

	TOTAL		-----	\$ 88,345
31-86	Tractors, Backhoe, and Mowers Gaithersburg Ford Tractor Company			\$ 41,900
53-86	Carpeting American Excelsior Co.			\$ 30,240
58-86	Frozen Fruits, Vegetables, and Other Frozen Foods and Chilled Cream Cheese Edward Boker Frosted Foods, Inc.		\$	9,490
	Carroll County Foods			14,359
	Continental Smelkinson			12,100
	Doughtie's Foods			11,304
	I. Feldman			4,148
	A. W. Schmidt & Son, Inc.			4,550
	TOTAL		-----	\$ 55,951
61-86	Fresh Eggs Carroll County Foods	Estimated		\$ 27,200
63-86	Frozen Potatoes Interstate Food Processing Corporation			\$192,980
73-86	Fresh Donuts Montgomery Doughnut Co., Inc.		\$	50,429
	GRAND TOTAL		-----	\$487,045

RESOLUTION NO. 531-85 Re: GAITHERSBURG HIGH SCHOOL -
CAFETERIA AIR-CONDITIONING (AREA 3)

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

WHEREAS, Sealed bids were received on November 14, 1985, for air-conditioning the cafeteria at Gaithersburg High School, as indicated below:

Bidder	Lump Sum
1, E. J. Whelan & Company	\$28,602
2. G. Leonard Daymude Co., Inc.	35,000
3. W. B. Maske Sheet Metal Works, Inc.	35,544
4. American Combustion, Inc.	43,420
5. Arey, Inc.	61,161

and

WHEREAS, The apparent low bidder, E. J. Whelan & Company, has

withdrawn its bid based on errors made in bid preparation; and

WHEREAS, The apparent second low bidder, G. Leonard Daymude Co., Inc., has performed similar projects satisfactorily; and

WHEREAS, Low bid is within staff estimate and sufficient funds are available in Account 999-71 to effect award; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That a contract for \$35,000 be awarded to G. Leonard Daymude Co., Inc., to accomplish air-conditioning the cafeteria at Gaithersburg High School in accordance with plans and specifications covering this work dated October 31, 1985, prepared by the Division of Construction and Capital Projects in conjunction with Morton Wood, Jr., engineer.

RESOLUTION NO. 532-85 Re: ACCEPTANCE OF MONTGOMERY BLAIR HIGH SCHOOL MODERNIZATION PROJECT (AREA 1)

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

RESOLVED, That having been duly inspected on November 11, 1985, the Montgomery Blair High School Modernization project now be formally accepted, and that the official date of completion be established as that date upon which formal notice is received from the architect that the building has been completed in accordance with the plans and specifications, and all contract requirements have been met.

RESOLUTION NO. 533-85 Re: ACCEPTANCE OF OAK VIEW ELEMENTARY SCHOOL MODERNIZATION PROJECT (AREA 1)

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

RESOLVED, That having been duly inspected on November 11, 1985, the Oak View Elementary School Modernization project now be formally accepted, and that the official date of completion be established as that date upon which formal notice is received from the architect that the building has been completed in accordance with the plans and specifications, and all contract requirements have been met.

RESOLUTION NO. 534-85 Re: ACCEPTANCE OF GAITHERSBURG HIGH SCHOOL ADDITION AND MODIFICATIONS PROJECTS (AREA 3)

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

RESOLVED, That having been duly inspected on November 11, 1985, the Gaithersburg High School Addition and Modifications projects now be formally accepted, and that the official dates of completion be

established as those dates upon which formal notice is received from the architect that the projects have been completed in accordance with the plans and specifications, and all contract requirements have been met.

RESOLUTION NO. 535-85 Re: ACCEPTANCE OF WOODFIELD ELEMENTARY
SCHOOL MODERNIZATION AND ADDITION
(AREA 3)

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

RESOLVED, That having been duly inspected on November 11, 1985, the Woodfield Elementary School Modernization and Addition project now be formally accepted, and that the official date of completion be established as that date upon which formal notice is received from the architect that the building has been completed in accordance with the plans and specifications, and all contract requirements have been met.

RESOLUTION NO. 536-85 Re: ACCEPTANCE OF FLOWER HILL ELEMENTARY
SCHOOL (AREA 3)

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

RESOLVED, That having been duly inspected on November 11, 1985, Flower Hill Elementary School now be formally accepted, and that the official date of completion be established as that date upon which formal notice is received from the architect that the building has been completed in accordance with the plans and specifications, and all contract requirements have been met.

RESOLUTION NO. 537-85 Re: ACCEPTANCE OF LAKE SENECA ELEMENTARY
SCHOOL (AREA 3)

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

RESOLVED, That having been duly inspected on November 11, 1985, Lake Seneca Elementary School now be formally accepted, and that the official date of completion be established as that date upon which formal notice is received from the architect that the building has been completed in accordance with the plans and specifications, and all contract requirements have been met.

RESOLUTION NO. 538-85 Re: FY 1986 CAPITAL BUDGET SUPPLEMENTAL
APPROPRIATION - EDWARD U. TAYLOR
LEARNING CENTER - AIR CONDITIONING

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

construction contract for the lump sum total of \$181,000 for the New Hampshire Estates Elementary School project.

RESOLUTION NO. 540-85 Re: ARCHITECTURAL APPOINTMENT - OAK VIEW
ELEMENTARY SCHOOL ADDITION (AREA 1)

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

WHEREAS, It is necessary to appoint an architect to provide required design services and administration of the construction contract for the Oak View Elementary School Addition project; and

WHEREAS, It is in the best interests of Montgomery County Public Schools to appoint the firm which designed the recent Oak View modernization project; and

WHEREAS, Staff has negotiated a fee of \$70,000 with Arley J. Koran, Inc., to accomplish the architect/engineer services; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education enter into a contractual agreement with the firm of Arley J. Koran, Inc., to provide required design services and administration of the construction contract for the lump sum total of \$70,000 for the Oak View Elementary School Addition project.

RESOLUTION NO. 541-85 Re: ARCHITECTURAL APPOINTMENT - ROLLING
TERRACE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL (AREA 1)

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

WHEREAS, It is necessary to appoint an architect to provide a feasibility study, required design services, and administration of the construction contract for the Rolling Terrace Elementary School project; and

WHEREAS, Staff has employed the Architect/Engineer Selection Procedures approved by the Board of Education in November, 1975; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education enter into a contractual agreement with the firm of S H W C, Inc., to provide required feasibility study, design services, and administration of the construction contract for the lump sum total of \$248,900 for the Rolling Terrace Elementary School project.

Re: BOARD/PRESS/VISITOR CONFERENCE

The following individuals appeared before the Board of Education:

1. Carol Fanconi, Gaithersburg High School PTSA
2. Judy Koenick
3. Linda Bocra

Re: STATEMENT ABOUT VANDALISM AT
FARMLAND ELEMENTARY

Dr. Shoenberg read the following statement which was signed by all members of the Board present:

"Let it be known. We the undersigned are united in our unwavering conviction that hate/violence incidents such as occurred at Farmland School are abhorrent to our community and will not be tolerated. We are committed to helping the police in the apprehension and conviction of those responsible. Let our outrage not fuel the fires of continuing hatred but rather catalyze our increased efforts to eliminate prejudice and hatred among us and our children. "

Dr. Shoenberg said that the statement went on to note the \$2,000 award offered through the hate/violence fund provided by Montgomery County and the Farmland PTA. Mrs. Praisner suggested that Mrs. DiFonzo be given the opportunity to sign.

Re: VIDEOTAPE ON STUDENT TRADES FOUNDATION

Mr. Jerry Murphy of the Automotive Trades Foundation and Mr. Clyde Haven of the Construction Trades Foundation showed a videotape on the student trades foundation. Mr. Murphy noted that last year the vocational program in Montgomery County had been recognized by President Reagan. Dr. Cody reported that the Montgomery County Chamber of Commerce had recognized MCPS for its outstanding contribution to the business community. The award recognized the partnership between the Chamber and the MCPS and cited the Retail Trade Foundation, the Adopt-a-school Program, Educators in Industry, Project High Hopes, the internships, and the Education Connection.

Re: REPORT OF THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON
CAREER AND VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

Dr. Frank Carricato, director of career and vocational education, introduced Mr. Jerry Malitz, chairman of the committee. Mr. Malitz reported that the committee consisted about 20 people who spent a lot of time and effort in developing career and vocational education. This year they had had four subcommittee reports, and probably the most important was the committee report on publicity. They had talked about getting female students more aware of career and vocational courses. They stressed the need for career and vocational education as part of a balance in education. He thought that some of this would be accomplished by the practical arts graduation requirement. Mr. Malitz suggested there be a program set up to make sure that every student was aware of the possibilities in career and vocational education. He hoped that the Board would look

upon this subcommittee report as being a very positive step. Mr. Malitz stated that another subcommittee report on manpower needs assessment had not been completed. The school system would be doing this in relation to the up-county career center. Their subcommittee had compiled information on the jobs that were available in the metropolitan area, and they expected that report would be completed in a few months.

Mr. Malitz said they had a subcommittee report on special needs students. They realized that more things needed to be done for their special populations. They needed to make information available to these students and make the programs more accessible to them. Another subcommittee report was an evaluation of the adopt-a-school program. He felt this was a very positive evaluation of an excellent program.

In addition, Mr. Malitz said they were working on a report on counseling. This was one area where they felt a lot of work needed to be done. They were not sure that the counselors were prepared to give information on career and vocational education. They had discussed this with the counseling advisory committee as well as with other people in MCPS. They felt that the counseling staff needed to have coordination with people in career and vocational education. Mr. Malitz reported that during the year they were involved with the ad hoc committee on the up-county center. The committee had ended in December 1984, and they were very positive about the chances of an up-county center but now the current timetable had it for 1990. They felt that the Council and the Board should have worked closer in making sure the center would happen sooner than 1990.

Mr. Malitz said they were also involved in a self-evaluation of the Edison Center. In two years the state would be conducting its own evaluation. Seven or eight people from his committee took part in that and felt very good at the conclusion of that evaluation. There were a number of items needing work, but the Edison staff took the recommendations very positively. They were pleased with the progress Edison was making. He said that a lot of people were discouraged by the low enrollment at Edison, but given the county's new leap into this field they did not think this should be regarded negatively. They spent some time talking with students, and he believed they would see a tremendous growth here in the upcoming years.

Dr. Shoenberg expressed the Board's appreciation for the very considerable effort the committee had put in. Dr. Cronin asked about the subcommittee report on public relations and how the recommended committee would not be the same as the charge given to the advisory committee. Mr. Malitz felt that a public relations committee was in itself a full time job and that a separate effort should be encouraged there. He said the county should be hearing about the programs from the business community.

Dr. Shoenberg thought that the subcommittee report on labor needs would be a significant contribution. The report showed occupational growth and decline over the next five years. Students were in high

school for four years so that the five year projection covered two classes and a little bit beyond. He presumed it would be difficult to use data like this to support the need for a multi-million dollar center like Edison. He explained that five years was a long time in terms of the employment market, but it was not a very long time in terms of programs. He asked if anything could be done to address that particular problem. Mr. Malitz replied that any occupational projections by the federal government only went five to seven years into the future. They believed that going to 1990 would be five years worth of seniors graduating, and they were going back to 1980 to see trends.

Dr. Shoenberg explained that he was not criticizing the report, but he wondered if there were other kinds of things that did not have to do with specific numbers and specific projections built on the estimates of local employers as to what they were going to need. Mr. Malitz said they could try to identify new industries and jobs that did not currently exist. There were some futurist organizations that looked at this. There had been a lot of talk about high tech programs, but as of today it was a very small part of the overall occupational picture in Montgomery County and elsewhere in the country. Dr. Shoenberg explained that this was posing a real dilemma for the Board in trying to decide what it wanted to do in this particular area. Mr. Malitz commented that the person heading up the subcommittee had been doing this work for a long time on the local and national level.

Mrs. Slye was interested in the center's voluntary self-study. She asked about areas highlighted for further development. Mr. Malitz replied that he was involved in the evaluation of the administration and there were some needs for training of teachers. It was felt that teachers needed more training to keep current. There was some concern about job placements and student evaluation of the programs. He said that he would share the overall report with the Board. Mrs. Slye inquired about an analysis of the student demographics and asked if there was some evidence that the best publicity came from peer contact. She asked if they had clusters of students coming from specific schools. Mr. Malitz replied that this information was available. He suggested they might want to look at the counselors in the schools from which the students were coming.

Dr. Carricato added that they had a careful analysis of the student body from every one of the feeder schools. However, they had not drawn inferences from that information other than informally. He said that the information had raised questions, and they were trying to analyze this to see if there were trends over time. They were looking at the information in regard to male/female enrollment. They had voluntarily joined a national study on barriers to enrollments in nontraditional occupations.

Dr. Shoenberg thanked the committee for the report.

Re: 1985 ANNUAL REPORT OF THE MONTGOMERY
COUNTY ADVISORY COUNCIL FOR

VOCATIONAL-TECHNICAL EDUCATION

Dr. Carricato introduced James Auerbach, the chairman of the committee.

Mr. Auerbach said that rather than reading the report he would note a few of their principal concerns. He called attention to an article from the American Association of Junior Colleges Journal on the "ambush of vocational education." The article noted an attack on vocational education. Also included were two other related articles. One noted that stiffer high school requirements might be driving up the dropout rate while robbing students of a balanced education. It noted that more was not necessarily better. The second article pointed out the concern of business about the future of high school vocational education. Improvement of academic education should not be done at the expense of vocational education.

Mr. Auerbach stated that an important concern of the council was improved articulation between the college and the public schools. They commended the Board for the support it had given to the original articulation agreements between Montgomery College and the MCPS. They looked forward to more formalized program articulation agreements between the two institutions, and they offered their assistance to facilitate such agreements. They noted with approval on-going efforts to establish the 2+2 tech-prep programs. They hoped that the committee would be invited to participate in the planning and development of such programs, and they believed that the establishment of 2+2 technology programs would help to assure the continuation of up-to-date, high quality vocational programs.

Mr. Auerbach reported that the committee had been following national legislation and expressed their appreciation for Dr. Carricato's efforts in this area. The committee had transmitted their concerns to the representatives of the U.S. Department of Education, the American Vocational Association, the Maryland State Council on Vocational Education, and Congressional committee staff members. He said that the regulations had eased, and they hoped that future amendments to the vocational education act would allow greater flexibility in the area of federal funding for existing programs as well as support for innovative programs. They also supported full funding of the Carl Perkins Vocational Education Act at the level of \$950,000.

Mr. Auerbach said they were concerned about what appeared to be the less than enthusiastic support by some members of the Board for the opening of the second career center. They strongly believed that an up-county career center would serve the needs of MCPS students as well as the needs of business and labor in the county. They felt that a second center would assist in the development of 2+2 tech/prep programs and in strengthening articulation between MCPS and Montgomery College. It would help to assure a smooth transition for students combining technological courses with advanced academic and business programs at postsecondary institutions. They hoped that the Board would give full support to the opening of an up-county career center as quickly as possible.

Mr. Auerbach noted that the committee was a mandated organization by the Annotated Code of Maryland. In order to do its job it needed to have a close working relationship with both Montgomery College and MCPS. He expressed their appreciation for the outstanding assistance and input of Dr. Carricato. He said that the excellent programs run under Dr. Carricato's direction had recently been recognized as exemplary by the U.S. Department of Education.

In regard to the up-county center, Dr. Cronin pointed out that they would be opening two new high schools up-county in the near future. There were also minicenters up-county. He explained that part of the tension they were feeling was the programs at the new high schools, the effect on the minicenters, and the cost of an up-county center. He suggested that the committee make its concerns known to the Council and the county executive because they were the funding agencies. Mr. Auerbach replied that they would be happy to do that. Dr. Floyd asked about a Board action that would connote enthusiastic support for an up-county center. Mr. Auerbach explained that their concern was about the date for the possible opening of the center. He felt that any effort to move that up would be appreciated. Dr. Shoenberg thanked the committee for their report.

Re: AUDIT COMMITTEE ISSUES: FURNITURE
AND EQUIPMENT STUDY AND UPDATE ON
ACCOUNTING, PAYROLL, PERSONNEL SYSTEMS

Mr. Richard Fazakerley, associate superintendent for supportive services, stated that the next two items had been discussed at some length by the Audit Committee. He said that the paper on the inventory issue selected the primary recommendations from the DEA study. He thought that these recommendations would demonstrate the interaction of the Audit Committee, the internal auditors, and the operating staff.

Mr. Fazakerley said that the first item was the need for a catalogue to identify furniture and equipment to be capitalized. They had found a way to convert an existing catalogue and use it as an appendix to the property control manual. The catalogue was presently being used by accounting personnel, supply personnel, coordinators, and in some instances by schools. At present they did not have a property control manual per se, but they did have other documents that were utilized and could be updated. He had just reviewed an outline for a manual which was being developed by Mr. Mason Nelson, the audit team, and appropriate staff. On December 16 he expected to refine the proposed manual because at that time they would have some decision on the use of bar coding. There was a schedule for the development of the manual which they hoped to have by June 30.

Mr. Fazakerley stated that the third item had to do with budgeting, accounting, and reporting on furniture and equipment using the object class. The FY 1987 budget would incorporate the recommendation. The next two items had to do with the information flowing to managers and their supervisors about the conduct of equipment inventory operations. They would have a system of semiannual reports which Mr.

Nelson would provide to Mr. Stafford which would cover monthly operations in the inventory system. The reports would look at accuracy, promptness, responsiveness, and understanding of the accountability responsibility. There would be an annual report which he would prepare. The semiannual reports would be provided to the area associates and the deputy so that they could follow through on any difficulties. Dr. Cody asked that he receive a copy of the semiannual reports as well. Mr. Fazakerley indicated that the first semiannual report would be prepared for the July 1 to December 31 period and would be available in February, 1986.

Mr. Fazakerley said that the last item had to do with the use of a bar code system to speed up the productivity and accuracy of inventory taking. Staff had visited Towson and the University of Maryland, and a committee would be preparing its report on December 5. They were working now to determine the costs involved in the implementation and maintenance phases as well as the cost avoidance that would come from this system.

Dr. Steve Frankel, director of accountability, commented that this report had been almost a model in terms of implementation of a management study. He was pleased that everything was going so well.

Dr. Cronin raised a question about the responsibilities for the random sampling of inventories as listed on page XI. Dr. Frankel replied that his office had maintained that there was no way they could do a continual audit of the inventory process. To meet this half way, they had amended the contracts of their contract auditors who would be making spot checks in the schools. They would look at 10 or 15 items to make sure they were on the inventory list and then look at the inventory list and see if they could locate particular items. Mr. Fazakerley disagreed and thought they should have an inventory control system check. He said this should be conducted by an internal audit, supplemented by external audits. However, bar coding might make a difference in this situation.

Dr. Cronin asked Dr. Frankel if the reports in items 4 and 5 satisfied the need for internal control to do spot checking. Dr. Frankel replied that it would depend on the back-up for these reports. He explained they wanted to raise the status of inventory taking because basically the overall view of property wasn't taken that seriously. Dr. Cody read page XI as the Department of School Services seeing that records were kept accurately. The recommendation went on to suggest specifically how this might be done and the way it suggested looked like the audit process. He thought they might have a terminology issue here. It would be up to Mr. Fazakerley and his staff to decide how they wanted to be sure that the records were kept accurately.

Mrs. Slye recalled that the August document had given some cost estimates on bar coding. She said that if they wanted to implement bar coding in the near future, there were cost considerations that would have to be part of the budget discussion. Mr. Fazakerley replied that the December 15 due date for the decision made it

possible to include any recommendations in the upcoming budget. Mrs. Slye asked if they would be planning to take interim action if there were problems which were included in the semiannual reports. Mr. Fazakerley indicated that there would be follow-up action on the individual reports as there had been in the past, but the semiannual reports would give greater visibility to the inventory process. Dr. Pitt added that in the past when auditing reports had come to him he had seen to it that corrections were made, and he thought the idea of the monitoring process getting up to the superintendent level would be very helpful.

Mrs. Praisner had a concern about monthly reporting and wondered about the necessity for doing this every month. Mr. Fazakerley explained that in the past they had done this by category of equipment each month. For example, they might do musical instruments one month and science equipment the next in order to minimize the impact on the schools and to spread the workload over the year. Mrs. Praisner wondered whether the inventory would be given more importance if the whole thing were done at once rather than monthly. Dr. Cody commented that this would be a tremendous undertaking. Dr. Cronin suggested that bar coding might change this process from a monumental task to a relatively simple job with the computer doing the work.

Mr. Fazakerley stated that the second part of the discussion had to do with a review of some of the difficulties surrounding the accounting and financial information systems. He recalled that in 1981 the Board of Education had commissioned a study on where they were going with ADP technology. After nine months and hundreds of staff hours they had come up with 18 different areas for the development of management information systems to support student services. In the area of business services, nine areas had been identified including personnel, operating, accounting, and payroll. In other areas they had identified systems to help in the transmittal and exchange of data between schools and administrative areas. In 1982-83 they got the new computer and added some positions for systems development and programming. They believed they were on a course which included the establishment of additional positions to develop the systems, but when they arrived at this point they faced a ceiling on administrative positions. At this point they decided to go for an off-the-shelf system for accounting and payroll and keep working on the personnel system in-house. He said they had had difficulties with the accounting system and were working on that, and at present they were looking for a payroll off-the-shelf system to be modified.

Mr. Fazakerley reported that he had asked Mr. Stephen Raucher, director of the Department of Management Information and Computer Services, to take on an additional assignment to coordinate efforts in accounting, payroll and procurement in the area of systems development. He said that they met every two weeks to discuss timelines for these various projects as they had been doing since June.

Mr. Raucher explained that he would give an overview on the business, personnel, payroll, and financial systems. On the one side they had information about staff which was the personnel information system, and on the other side they had information about money which was the financial data base. The bridge between the two systems was the payroll because it had to have information about people and it had to pay them. It was his objective to make the Board understand that payroll had to have both ends of the bridge anchored firmly before it could do anything.

In regard to the personnel system, Mr. Raucher stated that applicant tracking was already in use. They were also working in the area of certification and looking at who was up for certification and what the certification requirements were. Position control was the relationship between the budget document and the number of positions. Salary encumbrance was an area unique to school systems because most business did not calculate the fiscal effect of hiring someone. Another area was personnel evaluation in terms of who was up for evaluation, the date of the last evaluation, and the name of the evaluator. In addition, they needed to do simulations from salary simulation to fringe benefit simulation. He reported that the whole area of fringe benefits had to be included in the system as well. The data base would have to have demographic information about people and well as salary, placement on salary scale, dependents, and state of residence.

On the financial side, Mr. Raucher included the general ledger, accounts payable, accounts receivable, budget, inventory, purchasing, and management reporting. In the old system, management reporting was really using accounting reports as opposed to true management reports. He indicated that the data base was very wedded to the chartered accounts. They had to have a flexible series of levels so that they could accrue costs at the various levels and maintain account balances so that they did not overspend accounts.

Mr. Raucher reported that the payroll side was about 22 years old, but they had never missed a payroll and had a good record in that area. The first thing they had to do was calculate the gross pay to an individual; however, this was extremely complex because a number of employees held multiple jobs in the system. Currently they were running eight different payrolls to accomplish this, and their objective was to get down to one or two payrolls. Their goal was to have one check for each employee although there were problems because certain work was not eligible for retirement and might have a different leave status. One of the problems with the current system was they had two ways of tracking employee time. Professional time was tracked by days, and supporting services time was tracked by hours. In addition, they had 18 to 20 different kinds of leave to consider. They expected to have a report for Mr. Fazakerley in early December which identified the various issues, and at present there were 264 items in the data base. They hoped to winnow down the list and come to the Board with a dozen major items for the Board's attention.

Mr. Raucher said that after all these considerations including state and federal taxes, they had involuntary and voluntary deductions to consider. Ultimately they created a paycheck. Now they had to get that check to the employee, and there were three different ways of doing that. At present they were using pony distribution and the U.S. mail. They did have to look at the whole issue of direct deposit and see what could be done there.

After the employee was paid, they had to look to whether these monies were properly accounted for on the financial side. They had to show how much of the person's salary was to be charged to what account, and they had to send out money for the fringe benefit deductions. In addition, they had to supply tapes to social security as well as taxes.

Mr. Raucher reported that they had currently finished the design of the financial data base in house and were in the process of loading accounts to it. By the spring they expected to be able to provide managers with account status information. The second activity would be to bring up the general ledger and vendor accounts payable. He explained that they had to run in parallel with the existing system to assure the auditors that they were maintaining control of the system. They also had to decide on the best time fiscally to cut over to the new system.

Mr. Raucher said that on the personnel side the data base was moving ahead and parts of it were in place. They expected to complete that data base next year and would start to bring in payroll and fringe benefit information. He pointed out that there were a number of systems out there that had to be interfaced with whatever new system they came up with which did take a lot of resources to do. For example, there was a warehouse system which had to be interfaced with the new FIS.

Mr. Raucher showed the members of the Board a chart on the resources being used to implement the various systems as well a timeline for the various activities.

Dr. Cronin asked that this topic be scheduled at an Audit Committee meeting so that committee members would have an opportunity to raise questions. Dr. Shoenberg thanked Mr. Fazakerley and Mr. Raucher for their presentations.

Re: SUPERINTENDENT'S PRESENTATION OF
CAPITAL BUDGET

Dr. Cody stated that no purpose would be served by describing the contents of the capital budget. He indicated that one of the issues that the document itself did not resolve was the scheduling of the building of the two new high schools up-county. The Council had tentatively approved a long-range CIP leaving it up to the Board of Education to decide which school to build first. He would have a report to the Board which recommended building Quince Orchard High School first to open in 1988 with Watkins Mill to open in 1989. He

would recommend that they secure the funds this year to do the site work for both schools which would give some assurances to the community. He said they had been in touch with a number of community leaders concerning the two high schools, and he had been assured by Tim O'Shea that they would not take a position one way or the other in terms of choosing which school to open first.

Mrs. Praisner questioned whether they were meeting the needs and addressing enrollment projections and growth up-county. She did not feel comfortable that they were keeping pace with the growth. She felt they had to revisit the question of size of elementary schools and the numbers of them. In building larger schools she was not certain they were building adequate space, but she did not want to overbuild in this time period. She thought they were addressing this by moving towards types of buildings that could be relocated, but she was concerned about long-range planning issues and whether they were on target. She suggested they take some time to discuss these issues before they approved the capital budget. Dr. Cody explained the plan to build schools of 600-650 capacity with modular additions, if needed, to bring them up to 800 capacity. He said the one advantage of schools of this size was that even if population were to decline, the educational program would not be in jeopardy. He pointed out that the problem down-county was that so many schools were built with a capacity of 300 and when the enrollment went down, the question of school closings came up.

Mr. Ewing was concerned about the Woodfield area where a school would not be available until 1989. Their forecast for this area had been lower than actual enrollment, and they had always been behind in school construction and never seemed to catch up. He thought it would be easy to justify a school in the Woodfield area for the fall of 1987 rather than 1989 and the same thing might be true about the Germantown area. He was also beginning to become alarmed about the absence of any discussion about growth in junior high schools. They would have roughly 10 new elementary schools planning, and he assumed that these children would be at the junior high school in 1990 and 1991.

Dr. George Fisher, director of planning, explained that the first step in the Woodfield situation was the addition at Cedar Grove. When the addition was finished, there could be some redistricting between Woodfield and Cedar Grove. He admitted that the situation was tight and that Clarksburg and Damascus would be tight as well. He thought there could be a justification for planning the new school in this budget with construction in next year's budget.

Dr. Fisher explained that the junior high school was tied to the new high school and the moving of all ninth graders out of the intermediate school. When they did that, they increased by one third the capacity of the intermediate schools. He did not feel they would have a problem at the intermediate level until after 1995 and then only at King. He thought there were ways of addressing this without building another intermediate school.

In regard to portable classrooms, Mr. Ewing pointed out that there was a proposal for substantial number of additional portables as well as the continued use of portables. He suggested they had a standard for the use of portables. He assumed that this was tied to the capacity of the core facilities at a school as to whether they would add portables or an addition to the school. Dr. Cody agreed that this could be documented and shared with the public.

Dr. Cronin said that one of the questions raised was whether the site for each of the elementary schools was phased in with building so that they knew where in the up-county the major development was taking place. He wanted to know how staff phased in building permits. Dr. Cody agreed to check into this. Dr. Cronin also inquired about whether the yield factors they were using were accurate or needed to be updated. He was hearing from the community that these yields should be higher.

Mrs. Praisner inquired about preliminary approval information from the IAC. Dr. Phil Rohr replied that they were expecting about \$5.6 million from the state plus funds for portables. Mr. Ewing suggested that it would be helpful if the Board and the Council had a table which showed what the capital budget covered in previous years and what was new and what the additional cost was.

Re: BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS

Mr. Foubert stated that after the November all-day discussion regarding the attendance policy he had decided to drop his alternative of school service to combat the problem of class cutting. As a result of discussions he had had with Board members, he had decided to introduce amendments to the resolution which he would put in writing at a later date. These would include a change in the penalty for the fifth unexcused absence and include the transcript's showing the withdrawal with the grade the student had at the time of withdrawal.

RESOLUTION NO. 542-85 Re: EXECUTIVE SESSION - DECEMBER 10, 1985

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Dr. Cronin 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 December 10, 1985, 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.

RESOLUTION NO. 543-85 Re: MINUTES OF SEPTEMBER 17, 1985

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

RESOLVED, That the minutes of September 17, 1985, be approved.

RESOLUTION NO. 544-85 Re: MINUTES OF OCTOBER 30, 1985

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

RESOLVED, That the minutes of October 30, 1985, be approved.

RESOLUTION NO. 545-85 Re: APPOINTMENTS TO THE TITLE IX
ADVISORY COMMITTEE

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

WHEREAS, The Board of Education determined on July 19, 1977, that a Title IX Advisory Committee should be established; and
WHEREAS, The superintendent suggested that the committee be composed of 16 members, namely,

- 3 Montgomery County Public Schools staff members appointed by the superintendent in consultation with the employee organizations and the principals' associations
- 3 Student members recommended by the superintendent in consultation with the Montgomery County Region of the Maryland Association of Student Councils and Montgomery County Junior Council
- 8 Community members appointed by the Board of Education
- 1 Member either from the MCPS staff or the community (at the Board of Education's discretion)
- 1 Ex officio member from the Department of Human Relations

and

WHEREAS, Currently there are eleven vacancies existing on the committee, namely,

1 representative from MCEA
7 community representatives
3 student representatives

now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education appoint the following students, effective immediately, to serve on the Title IX Advisory Committee for a one-year term:

Karen Furlani, Wootton
Annette Lane, Blair
Irving Williams, Woodward

Re: 1985 FACILITIES UPDATE FOR AREAS 1 AND 3

Mrs. Slye moved and Dr. Cronin seconded the following:

WHEREAS, The Board of Education found it necessary during 1985 to have a special study of Area 2 school facilities that is nearing completion; and

WHEREAS, This special effort has reduced the time available to perform a complete update in 1985 for Areas 1 and 3 school facilities; and

WHEREAS, The Board is likely to adopt a new calendar to better synchronize the facilities planning and capital budget processes that will result in preliminary recommendations for the 1986 update in May 1986; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the Board hereby suspends the prescribed processes and time lines in its Long-range Facilities Planning policy relating to annual updates for the 15-Year Comprehensive Master Plan for Educational Facilities; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the superintendent is directed to provide a modified 1985 update for educational facilities in administrative areas 1 and 3 to deal only with those schools which require some relief from overutilization before September 1986.

RESOLUTION NO. 546-85 Re: NATIONAL SCHOOL BOARD ASSOCIATION

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

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education authorize a trial membership in the National School Boards Association Large District Forum.

Re: ITEMS OF INFORMATION

Board members received the following items of information:

1. Staff Response to Counseling and Guidance Committee Report
2. Procedures for Approval of Research in MCPS

Re: ADJOURNMENT

The president adjourned the meeting at 11:40 p.m.

President

Secretary

WSC:mlw