



introduced Mr. Michael Fleming, assistant director of Transportation, and Mr. John R. Haffner, transportation planner. Mr. Stafford explained that the appropriate MORE recommendations and county recommendations had been incorporated in the paper before the Board, and they would be discussing two policy changes. One would delete the restriction of regular pupils on special education buses, and the second would add language about elementary school youngsters not walking

\* Dr. Greenblatt joined the meeting at a later time.

across grade level mainline railroad crossings. He said that there were nine such crossings, and at present they did not have any elementary school youngsters walking across tracks.

Mr. Stafford said that further changes might occur as the Division developed a comprehensive plan. One of their main tracks was the reaffirmation of all lines of demarkation in the county. They expected to complete the secondary lines by the fall, and to date this had been done for 24 schools including some elementary schools. They had decided not to recommend changes in Board policy until they had reaffirmed all the lines. At that time they might recommend that youngsters not be permitted to walk back to bus stops.

In regard to magnet schools, Mr. Stafford reported that they had completed the work for Takoma Park and had established pickup points at JIM schools. This evening they would be meeting with parents at Takoma Park. Some parents had already expressed concerns about students traveling for over one hour, and they now had two bus routes that would be 50 minutes in length. At present the Ridgeview schedule required one hour and five minutes, and the Montgomery Village schedule took one hour and ten minutes. Dr. Cody added that over 130 students from outside the cluster had been admitted to Takoma Park; however, many of those from Gaithersburg might not attend because of the time involved. He was very pleased about the large number of students who had applied for the program.

Mr. Stafford said that a final decision would be made on the gifted and talented buses by August 23 to make use of all available information. The parents would be informed by letter of the pickup points. For the Burning Tree program they will receive similar information if their youngsters ride regular buses. MCPS would have to route a bus from Richard Montgomery and Churchill with the \$20,000 provided in the budget.

In regard to technology to assist transportation, Mr. Stafford said they had met with several vendors in order to get enough information to determine what specifications they wanted to write. They expected to have a request for proposal by the fall of 1984. They did plan to implement a pilot program using Ride-On buses at three senior high schools for after school activities.

Mr. Stafford reported that Mr. Haffner was working on a long-range plan for transportation. One aspect of this would be the revision

of field trip rates which had not been changed for three or four years. They would be looking at whether students should ride the same number bus in the afternoon as they rode in the morning. Dr. Cody explained that in secondary schools with so many students leaving early they might be able to run fewer buses in the afternoon. Mr. Stafford said they would be looking at pairing junior and senior high schools in close locations and consider bringing youngsters from one area to both schools. He indicated that there was only one item that might cause difficulty which was expanding the transportation window. The Department of Transportation had recommended that it be two hours in the morning and an hour and a half in the afternoon. They were also trying to standardize early dismissal days to curtail costs.

Mrs. Peyser thought that the Ride-On buses sounded like a good idea unless students would have a walk a mile to get to the bus stop. Mr. Stafford replied that the problem centered around the fact that the buses would not drop students off on school grounds. Mrs. Peyser asked about numbers of students leaving schools early. Dr. Cody explained that they had youngsters working part-time who would not be using the afternoon regular buses. Mrs. Peyser asked why students had to ride the same numbered bus in the morning and afternoon. Mr. Haffner explained that they tried to have the same students on the same bus to make it less confusing for students.

Mrs. Peyser remarked that in the interest of economy she would hope that students could learn two bus numbers. Mr. Stafford explained that at one time they used a spare bus and encouraged drivers to post the bus number in the window.

Dr. Cronin noted that the Ride-On schedule might not fit the school schedule and large numbers of students might have a heavy impact on the Ride-On system. Mr. Stafford replied that the county had spoken to the possibility of adding more buses. Dr. Cronin asked about differences in the cost of buses, and Mr. Stafford replied that it costs approximately \$33,000 for a school bus and \$113,000 for a Ride-On bus. They were inquiring about reduced fares for students and trying to determine the cost benefit of using Ride-On buses. They had discussed using a punch card or tokens for students using this service; however, the details had not been worked out.

Mrs. Praisner assumed that the Board would get some information about an evaluation process for students using the Ride-On system before they went any further with plans. She could see problems if the Ride-On buses did not arrive. Mr. Fleming explained that they had a very positive relationship using Ride-On at RICA. MCPS provided the funds to RICA, and RICA gave out tokens to students. Mrs. Praisner asked whether they were going to use different ways of funding such as tokens and punch cards, and Mr. Stafford replied that the details had not yet been worked out.

In response to Dr. Cronin's question about legal issues relating to costs and services, Mr. Stafford commented that they had not asked for a legal opinion. They did have to provide transportation to

students living outside the walking area. Dr. Cronin asked whether they had a way of limiting costs other than Ride-On. Mr. Stafford replied that they had cut back on the using of taxis. Dr. Cronin requested a five-year plan so they could see costs and projections. This would be similar to that timeframe provided for computer instruction.

Dr. Cody remarked that they wanted to have a lot in place by budget time next year. The issue was whether they could operate and provide the same level of services. Ride-On was only a trial, and any major changes in transportation service would not be for a year from this September. The one item that could lead to cost reduction was expanding the window in the morning and the afternoon. Dr. Pitt pointed out that they had held off purchasing more buses, and that would have to be one of the early decisions made. Dr. Cody added that the purpose of relooking at demarcation lines was to determine students eligible for transportation.

Mr. Ewing was pleased that they had made as much progress as they had with hiring a planner and looking at the county government study and the MORE report. He thought they had to look at the issue of liability for accidents before they went any further with the plan for using Ride-On. They also had to think about the seat belt issue. If this became law for school buses, he wondered what they would have to do about Ride-On buses. He was concerned about the lack of a serious analysis in the county study, and he suggested that if the county government could study the school system's transportation system, the school system ought to be able to look at the county government and at what they could do to improve the situation. For example, it might be safer for students to walk longer distances if some safety issues were addressed by the county government. In some cases there were poor roads and walkways. He suggested that the staff take a look at recommendations it could make to the county government to help MCPS improve transportation.

Mrs. Praisner agreed and stated that the staff response was extremely useful. She assumed that the Board would be receiving information on the Ride-On pilot. She was impressed with the work the staff had done. Mr. Stafford noted that last summer they had 184 special education buses, and this year the number was 149 by consolidating some routes.

Mrs. Praisner asked that they now turn to the policies which were scheduled for action on July 23. She pointed out that the first change would open up special education buses for regular education pupils. Mr. Ewing remarked that both changes were good; however, at some point the Board had to know what the cost of the transportation to gifted and talented programs would be.

Dr. Cronin asked for assurances that the needs of the special education students would be paramount. Mr. Stafford assured Dr. Cronin that they would not be changing the hours for the special education pickups at all. Dr. Cronin asked how much more they could do in cutting costs, and Mr. Stafford replied that the greatest

saving would occur if they were able to stagger school hours. Dr. Cody did not think they could save much more money without modifying services. Dr. Cronin inquired about the effect of not buying buses, and Dr. Pitt explained that these buses were to be used next year. Dr. Cody thought they could provide the same services with fewer buses next year, but they were not sure how many less than 60 it would be.

Mrs. Praisner stated that the policy would come back to the Board for action on July 23. She would anticipate that the Board would see a timetable and some discussion of budgetary needs. She asked about other changes to the policy, and she requested that staff identify areas where the county government could support and assist the school system regarding transportation.

Re: Policy on Policies

Mrs. Praisner explained that Mr. David Fischer, staff assistant to the Board, and Mrs. Mary Lou Wood, administrative assistant to the Board, had systematized Board policies and procedures that the Board had used for its operation and maintenance and had brought together all relevant actions of the Board in the past and tried to develop a policy. She added it was now the responsibility of the Board to look through it and make additions and deletions as far as Board policy was concerned.

Dr. Cody thought Mr. Fischer and Mrs. Wood had done a good job of identifying and consolidating the material into a statement that was not ambiguous in any way, but was concise, clear, and only a page and a half.

Mr. Ewing also thought the policy itself was a good one but requested a change from the word "Process" in the middle section to perhaps "Process and Content" and suggested the words "Board determines who shall have public hearing" be added to section B.2.c)(2). He also hoped the section on "Sense of the Board" would be repealed some day.

Re: Manual on Governance and Operation  
of the Board

Mrs. Praisner explained that Board staff had attempted to take all the resolutions the Board had passed and put them in one place. Dr. Cody thought Mr. Fischer and Mrs. Wood had done a terrific job of identifying and consolidating under one cover the basic material for a manual that would be adopted, and that now it needed to be really worked over to have a document that had a sense of the whole before being put on the agenda. He added that August 7 might be too early. Mrs. Praisner agreed and thought it would be appropriate for a Board committee to look at it and try to develop the manual. She asked for volunteers and Dr. Cronin said he would be glad to serve if it could be done after his vacation. Mrs. Praisner then announced that the Board would act on the Policy on Policies on August 7 but not on the Manual on Governance.

Re: Executive Session

The Board held an executive session at noontime on personnel and negotiations. Dr. Greenblatt joined the meeting at that time.

Re: Board/Press/Visitor Conference

The following individuals appeared before the Board:

1. Joyce Tolley
2. Sylvia Corn, Montgomery Village
3. Karen Scorsune, Woodfield
4. Jerome Lord

Resolution No. 370-84                      Re: Award of Procurement Contracts  
over \$25,000

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

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

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

2-84	Copiers for Elementary Schools	
	Name of Vendor(s)	Dollar Value of Contracts
	System Support Services	\$ 93,150
137-84	Health Room Supplies	
	Name of Vendor(s)	
	Chaston Medical and Surgical Products	\$ 8,074
	J. Cole Associates	7,087
	Commercial Wiping Cloth, Inc.	23,808
	Foster/Murray-Baumgartner	1,105
	Gamma Medical Systems, Inc.	267
	William V. MacGill and Co.	739
	Maryland First Aid Co., Inc.	
	T/A Zee Medical Services	3,883
	Mid-Atlantic Shared Services, Inc.	4,688
	Olympic Reconditioning Company	454
	Tri-Med Surgical Co., Inc.	8,775
	TOTAL	\$ 58,880
140-84	Shade Material	
	Name of Vendor(s)	
	Mileham & King, Inc.	\$ 11,516
	Park Avenue Venetian Blind Co.	8,500

	Rocky Mount Cord Company	5,419
	TOTAL	\$ 25,435
142-84	Piano Tuning and Maintenance	
	Name of Vendor(s)	
	Ms. Nancy Bogle	\$ 7,620
	Isacacs' Piano Service	17,468
	Potomac Keyboards	8,280
	Mr. C. Martin Staub	7,896
	TOTAL	\$ 41,264
144-84	Lamps	
	Name of Vendor(s)	
	Maurice Electrical Supply Company	\$140,030
156-84	Saltines, Speciality Crackers, and Taco Shells	
	Name of Vendor(s)	
	Carroll County Foods	\$ 29,117
	Frederick Produce Company, Inc.	9,712
	Kraft Foodservice, Inc.	24,975
	TOTAL	\$ 63,804
157-84	Spices and Condiments	
	Name of Vendor(s)	
	Carroll County Foods	\$ 4,697
	Frederick Produce Company, Inc.	2,940
	Gel Spice Co., Inc.	3,692
	Mazo-Lerch Co., Inc.	52
	John Sexton and Co.	5
	Stanley Food and Equipment	15,629
	TOTAL	\$ 27,015
158-84	Frozen Juice Bars	
	Name of Vendor(s)	
	Mazo-Lerch Co., Inc.	\$ 27,020
182-84	Driver Education Behind the Wheel Training	
	Name of Vendor(s)	
	Easy Method, Inc.	\$210,600
	Friendly Driver Training Academy	11,520
	Poly Method Driving School	10,800
	Potomac Driving School	10,800
	TOTAL	\$243,720
84-25	Rebuilt Automotive Engines	
	Name of Vendor(s)	
	Engine Distributors, Inc.	\$ 57,485
	GRAND TOTAL	\$777,803

Resolution No. 371-84                      Re: Mark Twain School - Reroofing

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





Morton Wood, Jr., engineer.

Resolution No. 373-84                      Re: Montgomery Blair High School (Area  
1) Physical Education Building -  
Mechanical and Electrical  
Improvements

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

WHEREAS, Sealed bids were received on July 3, 1984, for furnishing and installing equipment to perform mechanical and electrical improvements at the Physical Education Building, Montgomery Blair High School, as indicated below:

Bidder	Proposal A	Proposal B	Proposal C
1. Darwin Construction Co, Inc.	\$45,000	\$39,000*	\$82,000
2. W. B. Maske Sheet Metal Works	37,711*	60,056	98,767

\* Indicates acceptance of Proposals A and B

Description of Proposals:

Proposal A: Plumbing and electrical work, Drawings M-1, M-2 & M-3

Proposal B: Electrical work, Drawings E-1, E-2, E-3 & E-4

Proposal C: All work, Drawings M-1, M-2, M-3, E-1, E-2, E-3 & E-4

and

WHEREAS, The low bidders, Darwin Construction Company, Inc. and W. B. Maske Sheet Metal Works, Inc., have satisfactorily performed work in the metropolitan area, and sufficient funds exist to effect contract award; now therefore be it

Resolved, That a contract for \$37,711, which constitutes acceptance of Proposal A, be awarded to W. B. Maske Sheet Metal Works, Inc., and \$39,000, for Proposal B to Darwin Construction Company, Inc., to accomplish the requirements of the plans and specifications entitled "Montgomery Blair High School Physical Education Building - Mechanical and Electrical Improvements" dated June 15, 1984, prepared by the Department of School Facilities and Morton Wood, Jr., engineer.

Resolution No. 374-84                      Re: Woodfield Elementary School  
Modernization and Addition (Area  
3)

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

WHEREAS, Sealed bids were received on June 28 for the modernization



WHEREAS, Montgomery County Public Schools' involvement will include a use agreement, agency expertise in the development of plans and specifications, bidding, contract award, and supervision of construction; and

WHEREAS, Sealed bids were received on July 9, as indicated below:

Bidder	Lump Sum
1. Paul J. Vignola Electric Co., Inc.	\$ 55,515
2. S. Rock Corporation	58,000
3. M. C. Dean Electrical Contracting, Inc.	62,490
4. Darwin Construction Company, Inc.	169,000

and

WHEREAS, The low bidder, Paul J. Vignola Electric Co., Inc., has performed similar projects satisfactorily; and

WHEREAS, Low bid is within staff estimate and the cost will be temporarily charged to Local Capital Improvements, 999-42, pending receipt of the City of Rockville's appropriation; now therefore be it

Resolved, That a contract for \$55,515 be awarded to Paul J. Vignola Electric Co., Inc., to accomplish stadium lighting for the football field at the Richard Montgomery High School, in accordance with plans and specifications dated June 25, 1984, prepared by the Department of School Facilities; and be it further

Resolved, That the mayor and City Council of Rockville be requested to take the necessary steps to effect reimbursement to Montgomery County Public Schools in a timely manner.

Resolution No. 376-84                      Re: Submission of an FY 1985 Grant Proposal for the Development of an Evaluation Model to be Used to Assess Use of Microcomputers in Schools

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

Resolved, That the superintendent of schools be authorized to submit an FY 1985 grant proposal for approximately \$191,000 for the first year of a four-year grant to the National Science Foundation for the development of an evaluation model to assess the use of microcomputers in schools; and be it further

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

Resolution No. 377-84                      Re: Submission of a FY 1985 Grant

Proposal to Establish a Research  
Institute for the Long term  
Evaluation of the Effects of Early  
Intervention Programs on Severely  
Handicapped Children

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

Resolved, That the superintendent of schools be authorized to submit a FY 1985 grant proposal for approximately \$240,800 for the first year of a five-year grant to the U.S. Department of Education to establish a research institute for the long-term evaluation of the effects of early intervention programs on severely handicapped children; and be it further

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

Resolution No. 378-84                      Re: PACT II Reciprocity Agreement

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

WHEREAS, Recent County Council action transferred two PACT II therapeutic counselor positions from the budget of the Board of Education to the budget of the county government; and

WHEREAS, County ordinance requires execution of a reciprocity agreement for accumulated annual and sick leave accrued with the former employer; and

WHEREAS, The Board's attorney has reviewed the agreement and found it legally sufficient; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Board of Education authorize the superintendent to enter into a reciprocity agreement with the county government for the transfer of two PACT II counselor positions.

Resolution No. 379-84                      Re: Monthly Personnel Report

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Dr. Cronin 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. 380-84                      Re: Extension of Sick Leave

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Dr. Cronin

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
Peoples, Leroy	Building Service Worker Personal Illness Leave from Westland Intermediate	30
Savage, Leo	General Maintenance Worker Division of Maintenance	5

Resolution No. 381-84                      Re: Personnel Reassignment

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

Resolved, That the following personnel reassignment be approved:

Name	From	To
Larelda Gruber	Classroom Teacher	Instructional Assistant
	Robert E. Peary High	School to be determined
	MEQ+30-15	Effective July 1, 1984
		Will maintain present salary status and retire 7/1/85

Resolution No. 382a-84                      Re: Death of Miss Elizabeth A. Deveny, Secondary Counselor, Westland Intermediate School

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

WHEREAS, The death on June 13, 1984, of Miss Elizabeth A. Deveny, secondary counselor, Westland Intermediate School, has deeply saddened the staff and members of the Board of Education; and

WHEREAS, In the more than thirty years that Miss Deveny had been a member of the staff of the Montgomery County Public Schools, she had developed good communication and rapport with students, parents, and staff; and

WHEREAS, Miss Deveny's experience and competency added a special dimension to the total guidance and school program; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the members of the Board of Education express their sorrow at the death of Miss Elizabeth A. Deveny 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 Miss Deveny's family.

Resolution No. 382b-84                      Re: Death of Mrs. Irmgard M. Eck,  
Classroom Teacher at Sherwood High  
School

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

WHEREAS, The death on June 30, 1984, of Mrs. Irmgard M. Eck, classroom teacher at Sherwood High School, has deeply saddened the staff and members of the Board of Education; and

WHEREAS, In the twelve years that Mrs. Eck had been a member of the staff of the Montgomery County Public Schools, she provided a rewarding learning experience for her students; and

WHEREAS, Mrs. Eck's commitment to the foreign language program added strength to the total school program; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the members of the Board of Education express their sorrow at the death of Mrs. Irmgard M. Eck and extend deepest sympathy to her family; and be it further

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

Resolution No. 383-84                      Re: Personnel Transfer, Reassignment,  
and Appointment

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

Resolved, That the following personnel transfer, reassignment, and appointment be approved:

Transfer	From	To
----------	------	----

Leroy McFadden	Assistant Principal Montgomery Blair H.S.	Assistant Principal Eastern Intermediate Effective July 2, 1984
----------------	--	---

Temporary Reassignment for the 1984-85 School Year

Name and Present Position	Position Effective July 24, 1984	Position Effective July 1, 1985
J. Richard Stevenson Principal Diamond Elementary	Assistant Principal Stedwick Elementary	Elementary Principal
Appointment	Present Position	As
David L. Rotter	Supervisor of Elemen- tary Instruction Area 1 Office	Principal North Chevy Chase Elem. Effective July 11, 1984

Re: MORE Report - Food Services

Dr. Cody explained that he had asked staff to give the Board a status report on where they were in relation to the MORE report. Mr. Stafford commented that in his view their food service operation was outstanding, and the new warehouse had enabled them to implement many cost saving measures.

Mrs. Joanne Styer, director of the Division of Food Services, reported that there had been tremendous changes in the area of food services since the MORE study was published. However, a lot of these changes had been in the works prior to the MORE study. She said that one of the recommendations of the study was to convert all of the elementary schools to satellite. In 1982 they had five central kitchens serving 59 schools. Today there were 67 schools operating out of those five kitchens. This operation had made a difference in their profit status because they were able to expand and bring in schools that were more profitable. They had gone from a 4 percent loss to a 9 percent surplus. She stressed that this was not just a result of the satellite program because some of the increased efficiency had resulted from the warehouse operation. In September, 1984 they would be operating 81 schools out of those five central kitchens.

Mrs. Styer explained that they had a higher volume of sales but their costs were lower. Their new inventory process had enabled them to take advantage of discounts and maintain inventory control. They had compared their operation with that of Fairfax, and they were able to save 20 percent by doing their own warehousing. The warehouse had enabled them to bring in additional revenue by

providing warehousing for other agencies. The warehouse also eliminated overstocking in the schools, and they were able to take the dollars saved and invest the funds.

Mrs. Styer recalled that they had promised the Board and the County Council that the warehouse would be as accountable as possible. In December they had conducted a physical inventory of the warehouse and the overage was only three cases of cheese. In the spring inventory their deficit was \$10 out of a \$260,000 inventory. Mrs. Styer said they had managed to reduce positions and had absorbed much of the work previously done by the Accounting Division. They had not had a price increase in two years in spite of the rise in the cost of labor. Their major objective was to be cost effective but not at the expense of their people, and they had not had to lay off any personnel.

Mrs. Styer saw more efficiencies in the automation of free and reduced price food. She reminded the Board that Food Services was the only automated system that was user driven. They were trying to get more publicity about school lunches and now distributed a menu to the youngest child in the family. They were looking at the nutritive value of food and had developed menus based on good nutrition. She thanked the Board for all the support they had given to the Division. Mrs. Praisner thanked Mrs. Styer for sharing such a highly successful record.

Dr. Cronin inquired about the recommendation to bring more staff into the decision-making process. Mrs. Styer replied that the field staff had been able to work more closely with principals. They did have problems with some schools having an open lunch; however, she thought principals were much more interested in making sure their lunch program worked. In response to a question about multiyear planning, Mrs. Styer explained that in 1976 they had projected by 1982 they would have their fifth central kitchen and warehouse. This had been accomplished, and they did try to do multiyear planning. Dr. Cronin asked whether they had a five-year plan with budget and staffing implications. Mrs. Styer replied that they did for the satellite and distribution system and agreed to provide the Board with copies of the plan. Mrs. Praisner asked that the plans include those they had been working under as well. Dr. Cronin asked that the plans be on a time-phased basis and include costs.

Dr. Cronin inquired about the lack of staff comment about Recommendation 18. Mr. Stafford replied that Recommendation 18 was in Educational Accountability. Dr. Steve Frankel explained that they had held off on Recommendation 18 because the warehouse was so new. However, they would be looking at the warehouse in a year or so. Dr. Cronin inquired about the status of the recommendation to provide information to parents. Mrs. Styer replied that their brochure was complete and their audiovisual program was about 80 percent complete.

Mr. Ewing stated that he had great admiration for the way in which Mrs. Styer had been able to manage the program. He noted that the



MORE report listed over 40 recommendations and the staff had responded that some things would be implemented and others would not. Only about half were listed as being implemented, and he wondered whether the report missed the target or whether items listed as pending would be implemented. He was at a loss to know why items were accepted or rejected, and he thought it might be useful to have more information on the reasons for things being done or not being done. Dr. Cody explained that the response document was several months old. He also had the feeling that while the report was constructive, the authors put everything they could think of into the report. He did not have the feeling that actions by the staff in responding to the report had been less than effective.

Mrs. Praisner commented that they continued to get remarks by the Council on numbers of recommendations that had not been implemented. She noted that they did not present a true picture of the dramatic cost savings that had been effected. Dr. Frankel remarked that Mrs. Styer had concentrated on the recommendations where there was the greatest potential for savings. He explained that one thrust of the report which was radical was to go 100 percent satellite, for example.

Dr. Greenblatt thanked Mrs. Styer for her presentation. She suggested that when they talk about satellite expansion it would be useful to see the numbers because it had at first declined which made their progress even more spectacular. She asked about the use of surplus food from the Department of Agriculture. Mrs. Styer explained that she now had a better feeling about surplus because they now had the warehouse and were able to use the food in much more effective ways. For example, they were using surplus flour to make all their own bread, muffins, and cookies. Dr. Greenblatt inquired about computer programs helping them administer free and reduced price lunches. Mrs. Styer replied that the computer helped them to supply information, to let them know whether they were giving services to one member of the family and not another, and to provide principals with up-to-date information. They had also built in a verification process.

Mrs. Praisner noted that in some instances they had said a recommendation would not be implemented because it conflicted with guidelines. She hoped that staff would bring these issues to the Board. She congratulated Mrs. Styer on her successful program.

Re: Montgomery County Preschool  
Program

Mrs. Praisner explained that she had allotted five minutes to the Preschool Program to present their views. Ms. Helen Rubin stated that they were the first preschool in Montgomery County and in the state and for years they had provided an important service to parents, other community agencies, and to MCPS. They provided programs such as the parent-infant program when there were no MCPS programs available. They were now facing the problem of declining enrollment. In 1980 there were 70 students enrolled, and by June of

1984 this number had dropped to 49. There was a decrease in two and three year olds in the program, and without those younger children, the school was in trouble. This year 30 children had been "CARDed" for them, and only four of these were three-year olds. When they had had their annual spring meeting with Dr. Fountain, he had said there was no way MCPS could guarantee the number of children they would have in September. Dr. Fountain had also implied they were becoming non-cost effective. Ms. Rubin said that as a result of that meeting they decided it would be best to recommend closure of their school. However, they had not counted on the response they had received from the community which inspired MCARC to keep the school open.

Ms. Rubin stated that in order to keep the school viable they need more children and more referrals. She asked the Board to consider a change in the CARD process to give all public and private schools the names of parents in order for the schools to set up appointments for the parents to visit the schools. She said that federal and state law said the LEA did not have to exhaust all public placements before making private placements. She asked the Board to look into this legal question. The third issue was the least restrictive environment. Staff had stated that the public school was the least restrictive environment; however, they did have nonhandicapped children in their school.

Ms. Liz Roth reported that a lot of parents had found the Preschool by chance because it had not always been presented by MCPS as an option. They were concerned about the attitudes fostered by the professionals in the county. She suggested that parents should be informed beforehand about the CARD procedures. Mrs. Praisner asked Board members if they had questions.

Dr. Cronin requested the following information on MPAC: (1) five-year pattern of students in private placements by number and program, (2) an analysis of the cost effectiveness of running the program in MCPS, (3) the availability of a parent advocate prior to the CARD process, (4) the possibility of incorporation of the MPAC program with its staff into the school system, (5) numbers of children who need these services and how their placements were determined, and (6) staff reaction to the three MPAC proposals. Mr. Ewing requested a paper on state and federal laws regarding exhausting public placements before proceeding to private placements.

Dr. Cronin left the meeting at this point.

Mrs. Praisner asked for the following information: (1) is "services available to development delayed preschool children" still used by MCPS staff and, if so, how, (2) what information is sent to parents prior to the CARD process, (3) information on components on each of the Level 5 preschool programs, (4) information on PEP programs in regular schools and mainstreaming, (5) if MPAC closed what would be the impact on MCPS, and (6) the status of the PEP program, whether or not increases are planned, and enrollment in future years. She

asked MPAC to respond to several questions including plans for consolidation with other counties and future plans above and beyond MCPS.

Re: Annual Report of the Citizens Advisory  
Committee on Family Life and Human  
Development

Mrs. Frances Dean, director of the Department of Instructional Resources, introduced Ms. Tina Ruddy, chairperson of the committee, who then introduced other members of the committee: Mrs. Elizabeth Varga, representative of the Montgomery County Health Department, Division of School Health; Dr. Arthur Levens, representative of the Knights of Columbus; Mrs. Kathleen Enzler, representative of the Archdiocese of Greater Washington; and Mrs. Phyllis Brush, who had represented the Suburban Area Study Group for the past year.

Ms. Ruddy reported that the past year had been a productive one. The committee had completed the task of re-reviewing all materials found on the "approved materials" list of 1982 in compliance with Board Resolution No. 499-82. She hoped the upcoming school year would give the committee time to see new materials because there were a lot of good materials available and they needed to see a variety for comparison. Also, many appropriate materials are available that factually discuss opposing sides of sensitive issues and give students a chance to make personal decisions based on complete information. She also hoped it would be possible to see some pamphlets or "hand-outs," as well as books, in the curriculum.

Ms. Ruddy stated the committee's last meeting had been June 7, which allowed them to review and comment on the 8th grade health unit objectives and they had two concerns, one about Performance Objectives 1 and 2 which deal with religious viewpoints. By a majority vote, it was the committee's belief that the words "recognize" in #1 and "describe" in #2 should be changed to "be aware of" because it was more appropriate for students to be aware of religious differences but not receive a grade on the knowledge. The second concern was about the contraceptive unit. The committee had made a formal motion that supporting materials be used when instructing on contraceptive methods, that additional materials were needed showing methods, or contraceptives should be brought into the classroom. However, the 8th grade health unit was favorably received by the committee.

Ms. Ruddy said it was a pleasure working with staff of the school system because they were very supportive and always available. She also thanked the Board for the opportunity to share the committee's thoughts.

Mrs. Enzler also thanked the staff for their support and said she thought the committee was necessary, although a difficult committee in one way because members represented some interest of their own or their organization, and she thought the committee had to find ways to help all the children in Montgomery County.

Concerning new materials and the committee's access to them, Mrs. Praisner asked whether the committee should review all materials available and how much material is really needed. Ms. Ruddy responded that they had been reviewing according to the resolution, i.e., going through the already approved list, but there were new editions of materials already approved and new filmstrips. There were excellent materials on birth defects, many of them pamphlets not contained within the curriculum. There were Department of Health flyers on sexually-transmitted diseases. They were concerned with having such a long process that it was sometimes months before the materials were in the students' hands. She cited Rely tampons and the toxic shock problem making all the papers two years ago and what a long time it took for information on that to be filtered through; by the time students got it the tampons were off the market and the scare had passed. Herpes was another issue and the materials they had to review had no information about it.

Mr. Ewing asked what sorts of things the committee needed to address which were not now addressed and what kind of agenda they saw for the future. Ms. Ruddy said their main task was to review materials used in the curriculum, but it might help to take a look at what kind of materials were being produced and on the market so the committee could see what's available to compare what's good and what's not. Mrs. Praisner thought perhaps one area for the future would be for the committee to identify materials not available and solicit staff to send for them or draft appropriate materials.

Mrs. Peyser was shocked that the committee had recommended teachers bring in contraceptives, and questioned whether the committee had voted on that. Ms. Ruddy replied that on June 7 the committee went through the objectives and copies of the overhead chart and there was quite a bit of discussion about how a teacher could instruct about something without being able to show the students what it looked like. The majority agreed that if it was to be discussed, it would be really helpful to show a picture or a contraceptive itself. Mrs. Peyser said she would like to see the vote of the committee.

Mrs. Peyser thought at least one of the films she had viewed, "Understanding Human Reproduction," might possibly be in violation of the state bylaw and asked to see the minutes of the meeting where the committee approved it.

Dr. Greenblatt questioned how the committee arrived at a judgment that a particular piece of material was appropriate for all students to see in grade 5, or grade 8, or grade 12; whether the basis for their judgment was that it was okay for their children or were they considering the sensitivities of other families about the topic. Dr. Levens stated he made his decision by asking himself whether the material was the best thing for the entire group or whether it was going to hurt some segment. Mrs. Enzler said that, even though she was a Catholic, and while she would prefer contraception not be taught, there is a segment in the curriculum on natural family

planning, and she had a responsibility to all the children in Montgomery County. Ms. Ruddy believed that, as 29 individuals on the committee, they brought their own backgrounds and their own biases to it but that discussion followed the presentation of each piece of material and everybody had time to bat around their issues and they tried to keep in mind who is going to see the material.

Dr. Greenblatt asked how members decided if they were unsure in their own minds about the appropriateness of a certain piece of material; did they approve it or were they more restrictive. Ms. Ruddy responded that when there were major objections, it was not uncommon for the committee to table something and ask staff to see if there was anything better available which fit the guidelines but was more appropriate.

Dr. Greenblatt asked for the state bylaw and the background on recognizing the different religious viewpoints because she wasn't sure it had to be in the curriculum. She also felt the list of materials available should be limited instead of providing a greater abundance for local options.

Mrs. Praisner thanked the committee for coming to the Board meeting and for the work they put in in reviewing the materials. She said the Board definitely appreciated it and knew the family life committee was one of the hardest, if not the hardest, to serve on.

Re: Amendment to the FY 1985 Capital  
Budget

Dr. Greenblatt moved and Mrs. Peysner seconded the following:

WHEREAS, The County Council deferred the Board of Education's request for a FY 1984 supplemental appropriation to plan an addition at the Seneca Valley High School; and

WHEREAS, Based on a reconsideration of alternatives by staff, we believe the best option is to proceed with architectural planning in FY 1985 to design a new high school west of I-270 to open in September, 1988, with an addition to Seneca Valley High School to be constructed at a later date; and

WHEREAS, To implement this recommendation requires a FY 1985 Capital Budget emergency appropriation; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Board of Education requests a FY 1985 Capital Budget emergency appropriation of \$650,000 to plan a new high school west of I-270 to open in September, 1988, and that the FY 1985 Capital Improvements Program be amended accordingly; and be it further

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

For the record, Mr. Ewing stated that he didn't like planning a new

high school first and adding to Seneca Valley at a later date; it was much more responsible to build an addition to Seneca Valley High School and determine later whether to put up a whole new school.

For the record, Mrs. Praisner shared Mr. Ewing's comments.

By consensus, the following amendments were made to the resolution:

Added a new first Whereas, "WHEREAS, The Board of Education requested architectural planning funds for an addition at Seneca Valley High School and approval in the FY 1985 Capital Improvements Program of a new high school west of I-270; and."  
Added the words "on recommendations by the county executive and Park and Planning Commission, and deferral by the County Council, and" after the word "Based" in the second Whereas.  
Changed the word "best" in the second Whereas to "only."

Resolution No. 384-84                      Re: Amendment to the FY 1985 Capital Budget

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

WHEREAS, The Board of Education requested architectural planning funds for an addition at Seneca Valley High School and approval in the FY 1985 Capital Improvements Program of a new high school west of I-270; and

WHEREAS, The County Council deferred the Board of Education's request for a FY 1984 supplemental appropriation to plan an addition at the Seneca Valley High School; and

WHEREAS, Based on recommendations by the county executive and Park and Planning Commission, and deferral by the County Council, and a reconsideration of alternatives by staff, we believe the only option is to proceed with architectural planning in FY 1985 to design a new high school west of I-270 to open in September, 1988, with an addition to Seneca Valley High School to be constructed at a later date; and

WHEREAS, To implement this recommendation requires a FY 1985 Capital Budget emergency appropriation; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Board of Education requests a FY 1985 Capital Budget emergency appropriation of \$650,000 to plan a new high school west of I-270 to open in September, 1988, and that the FY 1985 Capital Improvements Program be amended accordingly; and be it further

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

Re: Board Member Comments

1. Mr. Ewing reported he had had some communication from the Oak View community about the French immersion coordinator position there. He was very concerned that ceasing to provide that position in that school conveyed the impression to a good many people in the community that the Board was not providing the level of support it had in the past to a magnet school. He wanted to know what the Board proposed to do about that and whether there wasn't a reason to continue that position. It seemed to him there was and he requested a response as soon as possible.

Mrs. Praisner wondered if staff would be able to respond in some way in the generic sense to the question of once a magnet program is developed what do they see is the long-term and short-term staff needs above and beyond the staff allocated to a school based on enrollment. When the Board creates a magnet, what kind of commitment does it make? Does a magnet include with it specific positions and for how long? What is the additional staff commitment to the entire Blair Cluster at this point based on Board action by school or program? The Board continues to have demands from communities for such programs and for magnets in those programs. What does it mean as far as budget and staff in the future? The Board needed to look at previous commitments and future commitments.

2. Mr. Ewing stated it was very important for the Board to undertake some way of systemically assessing what the impact is on closures or consolidations in communities, as well as needing to be made continuously and regularly aware of the impact. The Board does not receive responses or assessments about how well a consolidation is working or problems with it unless they get complaints from communities.

3. Mr. Ewing reported there was a letter to the editor of the Gazette from a delegate stating that the Board's vote on the Watkins Mill site was influenced by or dictated by politics, that it was done to generate votes for him in the general election. Mr. Ewing stated that was not his view of it, that he didn't think that was so, and that he certainly never communicated with any Board member, nor they with him, their interest in knowing whether the choice of Watkins Mill was likely to generate more or less votes, so he didn't see any evidence that that interpretation had any validity.

Resolution No. 385-84

Re: Executive Session Resolution

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Mr. Ewing 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 July





Ms. Tina Ruddy - Montgomery County Department of Health  
Mrs. Suzanne Reed - Allied Civic Group

and be it further

Resolved, That the following individuals be appointed for a two-year term to serve their respective organizations for a two-year term:

Mrs. Carol Steinman-Zilliagus - Montgomery County Education  
Association  
Mrs. Ethelyn Owen - League of Women Voters of Montgomery County  
Mrs. Carolyn Kokulis - Montgomery County Council of  
Parent-Teacher Associations

and be it further

Resolved, That these individuals be notified of their appointments to the Citizens Advisory Committee on Family Life and Human Development.

Re: New Business

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

WHEREAS, A goal of the Board of Education is to provide a positive and challenging curriculum for academically talented students; and

WHEREAS, Such a program should encourage (not penalize) those students willing to seek more challenging and more difficult courses; and

WHEREAS, It is equitable that courses which require greater effort, commitment and achievement have these factors reflected in the evaluation of student performance; and

WHEREAS, The present system rewards those students who select their courses not with the goal of learning as much as possible but of achieving the highest possible grade point average with the least amount of work; and

W

HEREAS, Class ranking and grade point average are significant factors used by colleges and universities in selecting students for admission; and

WHEREAS, Many college admissions officers agree that "Montgomery County students are at a disadvantage because weighted grades are not used for honors/AP courses." (See attached letters to the Board president from the Montgomery County Personnel and Guidance Association and the Advisory Committee on Guidance and Counseling); and

WHEREAS, "For the student competing for scholarship money, a class standing or GPA which does not reflect the higher level of

scholastic endeavor may compromise a student's chances even if the courses are identified clearly as honors courses." (See attached letter from Advisory Committee on Guidance and Counseling); now therefore be it

Resolved, That the superintendent develop a plan for weighted grades in honors and advanced placement courses.

Dr. Greenblatt requested the item be put on the agenda when all Board members would be present and Mrs. Praisner said that the first time would be in September. Mrs. Praisner asked for a brief description of weighted grades before the item comes up.

Re: Items of Information

Board members received the following items of information:

1. Items in Process
2. Construction Progress Report
3. Master Calendar of Board Meetings (for future consideration)
4. School Facilities Change Order/Bid Activity Quarterly Report
5. Recommendation for Approval of Revised Social Studies Course - Modern World History A and B (for future consideration)
6. Springbrook - Second Gymnasium

Resolution No. 390-84                      Re: Adjournment

On motion of Mrs. Peyser seconded by Mrs. Praisner, the following motion was adopted unanimously:

Resolved, That the Board of Education adjourn its meeting at 5:25 p.m.

President

Secretary

WSC:mlw