agenda for DEA was not what he would want. He saw the committee as meeting only once or twice a year. They could then determine that the budget cuts could be adjusted to meet the priorities of DEA and the Board and to see if future budgets for DEA met the Board's and DEA's priorities. Other meetings would be at the request of DEA to give them advice on how a DEA study might fit the needs of the Board.

Mr. Ewing said he did not agree with Dr. Cronin. He did not think

this was consistent with the charge that had been developed and adopted by the Board. Mrs. Praisner explained that the charge dealt with reviewing the agenda for the studies and to review them as to how they fit Board and system needs. It also clearly stated that none of the discussion of the committee or decisions of the committee would detract from the superintendent's management responsibilities in this area. She thought this needed to be stated again. Mr. Ewing said he would assert that the committee had never directed the work of DEA. The committee had reviewed DEA's plans and had made some recommendations to the Board and the superintendent. Mrs. Praisner thought that some confusion might come upon once the plans were in place and involve the forum the Board used to receive that information. Dr. Cronin hoped that the subtle psychology of being a Board subcommittee didn't go over into directing a DEA agenda. Dr. Shoenberg did not see the Board as having tried to direct the agenda of DEA. He thought the committee had raised a series of concerns relating to larger issues but also relating to DEA. His concern stemmed from his reading of #1 and #2 which created the impression that the Board's needs were the dog and the system's needs were the tail.

Dr. Pitt said when they looked at the services provided by DEA, there were many school systems that had evaluation arms in terms of looking at testing and auditing. However, there were very few school systems that had people who really did research. Although this was costly, he felt the return was well worth the effort and that the system was well served by DEA.

RESOLUTION NO. 446-87 Re: BOE APPEALS NO. 1987-15, -18, -19, and -20

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

RESOLVED, That BOE Appeals No. 1987-15, -18, -19, and -20 (student transfers) be dismissed on request of the appellants.

RESOLUTION NO. 447-87 Re: BOE APPEAL NO. 1987-14

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

RESOLVED, That BOE Appeal No. 1987-14 be dismissed as moot.

Re: ITEMS OF INFORMATION

Board members received the following items of information:

1. Items in Process
2. Construction Progress Report
3. Joint Occupancy Fees for FY 88
4. Suspension report - Fiscal Year 1987

Re: ADJOURNMENT

The president adjourned the meeting at 6:15 p.m. to executive session.

PRESIDENT

SECRETARY

HP:mlw