



Appointment	Present Position	As
Kenneth K. Muir Long-range	Director Dept. of Information	Director of Planning
Coordination		Grade P Effective January 2, 1985
		or thereafter

Re: Presentation of PEPCo Energy  
Competition Award for Flower Hill  
Elementary School

Mr. Steven Parker presented the energy award to the superintendent and members of the Board of Education. He noted that the school had won first place for all new construction in the Metropolitan area. He thanked the staff for their efforts and noted that Flower Hill was originally designed for Lake Seneca which is outside of PEPCo's service area. Therefore, Flower Hill had been entered into the competition, and he would see to it that both schools displayed the awards.

\* Mrs. Peyser joined the meeting at this point.

Resolution No. 599-84                      Re: Winston Churchill High School -  
Reroofing (Area 2)

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

WHEREAS, Sealed bids were received on November 20 for the reroofing at Winston Churchill High School as indicated below:

Bidder	Base Bid
1. Orndorff & Spaid, Inc.	\$304,319
2. J. E. Wood & Sons Co., Inc.	312,360
3. R. D. Bean, Inc.	315,565

and

WHEREAS, The low bidder, Orndorff & Spaid, Inc., has performed similar projects satisfactorily; and

WHEREAS, Low bid is within staff estimate and sufficient funds are available in account 999-42 to effect award; now therefore be it Resolved, That a contract for \$304,319 be awarded to Orndorff & Spaid, Inc., to accomplish reroofing at Winston Churchill High School in accordance with plans and specifications dated November 7, 1984, prepared by the Division of Construction and Capital Projects.

Resolution No. 600-84

Re: Reduction of Retainage -  
Washington Grove Elementary School  
(Area 3)

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

WHEREAS, The McAlister-Schwartz Co., general contractor for the modernization and addition at Washington Grove Elementary School, has completed 84 percent of all specified requirements as of November 13, 1984, and has requested that the 10 percent retainage amount, which is based on the completed work to date, be reduced to 5 percent retainage; and

WHEREAS, The project bonding company, The American Insurance Company, by letter dated November 9, 1984, consented to this reduction; and

WHEREAS, The project architect, Thomas Clark Associates Architects, by letter dated November 15, 1984, recommended that this request for reduction in retainage be approved; now therefore be it

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

Resolution No. 601-84

Re: FY 1985 Categorical Transfer  
Within the Provision for Future  
Supported Projects

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

Resolved, That the superintendent of schools be authorized to effect the following categorical transfer within the FY 1985 Provision for Future Supported Projects in accordance with the Provision for Transfer as adopted by the County Council:

Category	From	To
02 Instructional Salaries		\$ 5,000
03 Instructional Other		10,000
04 Special Education	\$15,000	
Total	\$15,000	\$15,000

and be it further

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

Resolution No. 602-84                      Re: Utilization of a Portion of the FY 1985 Provision for Future Supported Projects for the Maryland Drug/Alcohol Prevention and Intervention Program

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

Resolved, That the superintendent of schools be authorized to receive and expend, within the FY 1985 Provision for Future Supported Projects, a \$6,000 grant award in the following categories from the Maryland State Department of Education under the Education Consolidation and Improvement Act Chapter 2 to conduct a five-day training workshop for the Parkland/Wheaton and Baker/Damascus school communities and to provide support and technical assistance for the six additional community action teams:

Category	Amount
02 Instructional Salaries	\$ 420
03 Instructional Other	5,525
10 Fixed Charges	55
Total	\$6,000

and be it further

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

Resolution No. 603-84                      Re: FY 1985 Categorical Transfer within the Head Start Program

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

Resolved, That the superintendent of schools be authorized to effect within the FY 1985 Head Start Program funded by the Office of Administration for Children, Youth, and Families through the Montgomery County Community Action Agency the following categorical transfer in accordance with the County Council Provision for Transfer:

Category	From	To
03 Instructional Other		\$9,873
10 Fixed Charges	\$9,873	

and be it further

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

Resolution No. 604-84                      Re:    FY 1985 Supplemental Appropriation  
   to Provide Transition Programs for  
   Refugee Children

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

Resolved, That the superintendent of schools be authorized to establish 2.5, 10-month teacher (A-D) positions; and be it further

Resolved, That the superintendent of schools be authorized, subject to County Council approval, to receive and expend in the following categories this grant award from the Maryland State Department of Education under the Refugee Act of 1980, P.L. 96-212 for the FY 1985 Transition Program for Refugee Children:

Category	Supplemental
02 Instructional Salaries	\$55,140
10 Fixed Charges	14,894
Total	\$70,034

and be it further

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

\* Dr. Greenblatt joined the meeting at this point.

Re: Board/Press/Visitor Conference

The following individuals appeared before the Board of Education:

1. Mrs. Jane Stern, MCEA
2. Ms. Carole Lowe, Montgomery County Home Economics Association
3. Mr. John Smith, Alpha Phi Alpha
4. Mrs. Charlene Janes, Richard Montgomery Cluster Coordinator
5. Mrs. Ginny Miller, Walter Johnson Cluster Coordinator

Re: Report of the Citizens Advisory  
Committee for Career and  
Vocational Education

Dr. Frank Carricato introduced Mrs. Marilyn Scheiner, past chairman of the committee; Mrs. Diane Brasile, and Mrs. Joan Karasik. Mrs. Scheiner explained that their report had with it three addendum, the first of which was a copy of the goals and objectives they had set

for the coming year. They had already implemented some of these goals by dividing into subcommittees. One was to look at Board activities as they relate to career and vocational education, one was to look at program evaluation, one was the relationship of vocational education to manpower planning, another was guidance and counseling in career and vocational education, another was public relations and marketing, and the last was the continuing look at the needs of the special needs students.

Mrs. Scheiner said that the second item was a copy of testimony given to the National Commission on Secondary Vocational Education. She said that looking at some numbers in the national news it had been reported that less than a third of the graduates of 1984 would be graduating college in four to five years after high school graduation. They hoped to raise questions that the commission could study. One question was where the 1.9 million students not graduating from college would get their job skills. The other point was that even for the 800,000 students going to graduate from college the cost of college was astronomical. These students needed to have a skill that would allow them to earn more than the minimum wage to help them get through college. They hoped that these students would have the opportunity to learn these skills in high school.

Mrs. Scheiner indicated that the third item added to the annual report was a comprehensive look into the vocational preparation for handicapped students in Montgomery County. The committee accepted this report with its recommendations, and she called attention to these. In addition to these three items, the committee had made some other recommendations based on committee meetings and discussion. The first was that they hoped the Board would consider a graduation requirement in career or vocational subjects. They had found that one third of the high school students took a career or vocational course. If they added home economics, consumer awareness, and industrial arts, well over 70 percent of the students were taking courses. They also asked that more effort be made in marketing the vocational courses, and that counselors provide information to students in the sixth and seventh grades about these courses. She said that in getting information to homes they felt that information should be in a language that was understandable by students and their parents. They recommended that awards ceremonies in the schools give equal recognition to outstanding career and vocational students. They thought that more effort should be made to introduce career and vocational opportunities to female and minority students.

Mrs. Scheiner stated that they were looking forward to the up-county career and vocational center. They hoped that programs would reflect opportunities in the neighboring commercial areas and that the neighboring businesses would be brought into the planning process.

Dr. Cronin commented that when the Board received an annual report, generally the staff response was so late that the Board forgot the

original discussion. He asked whether they could speed up responses to these reports. He requested a staff response to the five recommendations of the full committee. He asked what could be done immediately to implement these without much resource commitment. He asked what would be required to implement the more difficult ones in staff time or resources. He also inquired about the time frame for implementation if they were to commit the resources.

Dr. Cronin said he was interested in the vocational preparation for handicapped students. He cited the recommendations on page 3 of this report on career education and asked what could be done with existing staff and effort, what must be done with additional staff and resources, and what the time frame would be. He inquired about the problems with giving the TAP and PIES tests. Mrs. Karasik replied that the teachers felt that the results coming out of the tests were not all that useful. They were suggesting that simpler tests be used and that the main emphasis be on the assessment of the individual student. They also suggested that there be specialized special education teachers who knew the vocational education field.

Dr. Cronin requested a staff response to these suggestions. Dr. Cronin called attention to the section which stated that vocational instructors received no advance information about handicapped students placed in their classes. Mrs. Brasile explained that this did not mean in all cases. These were comments received from teachers who included this as a problem. Mrs. Karasik cited the problem of communication between the home school teachers and the Edison teachers.

Dr. Cronin inquired about communication and coordination with Montgomery College for services to students who had graduated from MCPS. Dr. Carricato replied that not all handicapped students took a vocational program. The vocational staff did not have that type of communication with Montgomery College staff. He indicated that the next committee report dealt more specifically with coordination and communication between secondary vocational and postsecondary vocational. He felt they had very good communication, but except in the area of business education, they did not have good articulation. Dr. Cronin asked if he had any suggestions to get on with this articulation, and Dr. Carricato replied they would be meeting with Baltimore County staff because they had made progress in solving this problem. He said that it might be necessary for the state Board of Education to take an action for all counties to resolve this articulation problem. Dr. Cronin suggested that it might help if the Board asked its staff to do this and if the College asked its staff as well.

Dr. Cronin requested a report from staff on the in-service training given to regular teachers and the availability of such training for vocational education teachers who work with handicapped students. Dr. Shoenberg thanked the committee for the quality of the report and, in particular, cited the report on handicapped students for its clarity. He suggested substituting "work force planning" for "manpower planning." He commented that he got worried when they

talked about focusing on this because it raised issues of social engineering. He thought that if they set up a series of vocational programs for specific needs in the county, they would be making a mistake. Mrs. Scheiner replied that they had had a series of meetings with employers in the county. These employers told them that they did not need employees trained in specific applications or skills, but rather they needed employees who had basic skills plus the ability to think and reason, show up to work on time, and learn work and life skills. Dr. Shoenberg commented that all national reports suggested that the skills needed for students to take their place in the work force were the same skills students needed to go on to college. He thought they needed to be in a position to bring the vocational and the college preparatory closer to each other.

Dr. Shoenberg said he was starting to have second thoughts about eighth grade planning. He was not sure that a thirteen year-old could plan for much of anything other than how to explore. He was worried about "selling" programs to students. He hoped that they were planning how to explore. Mrs. Scheiner explained that they wanted students to know that they had many options. They did not want them to cut off vocational options in the eighth grade and concentrate on academic options nor did they want them to do the reverse. Dr. Shoenberg was worried about the "marketing" language because it seemed to him they were saying they had a good program and needed students to maintain these programs. Mrs. Scheiner explained that "marketing" created an atmosphere of information, and they hoped students were not shunning the courses because their peers and parents had the wrong impression.

Mr. Ewing remarked that this same language had caught his attention. He thought it was very important about students being made aware of their options and opening up opportunities. He thought that the seven-period day did this, and he thought it was important for students to have the opportunity to take some career and vocational education programs. He was interested in the fact that they were hearing from the business community that their concern was with work skills, attitude skills, and behavioral skills. He would like them to market the notion that the work place demanded a certain attitude toward the work place, the employer, and the employee responsibilities. It was important to be flexible and to learn new things effectively. He was interested in bringing career and vocational programs more closely together with academic programs. He thought at some point this would be an interesting area to explore further. He said that the report on vocational preparation was extremely helpful and useful. He thought they might do something with the recommendation on page three where they stressed an increased emphasis on vocationally-oriented materials for academic instruction. He would be interested in an explanation of "career infusion." Mrs. Karasik explained that there was a curriculum for career infusion into the regular curriculum at all levels. She felt this was extremely important for handicapped students. Mr. Ewing asked for more information on this program. Miss Duby requested specific information about clustering handicapped students in order to have more cost effective programs.



She reported that they were undergoing a thorough study of counseling and guidance services. One part of those services included career specialists. At her school they considered the career specialist more of a college specialist, and she wondered about how the specialists were operating in other schools, why they had more information about colleges, and if they worked with the vocational specialists in the individual schools. Mrs. Brasile said that the career technicians they interviewed seemed to be very knowledgeable and would do more if given more funding and more materials. She pointed out that the county sent more students off to college than to work, and part of this was the law of supply and demand. Mrs. Praisner suggested that Dr. Laramore provide some additional information on these positions.

Miss Duby said she was in agreement with showing parents and students information about the courses. She reported that she had taken business and vocational courses much to the dismay of her friends. She thought that many college-bound students would not enroll in vocational courses. She thought they had to stress that a student would learn these other skills. For example, when she had a college interview, the interviewer looked to see whether she had taken typing. This type of information was not given to students.

Dr. Greenblatt stated that she was a little concerned about the direction of the discussion. She thought it was very nice for them to say the students going on to college should be able to take vocational courses, but she thought they should not overlook the essential focus of the vocational-technical centers and the vocational program. They had a group of students who would not be going on to college and who should be prepared to be able to enter the world of work upon graduation from high school. They should do their best as a school system to make sure those students could get a first job as soon as they graduated. She said there was no better way for these students to learn work skills than in a vocational program where they had a very structured set-up in a work setting. She commented that many of them had seen people in the world of work who did not have attitudes necessary for success. She felt that the primary focus of the vocational education program should be these students who were going to go out and get a job. She said these students should have some beginning skills in plumbing, electricity, computers, and typing. She thought that these initial skills were critical.

Mrs. Praisner thought she was hearing a combination of things, a need for that kind of training and an opportunity for other students wanting that experience. From her own experience, she felt that college graduates needed to know they had to arrive on time and know what were good work habits. She thanked the committee for the report and hoped that they would have staff reactions as soon as possible.

Re: Report of the Local Advisory  
Council on Vocational-Technical  
Education

Dr. Carricato reported that nine members of the council were appointed by the Board of Education and nine members were appointed by the Board of Trustees of Montgomery College. The committee was mandated by federal legislation, and he was pleased to have been liaison to the committee since its origin. He introduced Mrs. Barbara Reitz, the chairperson, and Mr. James Auerbach.

Mrs. Reitz stated that the first area for discussion was articulation between Montgomery College and MCPS. She said that there were staff people from both the college and the school system working with their committee; however, the articulation was not working smoothly. They needed to review the offerings at the secondary and postsecondary levels to determine whether there was unnecessary overlapping of vocational programs. They had to look at where linkages between the levels could be made and at the feasibility of offering advanced credit to advanced secondary students completing certain programs. They were considering how secondary students might participate in programs prior to graduation. She said they needed to examine vocational programs at both levels to determine further cooperative efforts. They were also considering apprenticeship opportunities at the secondary and postsecondary levels. The committee was recommending periodic joint meetings between the Board of Education and the Board of Trustees and the local advisory council to discuss matters related to vocational-technical education in the county.

Mrs. Reitz explained that the council was very supportive of the Edison Center. They had a member sitting on the Edison Center advisory council, and she was on the mid-up county advisory group. Thirdly, they would like a designated Board member as a liaison to the LAC to discuss any issues and periodically attend their meetings. The last item was graduation requirements because they had sent a letter to the state Board of Education. They were concerned about the possible negative effects of changing graduation requirements would have on the vocational education student. They felt that adding on more requirements was not going to necessarily provide excellence. She asked Mr. Auerbach, who had been sitting on a national commission on vocational education, to describe the work of the commission.

Mr. Auerbach explained the work of the national commission. Their report had been submitted to the secretary of education and would be released shortly. He highlighted the recommendations of the commission and provided Board members with an advance copy of the report.

Dr. Cody inquired about the recommendations of the council regarding graduation requirements. Dr. Carricato replied that the council wanted the school system to continue to make available to students equal opportunities to access vocational education. In addition, the Council had addressed communications to the state Board of Education expressing their concern about adding fine arts to the exclusion of practical arts.

In regard to the request for Board member liaison, Mrs. Praisner said that they would take this under advisement. She had also heard a desire to improve communication with the College. She said that thanks to Mr. Subin, she and Dr. Cronin would be meeting with some members of the Board of Trustees on an ongoing basis.

Dr. Cronin explained that this past week he had gone to a hearing for SACVE and four points were raised. One point was the cooperation between secondary and post secondary, and the second was the needs of special education students in vocational education. The third was the need for better in-service training for teachers in the vocational area. It was suggested that Montgomery County take the lead in bringing together the teachers from Frederick, Howard, Prince George's, and Montgomery Counties. The fourth was that Boards should be very careful about increasing graduation requirements because of the effect on vocational education students.

Mr. Ewing assumed that when Mrs. Praisner and Dr. Cronin met with the Board of Trustees they would explore these issues. However, he was puzzled by what it was that existed in the way of barriers to better articulation. He asked whether they had specific items. Mrs. Reitz replied that it was the idea of turf and who was going to be teaching what. Mr. Auerbach commented that at no time was successful articulation an easy process. Dr. Cody asked that staff provide him with specifics on articulation patterns.

Dr. Floyd commented that he had heard repeatedly that things were difficult and not easy. However, he would raise the question of who said things were supposed to be easy. The fact that it was not easy did not mean this was something they ought not be tackling. He said he would raise a question as to whether it was a worthy effort, and assuming the answer was yes, he would ask whether there were mutual benefits in both instances. Therefore, the first challenge would be to identify the mutual benefits and go after them.

Dr. Shoenberg said they had heard that increasing graduation requirements would result in a reduced opportunity to take vocational courses. He did not see that. They had had 12 required courses and 20 credits required to graduate, giving the students 8 courses they must take in addition to the required courses. They proposed now to go to 14 credits, 22 required for graduation, giving the students 8 courses that they must take. They had had a six period day giving the students the possibility of taking 24 courses, which gave the possibility of 12 elective courses. They were now talking about the seven-period day in all schools giving students the possibility of taking 28 courses, and giving students the possibility of 14 elective courses. He wondered why they were hearing that increasing graduation requirements would decrease opportunities to take vocational courses. Mr. Auerbach replied that based on surveys it had this impact in other areas. Dr. Cody thought that the facts did not substantiate this at all unless there was something else they were missing.

Dr. Carricato explained that he had served on the task force for graduation requirements. He reported that vocational educators were very frightened about the tenor set by the fine arts requirement. This set up one elective above another, in their opinion, mutually valuable elective area. They had no problem with the increase of math from two to three or no major problem with the second diploma. He felt that the problem was the message that state and local boards were sending to students, parents, and staff. The fine arts made a Renaissance person and the practical was what was left if there was nothing else to take. He said that this would start a trend and youngsters would take the fine arts in the ninth grade and not sample other courses. Mrs. Praisner asked whether seventh and eighth grade students go to sample music, the arts, and the industrial arts in the exploratory elective. She asked whether by not requiring foreign languages they would be doing the same thing to foreign language. Dr. Carricato agreed. He pointed out that they did explore practical and fine arts in seventh and eighth grade, and he asked why they should give the fine arts a second shot as a requirement in the upper grade. He stated that he was not in favor of adding either and thought it should be a student choice. Mrs. Praisner thanked the committee for their report.

Re: Confirmation of Board Action on  
Increasing Graduation Requirements

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

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

One credit for mathematics  
One credit in fine arts as proposed and likely to be  
adopted by the state Board of Education

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 1985 for the graduating class of 1989.

Re: A Motion by Dr. Cronin to Amend  
the Proposed Resolution on  
Graduation Requirements (FAILED)

A motion by Dr. Cronin to amend the proposed resolution on graduation requirements by adding one credit in fine arts/practical arts failed for lack of a second.

Re: A Motion by Mr. Ewing to Postpone  
the Proposed Resolution on  
Graduation Requirements (FAILED)

A motion by Mr. Ewing to postpone the proposed resolution on graduation requirements until the Board received additional information from the superintendent failed with Dr. Cronin, Mr. Ewing, and Mrs. Praisner voting in the affirmative; Dr. Floyd, Dr. Greenblatt, Mrs. Peyser, and Dr. Shoenberg voting in the negative (Miss Duby voting in the affirmative).

Re: A Motion by Dr. Greenblatt to  
Amend the Proposed Resolution on  
Increasing Graduation Requirements (FAILED)

A motion by Dr. Greenblatt to amend the proposed resolution on increasing graduation requirements by increasing the requirement in science from two credits to three credits failed with Dr. Greenblatt and Mrs. Peyser voting in the affirmative; Dr. Floyd, Mrs. Praisner, and Dr. Shoenberg voting in the negative; Dr. Cronin and Mr. Ewing abstaining (Miss Duby voting in the negative).

Re: A Motion by Dr. Greenblatt to  
Amend the Proposed Resolution on  
Increasing Graduation Requirements (FAILED)

A motion by Dr. Greenblatt to amend the proposed resolution by increasing the social studies requirement by one to include non-U.S. history failed with Dr. Greenblatt, Mrs. Peyser, and Mrs. Praisner voting in the affirmative; Dr. Floyd and Dr. Shoenberg voting in the negative; Dr. Cronin and Mr. Ewing abstaining (Miss Duby abstaining).

Re: A Motion by Dr. Greenblatt to  
Amend the Proposed Resolution on  
Increasing Graduation Requirements (FAILED)

A motion by Dr. Greenblatt to amend the proposed resolution by requiring one credit in a foreign language failed with Dr. Greenblatt and Mrs. Peyser voting in the affirmative; Dr. Floyd, Mrs. Praisner, and Dr. Shoenberg voting in the negative; Dr. Cronin and Mr. Ewing abstaining (Miss Duby abstaining).

Re: A Motion by Dr. Cronin to Amend  
the Proposed Resolution on  
Increasing Graduation Requirements (FAILED)

A motion by Miss Duby to amend the proposed resolution on graduation requirements by deleting the requirement in fine arts failed with Mrs. Praisner voting in the affirmative; Dr. Floyd, Dr. Greenblatt, Mrs. Peyser, and Dr. Shoenberg voting in the negative; Dr. Cronin and Mr. Ewing abstaining (Miss Duby voting in the affirmative). For the record, Dr. Greenblatt stated that the definition of fine arts was as a humanity.

Re: A Motion by Dr. Greenblatt to  
Amend the Proposed Resolution on

Increasing Graduation Requirements (FAILED)

A motion by Dr. Greenblatt to delete "as proposed and likely to be adopted" failed with Dr. Floyd, Dr. Greenblatt, and Mrs. Peyser voting in the affirmative; Dr. Cronin, Mr. Ewing, Mrs. Praisner, and Dr. Shoenberg abstaining (Miss DUBY abstaining).

Resolution No. 605-84                      Re: Confirmation of Board Action on  
Increasing Graduation  
Requirements

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

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

- One credit for mathematics
- One credit in fine arts as proposed and likely to be adopted by the state Board of Education

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 1985 for the graduating class of 1989.

For the record, Mr. Ewing made the following statement:

"My opposition to that motion has to do solely with my feeling that Dr. Greenblatt and Mrs. Peyser in their usual way of legislating failed to explain why they want to do anything, and I can't support anybody's motion who doesn't explain why they want to do things. I never have, and I never will."

Re: Presentation of Preliminary Plans  
- Watkins Mill High School (Area  
3)

Dr. Shoenberg moved and Mr. Ewing seconded the following:

WHEREAS, The architect for Watkins Mill High School, Duane, Elliott & Associates, has prepared the schematic design in accordance with the educational specifications; and

WHEREAS, The Watkins Mill High School Planning Committee has approved the proposed schematic design; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Montgomery County Board of Education approve the schematic design report prepared by Duane, Elliott & Associates.

For the record, Dr. Greenblatt stated that she had raised a question about the bridge in the interior court.

Re: A Motion by Dr. Greenblatt to  
Amend the Proposed Resolution on  
Watkins Mill (FAILED)

A motion by Dr. Greenblatt to request an alternative presentation of the cafeteria area that would address the issue of the two-stories and the IMC failed for lack of a second.

Resolution No. 606-84                      Re: Presentation of Preliminary Plans  
   - Watkins Mill High School (Area  
   3)

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Dr. Shoenberg seconded by Mr. Ewing, the following resolution was adopted with Dr. Cronin, Mr. Ewing, Dr. Floyd, Mrs. Praisner, and Dr. Shoenberg voting in the affirmative; Dr. Greenblatt voting in the negative; Mrs. Peyser being temporarily absent (Miss Duby voting in the affirmative):

WHEREAS, The architect for Watkins Mill High School, Duane, Elliott & Associates, has prepared the schematic design in accordance with the educational specifications; and

WHEREAS, The Watkins Mill High School Planning Committee has approved the proposed schematic design; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Montgomery County Board of Education approve the schematic design report prepared by Duane, Elliott & Associates. For the record, Dr. Greenblatt stated that her reservation was exclusively with the configuration of the cafeteria because the rest of the plan was very creative.

Re: FY 1986 Capital Improvements  
Program (CIP)

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

WHEREAS, In accordance with the laws of the State of Maryland and Montgomery County, the superintendent of schools has prepared a recommended FY 1986 Capital Improvements Program; and

WHEREAS, A joint County Executive/County Council/Board of Education public hearing was held on the Capital Improvements Program on November 15, 1984; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Board of Education approves a FY 1986 Capital Budget totaling \$40,401,000; and be it further

Resolved, That this request includes a request to the state of \$40,570,000, of which \$14,584,000 is reimbursement for state-eligible projects previously forward funded by the County as shown on the summary; and be it further

Resolved, That this request includes \$14,415,000 in new appropriation authority from the County, resulting in a net \$169,000 offset from state funds to County accounts and thus shown as (\$169,000) on the summary; and be it further

Resolved, That the Board of Education approves a FY 1985 Capital Budget supplemental appropriation request from the county of \$3,605,000 as shown on the summary; and be it further

Resolved, That the Board of Education approves is priority list for state-eligible projects and the Five-Year Capital Improvements Program (FY 1987 - FY 1991).

For the record, Mrs. Praisner stated that she had listed to the tape and had read all the testimony from the public hearing.

Resolution No. 607-84                      Re: An Amendment to the FY 1986  
Capital Improvements Program (CIP)

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

Resolved, That the FY 1986 Capital Improvements Program be amended by adding New Hampshire Estates and Rolling Terrace to the list of projects for which planning funds are requested.

Re: A Motion by Mrs. Peyser to Amend  
the FY 1986 Capital Improvements  
Program (CIP) (FAILED)

A motion by Mrs. Peyser to amend the FY 1986 Capital Improvements Program by deleting \$1,384,000 in construction funds for the Area 3 administrative office failed for lack of a second.

Re: A Motion by Mrs. Peyser to Amend  
the FY 1986 Capital Improvements  
Program (CIP) (FAILED)

A motion by Mrs. Peyser to amend the FY 1986 Capital Improvements Program by deleting \$422,000 in planning funds for the Up-county Vocational-technical facility until a study was done of the Edison Center failed for lack of a second.

Dr. Greenblatt left the meeting at this point.

Resolution No. 608-84                      Re: FY 1986 Capital Improvements  
Program (CIP)



On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Dr. Shoenberg seconded by Dr. Cronin, the following resolution was adopted with Dr. Cronin, Mr. Ewing, Dr. Floyd, Mrs. Praisner, and Dr. Shoenberg voting in the affirmative; Mrs. Peyser abstaining (Miss DUBY voting in the affirmative):

WHEREAS, In accordance with the laws of the State of Maryland and Montgomery County, the superintendent of schools has prepared a recommended FY 1986 Capital Improvements Program; and

WHEREAS, A joint County Executive/County Council/Board of Education public hearing was held on the Capital Improvements Program on November 15, 1984; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Board of Education approves a FY 1986 Capital Budget totaling \$40,557,000; and be it further

Resolved, That this request includes a request to the state of \$40,570,000, of which \$14,584,000 is reimbursement for state-eligible projects previously forward funded by the County as shown on the summary; and be it further

Resolved, That this request includes \$14,571,000 in new appropriation authority from the County, resulting in a net \$13,000 offset from state funds to County accounts and thus shown as (\$13,000) on the summary; and be it further

Resolved, That the Board of Education approves a FY 1985 Capital Budget supplemental appropriation request from the county of \$3,605,000 as shown on the summary; and be it further

Resolved, That the Board of Education approves is priority list for state-eligible projects and the Five-Year Capital Improvements Program (FY 1987 - FY 1991).

Re: Board Member Comments

1. Mr. Ewing announced that the ceremony to restore the name Carver to the Educational Services Center would be held on Saturday, January 5, 1985, at 1 p.m.
2. Mrs. Peyser asked staff to look into a letter received from parents of students at Takoma Park Junior High School which states that it took the children two hours to get home on a school bus. These children lived a few blocks from Eastern.

Resolution No. 609-84

Re: Executive Session - December 11, 1984

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Dr. Shoenberg seconded by Dr. Cronin, the following resolution was adopted with Dr. Cronin, Mr. Ewing, Dr. Floyd, Mrs. Praisner, and Dr. Shoenberg voting in the affirmative; Mrs. Peyser abstaining (Miss DUBY voting in the affirmative):

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 December 11, 1984, at 9 a.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; and be it further

Resolved, That such meeting continue in executive closed session at noon to discuss the matters listed above as permitted under Article 76A, Section 11(a) and that such meeting shall continue in executive closed session until the completion of business.

Dr. Shoenberg assumed the chair.

Resolution No. 610-84                      Re: Letter to the President

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education send a letter to President Reagan indicating the Montgomery County Board of Education's desire that the new secretary of education be someone experienced in public elementary and secondary education.

Resolution No. 611-84                      Re: Adjournment - Sine Die

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education adjourn its meeting (sine die) at 12:35 a.m.

President

Secretary

WSC:mlw