

Resolved, That the members of the Board of Education express their sincere appreciation to each person for faithful service to the school system and to the children of the county and also extend to each one best wishes for the future; and be it further

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

Resolution No. 510-83 Re: Tuition for Out-of-County and
Out-of-State Pupils for FY 1984

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

WHEREAS, Resolution 364-77 which established the basis for noncounty tuition charges provides that the per pupil cost shall be based on the current year's estimated cost, including debt services; and

WHEREAS, The basis for the calculation of cost per pupil for tuition purposed in FY 1984 is as follows:

	Kindergarten	Elementary	Middle Junior/Sr.	Special Education
Estimated No. of Pupils	5,360	32,987	46,989	4,158
Out-of-County Maryland Pupils				
Cost:				
Regular Program	\$12,534,966	\$115,261,499	\$178,777,788	\$29,296,144
Debt Service	348,577	4,290,497	6,111,685	540,816
Total Cost	\$12,883,543	\$119,551,996	\$184,889,473	\$29,836,960
Cost Per Pupil:				
Regular Program	\$ 2,339	\$ 3,494	\$ 3,805	\$ 7,046
Debt Service	65	130	130	130
Total Cost	\$ 2,404	\$ 3,624	\$ 3,935	\$ 7,176
Out-of-State Pupils				
Cost:				
Regular Program	\$12,534,966	\$115,261,499	\$178,777,788	\$29,296,144
Debt Service	474,557	5,841,130	8,320,516	736,272
Total Cost	\$13,009,523	\$121,102,629	\$197,098,304	\$30,032,416
Cost Per Pupil:				
Regular Program	\$ 2,339	\$ 3,494	\$ 3,805	\$ 7,046
Debt Service	88	177	177	177
Total Cost	\$ 2,427	\$ 3,671	\$ 3,982	\$ 7,223

Comparisons with Previous Year

	1982-83		1983-84	
	Out-of-County	Out-of-State	Out-of-county	Out-of-State

Kindergarten	\$2,263	\$2,288	\$2,404	\$2,427
Elementary	3,375	3,424	3,624	3,671
Middle/Jr/Sr.	3,649	3,698	3,935	3,982
Special Education	6,791	6,840	7,176	7,223

now therefore be it

Resolved, That the tuition rates for out-of-county Maryland pupils and out-of-state pupils for the 1983-84 school year shall be:

	Out-of-County	Out-of-State
Kindergarten	\$ 2,404	\$ 2,427
Elementary	3,624	3,671
Middle/Junior/Senior	3,935	3,982
Special Education	7,176	7,223

Resolution No. 511-83 Re: Utilization of a Portion of the FY 1984 Provision of Projected Supported Projects for the Position of Site Administrator

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

WHEREAS, The County Council deleted the position of site administrator, or an amount of funds totaling \$33,126, from Category 1 of the FY 1984 operating budget; and

WHEREAS, The position is highly specialized and essential to provide specific planning and technical services for MCPS which cannot be effectively assumed by remaining staff; and

WHEREAS, The \$50,000 in revenue generated each year through management of MCPS properties is sufficient to fund the position of site administrator; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the superintendent be authorized to receive and expend within the FY 1984 provision for Projected Supported Projects of \$250,000 an amount of \$50,000 derived from rental of MCPS property to establish the position of site administrator to provide continued technical and professional services as MCPS facilities liaison with the county development process, including county, city and state governmental staff; Maryland National Capital Park and Planning Commission staff; public utilities agents and staffs; the builder/developer community; PTA and civic organizations; as well as the ongoing land management and operation of existing school facilities and rental properties; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the county

executive and County Council.

Resolution No. 512-83 Re: Relocation of Portable Classroom Buildings

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

WHEREAS, Sealed bids were received June 7, 1983, to relocate twenty-eight classroom units as indicated below:

Bidder	Base Bid	*Add Alternate	Total
1. H & H Enterprises		\$219,750	\$20,507
\$240,257			
2. South Carroll Contract., Inc.	219,000		24,900
243,900			
3. CMS Contractors, Inc.	348,000		62,000
410,000			

* Add Alternate 1 is for the relocation of the three locally-owned portable classrooms; and

WHEREAS, The lowest bidder, H & H Enterprises, is a firm which has successfully completed contracts of this nature for the Board of Education in the past; and

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

Resolved, That a contract for \$240,257, which is the base bid and add alternate 1, be awarded to H & H Enterprises to accomplish the requirements of the plans and specifications entitled "Relocation of Portable Classroom Buildings," dated May 12, 1983, prepared by the Department of School Facilities (Portables to be relocated as follows: Randolph Junior High to Broad Acres Elementary (2 rooms), Fox Chapel Elementary (4 rooms), Germantown Elementary (4 rooms), Kennedy High (6 rooms), and Wheaton High (2 rooms); Farquhar Middle to Banneker Junior High (4 rooms); Montgomery Village Junior High to Rockville High (2 rooms); Gaithersburg Junior High and Travilah Elementary to White Oak Junior High (3 rooms), and Whetstone Elementary to Redland Middle (1 room).

Resolution No. 513-83 Re: Sanitary Sewer Easement - Greencastle Future Junior High School Site (Area 1)

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

WHEREAS, The Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission has requested a right-of-way and temporary construction easement across the Greencastle Future Junior High School site for the purpose of

installing sanitary sewer service; and

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

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

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

Resolved, That the president and secretary be authorized to execute a permanent right-of-way and temporary access easement for the Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission at the Greencastle Future Junior High School site, for the purpose of installing new sanitary sewer services for the school site and the surrounding community; and be it further

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

Re: Inspection of Gaithersburg
Elementary Addition and
Modernization Project

The inspection date was set for the Gaithersburg Elementary School addition and modernization project. Mrs. Praisner will attend.

Resolution No. 514-83 Re: Bid 120-83, Ceiling Board and Grid
System Material

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

WHEREAS, Funds have been budgeted for the purchase of ceiling board and grid system material; now therefore be it

Resolved, That having been duly advertised April 27, 1983, the contracts for the furnishing of ceiling board and grid system material, for the period of June 15, 1983, through June 14, 1984, under Invitation to Bid 120-83 be awarded to the low bidders meeting specifications as follows:

	Dollar Volume	Line Items	Awarded
Clevenger Corporation			
Beltsville, Maryland	\$24,725	2	
J. B. Eurell Company			

Beltsville, Maryland	5,561	5
Total	\$30,286	7

Resolution No. 515-83 Re: Bid 125-83, Industrial Education
Cosmetology Supplies

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

WHEREAS, Funds have been budgeted for the purchase of industrial education cosmetology supplies; now therefore be it

Resolved, That having been duly advertised April 22, 1983, the contracts for the furnishing of industrial education cosmetology supplies for the period of June 21, 1983, through June 20, 1984, under Invitation to Bid 125-83 be awarded to the low bidders meeting specifications as follows:

	Dollar Volume	Line Items Awarded
Baltimore Beauty & Barber Supplies, Inc., Glen Burnie, Md.	\$ 823	8
The Burmax Co., Inc. Hauppauge, New York	4,480	37
Davidson Supply Co., Inc. Beltsville, Maryland	1,815	9
Henry Kayser & Fils New York, New York	8,140	55
Marianna, Inc. Omaha, Nebraska	4,293	39
Total	\$19,551	148

Resolution No. 516-83 Re: Bid 130-83, Vinyl Asbestos Floor
Tile

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

WHEREAS, Funds have been budgeted for the purchase of vinyl asbestos floor tile; now therefore be it

Resolved, That having been duly advertised April 22, 1983, the contract for the furnishing of vinyl asbestos floor tile for the period of June 15, 1983, through June 14, 1984, under Invitation to Bid 130-83 be awarded to the low bidder meeting specifications as follows:

	Dollar Volume	Line Items Awarded
Bode Flooring Corporation Ellicott City, Maryland	\$25,600	1

Resolution No. 517-83

Re: Bid 131-83, Duplicating and Word
Processing Supplies

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

WHEREAS, Funds have been budgeted for the purchase of duplicating and word processing supplies; now therefore be it

Resolved, That having been duly advertised March 29, 1983, the contracts for the furnishing of duplicating and word processing supplies for the period of June 15, 1983, through April 28, 1984, under Invitation to Bid 131-83 be awarded to the low bidders meeting specifications as follows:

	Dollar Volume	Line Items	Awarded
Advance Business Systems & Supply Company, Timonium, Maryland	\$ 42,525	3	
Alperstein Brothers, Inc. Washington, D.C.	7,139	12	
Chaselle, Inc. Columbia, Maryland	22,037	10	
A. B. Dick Company Lanham, Maryland	336	2	
M. S. Ginn Company Bladensburg, Maryland	16,495	6	
IBM Corporation Greenbelt, Maryland	10,616	5	
Modern Duplicator Company Rockville, Maryland	2,200	1	
Quality Services Gaithersburg, Maryland	12,096	4	
Reproduction Supply Company Baltimore, Maryland	2,355	2	
SCM Corporation Alexandria, Virginia	1,018	2	
Spartan Industries, Inc. Burtonsville, Maryland	642	2	
Standard Duplicating Machines Corp., Arlington, Virginia	15,350	1	
Virginia Impressions Products, Inc., Richmond, Virginia	643	4	
Visual Systems Company, Inc. Rockville, Maryland	117	4	
TOTAL	\$133,569	58	

Resolution No. 518-83

Re: Bid 137-83, Plumbing Supplies

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

WHEREAS, Funds have been budgeted for the purchase of plumbing supplies; now therefore be it

Resolved, That having been duly advertised April 5, 1983, the contracts for the furnishing of plumbing supplies for the period of June 15, 1983, through May 12, 1984, under Invitation to Bid 137-83 be awarded to the low bidders meeting specifications as follows:

	Dollar Volume	Line Items Awarded
Creed Company		
Concordville, Pennsylvania	\$ 657	1
Albert G. Fraley Enterprises, Inc.		
T/A Fraley Supply Company		
Rockville, Maryland	4,480	2
Frederick Trading Company		
Frederick, Maryland	7,923	11
Harrison Bros., Inc.		
Rockville, Maryland	5,608	97
Jolles Bros. Contractors		
Beltsville, Maryland	47	1
R. E. Michel Co., Inc.		
Washington, D.C.	9,211	28
Noland Company		
Falls Church, Virginia	18,422	48
J. A. Sexauer		
White Plains, New York	132	4
TRI Plumbing Supplies, Inc.		
Rockville, Maryland	2,535	12
Wolverine Brass Works, Inc.		
Grand Rapids, Michigan	38	1
Woodward-Wanger Co.		
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania	3,980	9
TOTAL	\$53,033	214

Resolution No. 519-83 Re: Rejection of Bid 142-83, Lamps

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

Resolved, That having been duly advertised April 5, 1983, the bids received for the furnishing of lamps under Invitation to Bid 142-83 be rejected.

Resolution No. 520-83 Re: Bid 147-83, Athletic Field White

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

WHEREAS, Funds have been budgeted for the purchase of athletic field

white; now therefore be it

Resolved, That having been duly advertised April 27, 1983, the contract for the furnishing of athletic field white, for the period of June 15, 1983, through December 14, 1983, under Invitation to Bid 147-83 be awarded to the low bidder meeting specifications as follows:

	Dollar Volume	Line Items Awarded
Carlisle & LeGore Keymar, Maryland	\$12,510	1

Resolution No. 521-83 Re: Bid 148-83, Automotive Batteries

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

WHEREAS, Funds have been budgeted for the purchase of automotive batteries; now therefore be it

Resolved, That having been duly advertised April 27, 1983, the contract for the furnishing of automotive batteries for the period of June 15, 1983, through June 14, 1984, under Invitation to bid 148-83 be awarded to the low bidder meeting specifications as follows:

	Dollar Volume	Line Items Awarded
E. J. Payne, Inc. Capitol Heights, Maryland	\$37,762	5

Resolution No. 522-83 Re: Bid 149-83, Business Education Furniture

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

WHEREAS, Funds have been budgeted for the purchase of business education furniture; now therefore be it

Resolved, That having been duly advertised April 27, 1983, the contract for the furnishing of business education furniture under Invitation to Bid 149-83 be awarded to the low bidder meeting specifications as follows:

	Dollar Volume	Line Items Awarded
Douron, Inc. Owings Mills, Maryland	\$23,541	2

Resolution No. 523-83

Re: Bid 154-83, Auto Mechanics
Equipment

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

WHEREAS, Funds have been budgeted for the purchase of auto mechanics equipment; now therefore be it

Resolved, That having been duly advertised May 4, 1983, the contracts for the furnishing of auto mechanics equipment under Invitation to Bid 154-83 be awarded to the low bidders meeting specifications as follows:

	Dollar Volume	Line Items
Awarded		
Sun Electric Corp.		
Beltsville, Maryland	\$12,950	1
Tools & Equipment, Inc.		
Baltimore, Maryland	5,900	1
TOTAL	\$18,850	2

Resolution No. 524-83

Re: Bid 157-83, Lighting Diffuser
Covers

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

WHEREAS, Funds have been budgeted for the purchase of lighting diffuser covers; now therefore be it

Resolved, That having been duly advertised May 11, 1983, the contracts for the furnishing of lighting diffuser covers under Invitation to Bid 157-83 be awarded to the low bidders meeting specifications as follows:

	Dollar Volume	Line Items
Awarded		
M & M Plastics Corp.		
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania	\$2,924	10
Malcolite Corp.		
Clifton, New Jersey	3,104	5
TOTAL	\$6,028	15

Resolution No. 525-83

Re: Bid 168-83, Elementary School Key
Telephones and Related Equipment

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

WHEREAS, Sufficient funds are available from utility cost savings for the purchase of telephone equipment for elementary schools and other MCPS facilities; and

WHEREAS, The purchase will be paid back in approximately two years through savings in equipment leasing costs and will provide an upgrade to electronic touch-tone service; now therefore be it

Resolved, That having been duly advertised May 18, 1983, the contract for the furnishing of elementary school key telephones and related equipment under Invitation to Bid 168-83 be awarded to the low bidder meeting specifications as follows:

	Dollar Volume	Line Items Awarded
North Supply Company Industrial Airport, Kansas	\$121,425	28
Resolution No. 526-83	Re: Proposal 83-19, Audits of School Independent Activity Funds	

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

WHEREAS, It is advantageous to MCPS to contract with outside auditors to perform audits of the Independent Activity Funds at some of the schools in the county; and

WHEREAS, Newspaper advertisements on March 29, 1983, and letter requests issued to a number of accountants have produced 11 qualified candidates, of whom six have been selected as being the best qualified; and

WHEREAS, Sufficient funds are included in the FY 1984 Operating Budget for this purpose; and

WHEREAS, The members of the Audit Committee of the Board of Education have recommended approval of this resolution; now therefore be it

Resolved, That contracts for auditing Independent Activity Funds at the schools for FY 1983 at a price of \$400 per high school, \$230 per junior high school or middle school, and \$120 per elementary school be awarded to:

- Kenneth L. Brown, CPA, Rockville, Maryland
- Craig R. Casper, CPA, Rockville, Maryland
- Michael S. Febrey, CPA, Bethesda, Maryland

Joseph D. Gregory, CPA, Gaithersburg, Maryland
Judith Ann Kellogg, CPA, Derwood, Maryland
Benjamin Weinmann, CPA, Gaithersburg, Maryland

Resolution No. 527-83 Re: Service Contract with Phonic Ear
Co., for Phonic Ear FM Auditory
Training Amplification Equipment,
Series #421, #431, #441, and #445

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

WHEREAS, Funds have been budgeted through the Division of
Maintenance; and

WHEREAS, Servicing of FM amplification equipment is necessary for
support of the hearing impaired students in the auditory programs;
and

WHEREAS, Repair and servicing of this equipment has not been
possible by any other service center nor by the MCPS electronics
shop; and

WHEREAS, Services rendered by Phonic Ear Co. have been satisfactory;
now therefore be it

Resolved, That the superintendent be and is hereby authorized to
enter into a contract with Phonic Ear Co. for servicing of FM
auditory amplification equipment for one year from July 1, 1983, to
June 30, 1984, at a total cost of \$8,435.

Resolution No. 528-83 Re: Changing the Scope and Price of
Contract Number RFP-DEA-79-01 for
the Annual Audit of MCPS Financial
Statements for FY 1983 by Touche
Ross & Co.

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

WHEREAS, On May 8, 1979, the Board of Education authorized the award
of a contract to Touche Ross & Co. for conducting the annual fiscal
audits of MCPS for FY 1979 through FY 1983; and

WHEREAS, On April 7, 1981, the Board approved a contract amendment
establishing price and scope for audits for FY 1981, FY 1982, and FY
1983; and

WHEREAS, On July 13, 1982, the Board approved another contract
amendment increasing the price and scope of the audits for FY 1982
and FY 1983; and

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

Resolved, That the superintendent of schools be authorized, subject to County Council approval, to effect the transfer below in the FY 1983 Appropriation of \$300,000 for Projected Supported Projects:

Category	From	To
01 Administration		\$10,000
04 Special Education	\$10,000	

and be it further

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

Resolution No. 531-83 Re: Utilization of a Portion of the FY 1983 Appropriation for Projected Supported Projects for Adult/Youth Workshops on Drug and Alcohol Awareness

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

Resolved, That the superintendent of schools be authorized to receive and expend from Category 01, Administration, within the FY 1983 Appropriation of \$300,000 for Supported Projects, a \$3,500 grant award from the Maryland State Department of Education under ESEA, Title V to conduct Community Action Team and parent group workshops within the Bethesda-Chevy Chase and Poolesville communities; and be it further

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

Resolution No. 532-83 Re: Utilization of a Portion of the FY 1983 Appropriation for Projected Supported Projects for a Kaleidoscope of Kids Program

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Mrs. Praisner seconded by Dr. Cronin:

Resolved, That the superintendent of schools be authorized to receive and expend from Category 01, Administration, with the FY 1983 Appropriation of \$300,000 for Supported Projects, a \$3,500 grant award from the Maryland State Department of Education under the Arts in Education of the Education Consolidation and Improvement

Act, Chapter 2 for the Kaleidoscope of Kids program at Lakewood Elementary School; and be it further

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

Re: Board/Press/Visitor Conference

The following individuals appeared before the Board of Education:

1. Mr. Jerry Schaefer, Candlewood Elementary School PTA
2. Mrs. Nancy Shaplin, Peary High School PTSA
3. Mrs. Barbara Stockman, Candlewood Elementary School PTA
4. Mr. Talbert Hughes, Candlewood Elementary School PTA

Re: Proposed Definition of Unexcused Absences

Dr. Pitt reported that he had asked Mr. Anson Wilcox, principal of Wheaton High School, to chair a committee to discuss a definition of unexcused absences. The committee was also to look at how well the process of loss of credit worked. Their second report would be before the Board in November.

Mr. Wilcox stated that they had looked at loss of credit in relation to absences and tardiness. The whole committee agreed that they had no reason to go away from the state's definition of absences. The felt MCPS regulations covered what they felt was acceptable and that the procedures were good. They did recommend that the deputy work with principals and teachers to make sure that proper monitoring was taking place. They were concerned about the teacher time required to contact parents. Secondly, a lot of schools did not have enough telephone lines to call out. In some schools there were six outgoing lines for a staff of 200. Once teachers were able to call out it took approximately 15 minutes per call to a parent. Mr. Wilcox pointed out that everything they mailed home cost 20 cents, and these funds came out of the materials of instruction account. He said that the committee's major recommendation was to develop plans for monitoring the loss of credit program.

Mr. Wilcox explained that the committee was unanimous in its recommendation that tardiness not be tied to the loss of credit policy. A student could miss 15 or 20 minutes during a semester and lose credit for the course.

Dr. Cronin indicated that he had several amendments to offer to the loss of credit policy. He asked about the possibility of using registered mail because too many things mailed home did not get there. Dr. Pitt indicated that he required all high schools to use registered mail when seniors failed; however, this was quite costly.

Mr. Hirsch said that in his discussions with students he had not come across one case where the policy was followed as it should.

Another problem was the differences in application of the policy from school to school, and he hoped the committee could address this in some way. In some schools a student could appeal and the appeal would be granted if the student signed a contract. He asked whether the committee discussed the differences in the appeal process from school to school. Mr. Wilcox replied that the committee had discussed everything in great detail, and the appeals process was spelled out. The final decision was up to the principal, but the recommendation was the teacher's. Mr. Hirsch said he was speaking about the different procedures employed by each school. He was concerned about the discrepancies and the fact that the policy was not being implemented uniformly. Mrs. Sandra Sonner remarked that the committee recognized there was great variation among the schools. She thought this problem would be helped if there were monitoring.

Mrs. Peyser said she was concerned that students felt they were entitled to one or two absences. When she was in the classroom, students did not get away with this. They would receive an "E" for that day. She was concerned about tardiness because when a student was late the whole learning process was interrupted. She commended the schools that had taken strong action about tardiness and asked whether there was a difference at the schools where a strong stand against tardiness had been taken. She said that the committee did not look at what happened to students after they received "LC's" because some schools dealt with this very well and others did not.

Mrs. Shannon remarked that she had problems with the whole idea of loss of credit. However, it was the Board's policy. She said the major part of the committee's report she would like to see implemented was the monitoring. She felt that anywhere judgments came into play they would have inequities. She would like to place emphasis on monitoring plans, and she would like to see the reports include race and sex.

It seemed to Dr. Shoenberg there was a strong feeling that the major burden was on the classroom teacher. He wondered whether the game was worth the candle. He, too, was concerned about the inequity from school to school. The problem he had heard the most about was the item on activities approved by the principal. It had to do with absences approved by parents such as travel. If they were going to notify and involve parents when there was concern about unexcused absences, he thought they had to respect the judgment of parents on the other end. He was concerned that these recommendations did not address that issue. Mr. Wilcox replied that they did discuss differences in decisions from school to school. In some schools these absences were turned down, and in other schools they were accepted if the school received a note from the parents ten days in advance and the student made up the work. The biggest problem, in his view, was ski trips. He would like to say that no one got out of school until school was over in June. Dr. Shoenberg commented that they were fooling themselves if they believed that a sizeable group of students couldn't miss a week of classes if their parents

made the judgment that the other activity was more important. This should not put the burden on the teacher and there should not be an obligation for a teacher to repeat a lecture.

Dr. Cronin stated that he was not sure given their mandate that children should attend school that they should allow parents to make the decision. He was concerned about the teacher as an attendance officer and felt they had done a disservice by putting it from the school to the teacher. Sometimes teachers avoid the issue by reporting students present when they were not in class.

Dr. Greenblatt stated that they should not lose sight of the overall impact which was that attendance was improved. They had been able to cut down on random cutting and absences. The point was that attendance was better, and teachers felt that was important. However, she thought there was room for improvement and noted that at one high school the first time a student cut a letter was sent to the parents. She said that the student had done something wrong, and the counseling provided should indicate that the student had done something wrong. She agreed that there was probably too much of an impact on teachers' ability to do this but there were students who acted as volunteers in the high school office. Once attendance had been taken, it should be easy to send out a postcard or phone the home. In regard to tardiness and loss of credit, she felt that this was a serious issue. It was important that they state that class started on time and there would be no interruptions. Part of that was teaching that in the world of work employees had to report on time.

Dr. Pitt commented that the discussion by Board members was similar to discussions held by the staff and committee. He said they were really talking about something that cut across the entire operation of the school system and how much structure should be built into this process and what should be done at the local level. Mrs. Praisner said that as long as they were talking about something as major as loss of credit, procedures had to be consistent from school to school. In addition, they should highlight successful practices. Any information provided the Board should be an assessment of what was going on to make sure there was consistency in definition, communication with parents, and an evaluation of the way in which they were handling tardiness. The other major issue was what did they do with students who had lost credit and whether this had budgetary implications.

Mr. Ewing agreed with Mrs. Praisner that the issue of a student's losing credit was a crucial issue. The other concern is that students were lobbying teachers not to record tardiness. He stated that it was important to have students in class, and they needed to address the issue of the resources necessary to make this policy work. For example, if parents were really notified, what was needed to do this. He thought they had not put the resources into this and did not have the resources to put in, and if they did not have the resources, they should not have the policy.

Dr. Cronin asked about the California computer system which contacted parents, and Dr. Pitt replied that the staff was looking into this. Dr. Shoenberg remarked that at the heart of all this was the degree to which they were centralized and the degree to which they had local options. He suggested that this whole subject might be a topic for the Board's retreat.

Re: Policy on Funding
Retirement/Pension System

Mrs. Praisner moved approval of the following which was seconded by Mrs. Peyser:

WHEREAS, The MCPS Employees Retirement System has been in effect since January 1, 1968; and

WHEREAS, The MCPS Employees Pension System has been in effect since January 1, 1980; and

WHEREAS, An actuarial review of both plans was conducted by Meidinger Company and discussed in public session on January 11, 1983; and

WHEREAS, The Board of Education desires to establish a general policy to accompany the MCPS retirement/pension plans as formerly adopted and to be published in the MCPS Policies and Regulations Handbook; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the MCPS Retirement System and the MCPS Pension System provide supplemental retirement/pension plan benefits for eligible employees who are members of the Teachers' Retirement/Pension Systems of the State of Maryland or provide full retirement/pension plan benefits for eligible employees who are not eligible for membership in the Teachers' Retirement/Pension Systems of the State of Maryland; and be it further

Resolved, That Montgomery County Public Schools maintain a plan of retirement/pension benefits which is adequately funded and will ensure employees sufficient income during their retirement years; and be it further

Resolved, That the results of the annual actuarial review by the funding agent be made available at the conclusion of each fiscal year to establish funding percentages for the coming year based on the unit credit cost method and that assumptions used in developing the actuarial valuation be kept current and adjusted as economic and demographic conditions change; and be it further

Resolved, That the review contain a funding percentage known as the "normal contribution" rate which when applied to annual compensation shall represent the cost of operating the plan during the current year; and be it further

Resolved, That the review also contain a funding percentage known as the "accrued liability" rate which when applied to annual compensation will produce an amount sufficient to liquidate the remaining liabilities of the particular retirement/pension plan over a period of 40 years from the inception dates and that actuarial gains and losses cause the "accrued liability" rate to be adjusted to amortize the additional accrued liability over a period of no less than 15 years from the date of the actuarial valuation producing such gain or loss; and be it further

Resolved, That the amount of money ascertained by applying the sum of the "normal contribution" and the "accrued liability" rate to the budgeted annual compensation less the employee contribution portion be included in the fixed charge section of the superintendent's annual operating budget; and be it further

Resolved, That MCPS have as a funding goal each year the improvement of the asset to accrued liability ratio towards the 100 percent funded level by the end of the amortization period; and be it further

Resolved, That any modifications to plan benefits be approved by the Board of Education and announced 90 days in advance of the effective date of implementation and that opportunities be provided to receive input from active/retired employees and all employee organizations; and be it further

Resolved, That every three to five years an independent actuarial firm be contracted to evaluate the plan in terms of goals and objectives and that the report be made available to the Board Audit Committee; and be it further

Resolved, That staff meet annually each fall with the Board Audit Committee to review the annual report on the actuarial valuation of the retirement/pension plan from the funding agent, plan assumptions, rate of return and budget recommendations for the coming fiscal year.

Resolution No. 533-83 Re: An Amendment to the Proposed
Resolution on Policy on Funding
Retirement/Pension System

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

Resolved, That the proposed resolution on policy on funding retirement/pension system be amended in the eighth Resolved to state "to plan benefits be announced 90 days prior to Board action and opportunities...."

Resolution No. 534-83 Re: Policy on Funding
Retirement/Pension System

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Mrs.

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

WHEREAS, The MCPS Employees Retirement System has been in effect since January 1, 1968; and

WHEREAS, The MCPS Employees Pension System has been in effect since January 1, 1980; and

WHEREAS, An actuarial review of both plans was conducted by Meidinger Company and discussed in public session on January 11, 1983; and

WHEREAS, The Board of Education desires to establish a general policy to accompany the MCPS retirement/pension plans as formerly adopted and to be published in the MCPS Policies and Regulations Handbook; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the MCPS Retirement System and the MCPS Pension System provide supplemental retirement/pension plan benefits for eligible employees who are members of the Teachers' Retirement/Pension Systems of the State of Maryland or provide full retirement/pension plan benefits for eligible employees who are not eligible for membership in the Teachers' Retirement/Pension Systems of the State of Maryland; and be it further

Resolved, That Montgomery County Public Schools maintain a plan of retirement/pension benefits which is adequately funded and will ensure employees sufficient income during their retirement years; and be it further

Resolved, That the results of the annual actuarial review by the funding agent be made available at the conclusion of each fiscal year to establish funding percentages for the coming year based on the unit credit cost method and that assumptions used in developing the actuarial valuation be kept current and adjusted as economic and demographic conditions change; and be it further

Resolved, That the review contain a funding percentage known as the "normal contribution" rate which when applied to annual compensation shall represent the cost of operating the plan during the current year; and be it further

Resolved, That the review also contain a funding percentage known as the "accrued liability" rate which when applied to annual compensation will produce an amount sufficient to liquidate the remaining liabilities of the particular retirement/pension plan over a period of 40 years from the inception dates and that actuarial gains and losses cause the "accrued liability" rate to be adjusted to amortize the additional accrued liability over a period of no less than 15 years from the date of the actuarial valuation producing such gain or loss; and be it further

Resolved, That the amount of money ascertained by applying the sum

of the "normal contribution" and the "accrued liability" rate to the budgeted annual compensation less the employee contribution portion be included in the fixed charge section of the superintendent's annual operating budget; and be it further

Resolved, That MCPS have as a funding goal each year the improvement of the asset to accrued liability ratio towards the 100 percent funded level by the end of the amortization period; and be it further

Resolved, That any modifications to plan benefits be announced 90 days prior to Board action and opportunities be provided to receive input from active/ retired employees and all employee organizations; and be it further

Resolved, That every three to five years an independent actuarial firm be contracted to evaluate the plan in terms of goals and objectives and that the report be made available to the Board Audit Committee; and be it further

Resolved, That staff meet annually each fall with the Board Audit Committee to review the annual report on the actuarial valuation of the retirement/pension plan from the funding agent, plan assumptions, rate of return and budget recommendations for the coming fiscal year.

Resolution No. 535-83 Re: Monthly Personnel Report

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Mrs. Praisner seconded by Mrs. Peyser, 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. 536-83 Re: Extension of Sick Leave

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

WHEREAS, The employees listed below have suffered serious illness; and

WHEREAS, Due to the prolonged illness, the employees' 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
Marshall H. Burch	Painter Division of Maintenance	33

Upton Carter	Roof Maintenance Worker Division of Maintenance	30
Irene Holmes	Building Service Worker Forest Knolls Elementary School	30
Harry Irvine, Jr.	Classroom Teacher Long-term Leave	37
Rebecca McFadyean	Instructional Assistant Rolling Terrace Elementary School	13
Felecia White	Assistant Principal Long-term Leave	17

Resolution No. 537-83 Re: Personnel Reassignments

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

Resolved, That the following personnel reassignments be approved:

Name	From	To
Dale Carlson	Teacher King Learning Center (on personal ill. lv.) M + 30 L3	Instr. Assistant To be determined Will maintain salary To retire July 1, 1984
Phyllis Carr	Teacher Bethe. Ch. Ch. M + 30 L1	Instr. Assistant To be determined Will maintain salary To retire July 1, 1985
John Hinkel	Area Sch. Fac. Planner Sch. Facil. Plan. & Develop. 25 H L3	To be determined To be determined Will maintain salary To retire July 1, 1986
Ester Moldawer	Teacher Kens/Parkwood MEQ 12	Instr. Assistant To be determined Will maintain salary To retire January 1, 1984
Charles Showalter	Teacher Walt Whitman (on personal ill. lv.) M + 30 15	Instr. Assistant To be determined Will maintain salary To retire July 1, 1984
Enrique Sylto	Teacher Walt Whitman M + 30 L2	Instr. Assistant To be determined Will maintain salary To retire February 1, 1984
Jean Waters	Admin. Sch. Sec. Peary 12 H L2	To be determined To be determined Will maintain salary To retire July 1, 1985

Geraldine Windham	Teacher	Instr. Assistant
	Earle B. Wood	To be determined
	M + 30 L3	Will maintain salary to retire July 1, 1984

Resolution No. 538-83 Re: Death of Mrs. Dorothy L. Root,
Instructional Assistant at Belmont
Elementary

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

WHEREAS, The death on May 23, 1983, of Mrs. Dorothy L. Root, an instructional assistant at Belmont Elementary School, has deeply saddened the staff and members of the Board of Education; and

WHEREAS, Mrs. Root had earned the respect and admiration of students and staff in her seventeen years of service with Montgomery County Public Schools; and

WHEREAS, Mrs. Root's outstanding interest and motivation, and her artistic skills have made her an asset to Montgomery County Public Schools; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the members of the Board of Education express their sorrow at the death of Mrs. Dorothy L. Root 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 the family of the deceased.

Resolution No. 539-83 Re: Death of Mrs. Avonell K. Pontius,
Resource Teacher at Gaithersburg
High School

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

WHEREAS, The death on June 9, 1983, of Mrs. Avonell K. Pontius, a resource teacher at Gaithersburg High School, has deeply saddened the staff and members of the Board of Education; and

WHEREAS, In the more than sixteen years that Mrs. Pontius had been a member of the staff of the Montgomery County Public Schools, she was recognized as a leader in the business education field; and

WHEREAS, Mrs. Pontius was a dedicated and competent resource to staff and students; now therefore be it

Edward S. Clements Principal Takoma Park Junior High	A & S Teacher	Principal
Jesse Beard Principal Takoma Park Elementary	A & S Teacher	A&S pos. for which qualified
James B. Judd, Jr. Assistant Principal Julius West Middle School	A & S Teacher	Pos. for which qualified

Resolution No. 541-83 Re: Academic Leave

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

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

Billy, Joel
Director (on academic leave)
Bridge School
Years of Service in Montgomery County - 14
Period of Leave - July 1, 1983, through March 28, 1984
Attend Virginia Polytechnic Institute for Ph.D. in Research and Evaluation

Chisley, Franklin
Teacher of Gifted/Talented
Rocking Horse Road Elementary School
Years of Service in Montgomery County - 7
Period of Leave - August 26, 1983, through June 29, 1984
Attend University of Maryland for Master's Degree in Computer Related Instruction

Fitzgerald, Camilla
Elementary Counselor
Chevy Chase Elementary School
Years of Service in Montgomery County - 11
Period of Leave - August 26, 1983, through June 29, 1984
Attend University of Maryland to complete internship in Psychology

Fleury, Karen
Counselor
Robert E. Peary High School
Years of Service in Montgomery County - 7
Period of Leave - August 26, 1983, through June 29, 1984
Attend University of North Carolina for Doctoral Program in Special Services Administration

Fleury, Russell
Assistant Principal
Montgomery Blair High School
Years of Service in Montgomery County - 7
Period of Leave - July 1, 1983, through June 29, 1984
Attend University of North Carolina for Doctoral Program in Organizational
Development and Institutional Studies

Fohrell, Martha
Teacher, Special Education Resource
William Tyler Page Elementary School
Years of Service in Montgomery County - 11
Period of Leave - August 26, 1983, through June 29, 1984
Attend George Mason University to complete Internship in Psychology

Gaston, William
Media Specialist
Burning Tree Elementary School
Years of Service in Montgomery County - 12
Period of Leave - August 26, 1983, through June 29, 1984
Attend the Instituto Cultural in Guadalajara, Mexico, to study Spanish

Goldenson, David
Teacher, Science
Mark Twain School
Years of Service in Montgomery County - 8
Period of Leave - August 26, 1983, through June 29, 1984
To complete an Internship in Psychology through the Child Guidance
Clinic at the Jewish Social Service Agency

Hopkins, Beverly
Supervisor of Elementary Education
Area 2 Administrative Office
Years of Service in Montgomery County - 10
Period of Leave - July 1, 1983, through June 29, 1984
Attend University of Maryland for Doctoral Program in Administration and
Supervision

Maloney, Jean
Teacher, Science
Thomas S. Wootton High School
Years of Service in Montgomery County - 8
Period of Leave - August 26, 1983, through June 29, 1984
Attend Lehigh University of Master's Program in Educational
Technology

Medin, Julia
Teacher, Mathematics
Thomas W. Pyle Intermediate School
Years of Service in Montgomery County - 17
Period of Leave - August 26, 1983, through June 29, 1984
Attend the American University for Doctoral Program in Mathematics

Education

Mero, Dianne

Principal

Benjamin Banneker Junior High School

Years of Service in Montgomery County - 7

Period of Leave - July 1, 1983, through June 29, 1984

Attend the American University for Doctoral Program in
Administration and
Supervision

Munter, Judie

Teacher, Gifted/Talented

Piney Branch Elementary School

Years of Service in Montgomery County - 15

Period of Leave - August 26, 1983, through June 29, 1984

Attend the American University for Master's Degree in Education

Parker, Kevin

Safety and Security Assistant

Sligo Intermediate School

Years of Service in Montgomery County - 7

Period of Leave - August 30, 1983, through June 29, 1984

Attend University of Maryland for B.A. Degree in Business

Pierson, Josephine

Teacher, Music

Montgomery Blair High School

Years of Service in Montgomery County - 7

Period of Leave - August 26, 1983, through June 29, 1984

Attend University of Maryland for Master's Degree in Music Education

Rhoads, Carolyn

Teacher, Mathematics

Montgomery Blair High School

Years of Service in Montgomery County - 7

Period of Leave - August 26, 1983, through June 29, 1984

Attend University of Maryland for Doctoral Program in Mathematics
Education

Riley, William

Teacher, Physical Education

Jackson Road Elementary School

Years of Service in Montgomery County - 18

Period of Leave - August 26, 1983, through June 29, 1984

Attend University of South Florida for Graduate Study in Physical
Education

Rosenblatt, Irma

Reading Specialist

Cloverly Elementary School

Years of Service in Montgomery County - 7

Period of Leave - August 26, 1983, through June 29, 1984

Attend Johns Hopkins University for Certificate of Advanced Study in
Learning Disabilities

Steel, Sarah

English Composition Aide

Poolesville High School

Years of Service in Montgomery County - 7

Period of Leave - August 30, 1983, through December 15, 1983

Attend Western Maryland College and complete Student Teaching in
English

Stephens, Barbara

Teacher, Art

Farmland Elementary School

Years of Service in Montgomery County - 15

Period of Leave - August 26, 1983, through June 29, 1984

Attend University of Maryland for Master's Degree in Art Education

Wallace, Helen

Reading Specialist

Piney Branch Elementary School

Years of Service in Montgomery County - 20

Period of Leave - August 26, 1983, through June 29, 1984

Attend Catholic University for Doctoral Program in Curriculum Instruction
and Technology

Resolution No. 542-83

Re: Amendment to the Position
Classification and Pay Plan

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

WHEREAS, As part of the established procedures for reviewing and
revising the position classification and pay plan, the
superintendent had recommended the changes described; and

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

Resolved, That the following classification and pay plan revisions
be approved effective July 1, 1983:

Change the classification of the position from teacher/specialist
pay grade C-D, to supervisor, home instruction services, pay
grade M (\$31,223 minimum to \$42,151 maximum FY 84).

Change the classification of the position from equal employment
opportunity assistant, pay grade 20 (\$22,542 minimum - \$35,422 maximum
longevity FY 84) to equal employment opportunity specialist, pay
grade 23 (\$26,124 minimum - \$40,643 maximum longevity FY 84).

Change the classification of the position from retirement counselor, pay grade 20 (\$22,542 minimum - \$35,422 maximum longevity FY 84) to career and retirement counselor, pay grade 25 (\$28,766 minimum - \$44,532 maximum longevity FY 84).

Re: Proposed Policy on Early Entrance
to First Grade

Mrs. Peyser moved the following which was seconded by Dr. Greenblatt:

WHEREAS, The Public School Law of Maryland, Bylaw 13A.08.01.01, provides that a local Board of Education may adopt a regulation permitting a 5-year-old child, upon request of the parent, to be admitted to the first grade if the local superintendent or his designee determines that the child has demonstrated capabilities warranting early admission; and

WHEREAS, In December, 1982, the superintendent was asked to recommend such a policy; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the attached policy be adopted by the Board of Education.

Resolution No. 543-83

Re: A Substitute Motion by Dr.
Shoenberg On Early Entrance to
First Grade

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

WHEREAS, The Public School Law of Maryland, Bylaw 13A.08.01.01, provides that a local Board of Education may adopt a regulation permitting a 5-year-old child, upon request of the parent, to be admitted to the first grade if the local superintendent or his designee determines that the child has demonstrated capabilities warranting early admission; and

WHEREAS, In December, 1982, the superintendent was asked to recommend such a policy; now therefore be it

Resolved, That it shall be the policy of the Montgomery County Public Schools to permit early entrance to first grade for exceptional children eligible for kindergarten who exhibit academic, social and emotional characteristics that suggest the appropriateness of such placement; and be it further

Resolved, That the decision as to early admission shall rest with the principal of the school following identification criteria and application and screening processes developed by the superintendent and included in the administrative regulations implementing the policy; and be it further

Resolved, That superintendent shall annually report to the Board of Education on the implementation of this policy for the first two years.

Re: Biennial Review of the Student
Rights and Responsibilities Policy

Mr. Hirsch moved the following which was seconded by Mrs. Shannon:

WHEREAS, The committee was established as required by the Student Rights and Responsibilities Policy to conduct a biennial review; and

WHEREAS, This committee submitted its report to the superintendent; and

WHEREAS, The superintendent had made his recommendation; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the superintendent's recommended changes to the Student Rights and Responsibilities Policy be adopted.

Resolution No. 544-83 Re: An Amendment to the Student Rights
and Responsibilities Policy

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

Resolved, That the student rights and responsibilities policy be amended to substitute "shall be encouraged to exercise their right to" for "have the right to" in 1.A.1.

Resolution No. 545-83 Re: An Amendment to the Student Rights
and Responsibilities Policy

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

Resolved, That the student rights and responsibilities policy be amended to substitute "students in consultation with the appropriate school administrators shall have the prime responsibility" for "students shall have the prime responsibility" in Section 1.C.1.b.

Re: A Motion by Mrs. Peyser to Amend
the Student Rights and
Responsibilities Policy

Mrs. Peyser moved and Dr. Greenblatt seconded that Section II on attendance be changed to substitute "shall" for "have a

responsibility to" to read "except when ill or excused, all students shall attend their scheduled classes..." and delete "excessive" and add "teachers" to read "At grade levels 9 through 12, unexcused absences will result in consultation with school administrators and/or specialists, teachers...."

Mr. Hirsch asked that the question be divided.

Re: A Motion by Mrs. Peyser to Amend
the Student Rights and
Responsibilities Policy (FAILED)

A motion by Mrs. Peyser to amend the student rights and responsibilities policy by substituting "shall" for "have a responsibility to" in Section 2 failed with Dr. Greenblatt and Mrs. Peyser voting in the affirmative; Dr. Cronin, Mr. Ewing, Mrs. Praisner, Mrs. Shannon, and Dr. Shoenberg voting in the negative (Mr. Hirsch voting in the negative).

Resolution No. 546-83 Re: An Amendment to the Student Rights
and Responsibilities Policy

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

Resolved, That the students rights and responsibilities policy be amended in Section 2 to delete "excessive" and add "teachers" to read: "At grade levels 9 through 12, unexcused absences will result in consultation with school administrators and/or specialists, teachers...."

Re: A Motion by Dr. Cronin to Amend
the Student Rights and
Responsibilities Policy (FAILED)

A motion by Dr. Cronin to amend the student rights and responsibilities policy by deleting "or oral" in the third line and "either an oral or" in the seventh line of III.B. failed for lack of a second.

Re: A Motion by Mrs. Peyser to Amend
the Student Rights and
Responsibilities Policy

Mrs. Peyser moved and Dr. Greenblatt seconded that in III.C. the word "substantially" be deleted and in IV.C.2.c(3) the word "substantial" be deleted.

Mr. Ewing asked that the question be divided.

Re: A Motion by Mrs. Peyser to Amend
the Student Rights and
Responsibilities Policy (FAILED)

A motion by Mrs. Peyser to amend the student rights and responsibilities policy by deleting "substantially" in Section III.C. to read "or may interfere with the effective operation of the school" failed with Dr. Greenblatt and Mrs. Peyser voting in the affirmative; Dr. Cronin, Mr. Ewing, Mrs. Praisner, Mrs. Shannon, and Dr. Shoenberg voting in the negative (Mr. Hirsch voting in the negative).

Re: A Motion by Mrs. Peyser to Amend
the Student Rights and
Responsibilities Policy (FAILED)

A motion by Mrs. Peyser to amend the student rights and responsibilities policy by deleting "substantial" in IV.C.2.c)(3) to read "causes or may be reasonably expected to cause disruption of school activities" failed with Dr. Greenblatt and Mrs. Peyser voting in the affirmative; Dr. Cronin, Mr. Ewing, Mrs. Praisner, Mrs. Shannon, and Dr. Shoenberg voting in the negative (Mr. Hirsch voting in the negative).

Re: A Motion by Dr. Cronin to Amend
the Student Rights and
Responsibilities Policy (FAILED)

A motion by Dr. Cronin to amend the student rights and responsibilities policy by adding "either orally or" to III.C. to read "the reasons for such abridgement must be stated either orally or in writing" failed with Dr. Cronin, Dr. Greenblatt, and Mrs. Peyser voting in the affirmative; Mr. Ewing, Mrs. Praisner, and Mrs. Shannon voting in the negative; Dr. Shoenberg abstaining (Mr. Hirsch voting in the negative).

Re: A Motion by Mrs. Peyser to Amend
the Student Rights and
Responsibilities Policy (FAILED)

A motion by Mrs. Peyser to amend the student rights and responsibilities policy by adding "Student government officers must maintain passing grades in all their subjects" to III.D. failed with Dr. Greenblatt and Mrs. Peyser voting in the affirmative; Dr. Cronin, Mr. Ewing, Mrs. Praisner, and Dr. Shoenberg voting in the negative; Mrs. Shannon abstaining (Mr. Hirsch voting in the negative).

Re: High School Issues: National
Commission on Excellence in
Education, Evaluation of the
Impact of the Basic Core of Course
Offerings on Senior High School
Programs, and Increasing

Graduation Requirements

Mr. Ewing stated that the Board would be discussing the report of the National Commission on Excellence in Education and a series of other issues. The general issue was what they needed to do in the school system to improve the quality of instruction. They were fortunate to have with them the United States Secretary of Education, Dr. T. H. Bell.

Dr. Bell said he wanted to be present at this Board meeting because it was the last Board meeting for Superintendent Andrews. He expressed his admiration for Dr. Andrews and his appreciation for his wonderful service to this very outstanding school system. He was pleased that Dr. Andrews would be continuing at the University of Maryland. He explained that he had tried to persuade Dr. Cody to join the Department of Education, and he congratulated the Board on recruiting Dr. Cody as the new superintendent. He said that as they all knew education had moved to the top of the agenda. He had appointed the National Commission on Excellence a year ago last August, and since their report they had had a phenomenal response nationwide. Many people had asked him whether education was being politicized, and his response was that education was very critical in determining public policy. He felt that it was great that it was as high on the agenda as it was at the present time. He hoped that everyone -- Democrats, Republicans, candidates for president, candidates for governor, candidates for legislature, and candidates for Congress and the Senate--will all be debating and vying for ways to improve the quality of American Education.

Dr. Bell said that the findings of the Commission and the recommendations were now receiving a great amount of attention. They thought that some of the findings could be implemented without spending more money, but more money would be required to implement all of the findings. He emphasized that they ought to do those things that they could do to strengthen their schools and make improvements they ought to make. These changes could be made by different policies and rules. Following that, they had to look at other changes that were going to cost money. Dr. Bell indicated that many of the requirements in the report were being met by Montgomery County schools right now, and the school system should be commended.

Dr. Bell commented that what often happened was that a good school system was not as appreciated at home as looking at it from a distance. If they had an opportunity to look at education nationwide, they would appreciate the public schools in Montgomery County even more than they did. But as good as it was, he was sure they wanted it to be even better. He would like to see the school system and the new superintendent take the fine system from where it was and see if they could be an example to the nation for excellence in education. He said it was a very diverse school system, and he was surprised to learn they had quite a bit of rural area. He thought they were getting a good mix of minority students and a good

mix of students who had grown up in other parts of the country. He knew what it did to the language challenges they had, but by and large it would provide students with a rich opportunity. He appreciated the invitation to a Board meeting.

Mr. Ewing noted that Board members had had the report for some time, and he was sure they had questions for Dr. Bell. Dr. Greenblatt thought that when many of them read "A Nation At Risk" they said it said exactly what they had been trying to do these past several years. She found throughout the document many examples of what the Montgomery County Board had been acting on such as needing homework, needing appropriate textbooks, requiring students to be in class, and looking at graduation requirements. She said that the most controversial aspect was the career ladder and master teacher aspect. Last year in their negotiations process they did include a bonus for principals who were excellent administrators. She was wondering from the point of view of looking at the long-range implications of this. Years ago it was said that teachers were better prepared if they did graduate work. Now most of their

teachers had masters degrees. She asked how broad the master teacher category should be.

Dr. Bell remarked that the master teacher idea was getting the most publicity right now. He had spent most all of his adult life in the public schools, and the last five years he served served as commissioner of a state system of higher education. He watched how they recognized, rewarded, and advanced academic professional. He had watched how the decision was made as to who would be advanced to the rank of full professor. He thought that in the elementary and secondary schools they could tear a page out of that book. Some people called that merit rating. He did not have in mind the old style system where they would say if they came up with a score of 600 then you could qualify and were merit rated. He did not think that was going to work. The point that he had in mind was to create at least another position in the schools, and for want of a better term the position was called master teacher. Many teachers did not want to have any part of a merit system where the administrators handled it. The thing he had in mind was that they would create this new position and if they equated it with higher education they could reward distinguished teachers. He noted that there were only so many full professor positions on a departmental faculty, and if there were three openings, the openings would be posted, people would apply, and a peer review would take place. This happened in the Montgomery County Public Schools when they had an opening for a principal. Dr. Bell stated that the system was not perfect, but it was a lot better than the flat terrain they had now because teachers needed a career ladder. He agreed that this was going to take some time, but he would like to see it tried in an area. He thought the faculty members ought to have a major voice on a review panel to appraise the candidates for advancement in rank. He felt they could get more money for teachers' salaries if they moved to this type of system. He thought they could keep more of their outstanding teachers in education if they could provide some

upward mobility for them. If 20 percent of the faculty were able to go into this program, more young people would select teaching as their profession.

Dr. Bell reported that the previous day he met with the 125 Presidential Scholars, and not one of them planned to go into teaching. He would argue that the salary schedule ought to be as high as they could get it. Beginning teachers might be the equivalent of the assistant professor and the rest might be associate professors. He asked whether the dynamics were such that it could work in Montgomery County. He was not naive about this because he knew how tough it was at the bargaining table and respected the rights of teachers. He had talked to Al Shanker about this, and AFT was willing to take a look at this and a few NEA people had expressed an interest.

Mrs. Praisner gathered from Dr. Bell's comment that he had some knowledge of Montgomery County and how seriously they took education within the community. There was a great deal of diversity in the community, but they all came together to say they had a very good school system and wanted to make it better. She pointed out that within their 90,000 students there were 11 percent who were receiving handicap services. They had a number of students speaking foreign languages, and in high school over 70 languages were spoken. One of the things she was interested in was the question of support for the school system. In the preamble of the report there was talk about the dismantling of the essential support system for education. She was concerned about building again that support system when they had a decrease in the number of public school students and a decrease in the number of citizens knowledgeable about the public schools. She asked about where the federal government might help with providing some support systems.

Dr. Bell believed there was a significant federal role in education, and they had had quite a debate about that in the administration. Their proposed budget which was before Congress with the support of the president was higher than the budget mark they started with. If they allowed for the fact that over a billion dollars was being saved in the guaranteed student loan program because of a reduction in interest rates, they had close to a level funded budget with the previous year. He thought they should continue to lend assistance to special student populations, but he thought it ought to supplement and supplant what Montgomery County and the State of Maryland did. He said they should do a lot more than they had been doing in the area of research and development. They had a very heavy responsibility with respect to civil rights and equal opportunity. He hoped they could continue to maintain their commitment to the Chapter I program. He said that a sore subject in Montgomery County was impact aid. They were committed to funding the A students, but the B students paid into the Maryland state coffers and paid local property tax. Maybe there wasn't as much justification there as in other areas. He did not think the federal government ought to assume a percentage of the cost of financing the schools. However, he believed there was a federal role and was pleased that contrary to a year ago they had a better budget to back that up this

year. They did have a proposal for the math and science initiative, and he thought they would get a math and science bill passed by Congress.

Mrs. Praisner commented that when she was looking at the report there was much in it that she agreed with but it did not speak to the diversity of the student population today and the recognition of meeting individual student needs which has been the cornerstone of Montgomery County Public Schools. It seemed to be geared to science, math, and high school students. She was also concerned about meeting the needs of minority students. Dr. Bell replied that the report might be deficient in that respect. He explained that the membership on the committee was very scholar/scientist oriented. He said that she had touched on something they probably ought to look at more carefully.

Mr. Ewing asked what it was a school system could do as it pursues excellence for all of its students to assure that minority students also achieve and also make outstanding progress. All across the country and in Montgomery County there was a gap between minority student, particularly black student, achievement as measured by testing and majority student results. They did not seem to have a formula for addressing that. He asked Dr. Bell if he had some strategy or approach which might be useful for Montgomery County or others to pursue. Dr. Bell replied that in his experience student achievement in various neighborhood schools correlates closely to the income level there, and unfortunately they had put minorities down so much and it had only been so recent in their history that they had started to develop a social conscience with respect to that. He knew that they had a long way to go. He had a great interest in educational tests and measurements, and from his experience he knew that they were all blessed with intelligence, minorities, males and females. Bright and capable students were found in all walks of life. It was encouraging to him to see the number of minority youngsters as Presidential Scholars.

Dr. Bell thought that school boards ought to have foremost in their policy manuals a strong statement about standards. They should address themselves to the parents and say what the Board of Education required. They were after excellence and needed a strong statement about time on task and about activities because he thought too many secondary schools were socially oriented. He thought they would solve some other problems about drug and alcohol difficulties if they had more homework. He wanted to see a strong statement placed in the hands of the parents to say what their responsibility was. If there were anyway they could reach out to the minority homes, they should emphasize this. He worried about the differentiation that was going to come as they moved into the computer age because the computer in the home was a new phenomenon and would disadvantage the disadvantaged home even more. He pointed out that in the United States they had had experience since 1965 in how to educate Title I children, and there were some programs that had yielded phenomenal success and he did not think they were seeking them out as vigorously as they could. He had ordered an

appraisal to take place.

Mrs. Shannon said she was glad to hear Dr. Bell state that minorities were blessed with the entire spectrum of intelligence. In regard to minority parents, she thought they would find that by and large minority parents had the same expectations for their children in terms of their expected success in school that any other parent had. Part of the problem, which was not a minority problem, went to the differentiated expectations once the minority students arrived in the schools. The problem and concern was what happened to that self confidence. She did not want to see any real discussion about standards being lowered for minorities because they were capable to reaching any standards. She expected those standards to be just as high for minority students as for anyone else. She remarked that the constant coupling of Title I with minority with disadvantaged also contributes to that perception and to that problem. Mrs. Shannon commented that the committee writing the report was composed of scientists and scholars and the entire report was aimed in that direction. She noted that in Montgomery County close to 80 percent of their students went on to higher education, but she asked about what happened in other school systems to those students who were not scholars and scientists. She asked where the report addressed what happened to them.

Dr. Bell explained that while there were scientists and scholars on the committee there were others, the high school teacher, the minority principal, and the Hispanic superintendent. He thought that the commission addressed itself to that education that should apply to all students. They recommended three years of mathematics in high school and students could not afford to have less than that. The feeling was that every student ought to have four years of English, three years of math, and three years of science. However, these might have a different orientation for the youngster who was not college-bound. It was the feeling of the commission that the report applied to all students. In regard to expectations, Dr. Bell thought this was significant and the report emphasized expectations. As they thought about Title I students, they should be thinking of the real measure which was income level, and there were plenty of majority students with the same needs also.

Dr. Cronin believed that one of the aspects of the report that would be very useful was in giving Dr. Bell's office a very strong national voice and a platform upon which to become their spokesman nationally. He stated that he could not underestimate the power of the tax-reform movement, and he felt they would need a strong voice in education at a national level. He said that one of the deficiencies in the report needed to be addressed in subsequent actions. The report spoke to high school curriculums, standards, achievement, and the articulation from high school to college. He suggested that by the time the student was in high school the game was either won or lost. It was in the elementary schools where their educational system was to succeed or fail. If students left the elementary schools without proper preparation, they would have to do remedial work in high school and in college. He asked whether

the report and Dr. Bell's program addressed the elementary school system.

Dr. Bell remarked that the implied criticism was fair. He said he would have to take some of the blame for the fact that there wasn't much emphasis on the elementary school. When the commission was established, a charter had to be written and he urged them to pay particular attention to the education of teenage youth. The data they had indicated that students seemed to be closer to grade level nationwide on the elementary school level. It seemed to be in the teenage years that they had an enormous drop. He reported that the elementary school principals association had chastised him about that. He acknowledged that the solid basics in the elementary schools were essential. He pointed out that 35 of the 50 states only required one year of math and one year of science to graduate from high schools. He said that you could still get a master's degree without a foreign language. He thought that higher education had been sending the wrong signals to the high schools by lowering their college entrance requirements. He also thought they sent the wrong signal by the way they had been neglecting their schools of education.

Mrs. Peyser said she would like to return to the question about diversity of students, students who were not scholars, and different expectations for students. She said they would be getting to an item about increasing graduation requirements, and she had asked the Board to look again at the Paideia Proposal. Mortimer Adler was considered to be the leader of the group, and she was most struck by the recommendation that all students were capable of a rigorous academic education including four years of math through calculus. The group completely rejected multiple tracks, and she noted that in Montgomery County they had over 500 courses at the high school level. She hoped that they would keep the Paideia Proposal in mind as they addressed these serious concerns about educating the diverse student populations that they had. Dr. Bell replied that he was not as knowledgeable as he should be of Adler's Paideia Proposal, and he felt that he needed a good orientation about this report.

Dr. Shoenberg thought that the Paideia Proposal and the commission report had two things in common. They were both polemics. They were a case of a very strong ideologically motivated argument for a particular point of view, and for that reason he thought it was a danger if they were taken as blueprints. He thought that "A Nation at Risk" presented a very good critique of the state of secondary education in general. For that, it had brought together a lot of concerns that they had all intuitively held, and it did a reasonable job of documenting the basis for those concerns. There was one piece of documentation that confused him a great deal, and that was the comparison of the performance of American high school students with those of high school students in other industrialized countries. There was a great deal made of the fact that American students did not measure up very well; however, he would like to point to a couple of other items in the report. He quoted:

"It is important to recognize that the average citizen today is better educated and more knowledgeable than the average citizen of a generation ago. More literate and exposed to more mathematics, literature, and science. The positive impact of this fact on the well-being of our country and the lives of our people cannot be overstated. Nevertheless, the average graduate of our schools and colleges today is not as well educated as the average graduate of 25 or 35 years ago when a much smaller proportion of our population completed high school and college. The negative impact of this fact, likewise, cannot be overstated."

Dr. Shoenberg said that at the end of the report it was pointed out that the top 9 percent of American students compared favorably with their peers in other countries when those comparisons on which the critique rests were made a decade ago. He did not know who was being compared with whom in that report. He asked whether they were comparing all American high school graduates with the graduates of the most selective secondary schools. That was such an essential part of the critique that it was important to straighten it out. He sensed in the report a really serious confusion about the ends of public education. He would criticize the task force for failing to get that clear. They made a series of recommendations but did not make clear to what end. If they were to educate all students to minimum standards of competence, what was the minimum and what were the essential competencies. Was it only cognitive competencies that schools were expected to develop? Here was where he thought the bias of the group really came through and did them a disservice. It seemed to him that what they were really thinking about here was the promotion of achievement of their most able students. He said that Recommendation A read like a statement of admissions requirements from a college catalogue. The high school described would teach what it did so that students could go on and learn what came afterward. It did not treat the high school as an end in itself, having its own particular role and mission. So they got students who were turned off by the curriculum because the only justification they got for what they were asked to learn was to learn the next thing. He thought that the commission had bought into that. He hoped that they would have come out with a recommendation that what they wanted for students was that they fulfill their own potential and their own capabilities. That did not mean just in cognitive areas. He did not see anything in the report about high schools preparing people for adult roles in which they had a responsibility to other people and to the community. He said there was an implicit put-down in that report of those courses which came under the rubric of peripheral that, in fact, did help students to do that. The report did not speak to those groups struggling for enfranchisement. He was talking about women, racial and ethnic minorities, the handicapped, and people who were gifted in noncognitive ways.

Dr. Shoenberg said that while the critique had some cogence in it, he thought the recommendations if they were to follow them would

give them a very limited notion of what they were about educationally in Montgomery County and nationally. Dr. Bell replied there was no question that there was a strong theme of preparation for college in the recommendations. There were four college presidents and two professors on the commission; therefore, they would expect that but the feeling was that all students needed these minimum courses that were very rigorous and extended the students to the outer limits of their abilities. He said that whether they went on to college or not, they must attain such a level of literacy and basic academic competence that they would continue learning. The commission criticized the high school offerings such as bachelor living as an example of the preparing for life idea that had permeated the high school curriculum. The commission was saying they should zero in on academic competence, learn how to learn and engage yourself in such a rigorous curriculum that you attain a joy from learning. This applied to the youngster who was going to repair automobiles. He said that Board members elected by the people could accept or reject the recommendations.

Mrs. Shannon asked whether Dr. Bell thought all students were capable of calculus. Dr. Bell replied that he did not, but he thought all students were capable of attaining much more than most of them had been getting in America's schools up to this time. The definition of excellence in the report was to let every child perform out to the outer limits of his or her ability. He accepted that, and he knew that Montgomery County believed in that. He felt that they were not crowding enough students out to those outer limits. The greatest challenge in American education was motivation, and he believed this should be built into their system as they recognized and rewarded their magnificent teachers. He hoped that they could get some takers on the master teacher idea. On behalf of the Board and the community, the superintendent said that Montgomery County had always felt that public education was valued and was important. With the appointment of the commission, he said whether anyone agreed or disagreed with any of the specific recommendations, the fact was that education was very important to everyone now. He thought that Dr. Bell more than anyone else in the country had accomplished that, and for that he was personally grateful. Dr. Bell left the meeting at this point.

Mr. Hirsch said that he and his family had had some interesting conversations about the report. In trying to formulate his opinions on the report, he decided the reason why his opinions differed was that he had become a fan of a lot of things John Dewey had to say. One of the things was that education was not preparation for life, education is life. His definition of education was different from the definition of education in the national commission report. In his opinion, what was missing from the report was the realization that there is more to learning than academically oriented courses. The report spoke to longer school days, longer school years, and more requirements and homework. He did not think that more or increased or bigger or longer was going to equal better. However, he thought there might be some merit to requiring more and to some

of the proposals; but what was missing was that students get things out of afterschool jobs, nonacademic courses, and extracurricular activities. He did not think spending more time in the classroom was going to make a better person or a more scholarly person. To become scholarly you had to learn about the world around you, and he did not think they were going to get that as much in the classroom as by getting out and doing. The final word in the report was a message to students, and he read it over a couple of times. It was a good message, that "you forfeit your chance for life at its fullest when you withhold your best effort in learning." He would add the words, "and living." He thought that was what was missing from the report and that was what they should be honing in on. He said the report had been very good in starting a nationwide discussion.

Mr. Ewing thought the most important question for them was to ask if the report was on target with respect to education in Montgomery County, both in its diagnosis and its remedies. It was his view that it was helpful in stimulating discussion but not very helpful in finding solutions to their problems in this county today. If that were so, he was worried that they might be misled into doing some things that they ought not do in order to be on some kind of national bandwagon. He was bothered by the sweeping indictment of education and the rising tide of mediocrity, because he did not think that applied to Montgomery County. He thought there were plenty of things they could do to improve the quality of education in Montgomery County, and he did agree with Dr. Bell that it was important for them to reappraise where they were and where they wanted to go. He believed they were poised now for substantial growth and improvement in the quality of education in Montgomery County. He said they were building on a very strong and excellent foundation to do that. He felt that the report was really quite unclear about the purposes of education but at cross purposes with itself about those purposes. It talked from its title that the reason they should do something about education was because they had foreign and economic competitors and potential military competitors and rivals. That might be true, but it was hardly the basis for motivating students to do homework. There had to be another kind of focus for it to make a difference for kids. That focus had to be what it did for them as human beings, to prepare them to be successful citizens, and to prepare them to be successful in the economic world they will have to enter. Mr. Ewing thought those were the things on which they needed to focus and not some set of national priorities. He was worried that they would do things based on those national norms that would distort what education ought to be about. For example, the report suggested increasing graduation requirements in content areas. He did not object to students taking lots of courses in serious areas, but what did it mean to do that. The report was not clear because it just said have more math and more language. He thought instead what they needed to do was to focus on what it was students needed as individuals and to help them build programs through counseling, individualized attention, and instruction. These should equip them with all of the basic skills they need, and they had to reassess what those basic skills were.

He did not think that simply increasing graduation requirements would insure that they had a better education for students.

Mr. Ewing was convinced that the report omitted to do something else which he thought was tremendously important. No where in the report did it talk about teaching children to think, to analyze, to ask questions, to be critical, to understand, to compare, and to know how to use and organize data to make decisions. It seemed to him that was far more important than simply increasing graduation requirements and doing more homework. It was his view that the report was a mechanistic approach to education. As far as the business about pay, Mr. Ewing said that for far too long they had relied on a reservoir of talented women who were unable to find jobs in other fields and whom they exploited successfully because of that. The result has been that as women have found other opportunities, the school systems of the nation and eventually Montgomery County would feel this impact. They would find themselves unable to attract capable people to the degree they had been able to do in the past. That tradition had meant that salaries were low. In addition, people expected to be consulted and taken seriously as peers and professionals, and in many school systems there had been a tendency to treat teachers as if they were so many clerks. He knew that people today were looking for jobs where they did get that kind of professional respect and treatment.

So that had to change, too. If pay didn't change for everyone, no amount of merit pay would make the least bit of difference in their ability to assure they had the best quality teachers. It was his position that teachers' salaries were way too low, and until they were higher they were not going to have the success they needed to attract good people and keep good people.

Mr. Ewing said he worried that they had expectations sometimes that were too low for many students. Other countries assumed that everyone could learn a foreign language and it was not something you had to be gifted to do. Other countries assumed that students could make far more progress in science and math than they tended to assume. While he would agree that not everyone could master calculus, they sometimes had expectations that only a few could learn a lot. They should assume that all students could learn a great deal and would be able to benefit from that regardless of what they did.

Mr. Ewing urged that they not be swept away by national reports, but take account of them and prepare their own agenda for making an outstanding school system in the future as it had been in the past. He was comfortable with where they were and where they were going. Dr. Cronin said he had one caution to the Board as they approached the report and graduation requirements. If they were to increase graduation requirements, tighten the standards, look to broadened programs, extend the school day and year, and go for merit pay and higher salaries, he asked whether they were willing to reflect that in next year's budget and in the following years. He pointed out that what they were attempting to do here would cost money.

Dr. Greenblatt hoped that they would not be so defensive about what was written in the report because most of it did not require any money. They were talking about restoring rigor to the schools so that all the students would be able to develop themselves to their full potential. She did not think that requiring homework cost more money or having a focus on more time on on task or the study of basic skills was going to cost more money. Having achievement tests and ending social promotion did not cost more money. These would drastically change the focus of the school system so that they could become more achievement oriented. The item on increasing graduation requirements was an excellent way to start off and continue the discussion.

Mr. Hirsch asked whether increasing graduation requirements would cost more money. The superintendent replied that with regard to science they would have to look at laboratory spaces and materials. With regard to some other requirements, it might be possible for the Board to do that without additional costs.

Mr. Ewing said that the next item was on the basic core of courses. The superintendent stated that the executive summary showed some of the impact of the adoption of the core of courses. They found that most of the high schools were in general compliance with the basic core. He explained that they had to get the whole sequence of the relationship of the core to class size.

Dr. Steve Frankel, director of the Department of Educational Accountability, stated that the first finding of the report was that 90 percent of the courses dictated by the basic core policy were offered in the high schools they studied and 85 percent of the courses were actually given. Secondly, they did find a statistical relationship confirmed between the size of the schools and the number of courses given. The larger the school, the more basic core of courses were offered. There was a slight increase in enrollments in Category 1 courses. He said a very interesting relationship was found between the academic achievement levels of students and the number of Category 1 courses they took. High achieving students took ten Category 1 courses in two semesters from the 12 they were able to take. They were saying the diversity of the student population could affect the proper mix of Category 1 courses within a school. In regard to staffing, the number of teachers assigned to senior high schools from the 1979-80 school year to the 1981-82 school year declined faster than the drops in enrollment. The percent of teachers teaching part-time increased. Dr. Frankel said that despite what was said at the Council about free time for teachers at seven schools studied intensively virtually everyone was teaching full loads. The average class size for the sample of teachers they looked at was 23.3; however, for 2 percent of the teachers excluding band and p.e. teachers, the average class size was over 30 students. He reported that 78 percent of the sample teachers had three or fewer preparations. Seven percent had six or more. They found very little impact on class size because of the basic core policy. Interestingly reliance on absolute class size was seen as disruptive and counterproductive by principals.

Dr. Frankel said they did a series of simulations to see what changes in Board policies would bring about. The first one was establishing minimum class sizes for Category 2 and 3 courses in Group B of 15, 20, and 25. They found that establishing minimum size of 15, 20, and 25 would only result in decreasing Category 1 Group A class sizes by 2/10's, 4/10's, and 8/10's of a student respectively. At the same time this would cause one third to one half of all Group B courses to be eliminated. They were recommending the Board think very carefully before putting in those kind of limits. The second simulation was the impact of reducing the proportion of Category 3 courses from its present level of 15 percent to 10 percent which would only result in a 4/10's improvement in Category 1 while eliminating one third of the Category 3 courses. The conclusion was to leave well enough alone. Principals had commented that some consideration might be given to backing off from the present class size maximums.

Mrs. Peyser said she had questioned their priorities because the largest classes in their secondary schools were in the academic courses. The very smallest classes were the nonacademic like guitar and crafts. She had very serious concerns about this as a reflection of their priorities. She was disappointed that their analysis did not include Category 1 nonacademic courses because the resolution adopted by the Board asked for this information for all nonacademic courses. Yet they only used Categories 2 and 3. She thought the results would be very different because there were 50 nonacademic courses in Category 1 which were required to be offered and given at all high schools. She said that if those had been included in the study, the results would have shown they could have an impact on the academic classes. She pointed out that they offered over 500 courses and only 110 were academic. Dr. Frankel indicated that they could provide the analysis that way. He explained that they were not making a value judgment but were saying the payoff was not very great. He said they would run it that way and report this to the Board.

Mrs. Peyser said that twice in the introduction to the report people suggested that instead of having class size maximums that they use an average of a number of students each teacher had. She did not think this really addressed the problem of the student in that large class. If a student was in a class of 35 or 40, he was not getting a chance for individual attention. She hoped they did not consider that suggestion very seriously. Dr. Frankel thought that would be dangerous, but they reported this as coming out of the interviews.

Dr. Cronin was concerned about a couple of charts because of discrepancy in numbers on pages 9, 12, and 13. Page nine showed a dramatic drop in cooperative voc. ed., career education, and health education. Page 12 showed a dramatic difference between foreign languages, social studies, and cooperative voc. ed. Page 13 showed a dramatic difference for physics, biology, and chemistry. Dr. Steve Checkon explained that drops might be in the definition of the basic core itself. Dr. Cronin inquired about the low offerings in languages and social studies areas, and Dr. Checkon explained that

Category 2 foreign language courses were the higher level courses and did not have a large number of students taking them.

Mrs. Praisner asked whether the superintendent had any recommendations for changes in mandated maximum class size or in definition of core courses or in recommendations as to the number of students required for a class to be offered. She said she was concerned about the absolute number of 15 given the range of enrollments in high schools. The superintendent replied that they had not taken staff time at that level of detail in reviewing the report. On the next document, he proposed that they not increase graduation requirements until they saw what the state did. He felt that this document, the state Commission on Quality Teaching document, Mr. Ewing's paper, and the national report should be looked at together. He said there was an awful lot going on, and he hoped that they could make a list of questions and develop a measured process to decide what it was they wanted their secondary education to do. He thought there should be changes, but they should build a data base with a number of interrelating local policies that had to be part of the whole consideration. In regard to student course selection, Mrs. Shannon said they had tied in the diversity of a student population with interest and ability. She asked whether they had determined whether the students themselves selected the courses or whether they were counseled into some of the courses. Dr. Checkon replied they had a question on how students were counseled into courses, but they did not follow up with that particular item. In informal conversations, they did not see much distinction in guidance in selecting either Category 1 or 2 courses.

Dr. Greenblatt remarked that she was somewhat amazed by this study and the statement that mandated maximum class size appeared to have little effect on the high schools in their implementation of the basic core. She remembered indicating a number of courses that were now under the maximum limitation whereas before these numbers were excessive. She did not understand how this statement could be made when they had all the evidence annually that because of maximum class sizes the sizes had been brought down. Mr. Clifford Baacke replied that the sentence was not addressing maximum class size per se. The question was the impact of the basic core on maximum class size and of maximum class size on the basic core. The two of them did not appear to be directly affected in any large or significant way. That was not to say what would happen if they studied class size in schools or any other kind of issue. All they were saying was they could implement basic core without a big impact on class sizes, and class size could be mandated without a big impact on basic core. Dr. Greenblatt stated that it was clear in their budget they had added a substantial number of teachers to reduce class size in the basic core and the academic subjects. Dr. Checkon said they were trying to find out whether or not the basic core resolution was having a negative effect on any other policy. They found no conflict between the policies.

Dr. Greenblatt commented that this was a way of encouraging the

administration at the various schools to make sure that the class sizes were reduced. She said that a person just reading the study would come to the conclusion that maximum class sizes were of no use. She asked about the impact of the seven-period day on their conclusions. Dr. Checkon replied that again it was in the same context. There was no conflict.

Dr. Cronin referred to the paragraph Mrs. Shannon had discussed which said the ability of a school to offer courses depended upon the level of the students and that student performance on countywide tests affected course selection. He said the way in which the department released test scores was by average. He said that averages told them very little, and he would like the Board to instruct the department to cease the use of averages and to tell them by ten percentiles how many students in each school were in 0 to 10, 10 to 20, etc. Therefore, they would have a range of student achievement within a particular school rather than knowing simply what the base average was. Dr. Frankel hoped they would be able to give this information to the Board both ways.

Mr. Ewing thought that this was a useful analysis. He would agree with the superintendent that there not be a set of immediate recommendations. He said it was barren ground as far as policy was concerned but was useful information for the policy makers. He said this was an analysis of a set of policies that did not seem to make very much difference. They might better address themselves in other ways to achieve excellence than fiddling with core courses and class size maximums. He thought they had focused far too much on the mechanics and far too little on the way in which they dealt with instructional problems and issues.

Re: A Motion by Dr. Greenblatt on
Increasing Graduation Requirements

Dr. Greenblatt moved the following which was seconded by Mrs. Peyser:

Resolved, That the requirements for graduation be increased as follows:

- 1 credit for math including half a credit for computer math
- 1 credit for science
- 1 credit for social studies including world history or non U.S. history
- 1/2 credit for art, music, or drama

and be it further

Resolved, That the total number of credits for graduation be increased from 20 to 22; and be it further

Resolved, That these requirements be implemented for September, 1983 for the graduating class of 1988; and be it further

was he joking about this. He objected to the characterization as if he were joking.

7. Mrs. Praisner reported that they had a budget which had copiers for elementary schools, and she would like to know how they were going to go about the process of deciding which elementary schools would get those copiers.

Resolution No. 548-83 Re: Executive Session - June 27,
1983

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

WHEREAS, The Board of Education of Montgomery County is authorized by Article 76A, Section 11(a) of the Annotated Code of Maryland to conduct certain of its meetings in executive closed session; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Board of Education of Montgomery County hereby conduct its meeting in executive closed session beginning on June 27, 1983, at 7:15 p.m. to discuss, consider, deliberate, and/or otherwise decide the employment, assignment, appointment, promotion, demotion, compensation, discipline, removal, or resignation of employees, appointees, or officials over whom it has jurisdiction, or any other personnel matter affecting one or more particular individuals and to comply with a specific constitutional, statutory or judicially imposed requirement protecting particular proceedings or matters from public disclosure as permitted under Article 76A, Section 11(a) and that such meeting shall continue in executive closed session until the completion of business.

Mrs. Praisner assumed the chair.

Resolution No. 549-83 Re: Minutes of March 24, 1983

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

Resolved, That the minutes of March 24, 1983, be approved.

Mr. Ewing assumed the chair.

Resolution No. 550-83 Re: Minutes of March 31, 1983

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

Resolved, That the minutes of March 31, 1983, be approved.

Resolution No. 551-83 Re: Minutes of April 12, 1983

On motion of Mrs. Mrs. Peyser seconded by Mrs. Praisner, the

following resolution was adopted unanimously:

Resolved, That the minutes of April 12, 1983, be approved as corrected.

Resolution No. 552-83 Re: Minutes of April 28, 1983

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

Resolved, That the minutes of April 28, 1983, be approved as corrected.

Resolution No. 553-83 Re: Counseling and Guidance

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

WHEREAS, Board of Education policy includes a strong program of counseling and guidance services for students; and

WHEREAS, The Board of Education has increased the number of elementary counselors and has encouraged high school students to register for a rigorous academic program; and

WHEREAS, Recommendations from the Commission on Children and Youth, Principals' Associations, Minority Affairs Advisory Committee, Title IX Advisory Committee, Gifted and Talented Advisory Committee, the Advisory Committee on Counseling and Guidance and the Citizens' Minority Relations Monitoring Committee all require strengthened guidance services and/or regular support from counselors to succeed; and

WHEREAS, It has been several years since a comprehensive study of counseling and guidance services in Montgomery County Public Schools has been done; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Board of Education reaffirms its commitment to a strong program of counseling and guidance services; and be it further

Resolved, That the superintendent be directed to develop a plan for assessing and improving counseling and guidance services in Montgomery County Public Schools; and be it further

Resolved, That such plan shall be developed with input from staff, citizens, students, and the Advisory Committee on Counseling and Guidance.

Re: Proposed Resolution on
Interruptions to English Classes

On May 23, 1983, Mrs. Peyser introduced the following which was seconded by Dr. Greenblatt:

WHEREAS, Numerous activities unrelated to the English program (yearbook pictures - at least two days; elections of SGA officers and representatives; elections of prom and homecoming queen and princesses; promotions of plays, fairs and other club events; registration - four days; standardized testing; Project Basic testing; SGA weekly reports and discussions, visits by counselors and student advocates explaining their roles; plans for senior activities - banquet, prom, trips, filling out name cards for diplomas; student Board member videotape; voting for the student on the Board; etc., etc.) interrupt secondary English classes throughout the school year; and

WHEREAS, These continuing distractions take valuable instructional time from the teaching and learning of the English curriculum; and

WHEREAS, These distractions not only take the time needed for the activities, but they also affect the preceding and remaining class time which must be used to settle the class down and get them focussed on the classwork; and

WHEREAS, These constant interruptions reduce respect for learning and contribute to an anti-intellectual attitude in our schools; and

WHEREAS, It appears to students that if everyone can interrupt English class, why should anyone pay attention in class; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the superintendent appoint a committee consisting of high school principals, concerned English teachers, parents, and students to recommend to the Board actions it can take to eliminate these interruptions to English classes.

Re: A Substitute Motion by Dr.
Greenblatt on Interruptions to
English Classes (FAILED)

A substitute motion by Dr. Greenblatt that the superintendent analyze the problem of class interruptions and provide the Board with ways the system would be able to address this failed with Dr. Greenblatt, Mrs. Peyser, and Dr. Shoenberg voting in the affirmative; Dr. Cronin, Mr. Ewing, and Mrs. Shannon voting in the negative; Mrs. Praisner abstaining (Mr. Hirsch voting in the negative).

Resolution No. 554-83

Re: A Substitute Motion by Dr. Cronin
on Interruptions to English
Classes

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

Resolved, That the Board calls the problem of interruptions to English classes to the attention of the superintendent and asks the superintendent to take measures to alleviate the situation.

Resolution No. 555-83 Re: Delegating Responsibility for
Family Life Curriculum

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

Resolved, That the Board allow the associate superintendent for instruction and program development to designate a staff member to handle health and sex education curriculum materials by rescinding the portion of Resolution No. 499-82 which delegates this responsibility exclusively to the associate superintendent for instruction and program development.

Re: New Business

1. Mrs. Peyser moved and Dr. Greenblatt seconded the following:

WHEREAS, The current transfer policy correctly denies eligibility for one calendar year to students who transfer schools for the purpose of playing on a particular athletic team; and

WHEREAS, This protection is necessary to discourage coaches from recruiting athletes from other schools and to prevent unbalancing teams; and

WHEREAS, The policy as it is now written prevents any student who transfers to another school, no matter what the reason, from participating on any team, or cheerleaders or pom poms, even if the student has never been on a team before; and

WHEREAS, We should presume someone is innocent until proven guilty; the current policy, however, presumes the student is guilty, punishes him for an entire year, and never gives him the chance to prove he is innocent; and

WHEREAS, Most students who transfer do so for legitimate reasons and should not be denied the opportunity to participate fully in school activities; and

WHEREAS, This policy punishes many students for the actions of a few coaches and a few students; and

WHEREAS, Being declared ineligible for an entire calendar year is an extremely harsh punishment for a student who has done nothing wrong; and

WHEREAS, Physical fitness and the many other benefits of participating in a team sport are among the important goals of education; and

WHEREAS, Participating on athletic teams is an important part of a student's high school career, contributes to school spirit, and keeps many students away from cigarettes, alcohol, drugs and other problems; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the following be added after D in the first Resolved in Policy JEE:

TRANSFERS SHALL NOT BE HONORED IF THE STUDENT IS TRANSFERRING FOR THE PURPOSE OF PARTICIPATING ON A PARTICULAR TEAM.

and be it further

Resolved, That the second sentence in the second Resolved in Policy JEE be replaced with the following:

"Resolved, That if a student transfers schools FOR THE PURPOSE OF PLAYING ON A PARTICULAR ATHLETIC TEAM without a corresponding change of residence of the parents or legal guardian from a district where he had been in attendance to the new district or if there has been no change of residence, he shall attend one calendar year from the date of enrollment at the school to which he is transferred in order to establish his eligibility."

2. Dr. Greenblatt moved and Mrs. Peyser seconded the following:
Resolved, That the superintendent study and consider the impact both fiscal and on the community of using one of the designated closed senior high schools for an exchange for the Educational Services Center and the potential sale of ESC.

Re: Items of Information

Board members received the following items of information:

1. Items in Process
2. Construction Progress Report
3. Joint Occupancy Report - 1983-84
4. Educational Specifications for Lake Seneca Elementary School:
New School
5. Educational Specifications for Oak View Elementary School:
Modernization
6. Educational Specifications for Montgomery Blair High School:
Modernization of C Building and Modifications for the Magnet Program

Re: Adjournment

The president adjourned the meeting at 7:20 p.m.

President

Secretary

EA:mlw

