

APPROVED
44-1986

Rockville, Maryland
November 11, 1986

The Board of Education of Montgomery County met in regular session at the Carver Educational Services Center, Rockville, Maryland, on Tuesday, November 11, 1986, at 10:05 a.m.

ROLL CALL Present: Dr. James E. Cronin, President
in the Chair*
Mrs. Sharon DiFonzo
Mr. Blair G. Ewing
Dr. Jeremiah Floyd
Mrs. Marilyn J. Praisner
Dr. Robert E. Shoenberg*
Mr. Eric Steinberg

Absent: Mrs. Mary Margaret Slye

Others Present: Dr. Wilmer S. Cody, Superintendent of Schools
Dr. Harry Pitt, Deputy Superintendent
Mr. Thomas S. Fess, Parliamentarian

RESOLUTION NO. 597-86 Re: BOARD AGENDA - NOVEMBER 11, 1986

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

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education adopt its agenda for November 11, 1986, with the deletion of the item on amendments to the personnel classification and pay plan.

*Dr. Shoenberg joined the meeting at this point.

Re: FOREIGN LANGUAGE PROGRAM REQUIREMENTS:
NEXT STEPS

Dr. Mimi Met introduced Ambassador Raymond Ewing, Dean of the language school of the Foreign Service Institute, and Dr. Richard Tucker, president of the Center for Applied Linguistics. Dr. Cody reported that the major purpose of the discussion was to talk about the purposes and values of students learning a foreign language. On behalf of the Board, Dr. Floyd stated that it was a commendable effort to reach out to people with other kinds of experience to join the Board in this very significant dialogue.

* Dr. Cronin joined the meeting at this point.

Ambassador Ewing explained that he was not a professional language person; he was a career foreign service officer with the Department of State for 29 years. Most recently he was the ambassador to Cyprus before taking the position of dean of foreign language studies about a year and a half ago. In the diplomatic service it was important to have oral and writing skills in English, but a second language study

was also of vital importance. He noted that Washington was a world capital and a city with embassies as well as the headquarters of the World Bank, IMF, and the Organization of American States. In addition, they had a large immigrant population.

Ambassador Ewing pointed out that the study of a foreign language was intellectually stimulating and helped one to better understand his or her own language and culture. He said that what was particularly important in foreign language was proficiency, the ability to actually use and comprehend another language. From his point of view, the purpose of foreign language study was to be able to communicate effectively abroad, deliver a message, and understand what was being said.

Ambassador Ewing noted that it was surprising to people that there was no foreign language requirement for the Foreign Service at entry. He explained that many people they were most anxious to have in the State Department had not had an opportunity in American colleges and universities to really use a foreign language to the point where they could use it effectively to function abroad. However, they did give an advantage to those who had foreign languages of national importance including Chinese, Japanese, Arabic, and Russian. However, before an officer could be tenured after four or five years, they had to show proficiency in a foreign language. He said that the average entry age was 31 and at present most of these new employees did have language credentials. They also required foreign language for officers to serve in particular positions abroad. They had identified 1,600 jobs that required language at a particular level. In their most recent statistics, about 74 percent of those jobs were filled by people who had the full qualification in the language. Ambassador Ewing stated that they also had a new program where they were trying hard to increase the overall language competence of everyone serving in their posts abroad. This was called their "enhanced language post program," and identified seven posts where everyone would have language at a professional level or at least would have an opportunity to take a short-term familiarization course before reporting for assignment. He reported that they were not particularly happy with their foreign language situation because language training was expensive. In the past year a report was done studying how well they were doing in the four hard languages and specific suggestions were made to improve competence. The recommendations were to take people at an earlier age in their careers and train them to higher levels of proficiency by using them more than once in assignments where the language were used. The report stated that there were no miracles and no shortcuts. There was a need for good students, good teachers, and hard work. The four precepts were the following: (1) young students tended to learn faster than older students, (2) those with natural aptitude tended to learn better than those without, (3) highly motivated students tended to learn better than those who were not, and all students needed ample time to learn a hard language well.

Ambassador Ewing said that at the Foreign Service Institute they taught about 45 languages to government employees and their adult

family members. The programs lasted from six to ten weeks for familiarization courses, 20 weeks for full basic courses in French and Spanish, and 44 weeks for the hard languages. They also had four field schools in Chinese, Japanese, Korean, and Arabic which were two year programs, a year in Washington and a year overseas in the language environment. They had no more than six students in a class, and all of their teachers were native speakers of the language. Most people attended six hours a day, five days a week. He said it was important that they have a purpose when they taught a language. For them, it was to prepare people for assignments abroad for government agencies.

Dr. Tucker noted that he was a graduate of Richard Montgomery High School, and he was pleased that his own foreign language studies started at Richard Montgomery. His daughters had also studied foreign languages in the Montgomery County Public Schools. His language experience in MCPS shaped his educational and career choices.

Dr. Tucker said it was his personal belief that they should work as diligently as they could and ascribe the highest possible educational priorities to the development of a language-competent American society. It was extremely important that they encourage the development of the highest possible proficiency in speaking, reading, writing, and understanding English on the part of all of their students. Simultaneously it was important that they offer their youngsters the opportunity to acquire the highest degree of facility possible in some other target language.

Dr. Tucker commented that for many years he was a professor of linguistics at McGill University in Montreal. He had had an opportunity to work in Canada and other countries to implement, evaluate, and describe innovative language education programs. When they talked with parents and educators, they asked five basic questions:

- (1) If an innovative program was implemented and increased the teaching of foreign language as a part of the basic curriculum, what would be the implications for mother tongue mastery?
- (2) Suppose they introduced some innovations in the curriculum, what would happen in terms of content subject mastery?
- (3) If they introduced the non-intensive or the intensive study of a foreign language, what would happen to children's cognitive development?
- (4) What about the child's personal or social development?
- (5) Are there any things they should know about how best to introduce a foreign language to enhance the likelihood that the language would actually be well learned ?

Dr. Tucker said it was his belief based on his experience around the world that the summary statement prepared for the Board represented an accurate reflection of the state of their research knowledge. If they introduced the child to foreign language study, there was good evidence that this would not harm the mother tongue language

development, and there was a good deal of evidence that as one increased the intensity of the foreign language exposure that this might have a facilitating effect on mother tongue development. With respect to content mastery, there was no evidence that taking time away from math, social studies, and science would result in a decrease in the ability to master some of these subjects. In regard to cognitive development, there was no indication that the child would be held back. There was good evidence that as one moved toward a high level of proficiency in a second language that there were cognitive benefits that resulted. Regarding attitudes and social development, they had found an opportunity to study another language encouraged students to develop more tolerant and open-minded views toward other peoples. In regard to a child's being able to function in the language, they would find three favors important here. The first was they had to allow sufficient time for foreign language study. They had to begin early. In addition, they had to bring together the language teacher and content subject teacher so that they would work together and cross fertilize the concepts developed in one course with those developed in another.

Dr. Tucker said he would say to parents that from their perspective when they talked about disadvantaged it was the monolingual English-speaking American who might be the most disadvantaged of all. They saw distinct benefits that accrued to the individual who had an opportunity to begin to or continue to study a second language in the school system. They saw benefits in terms of positive effects on mother tongue development. They saw positive effects on cognitive development and attitudinal development. He remarked that he and his family had come back to Montgomery County because it was possible for his children to continue their foreign language study and add another language to their repertoire. He gave his personal support for the draft statement before the Board and for the language education profession.

Dr. Cronin thanked Dr. Met for bringing Ambassador Ewing and Dr. Tucker to participate in the discussion. Dr. Floyd said that the Board would be interested in knowing how the Canadians answered the series of questions raised by Dr. Tucker.

Mr. Steinberg stated that he supported the proposal, but several considerations should be taken into account before implementing the plan. He asked if the speakers could provide him with copies of the studies they had cited. He said that his language study had helped him in his social development. However, he pointed out that not all students were national merit scholars, and an extra burden might be detrimental. From his personal experience, the extra workload could be troublesome. He had found a lot of language instruction to focus on rote memorization and not culture and diversity. He thought the opportunity was excellent and should be there, but they should look at these considerations.

Dr. Cronin reported that they had a statement of purpose before them and a couple of statements relating to the PROGRAM OF STUDIES, a year and a half revision process, and funds in certain budget years. He

wondered if they would have the ability to get the teachers if the Board decided to implement this statement of purpose.

Dr. Cody stated that opportunities to study language in secondary schools were quite extensive in Montgomery County. For example, about 80 percent of the students finishing high school had studied a foreign language for one or more years. They could look at what was going on, say it was great, and continue what they were doing. Another way was to say that students would be better served by more in-depth study and a higher level of proficiency; therefore, they wanted to increase the opportunities. There were several alternatives for this option. The third issue was whether or not foreign language was so valuable and important to require it of all students. Then they would be involved with the other 20 percent. The Department of Educational Accountability was looking at who these students were. If they required all students to study a language, they had the options of doing it in high school, doing it in high school and elementary school, doing it in elementary school only, summer school, or all of the above.

Dr. Cody thought that any of the options could be accommodated in terms of the employment of teachers in Montgomery County. Dr. Met was advocating an elementary school program which was supplemental to what they now had which would mean adding teachers with a \$6 million price tag. If it became a requirement in high school, it would not cost anymore. He reported that he did have a cost paper which would be shared with the Board.

Mr. Ewing asked Ambassador Ewing if they had people who were unable to learn the language and who dropped out. Ambassador Ewing replied that not very many students were in this category. They had about 500 students at any one time, and they used the modern language aptitude test which gave them some idea of whether there were going to be problems. They had some degree of flexibility for grouping students. There were cases where the person could not learn the language without a lot of time, cost, and effect on other students. This happened very infrequently, but he did think there was a lot of preselection that took place before it became a problem.

In regard to the 20 percent not taking language training, Mr. Ewing asked if everyone could learn a foreign language and benefit from the learning of that language. He asked how they persuaded people who did not see the benefits to be willing participants in such a program. Dr. Tucker replied that everyone could learn a foreign or second language. He noted that the United States stood out in its monolinguality. In many parts of the world, second language study was a part of life and bilinguality was the status quo. Research looking at second or foreign language mastery as a function of socioeconomic level and I.Q. found no relationship. People at the bottom end of the spectrum were as able to develop proficiency in the second language as those at the top.

Dr. Tucker said that another question was persuading those who did

not see foreign language study as an option. In Canada they spent a lot of time, two to three nights a week for ten to twelve weeks each term, talking to PTAs, parent groups, principals, and superintendents about benefits that could accrue to a child adding a language. They found that children in technical/vocational tracks could use the language as they moved into multi-ethnic situations or travelled abroad with the army or on vacation.

Dr. Shoenberg noted that they had before them an argument for a language requirement. They could decide as a county they were going to sufficiently reorganize their system of instruction to introduce language and have each student engaged in a language study at the level of effort put forward in most European countries. This would take an enormous redesign of the school system. It would be a question of resources and teachers available for the elementary level. If they stopped short of doing that, the question for him became "when we are going to do what." If they were going to require that all students had some contact with the study of a language, the place to do that was the elementary school. None of the arguments that he saw in this document was an argument for a language requirement that began in the secondary schools. There were several social goods in addition to the cognitive value for the individual that seemed to become the principal argument for the study of a language. These had to do with people needed by the nation who were proficient in a foreign language and with cross-cultural understanding. It seemed to him that the latter could be enhanced by language study, but the study of language was not the only way to do that. The former argued for producing the kind of people Ambassador Ewing was talking about. He did not know whether they could afford this or if they could stand the redesign of the system. Short of that, they really had two goals here. One was to produce cross-cultural understanding and the other was to produce people who were proficient. He would go for some kind of a cross-cultural requirement in the high schools that might or might not involve language. He would certainly go for providing at the secondary level an opportunity for an intensive study of language. He hoped that something like this would start with the program at Richard Montgomery.

Dr. Shoenberg said he had paid particular attention to Ambassador Ewing's statement that "whatever we are going to do, we ought to know why we are doing it." He did not yet see a relationship between the arguments that have been put forth in support of the study of foreign language, all of which were appropriate but not in all contexts and for all programs. He hoped they were going to see a recommendation that made clear some relationship between what they proposed to do and why they were going to do it. He did not think that nexus had been built yet.

Dr. Cronin commented that Dr. Shoenberg had well stated their next task. He recalled that when he started teaching Latin at Montgomery College he found that a graduate of MCPS did not know what a noun was.

Mrs. DiFonzo commented that they taught foreign languages in terms of nouns, verbs, declining, and diagramming sentences. That student could still speak the language even though the student did not know what a noun was. This was a fundamental issue they had to grapple with. How were they going to teach that language? Were they going to teach it in a noun-verb context or in a communication context? These would require different strategies and levels. They also had to deal with how much time they wanted to put into this. She said they also had to decide how they would define a proficiency. She said that when she was out of the country two months ago almost everyone spoke some English. These people had starting learning English when they were 13 and were required to study English for six years. She suggested that they had to be aware of budget implications and should receive a list of options. Dr. Cronin added that these options should include some indication of what their measures of success should be.

Dr. Cody stated that their first decision should be what they wanted to accomplish. Once they had that clear, the methods and options would be easy to lay out.

Mrs. Praisner said she would be interested in knowing about the development of the method of teaching and the difference she saw in teaching Japanese, for example, as opposed to instruction in French and Spanish. Through the federal government, she had had instruction in order to be able to read a language as opposed to conversing. The school system had to address the outcomes they wanted and had not done that yet.

Dr. Shoenberg remarked that in some of their thinking they tended to overlook what happened in the J/I/M schools. Secondly, he hoped that when they designed this program they would do it with some level of realism about the nature and quality of the teaching of foreign language.

Dr. Cronin stated that they had come to the conclusion that language was valuable. The next step was the hard one to take. They had to look at how they implemented this, where they implemented it, the cost, and the purpose. He said that when they next discussed this he wanted to see it couched in a variety of optional directions, ways to accomplish them, costs to accomplish them, and outcomes to be delivered by that process. Dr. Cody stated that they would link specific purposes to the general agreement that language was valuable. They would define the objectives, lay out one or more programs to accomplish those objectives, and the consequences. He thought the different objectives would be fairly easy to identify and describe from the conversation they had had. They might have this in the form of alternatives or a specific recommendation.

Dr. Floyd asked about the length of time for a review of the existing foreign languages in the PROGRAM OF STUDIES. Dr. Met replied that there were two separate processes. The first was the review of the current PROGRAM OF STUDIES which was a relatively short-term process.

However, to get that rewritten would require about a year. The last time this was totally redone was about 15 years ago. The Maryland State Department of Education had issued a curriculum framework in foreign languages which aimed toward the communication skills. She reported that the whole profession was moving toward a philosophy of language use rather than knowledge about language, but this did not mean that they stopped teaching grammar. It would take time to train teachers not only to teach a revised program but in some instances to train teachers to participate in the development of a PROGRAM OF STUDIES.

Dr. Shoenberg asked if they would be looking at the PROGRAM OF STUDIES as a revision of what they were now doing rather than looking at what they ought to be doing. He said that the effectiveness of the program needed to be a question and the logistics needed to be a question. It seemed to him the way they looked at what they now did would depend on what it was they decided they ought to do. He would rather have "what they ought to do" driving the system. Dr. Met agreed. She commented that if there were any lesson they had learned from the elementary immersion program it was that it was possible to teach people to become fluent in another language without focusing on conjugating verbs. She said they would look at secondary programs to focus in on language skills.

Dr. Cronin thanked Ambassador Ewing and Dr. Tucker for participating in the discussion.

Re: REPORT ON ENROLLMENT AND TUITION
PROCUREMENTS FOR NONRESIDENT STUDENTS

Dr. Cronin thanked staff for the quality of the report. He called attention to the statement the superintendent had provided and the statement on next steps. The superintendent would be drafting a revised policy for Board consideration at a future meeting. A policy statement would be subject to public comment and a public hearing, and there would be ample opportunity for members of the community to address particular concerns.

Dr. Cody commented that the report was very thorough, indicated they had some problems, and gave them suggestions for solving those problems. Dr. Pitt stated it made sense to have one group dealing with waivers rather than five or six different people. Some of the concerns were focused on policy consideration including a definition of crisis. Dr. Cody added that the ambiguity over a definition of crisis made it difficult for the staff to make decisions consistently.

Mr. Clifford M. Baacke, director of the Division of Administrative Analysis and Audits, explained that DEA was asked to undertake the audit primarily to look at existing policies and produces, determine their consistency and completeness, to evaluate current operations in terms of those policies, and see whether there might be modifications of the administrative functioning of the process. Initially they were not asked to go into areas where new policy could be written.

Nevertheless, in the course of the study a great many broader policy questions did come up.

Mr. Baacke stated that the report ended up with three topics, rather than the two they started with. They had some findings and some recommendations which had to do with potential changes to clarify or improve the current policies. They also raised a set of issues in Chapter 10 which were broader policy questions the Board might want to take up. Then they had a section on a number of administrative matters that could be taken care of.

Mr. Baacke reported that the current process began at the school level. A student planning to attend MCPS goes to the local school, and the local school has to make one of three determinations. The first one is whether this is an international student or a U.S. student. If it is an international student, they are referred to the International Student Admissions Office. For all other students, the school must then decide whether the student is resident or nonresident. If the school determines they are residents, they are enrolled. If the school determines they are nonresidents, the school does not enroll them unless either tuition is paid or the process of asking for tuition waiver is initiated. If the student gets to the International Admissions Office, one of the many things the office does is to make the same determination that the school has to make. If a student is determined to be nonresident and elects to pay tuition, it is collected and the student enrolled. If they are declared nonresident and wish to apply for a waiver, they can apply. The application then goes to the tuition waiver review committee which makes the determination. If they determine to waive tuition, the school is notified and the student enrolled. If they determine that tuition has to be paid, the student can go to the school, pay the tuition, and enroll.

Mr. Baacke said there was an appeal process from the tuition waiver review committee which could go through any number of levels. In a certain number of cases, this reached the Board. He stated that the administration of that process was rather fragmented. The school had the initial responsibility for a determination, and the International Student Admissions Office had the same responsibility for a subset of students. The tuition waiver process was run as a function of one of the departments under Dr. Fountain's office. The financial implications were divided between the school which was supposed to collect the first payment of tuition and Financial Services which was responsible for the continuing collection and record keeping. Reports could emerge from any of those offices, and even DEA was getting involved with the inclusion of resident and nonresident students in the enrollment report going to the State. Mr. Baacke explained that one of their administrative and policy suggestions was to consider centralizing as much of the process as they could. Dr. Floyd asked if Mr. Baacke would identify the distinction between international student, U.S. student, and nonresident. Mr. Baacke replied that whether a student was resident or nonresident had nothing to do with citizenship. Whether a student was an international student or a U.S. citizen had nothing to do with the

determination of where the student was resident. They considered all non-U.S. citizens to be international students although this definition was not written. That had nothing to do with the question of whether they were resident or not. For example, an international student could be the son of an ambassador living in Montgomery County with an established residence. The residency question which was more germane to the question of paying tuition was the determination of whether the person had a bona fide residence in Montgomery County. If the student was less than 18 years of age, the determination was the residency of the parent or the legal guardian. If the student had reached the age of majority, it could be their own address. If they did not have a bona fide residence, they were considered nonresident regardless of their nationality.

Mrs. Praisner said the implication was that policy and regulation changes needed to be made. One of the issues was the definition of a crisis situation. She had requested copies of policies from other jurisdictions, but in a brief examination of those policies she did not see that issue resolved. She said they could have a more specific definition of a crisis situation. One issue had to do with the situation in the country from which the student had come. She was not sure the staff could define the specific situation for that individual. She was not sure what material would be available for them to better define a crisis. It seemed to her that at some point it would still have to be a judgment decision on the part of staff. She was not sure that she wanted to go into a very detailed definition of a crisis situation which the staff seemed to be recommending.

It seemed to Mr. Ewing that they might not ever be able to do better than the present definition of a crisis situation. He called attention to the first example of political crisis in which a child's aunt wrote a letter stating the student's parents were unable to support him. He did not know how they could investigate that. All they could do in many cases was listen to what people told them and make a judgment. He agreed they should have some definitions of a crisis situation and, in addition, needed to give general guidance about the process by which they expected people to make these decisions. In the end, they were going to have to say that a decision needed to be made on whatever was available. In cases that were troublesome, he would think the person making the decision would want a second opinion.

Dr. Shoenberg said he would echo that, but he would suggest the opportunities the person making these judgments had. In one extreme, Montgomery County could become a part of the sanctuary movement. At the other extreme, they could become as hard-nosed as the very letter of the law. Requests coming to members of Congress were probably about as numerous for immigration cases as they were for almost anything else. He said that they had the problem of their inability to document the situation that existed in the country from which the child came. People might take advantage of the situation, but on the other hand they had people who were really desperate. Meanwhile the child was in Montgomery County, and the question was what they did

with that child. In addition, they were dealing with many guardians who could not afford the tuition. He did not see how they could define anything that would provide good guidance in all situations. He thought they needed suggestions for the level of severity with which they wished to enforce the regulations. He did not think he could write a definition of crisis which would be better than the existing definition.

Dr. Cronin noted that there was a double level of crisis. One was international, and the other was a family crisis. Mr. Baacke stated that as they wrote the report, they agreed with what had been said here. There was no way at the Board table that they would be able to deal with a definition that was so all encompassing it would handle all the cases that would come up. For that reason, the report recommends some changes in the tuition waiver review committee itself to bring some different and broader perspective to making that decision. Nevertheless, he thought there were intermediate levels where the Board could be helpful to staff. He said that at one extreme, even the very broad definition of crisis was not included in the Board policy. This definition was written and put in the administrative regulation. One small first step might be for the Board to see if they agreed with that definition and wanted to elevate it to policy level. There were some categorical situations where the Board could give some guidance as to whether or not their intention was this way or that way. For example, the definition of crisis was oriented to the individual student. There were times when the crisis was taken to be a collective crisis and would include all students from a certain country. They did not have any feedback as to whether the Board intended for there to be a collective crisis which would automatically confer a tuition free status.

Mr. Baacke said that a third step was that except for the few cases that got to the Board on appeal, there was no feedback to the staff as to whether the kinds of precedents the staff was establishing through individual decisions were collectively pointed in a direction acceptable to the Board. There should be a way to confirm that the Board was comfortable or uncomfortable with the decisions.

Mr. Ewing stated that from his point of view putting a broad definition of crisis in the policy was probably a good thing to do. However, he did not know enough about the decisions to provide feedback. With respect to the issue of a collective crisis, he thought the answer for him would be "no." He felt that cases should be dealt with in terms of individual circumstances.

Dr. Pitt did not think it was appropriate for the Board to give staff feedback after the decisions were made. A Board decision gave the staff guidance. He thought that today's discussion with the Board was helpful. He felt that the process would be improved by having one group dealing with the process. They would have better data which would be reviewed to provide feedback. One of the big problems now was that data was difficult to gather and not at all consistent. Mr. Baacke explained that he was not suggesting that the Board second guess the staff on each individual case. He was thinking more in line with whether they tended to be too tough or too lenient.

Mr. Fess called the Board's attention to Chapter 3 and the discussion of Armour vs. the Board of Education of Montgomery County. This was a controlling decision which provided a conceptual framework for the attitude the Board might wish to take in this matter. They could become a sanctuary or be very hard-nosed. He noted that they were an agency of the state and did operate under the guidelines and bylaws of the State Board of Education, the compulsory attendance law, and the concept of free public education. He suggested the Board had to examine how far it wished to go. They had the Texas decisions, and there was recommendation about notification to Immigration and Naturalization Services. He suggested that the Board should consult with its attorneys before reaching any conclusions. He complimented the staff on their very cogent report. He was in favor of the recommendations for centralization and better documentation from the beginning of the process.

Dr. Shoenberg agreed with the recommendation that there be an office responsible for the collection of tuition and monitoring of the process. He suggested that they proceed with this immediately. When they had one place working with these decisions, they would have better consistency and expertise. This also removed the International Students Office from a schizophrenic role. This office saw itself in an advocate role, and it should not be in a judgmental role. He hoped that when they set up the new office, they would find some way of streamlining the appeals process which was enormously burdensome. Mr. Baacke noted that the recommendation was for the hearing officer plan for appeals as they were now using for transfer appeals. Dr. Cronin inquired about the costs of going to a hearing examiner. Mr. Baacke said they could not predict how many cases would get to that level considering all the other changes that were recommended here. Dr. Pitt added that if they had dealt with it the way they did now they would have a limited number of appeals, but if they made it more difficult to receive a waiver, there would be more appeals.

It seemed to Mrs. DiFonzo that the entire issue was a matter of common sense and compassion. She said she was not prepared to offer free tuition to all the little children of the world, but personally she would prefer to err on the side of making mistakes and granting tuition waivers so that children could attend school than having the children sit at home. She thanked Mr. Baacke for an excellent report. She thought they were already erring on the side of reasonableness and compassion because of the appeals she did not see. She would rather have the taxpayers swallow a few extra thousand dollars to make sure these children were being educated.

Dr. Floyd said he would associate himself with Mrs. DiFonzo's remarks. They had a situation with almost all of the 10,000 students mentioned in the report being admitted as residents. There were 234 granted waivers, and 16 where the waivers were denied. It seemed to him that common sense would suggest they err on the side of insuring that children got an education.

Mr. Ewing suggested that they look at the issue of the grace period. They should say they had a grace period or they did not. He did not get a sense from the analysis made by the staff or from the recommendations as to how that might be dealt with best. He was concerned that if they had an announced grace period policy there was the possibility that people would come to the county and use that as a device to escape paying tuition. On the other hand, if the intent was to settle in the county in order to take advantage of the public schools and pay taxes and people were not able to get that done by the time school started, it made good sense to have a grace period. Mr. Baacke replied that they tried to limit their findings and recommendations to identify where the difficulties were rather than taking a position. This was a call either way, and only the superintendent and Board members could make that call. There were situations where people needed to be in the county for short periods of time when they could not technically be declared a resident. Once you crossed the line from no grace period to any grace period, there was a temptation to have grace period on grace period. Some neighboring jurisdictions had grace periods, and others did not.

Dr. Shoenberg remarked that if they had one person monitoring this process, the possibility of their being a grace period became a more sensible alternative. He would not be in favor of their allowing for some specified grace period within regulation but indicating that under extraordinary circumstances a grace period might be granted.

Dr. Cody added that this came up with students who claimed they were moving to the county.

Dr. Cronin asked when staff had to come back to the Board, and Dr. Cody replied that they needed to have something in place by the end of this year to be effective the following year. He suggested that he come back to the Board in February or March. Dr. Pitt indicated that they would be coming in with some budget recommendations related to this.

Dr. Cronin suggested that if Board members had other issues, they should communicate these to the superintendent. Dr. Cody reported that they would deal with issues of organization and procedural change in the context of the budget. Mr. Baacke expressed his appreciation to John Pennington and Sarah Turner for their work on the report.

Re: EXECUTIVE SESSION

The Board met in executive session on personnel issues from 12:10 p.m. to 1:35 p.m.

Re: ANNOUNCEMENT

Dr. Cronin announced that because of a work commitment Mrs. Slye would be unable to join the meeting today.

Re: BOARD/PRESS/VISITOR CONFERENCE

The following individuals appeared before the Board of Education:

1. Phyllis Shaw, Frost parent
2. Joseph Simpson, Montgomery County Taxpayers League
3. Mark Allen, Farmland PTA
4. Vicki Rafel, MCCPTA
5. Thomas Clemens, Landon Systems

RESOLUTION NO. 598-86 Re: UTILIZATION OF FY 1987 FUTURE SUPPORTED
PROJECTS FUNDS FOR THE BEVERLY FARMS
DISRUPTIVE YOUTH PROJECT

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

RESOLVED, That the superintendent of schools be authorized to receive
and expend the \$2,430 grant award in the following categories within
the FY 1987 Provision for Future Supported Projects from the Maryland
State Department of Education, Division of CUSP, Disruptive Youth
Funds, to further improve the school climate for students and staff
at Beverly Farms Elementary School:

CATEGORY	AMOUNT
01 Administration	\$1,504
03 Other Instructional Costs	900
10 Fixed Charges	26

TOTAL	\$2,430

and be it further

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

RESOLUTION NO. 599-86 Re: FY 1987 SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION FOR
IMPROVING INSTRUCTION IN ELEMENTARY
SCHOOL FOREIGN LANGUAGE IMMERSION
PROGRAMS

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

RESOLVED, That the superintendent of schools be authorized, subject
to County Council approval, to receive and expend in the following
categories an FY 1987 supplemental appropriation of \$148,857 from the
U. S. Department of Education under the Education for Economic
Security Act, Secretary's Discretionary Program for Mathematics,
Science, Computer Learning and Critical Foreign Languages for a
project to improve instruction in elementary school foreign language
immersion programs:

CATEGORY	POSITIONS	AMOUNT
02	Instructional Salaries	
	Teacher (A-D) 1.0	\$102,470
	Secretary (Grade 10) .8	
03	Other Instructional Costs	18,002
10	Fixed Charges	28,385

	TOTAL	\$148,857

and be it further

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

RESOLUTION NO. 600-86 Re: FY 1987 CATEGORICAL TRANSFER WITHIN THE
JOB TRAINING PARTNERSHIP ACT GRANT

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

RESOLVED, That the superintendent of schools be authorized to effect within the FY 1987 Job Training Partnership Act Grant the following categorical transfer in accordance with the County Council Provision for transfers:

CATEGORY	FROM	TO
02	Instructional Salaries	\$1,092
03	Instructional Other	2,200
07	Transportation	\$3,292
	-----	-----
	TOTAL	\$3,292

and be it further

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

RESOLUTION NO. 601-86 Re: UTILIZATION OF A PORTION OF THE FY 1987
PROVISION FOR FUTURE SUPPORTED PROJECTS
FOR VOCATIONAL-TECHNICAL EDUCATION

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

RESOLVED, That the superintendent of schools be authorized to receive and expend, within the FY 1987 Provision for Future Supported Projects, a grant award from MSDE for Vocational-Technical Education in the following categories:

CATEGORY	AMOUNT
02 Instructional Salaries	\$ 5,066
03 Instructional Other	40,959
10 Fixed Charges	3,150

TOTAL	\$49,175

and be it further

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

RESOLUTION NO. 602-86 Re: FY 1987 CATEGORICAL TRANSFER WITHIN THE PROVISION FOR FUTURE SUPPORTED PROJECTS

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

RESOLVED, That the superintendent of schools be authorized, subject to County Council approval, to effect the following categorical transfer within the FY 1987 Provision for Future Supported Projects:

CATEGORY	FROM	TO
02 Instructional Salaries	\$13,000	
03 Instructional Other		\$39,000
04 Special Education	12,000	
10 Fixed Charges	14,000	
	-----	-----
TOTAL	\$39,000	\$39,000

and be it further

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

RESOLUTION NO. 603-86 Re: FY 1987 SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION FOR THE MOBILE EDUCATION TEAMS (METs)

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

RESOLVED, That the superintendent of schools be authorized, subject to County Council approval, to receive and expend in the following categories an FY 1987 supplemental appropriation of \$141,027 from the U.S. Department of Education under ESEA Title VII to establish an FY 1987 intensive catchup program for LEP students, Grades 6-9, under Project METs in the following categories:

CATEGORY	POSITIONS	AMOUNT
----------	-----------	--------

02	Instructional Salaries		\$ 97,593
	Teacher Specialist (C-D)	1.5	
	Counselor (A-D)	.5	
	Instructional Assistant (10)	1.5	
03	Other Instructional Costs		14,250
10	Fringe Benefits		29,184
		---	-----
	TOTAL	3.5	\$141,027

and be it further

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

RESOLUTION NO. 604-86 Re: FY 1987 SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION FOR
THE FY 1987 BASIC SKILLS MATERIALS
DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

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

RESOLVED, That the superintendent of schools be authorized, subject to County Council approval, to receive and expend in the following categories an FY 1987 supplemental appropriation of \$59,569 from the U.S. Department of Education under ESEA Title VII to establish an FY 1987 basic skills materials development project:

CATEGORY	POSITIONS	AMOUNT
02	Instructional Salaries Teacher Specialist (C-D) .5	\$47,277
03	Instructional Other	4,000
10	Fringe Benefits	8,292

	TOTAL	\$59,569

and be it further

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

RESOLUTION NO. 605-86 Re: UTILIZATION OF FY 1987 FUTURE SUPPORTED
PROJECTS FUNDS FOR PROJECT IMPACT II

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

RESOLVED, That the superintendent of schools be authorized to receive

and expend the \$3,000 grant award in Category 1, Administration, within the FY 1987 Provision for Future Supported Projects from the Maryland State Department of Education under ECIA Chapter 2 for Project IMPACT II; and be it further

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

RESOLUTION NO. 606-86 Re: UTILIZATION OF FY 1987 FUTURE SUPPORTED PROJECTS FUNDS FOR PROJECT PRODUCT

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

RESOLVED, That the superintendent of schools be authorized to receive and expend the \$6,000 grant award in the following categories, within the FY 1987 Provision for Future Supported Projects from the Maryland State Department of Education under ECIA Chapter 2 for Project

PRODUCT:

CATEGORY	AMOUNT
01 Administration	\$5,930
10 Fringe Benefits	70

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. 607-86 Re: FY 1987 SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION FOR COMPETENCY-BASED ADULT EDUCATION (CBAE) PROGRAM (PROJECT MAPP)

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

RESOLVED, That the superintendent of schools be authorized, subject to County Council approval, to receive and expend in the following categories an FY 1987 supplemental appropriation of \$51,287 from MSDE under the Adult Education Act to continue development of the Competency-based Adult Education Instructional program:

CATEGORY	AMOUNT
02 Instructional Salaries	\$36,550
03 Instructional Other	11,600
10 Fixed Charges	3,137

TOTAL

\$51,287

and be it further

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

RESOLUTION NO. 608-86 Re: PROCUREMENT CONTRACTS OVER \$25,000

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Dr. Shoenberg, 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 Bid 86-20, On-site Service for Microcomputer Maintenance, be withdrawn; and be it further RESOLVED, That having been duly advertised, the contracts be awarded to the low bidders meeting specifications as shown for the bids as follows:

	NAME OF VENDOR(S)	DOLLAR VALUE OF CONTRACTS
12-87	Motor Vehicles	
	JKJ Chevrolet	\$ 106,482
	Spirit Vehicle Services, Inc.	80,519
	Dick Stevens Chevrolet, Inc.	73,986
	Watkins-Burdette Dodge, Inc.	21,996
	TOTAL	----- \$ 282,983
19-87	Typewriters and Calculators	
	A. J. Stationery & Office Supplies	\$ 5,980
	Federal Office Products Center, Inc.	1,788
	Tri-County Office Equipment, Inc.	60,058
	TOTAL (less trade-in)	----- \$ 67,826
22-87	Motor Vehicles, Automobiles, Pickup Trucks and Vans	
	JKJ Chevrolet	\$ 53,770
	Spirit Leasing & Vehicle Services, Inc.	15,942
	Sport Chevrolet Co., Inc.	52,737
	TOTAL	----- \$ 122,449
26-87	Automotive Radiator Repair	
	Discount Radiator Repair	\$ 54,132
	Rockville Radiator Shop	28,107
	TOTAL	----- \$ 82,239
32-97	Frozen Foods	
	Edward Boker Foods, Inc.	\$ 5,518
	Carroll County Foods	12,692

	Continental Smelkinson	5,611
	Frederick Produce Co., Inc.	1,872
	Mazo Lerch Co., Inc.	1,845
	A. W. Schmidt & Son	1,969
	Frank A. Serio & Sons, Inc.	14,484

	TOTAL	\$ 43,991
41-87	Ice Cream and Novelties	
	Briggs Ice Cream Company	\$ 781,066
	GRAND TOTAL	\$1,380,554

RESOLUTION NO. 609-86 Re: PINEY BRANCH ELEMENTARY SCHOOL -
ACCESSIBILITY MODIFICATIONS FOR THE
HANDICAPPED (AREA 1)

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

WHEREAS, Modifications, consisting of facility alterations to building and pool access and to both male and female shower and toilet areas, are required to make the Piney Branch Elementary School pool area and support spaces accessible to the handicapped, as required by Montgomery County law; and

WHEREAS, Sealed bids were received on October 30, 1986, for the construction of accessibility modifications for the handicapped, in the pool area of Piney Branch Elementary School, as indicated below:

BIDDER	BASE BID
1. Ernest R. Sines, Inc.	\$69,800
2. 4-S Construction, Inc.	71,927
3. Smith & Haines, Inc.	78,726
4. Hanlon Construction Company, Inc.	94,720

and

WHEREAS, The low bidder, Ernest R. Sines, Inc., has performed similar projects satisfactorily; and

WHEREAS, Recommended bid is within staff estimate and sufficient funds are available to effect award; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That a contract for \$69,800 be awarded to Ernest R. Sines, Inc., to accomplish the construction of accessibility modifications for the handicapped at Piney Branch Elementary School in accordance with plans and specifications covering this work, dated August 1, 1986, prepared by Arley J. Koran, Inc., architect.

RESOLUTION NO. 610-86 Re: DUFIEF ELEMENTARY SCHOOL - EXTERIOR
RENOVATIONS (AREA 3)

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

WHEREAS, The exterior walls and roof perimeter flashing at DuFief Elementary School require waterproofing modifications and repairs to make the building weathertight; and

WHEREAS, One sealed bid was received November 3, 1986, for these exterior renovations, as indicated below:

BIDDER	BASE BID
Arlandria Construction Company, Inc.	\$229,000

and

WHEREAS, The only bid exceeds staff estimate by a substantial amount; and

WHEREAS, Staff believes additional competition and a lower cost can be obtained by rebidding the project; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the bid for exterior renovations for DuFief Elementary School from Arlandria Construction Company, Inc., be rejected and that the project be readvertised at the earliest possible time.

RESOLUTION NO. 611-86 Re: NEW ROLLING TERRACE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL (AREA 1)

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

WHEREAS, Sealed bids were received on October 2, 1986, for the Rolling Terrace Elementary School project; and

WHEREAS, The low bid received on October 2, 1986, substantially exceeded staff estimate for this project; and

WHEREAS, The Board resolved that all of the October 2, 1986, bids submitted for Rolling Terrace be rejected, and that the project plans and specifications be modified and rebid; and

WHEREAS, Sealed bids were received on November 6, 1986, for the modified plans and specifications as indicated below:

	BIDDER	
	DUSTIN	KIMMEL&KIMMEL
BASE BID	\$7,395,000	\$7,463,000
Add Alt.1 (Terrazo tile in corr.)	8,700	8,400
Add Alt.2 (Addl. landscaping)	21,000	31,200

Deduct Alt. 3 (art courtyard)	10,000	27,400
Deduct Alt. 4 (science courtyard)	11,500	27,700
Deduct Alt. 5 (part.sci.courtyard)	5,000	9,400
Deduct Alt. 6 (Exten.contr.comple.)	-0-	10,000
Deduct Alt. 7 (Fabric banners)	6,400	8,100
Deduct Alt. 8 (hill slide)	14,000	15,400
Deduct Alt. 9 (concrete stairs)	29,000	20,000
Deduct Alt. 10 (Venetian blinds)	6,500	5,900
Deduct Alt. 11 (metal shelving)	15,000	15,100

and

WHEREAS, Staff, the planning committee, and the project architect feel that Add Alternates 1 and 2 are not essential to the project and should not be accepted; and

WHEREAS, Staff, the planning committee, and the project architect feel that Deduct Alternates 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 10, and 11 can be deferred without adversely affecting the program and should be accepted; and

WHEREAS, The low bidder, Dustin Construction, Inc., has successfully performed similar projects on other Montgomery County public schools;

and

WHEREAS, Sufficient funds reside in the appropriation for the Blair Cluster Elementary Schools construction project to award a contract to the low bidder; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That a contract for \$7,331,600 be awarded to Dustin Construction, Inc., which includes the base bid and acceptance of Deduct Alternates 3, 4, 7, 8, 10, and 11 in accordance with plans and specifications entitled "Rolling Terrace Elementary School" prepared by SHWC.

RESOLUTION NO. 612-86 Re: AWARD OF CONTRACT OF INDUSTRIAL ARTS
AREA SAFETY AND VENTILATION
MODIFICATIONS - VARIOUS SCHOOLS

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

WHEREAS, Sealed bids were received as follows:

BIDDER

Arey, Inc. Proposal A - BCC - \$6,554; Proposal B - Blair - *\$9,775;
 Proposal C - Frost - \$13,176; Proposal D - West - \$24,249;
 Proposal E - Westland - \$18,600; Proposal F - Whitman - \$7,562;
 Proposal G - Hoover - \$8,694
 Darwin Construction Company Proposal A - BCC - \$14,000; Proposal B -
 Blair - \$16,000; Proposal C - Frost - \$20,000; Proposal D - West
 - \$38,000; Proposal E - Westland - \$9,000; Proposal F - Whitman
 - \$12,000; Proposal G - Hoover - \$10,500

W. B. Maske Sheet Metal Works, Inc. Proposal A - BCC - *\$5,339;
Proposal B - Blair - \$10,237; Proposal C - Frost - *\$12,789;
Proposal D - West - *\$20,864; Proposal E - Westland - *\$13,414;
Proposal F - Whitman - *\$6,377; Proposal G - Hoover - *\$8,038

* Recommended award

WHEREAS, Darwin Construction Company by letter dated October 30, 1986, has withdrawn its bid; and

WHEREAS, The low bids are within staff estimates, and the bidders have successfully performed similar projects for MCPS; and

WHEREAS, Funds are available for contract awards; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That a contract be awarded to Arey, Inc., for \$9,775 for furnishing and installing equipment to perform safety and ventilation modifications in industrial arts areas at Montgomery Blair High School, in accordance with plans and specifications prepared by Morton Wood, Jr., consulting engineer; and be it further

RESOLVED, That a contract be awarded to W. B. Maske Sheet Metal Works, Inc., for \$66,821 for furnishing and installing equipment to perform safety and ventilation modifications in industrial arts areas at Bethesda-Chevy Chase High, Robert Frost Junior High, Julius West Middle, Westland Intermediate, Walt Whitman High, and Hoover Junior high Schools in accordance with plans and specifications prepared by Morton Wood, Jr., consulting engineer.

RESOLUTION NO. 613-86 Re: WORKS OF ART FOR CEDAR GROVE, JONES
LANE, AND GUNNERS LAKE ELEMENTARY
SCHOOLS

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

WHEREAS, Authorization for the selection of artists to receive commissions to produce works of art is delineated in Article V, Section 1, Chapter 8, "Buildings," of the MONTGOMERY COUNTY CODE; and

WHEREAS, Staff has employed selection procedures submitted by the superintendent to the Board of Education on February 10, 1984; and

WHEREAS, The Montgomery County Arts Council has participated in the selection process as required by law; and

WHEREAS, Funds have been appropriated for this purpose in the FY 1987 Capital Improvements Program; and

WHEREAS, The law also requires County Council approval before the Board of Education can enter into contracts with said artists; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education enter into contractual agreements, as indicated, subject to County Council approval:

ARTIST	WORK	COMMISSION
Irene & Azriel Awret	Mural (Cedar Grove)	\$14,000
Steven Weitzman	Sculpture (Cedar Grove)	16,000
Ned Bittinger	Mural (Gunners Lake)	14,000
Jim Gary	Sculpture (Jones Lane)	28,000

and be it further

RESOLVED, That the County Council be requested to expeditiously approve the above commissions to the indicated artists.

RESOLUTION NO. 614-86 Re: TRANSFER TO THE LOCAL UNLIQUIDATED SURPLUS ACCOUNT (997-01) FROM THE PROPOSED WATKINS MILL HIGH SCHOOL PROJECT (545-01)

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

WHEREAS, \$1,300,000 was appropriated in the FY 1987 Capital Budget for preliminary site grading at Watkins Mill High School; and

WHEREAS, The Board approved a contract on October 27, 1986, to Pleasant Excavating Co., Inc., in the amount of \$871,600 for the site grading at Watkins Mill High School; and

WHEREAS, As a result of this contract award, surplus funds are available in the appropriation for site grading for Watkins Mill High School; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That residual appropriation authority in the amount of \$229,400 be transferred from the Watkins Mill High School project (545-01) to the Local Unliquidated Surplus Account (997-01); and be it further

RESOLVED, That the county executive be requested to recommend approval of this transfer of funds to the County Council.

RESOLUTION NO. 615-86 Re: TRANSFER OF FUNDS FROM THE LOCAL UNLIQUIDATED SURPLUS ACCOUNT (997-01) TO THE RELOCATABLE CLASSROOM BUILDINGS PROJECT

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

WHEREAS, Funds were appropriated in the FY 1987 capital budget for relocation of existing and purchase of new relocatable classrooms at

various schools; and

WHEREAS, Additional funds in excess of the FY 1987 appropriation were required to complete the installation of the relocatable classrooms identified as part of the relocatable classroom project; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That \$220,000 be transferred from the Local Unliquidated Surplus Account (997-01) to the Relocatable Classroom Building Account (968-06); and be it further

RESOLVED, That the county executive be requested to recommend approval of this transfer of funds to the County Council.

RESOLUTION NO. 616-86 Re: CHANGE ORDERS FOR RELOCATABLE CLASSROOMS

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

WHEREAS, Contracts were awarded by the Board on May 27 and June 12 to install steps, decks, ramps, and electrical service for relocatable classrooms at various schools; and

WHEREAS, Additional step, deck, ramp, and electrical service work was required to install relocatable classrooms not included in the original contracts; and

WHEREAS, This additional work could not be bid and completed in time to have the relocatable classrooms available for the opening of school; and

WHEREAS, Unit cost schedules were solicited from the vendors under contract to complete the additional work; and

WHEREAS, These costs were reviewed by staff and adjusted to provide equitable compensation for the proposed work; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the contract to H & H Enterprise to provide steps, ramps, decks, and skirting for new and locally owned classroom buildings be adjusted by a change order for \$93,357; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the contract to Jack Stone Electrical Construction, Inc., for electrical service for modular classroom buildings be adjusted by a change order for \$206,491.

RESOLUTION NO. 617-86 Re: MONTHLY PERSONNEL REPORT

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Mrs. Praisner seconded by Mrs. DiFonzo, 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. 618-86 Re: EXTENSION OF SICK LEAVE

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Mrs. Praisner seconded by Mrs. DiFonzo, 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
Buckley, Margaret	Classroom Teacher Meadow Hall ES	30
Clarke, Dorothy	Instructional Asst. Albert Einstein HS	30

RESOLUTION NO. 619-86 Re: DEATH OF MR. IRA L. INGRAM, BUS OPERATOR IN AREA 1 TRANSPORTATION

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

WHEREAS, The death on October 11, 1986, of Mr. Ira L. Ingram, a bus operator in Area 1, has deeply saddened the staff and members of the Board of Education; and

WHEREAS, In the two years Mr. Ingram worked for Montgomery County Public Schools he demonstrated competence as a school bus operator; and

WHEREAS, His pleasant personality and friendly manner in dealing with the children made him a valued employee of the school system; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the members of the Board of Education express their sorrow at the death of Mr. Ira L. Ingram and extend deepest sympathy to his family; and be it further

RESOLVED, That this resolution be made part of the minutes of this meeting and a copy be forwarded to Mr. Ingram's family.

RESOLUTION NO. 620-86 Re: DEATH OF MR. KIRK R. McNANEY, CLASSROOM TEACHER AT ALBERT EINSTEIN HIGH SCHOOL

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Mrs.

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

WHEREAS, The death on October 26, 1986, of Mr. Kirk R. McNaney, a classroom teacher at Albert Einstein High School, has deeply saddened the staff and members of the Board of Education; and

WHEREAS, In the time Mr. McNaney was a member of the staff of Montgomery County Public Schools, he provided a rewarding learning experience for his students; and

WHEREAS, Mr. McNaney was a competent and personable staff member whose contribution to the school program was highly appreciated by students and staff; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the members of the Board of Education express their sorrow at the death of Mr. Kirk R. McNaney and extend deepest sympathy to his family; and be it further

RESOLVED, That this resolution be made part of the minutes of this meeting and a copy be forwarded to Mr. McNaney's family.

Re: STUDY OF HIGH SCHOOL MEDIA CENTER
RESOURCES

Dr. Cody commented that Mrs. Fran Dean, director of the Department of Instructional Resources, and Mrs. Regina Crutchfield, coordinator of school library media program, had done a good job of putting the report together. The report presented an accurate description of where they were, but there was another step as to where they should be. Clearly they should be at their own standards in terms of book collections, but the question was should they be at the state guidelines. For example, the state did not recognize bulletin boards through computers which were major sources of information. Dr. Cody reported that it would cost Montgomery County \$7 million to go to the state guidelines. He said that Mrs. Dean and Dr. Martin believed they should not be quick to immediately embark on a \$7 million campaign. He thought they had to consider where they should put their resources because this was a complicated issue in light of recent advances in computer technology. This document provided the Board with the status of their collections, and they would be returning to this topic in their budget considerations.

Mrs. Dean reported that they were using computer discs, and an encyclopedia on a disc was \$230 with 117,000 references. While this sounded great, a media center needed \$8,000 for a disc player. They had a lot of issues to decide involving technology and software. Dr. Cody added that their present collections did not prevent schools from being accredited by Middle States.

Dr. Shoenberg remarked that the report was quite clear and the criteria were clear and helpful. He had a question about the cost of paying the people to order the books at a level of \$177,000 a year. He said that this could be done by the media center directors and

their staffs. If they were talking about \$1 million a year in acquisitions, then they were talking about something that probably exceeded the time available to media directors. He asked at what point they got to the point where it cost them more than the cost of the books to do the buying. Mrs. Dean hoped that this would never happen. She explained that they had gotten together several basic lists in sciences, the humanities, etc. and these were given to media specialists for their selections. It became more of a checklist as opposed to the old traditional way. This did save the media specialists a lot of work. Dr. Shoenberg asked if they usually purchased current books rather than out-of-print books, and Mrs. Dean replied that they mostly ordered current materials.

Mrs. DiFonzo noted that when she looked at the numbers of library books there were a couple of schools in the 20,000-volume range, most of the other schools were at 12,000-13,000, and one school was down to 9,000. She asked about the difference. Mrs. Dean explained that one of the reasons was diversity of student body. She thought that the schools with the high book count had been very stable over a period of time. She commented that having a lot of books was not necessarily the best thing to have. They could have a lot of books that were almost worthless to the current curriculum, but the weeding of the collection was a constant and on-going process. It was difficult to keep to a buying plan to assure that collections were current to the needs of the students and curriculum.

Dr. Cody remarked that he had been told that Gaithersburg High School had the best program even though the actual book collection was the lowest. Mrs. DiFonzo inquired about the media material from Northwood and the material from Woodward's library. Mrs. Dean replied that the Northwood collection was excellent and was being held for the new high school. She thought the Woodward collection would meld in very easily with the Walter Johnson collection although there would be some duplication.

Mrs. DiFonzo asked if they would have space for the collections if they had a windfall of \$7 million which would bring them up to the state guidelines. Mrs. Dean replied that in many cases there would not be space. They would have to make sure they were utilizing all existing space and consider adding shelving. She explained that the state standard was a recommendation and a goal for books and nonprint materials.

Dr. Cronin commented that technology would lead them into a new technological system which could deliver by computer to a student in a library with a hard copy if the student wished to have it. He asked if they could go in that direction according to state guidelines rather than go into the need for physical books in a school. Mrs. Dean said that Quince Orchard would be their first example of a high tech media center. They already had "dialog" available to all high schools, but Quince Orchard would have more technology.

Mr. Ewing asked about the issue of the hours during which the media

centers were open to students. They planned to survey students about their research needs. He hoped that they would get some information from parents and teachers because it would be useful to have different points of view. He said it was important for them to make sure facilities were available at a time when students could use them. He noted that this was a budget item and asked Dr. Cody to inform the Board if there were an immediate need. Mrs. Dean replied that the media specialists had staggered their shifts, and in schools where they had only one media specialist, they had money to stay open for extended hours.

Dr. Cody reported that he had asked for a similar study for all the elementary libraries. Mrs. Dean believed that the collections in elementary schools were in much worse condition than the senior highs. Young children wore out books, and the replacement money in the past had not kept up with the increased costs of books. For example, elementary school books no longer cost less than those for senior high schools.

Dr. Shoenberg noted that they had used items-per-student as a criterion, but one wanted to know the adequacy of the collection in terms of the kind of use it received. He also asked if teachers gave the kinds of assignments that the library resources would support, and if the resources were greater he wondered if teachers would give different assignments. Mrs. Dean replied that when she and her staff visited schools they did try to address some of those issues. They observed media specialists planning with other teachers. They discussed the adequacy of the collection with principals. She said that as the curriculum changed, the collection had to change. They did encourage media specialists to plan with faculties on what was selected to go in that school. Dr. Pitt felt there had been a great improvement in the training of media specialists at the high school level, but the elementary school media specialists had always been involved in planning with teachers. Mrs. Dean added that one component of the new standards included direct instruction by the media specialist.

Dr. Cronin stated that the next steps would be in the FY 1988 operating budget. In addition, they would have a proposed policy revision in the spring which he assumed would look at the needs of collections for the future and the impact of technologies. He expected they would have a plan for future budgets to upgrade the libraries. Dr. Cody added that they needed to talk about their own guidelines for collections before they talked about funds. He thought they had to look at the elementary libraries as well before they got too far down the track. Dr. Cronin hoped that the plan would give them a firm foundation for the next five years. It seemed to Mr. Ewing that one element of their future policy ought to be that it was up to schools to go through a process on a regular basis of reviewing the collections and weeding them out and adding in a systematic way. Mrs. Crutchfield replied that they did have collection building, and they worked with schools to develop three to five year buying plans and specifically look at areas in relationship to the curriculum. In every school, the plan was either developed or

a person identified to develop that plan.

Re: ANNUAL GROWTH POLICY

Dr. David Thomas, associate superintendent, stated that the purpose of the presentation was to provide information to the Board about the Planning Commission meeting and the growth policy being developed. Mr. Bruce Crispell, demographic planner, explained that the purpose of the Annual Growth Policy was to provide guidance for the administration of the Adequate Public Facilities Ordinance. The County Council would adopt thresholds as policy, and the AGP would be able to link decisions on capital projects with growth regulation decisions. The staff draft discussed methodology for measuring adequacy of facilities and for considering CIP's of those facilities in future growth management decisions. This was the first product of legislation adopted in spring of 1986. On December 1, the Planning Board was required to transmit the draft to the county executive who would review it and recommend revisions. By January 1, the county executive would send those revisions or a new document to the County Council, and after that time the Board of Education could provide its comments on the draft.

At the same time the County Council was considering the draft, the county executive would be transmitting the capital budget. By May 15, the Council had to adopt the CIP and by June 30 they had to adopt an annual growth policy for the next fiscal year. Mr. Crispell explained that the purpose of the AGP was to provide the Council with more explicit implications on the development implications of their actions on capital budgets. They would adopt a capital budget before they adopted the growth policy. The Planning Board was including information about the BOE's proposed CIP to show the relief the CIP would give in certain geographic areas to overutilization problems. Once the Council decided on the CIP, they would be making some kind of statement about growth regulation that had to follow. If the CIP was not adequate to cover facilities that would be available four years in the future, they should adopt some kind of restraint on development.

Mr. Crispell explained that the implementation of the CIP was up to the county executive, and the implementation of the AGP was up to the Planning Board after June 30. This meant reviewing subdivision plans under the Adequate Public Facilities Ordinance and using whatever ceilings were adopted by the County Council.

Within the AGP document, the staff had prepared two types of school reviews. They favored the policy ceiling review over a local area review. The local area review was the same as that adopted by the Board last year and was being used by MCPS staff. Because the AGP was aimed at a one year assessment of future conditions, this only looked at conditions for one year, and the first AGP would be looking at the 1991-92 school year. The capacities for all facilities would be compared to projections. Because of that there would not be a deferral; a subdivision would either be approved or denied. The other difference was that they had proposed a 110 percent utilization

rate for both elementary and secondary. The thinking behind that was that there were a lot of solutions the Board could adopt which were non-capital. MCPS was now using 90 percent of capacity at the secondary level and 100 percent at the elementary level.

However, Park and Planning staff favored that a policy ceiling be set for high school areas. They discussed converting school information to their own planning units but favored sticking to high school geography for those ceilings. This would ensure that the County Council would adopt a ceiling value or level of capacity available in that cluster for that year in the future. The other method required one-at-a-time subdivision reviews. The ceilings they were proposing were very analogous to their traffic ceilings. It would be based on MCPS projections and all the capacity they would put into place within a cluster within four years. Mr. Crispell felt that this was narrower than the existing method because it looked at one high school cluster while the current method looked at two clusters. This was traded off by raising the ceiling of allowable utilization to that 110 percent. The Board had to consider whether this was an acceptable tradeoff.

Dr. Cronin thanked Mr. Crispell for his excellent summary. Dr. Cronin asked about the timing of Board reactions, and Mr. Crispell explained that after December 1 they could make comments about the Planning Board proposal. However, the legislation allowed the county executive to take the Planning Board document and revise it and deliver this as the AGP. Dr. Phil Rohr, director of planning, added that this was different than most documents because the county executive could come up with his own document. He suggested that in December they respond to the county executive on the recommendations of the Planning Board. There would also be an opportunity to respond in January-July to the County Council. The Council itself would adopt the method by which the capacity was determined. He explained that in theory when they developed the FY 1989 CIP they would be in synch with the FY 1988 growth policy.

Dr. Shoenberg stated that the first AGP would be for the school year 1991-92, and he asked whether it would make projections into the future. It seemed to him that the 110 percent capacity was based on their ability to make adjustments during that four-year period. However, they might want to wait to do something in 1995 because they saw what was coming. Mr. Crispell replied that if it turned out to be a ceiling approach that was established for schools, they would have to have something adopted for the four-year period in the future that had to look at the level of capacity versus enrollment at that point in time. It seemed to Dr. Shoenberg that this was a flaw. Dr. Rohr explained that they would project ahead, but when they reviewed capacity it would only be the capacity available in 1991. If they had a new school coming on line in 1992, they would deny that subdivision because the capacity was not there in 1991. Dr. Shoenberg cited the case where it might seem a four-room modular addition was needed in 1991-92, but when they looked to 1995 they would see that a whole school was needed. Dr. Rohr acknowledged Dr. Shoenberg's point. They might not want to expend funds in the near

term if they had a long term solution.

Dr. Shoenberg commented that to look at 1991-92 and put a restraint on development was probably too late because development was already approved past that point. They had originally talked about a six year time horizon. Mr. Ewing asked why they picked that time rather than the end of the six-year CIP. Dr. Rohr replied that this came out of the traffic analysis. The opposite side of the coin was that they needed to get the roads built within the four year period rather than looking out to the entire six-year period. If the roads were not there by 1991, the subdivisions would not be approved. The idea was to try to speed up the appropriations for roads. The road forecast assumed that everything in the pipeline would be built within the four-year period, but for schools they were not suggesting that. They were suggesting that schools be based on projections for housing occupancy. Mr. Crispell explained that the pipeline was 44,000 units approved, and Dr. Rohr said they were projecting 31,000 in the next four years. If they built a road too soon, it didn't hurt so much because the traffic would always be there and it did not cost so much to operate. For schools, they ran the risk if the housing market dried up of schools being built and not being filled up, and there was a substantial operating cost for those schools.

Mr. Crispell said that at the public hearing it was stated that it was good to have a large pipeline in terms of affordability of housing. This increased competition in the market. It was stated that the APFO was designed to govern the size of the pipeline but not to really provide any short term relief in congestion. The focus on short term relief was in the CIP. He said that the schools would get the most attention in the CIP in terms of what was needed in the way of funding to meet the growth projection. If they did not fund all the needs, they could address the pipeline but there were negative impacts to reducing that pipeline. Dr. Shoenberg did not think this policy affected what was in the pipeline and did not help them to address this.

Dr. Cronin asked if they had any figures which might indicate they were overbuilding in a particular year. Mr. Crispell replied that their forecast reflected the assumption that 10,500 units would be built in 1986, then 9,000, then 6,500, and then 5,000 for every year thereafter. Dr. Cronin asked if they had a warning signal if the building went above that level. Dr. Rohr replied that the Board had that ability when their CIP request was amended in the spring. In the third and fourth year out, they could bring on additional capacity. This year, for example, they were programming more schools to open earlier. The Planning Board staff thought the school system had more flexibility than roads or water and sewer. Dr. Cronin suggested that they had to make this clear to the public. He noted that every time they came in with a supplement it was as if they got caught off guard. MCPS staff seemed to be taking the grief for poor planning rather than not being able to get the funding to meet the planning needs they knew were there.

Mrs. Praisner asked about the statement that it took MCPS a shorter

timeframe to build a school than it did to construct a road. She had seen roads built in six months, and she knew they could not construct a school in six months. Dr. Rohr explained that he was saying that was what the Planning Board staff believed. Dr. Shoenberg commented that they were not talking about building a whole school but rather various bandaied approaches such as boundary changes and use of relocatable classrooms. He assumed that when they made some boundary changes to adjust for the Richard Montgomery underutilization that they would be about out of space to be able to make boundary adjustments. He thought that statement was unreal in terms of the actual situation that existed. Mrs. Praisner thought they should raise this issue.

Mr. Ewing recalled that when they had talked with the Planning Board before they had tried to make clear that the notion of constant boundary change was not attractive. They were trying to move as quickly as they could to make available space in all of their schools with modular construction. He thought the Planning Board position was that the school system should always be prepared to shift boundaries and add portable classrooms as the first order of business. He thought this was a position that the Board did not really favor. He also thought that the 110 percent figure was a problem. For example, if they had a school with a 700 capacity that was at 110 percent, that meant 70 students which was another three classrooms.

Dr. Cody stated that they got to 110 percent because MCPS staff had argued that 120 percent originally proposed was too high. In regard to roads, he said that anytime there was a new road to be cut through or a widening of a road, the property acquisition took time. It was not construction.

Dr. Pitt asked if the 110 percent included any portables in this count. Dr. Rohr replied that they did not. He explained that it was the MCPS definition of program capacity at the elementary school level.

Dr. Cronin reported that the Board would be meeting with Park and Planning on November 12. The agenda included a presentation by Park and Planning staff of the guidelines for the CIP and APFO including the policy ceiling review approach and the local area review approach, definitions and capacity measures, and utilization levels. For the next hour they would review questions and concerns, a discussion of next steps, and a discussion of a timetable for future interaction. He asked staff to provide a listing of their concerns with the process.

Mr. Ewing noted that the Board had not stated its preference for the review process. Mrs. Praisner thought it might be too early to discuss this because they had not had an opportunity to look at the implications of each. Dr. Rohr thought it might be a good idea to hear what Park and Planning staff had to say.

Dr. Shoenberg noted that in the packet there was a memorandum from

Mr. Menke. Mr. Crispell said that the significant thing in that memo was the hope that AGP would have had more real policy about growth itself. In addition, Mr. Menke looked at technical issues and policy issues. He felt the AGP needed to be a little more clear so that people could understand direct impacts of certain decisions they were making when it got to the County Council level. Dr. Rohr added that the Council would have different options on growth and then they would relate that back to the CIP.

Dr. Cronin said the Board was looking forward to the dialogue with Park and Planning on November 12. He thanked MCPS staff for their presentation.

Re: ADVISORY TASK FORCE REPORT ON ADOLESCENT
DEPRESSION AND TEEN SUICIDE

Dr. Cronin thanked Mr. Edward Masood, chair of the task force, for another excellent job.

Mr. Masood reported that he had just distributed a letter from Dr. Lee Haller, the chair of the Mental Health Subcommittee. Mr. Masood said that Dr. Haller's comments were similar to those he was going to make in his opening statement.

Mr. Masood stated that the task force did follow its charge and evaluated the program of the Fairfax public schools. They found that this program was very heavy in terms of administrative training and not heavy in meaningful activities for students. They then pursued several other activities and reviewed pieces of information and programs. This brought them to the report before the Board. They recommended that MCPS implement a comprehensive program dealing with prevention activities, intervention activities, and "postvention" activities. The American Association of Suicidology had recognized this word, and this was being used in the programs for San Mateo and Anne Arundel. The task force would propose this for closing the loop for activities which would occur after a completed suicide. In regard to Dr. Haller's comments, Mr. Masood noted that he had highlighted the fact that suicide was a major problem among the adolescent and even preadolescent. Mr. Masood said their report indicated that it was the number two cause of death between persons aged 15 to 24. Dr. Haller stated that accidents were always listed as number one, but many suicides might be reported as accidents. Therefore, suicides might be the number one cause of deaths. Dr. Haller also called attention to the direct relationship between the abuse of alcohol and drugs tied into the adolescent's inability to cope and deal with everyday problems. The third point was a recommendation that the members of the private and public sector be identified who would serve as a member of the school-based intervention team. The task force was referring to this team as the PIP team (prevention-intervention-postvention). They were talking about a school-based team of persons who would serve as the nucleus to provide the assistance in doing the follow-up activities and initiating the contacts within that particular school community

should there be an attempt or a completed suicide. Dr. Haller thought there was a need for physician input on that team because many times there was a need for providing medical assistance which might require the administration of medication. The task force could recommend the school medical advisor to fill the position, but they did not have enough people to go around.

Mr. Masood said another point was that a significant effort must be put forth to educate parents as well as students, and the task force had recommended this as part of the overall model. There was a statement that frequently parents were uncertain as to whether to take an adolescent's statement seriously. Dr. Haller indicated his concern that if parents were not educated they might not be prepared for the student raising suicidal concerns and might not take appropriate action in getting help for the youngster. Mr. Masood reported that the Mental Health Subcommittee had been involved through this entire process through the participation of Dr. Haller. Mr. Masood asked Board members to turn to page four of the report so that they could go through the recommendations. The first was that MCPS plan and implement a comprehensive program to deal with stress, depression, and suicide by making opportunities available for all students to develop coping and problem-solving skills. The program must contain prevention, intervention, and postvention components. The central feature of the recommended program was a school based team which would be comprised of an administrator, one counselor, the school nurse, a pupil personnel worker, a school psychologist, and others.

The second recommendation was that the program contain feedback indicators to determine program effectiveness and for perpetuating the school based program. They had a serious problem with initiating programs and finding it difficult to maintain these programs. The third recommendation was that the program should emphasize a partnership between agencies at the local and state levels and include community suicide prevention and crises centers. This would put them in concert with some of the state legislation. Recommendation four described the program components. It included a detailed description of prevention efforts as well as recommendations for staff training and for student training. They described the prevention training model. Mr. Masood called attention to the section on intervention or the point from which a person first exhibits symptoms of depression, discusses suicide, or attempts or completes suicide. He explained that they tried to have clear descriptions because they had to transmit these to teachers who were already heavily burdened with a lot of other tasks.

Mr. Masood said that the last section dealt with postvention. These activities would involve the school based team and insure links between the school, parents, clergy, and mental health professionals. This would be a recycling of the prevention and intervention phases until postvention was again required. They felt strongly that the PIP team should meet as soon as possible following a completed suicide. There should be some method in place where the members of the team were called together within 24 hours.

Dr. Cronin asked if they envisioned this also for other student deaths. Mr. Masood said it would because part of the program would get into the issue of death and dying, grief, and loss. They had listed some detailed items for staff, students, for parents, and for the school based team in terms of the area of prevention.

Mr. Masood stated that the task force thought that now was a good time to look at some other policies that might have impact on the ability to make referrals. He thought this policy was being reviewed.

The task force recommended that the Board and superintendent expedite implementation of the program by considering the immediate training of staff which might require shifting resources. They recommended monitoring the activities of the Maryland State Department of Education to seek funding as it became available to develop and implement a suicide prevention program. There was a sum of money attached to two pieces of state legislation with a total dollar amount of \$60,000. It was his understanding that \$45,000 would go for the state task force, and \$15,000 was to go to the implementation of programs through state grants.

The task force also recommended that funds be included in the MCPS operating budget for additional guidance counselors. This would insure proper implementation of the guidance and counseling program. The task force felt there were some good things going on in the school system, but these were not in every classroom across the system. The objectives in the health education curriculum and the guidance and counseling program seemed to be the kind of approach to give students help in dealing with the pressures they faced. The task force stated that consideration should be given to recommending to the county government that an increase be made in school nurse positions in addition to the recommended counselor positions. He explained that they were placing a lot of emphasis on utilizing the services of the school health nurses.

Ms. Sue Goldstein remarked that it was a real privilege to sit on the task force. For example, when there was a suicide in the Whitman community, and members of the task force were able to get something in motion. Ms. Diedra Morgan stated that there had been a death in an elementary school where she had served as a counselor, and the school nurse had played a very important part. She agreed that they needed more medical personnel in the school, and she stated that in her role she saw a lot of stress in students.

Ms. Ilene Dwyer thanked Mrs. DiFonzo because it was her impetus that started the task force. She would emphasize the preventive aspects and the need for training K-12. She said that they needed to emphasize coping skills so that students would know that there were alternatives when they had a problem. Ms. Laurie Friedman reemphasized the need to make sure that they were looking at the elementary age child as well. She would add that they should look at the number of schools and children they were asking their school psychologists to be dealing with. Mr. Mike Thornet said that in the

high schools the biggest problem they had was communication. The team idea would give them a group of people who were prepared in a crisis situation.

Mrs. DiFonzo remarked that she was delighted with the report. She felt that these were good and solid recommendations and were realistic requests. However, she did not know whether they would be able to get these funded. She suggested that they highlight some of the more important parts of this to the Council and the chief health officer. She asked that copies of the report be sent to the members of the Council, Mr. Kramer, and Dr. Swetter. She had one concern. She would not want the school system to appear to be in the position of referring patients to particular doctors. To recommend medical care was one thing, but she would like to avoid setting up a group of doctors for a particular group of students.

Mrs. DiFonzo said she was prepared to ask the superintendent to come up with some funds to see if they could implement some of those things now. She suggested that they take those recommendations into consideration during the budget process. Dr. Cronin noted that the superintendent would be preparing a response and next steps. He suggested that the Board see a response at the all-day meeting in December which would see if funds could be reallocated now. Dr. Cody reported that in the next couple of weeks they would define the training that was needed which might not be a major financial issue. It seemed to Dr. Shoenberg that the committee was saying that if they were serious about this business, here was something sensible that could be done. He did not know that the dollar cost was terribly high here. If he had a concern, it was an effort that went into this program would not go someplace else. The Board had been concerned about putting funds into the schools for peer counseling programs, and those efforts could become a part of this effort. He was mindful about the need to keep this mechanism in working condition over periods of time, but he wondered what they could do with this structure that would keep it alive. He noted that they did not deal in any detail with helping students cope with stress. Stress seemed to be more prevalent with teenagers now than it had ever been, and he thought this was worse in the Washington area. He said they were talking about a major mental health program, and he wondered if they wanted to see it being directed at the rare occurrence of an actual suicide or more at a program helping students deal with the problems they face every day. This would mean somewhat of a change in the focus of the program.

Mr. Ewing agreed that if they were going to move in this direction they needed to be sure that they were not only doing the kinds of things the task force was recommending but that they also think about how the services they could provide could be used in ways that would assure they were dealing with a whole range of problems. He said that the committee had been realistic about not suggesting a large increase in resources overall; however, if counselors were going to have more time, it was a matter of adding counselors or supports so that they would have more time. If they were going to use nurses, they would have to have more nurses. The Board had to take the

important step of making a very strong case for that to be included in the county budget. He suggested that they take this strong position as soon as possible because the county executive's budget was being put together. Dr. Cronin hoped they would see a recommendation at the all-day meeting in December.

Dr. Cody agreed that they would come up with a plan on the major components of this as quickly as possible. He saw the guidance counselors as serving as the institutional focus for continuity from year to year to maintain the PIP.

Mr. Steinberg stated that the report was excellent and very thorough. He suggested that for future committees they look toward more of a variety of students from different groups. He agreed that there was high academic and social stress on students in Montgomery County. He thought that the Whitman situation was handled very smoothly, and students were able to talk about it. However, students in other schools did not understand the situation and did not know how to deal with this. He hoped they would not wait until something of this nature occurred in other schools. He felt that this was an important issue in this county above budget and facilities, and he hoped that it would be dealt with now before the year ended.

Dr. Floyd remarked that as Board members ran for election they had been inundated with a number of questionnaires and surveys. One survey asked candidates what they saw as the most significant problem the MCPS would face in the next four years. He had identified the subject under discussion because they were dealing with a subject for which there was no recourse. There was no recourse to a suicide. He had also said that anything they could do to intervene in that situation was something they ought to do because not only they would be saving a life but they might be saving a Salk, a Curie, or a George Washington Carver. He commended the committee for its thoroughness and its bold and imaginative approaches. He urged that the Board do whatever was required in order to see those recommendations were put into effect.

Dr. Shoenberg stated that there were a number of problems they had chosen to undertake or had been asked by the community to undertake that were primarily problems of children of school age but were not necessarily school problems such as drug and alcohol abuse. Alcohol abuse, depression, and stress might or might not have its origins within the four walls of the school. He thought they needed to bring to the attention of the county more generally the role that they were taking on on their behalf. This was not to say they should not do these things. Certainly it was not an undertaking in which they could succeed by themselves in dealing with the problem. They did need the help of other people.

Mrs. DiFonzo asked that the film mentioned in the report be shown to Board members. Mrs. Praisner suggested that the film be shown some evening prior to a Board meeting. Dr. Cronin thanked the committee for the report.

Re: BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS

1. Dr. Floyd read the following into the record:

"During the two years, Mr. President, I've sat around this table, I have deliberately refrained from offering any critical comments or criticizing proposals that are offered by my colleagues or discussing possible motives for same. It is, therefore, with extreme reluctance that I find that I must depart from this tradition here today.

"The members of the Board and Dr. Cody received a memorandum from Mr. Ewing dated November 6 under the subject of 'Strategies for Minority Student Achievement.' I find the timing and the circumstances leading up to this action to be curious indeed. It comes only one day after the absentee ballots were counted which certified that there would no longer be a member of the Board of Education who is of a minority race.

"Why do I say that that's curious? I say this was curious because Mr. Ewing did endorse three of the four incumbent school Board members in the election including me, the black incumbent. The fact is that he spent the bulk of his time campaigning for the non-incumbent candidate and persuading others to do likewise. This latter fact is well known. I do not feel personally slighted by this action because I think it is his right to support and campaign for anybody he pleases. But to pretend to have grave concerns for minority representations throughout the school system on the one hand and to strenuously campaign for someone who he surely knew or should have known posed the greatest threat to the minority candidate's continuing tenure on the Board is in my view a contradiction of the crassest kind and to engage in a blatantly duplicitous act of rushing in the day after the final votes are counted and pretend again to be gravely concerned about the future of black and other minority students and their achievement by suggesting this strategy which he proposes is the one best suited for this challenge, is, I think, an insult to minority students, their parents, and all other minority citizens in this county. I for one simply cannot remain silent on this issue.

"Following a nearly two year period of time the Board has been grappling with this thorny issue and trying to find the most effective approach to addressing it. The Board and the superintendent mutually agreed that something special needed to be done. Therefore, following that concurrence, the Board created a special position of minority education in the superintendent's office as the superintendent had recommended. Further, the Board approved the superintendent's recommendation to appoint a competent and able black educator, Dr. Paul Scott, to this position. Dr. Scott has only been in that job for a few months, in fact, about four.

"The superintendent's memorandum of November 10 indicates that some specific recommendations are going to be forthcoming for actions by the Board. I think, Mr. President, that Dr. Cody and the rest of the executive leadership of this school district deserve a chance to

exhibit that they can get this job done in a reasonable time and with adequate resources. I submit to you further that there is nothing in Mr. Ewing's proposal which offers any more hope that success can be anticipated if the Board were to follow his suggestions. Therefore, I want to go on record today saying that if this proposal is offered as new business and if it comes before the Board on November 24 for Board action as is indicated, I intend to vote against it because to me it is a hypocritical sham, and I would urge other members of the Board to see it for what I think it is and take the more honorable approach to support the superintendent's recommendations once they are presented to you.

"Finally, I come back to the topic which caused me to bring this matter up for comment and suggest to you that it is indeed ironic that the Board member who was most steadfast in promoting the need to assure that black leadership and participation continues on this Board of Education after Mrs. Shannon resigned now turns out to be the individual who contributed a significant amount to the discontinuation of that leadership. It is very difficult for me to make those remarks because I have known Mr. Ewing for nearly ten years, almost as long as I have been in the county. He is a personal friend of mine. I have enjoyed my association with him. He said to me after this that he was sorry that he did not expect the outcome to be as it was, and I have no reason to doubt his word. I believe that. But he has also stated in the paper which he submitted to the Board that the Board's direction in this issue is making black leadership in the community almost despair of MCPS' commitment or lack thereof to improving achievement for minority students.

"I wonder what the black community thinks about the electorate's commitment to black participation on the Board of Education where the direction for the school system is set. I wonder what the black leadership thinks about Mr. Ewing's role in influencing the electorate this year. I hope that these questions will be answered in the very near future, and I look forward to finding out what they are.

"I simply want to close by saying that the substance of this subject runs very deep within my experience as well as within my personal psyche. My experience has taught me and history has shown that black people have had long and multiple experience of having their interest undermined and compromised by well meaning individuals. I regret to say that in my view this is simply one more case in point."

2. Dr. Cronin stated that he was grieved also because he was the person against whom the attempt to replace a Board member was directed. He was sorry that this cost Dr. Floyd his seat. He shared in Dr. Floyd's concern about the memo before the Board and would not vote for it either.

3. Mr. Ewing made the following statement:

"I regret that Dr. Floyd sees this in that light, and I reject out of hand his notion that somehow or other this is pretense. It isn't.

Nor it is a hypocritical sham, and I won't go on to speak of some of the other things he said.

"Let me say that I have been working on this issue for a long time on the Board, and I think it is right to say that by no means has it been my issue exclusively or anybody else's issue exclusively, but it has been a matter of great concern to me and I have spoken to it repeatedly over the years. The thing that I have said about it is that I think it is important for us to be able to say with some clarity and specificity what the specific strategies are which we are pursuing which we can say have some specific effects and which will give us some sense that what it is that we are doing has the effect that we want to achieve.

"Certainly it has nothing whatever to do with this election. I suppose I could say that I was flattered by the notion that the very small effort I made to support Bruce Goldensohn caused the election to come out the way it did. I don't know what impact what I did may have had on the election, and I, indeed, do regret that Jerry Floyd was not elected. I supported him. I voted for him. Indeed, I was the person on the Board who nominated him for the position in 1984, and I supported him throughout every single ballot. I feel strongly that he has been a good Board member and made a major contribution to the Board. Nothing that has happened today changes my mind one wit about that.

"What I am suggesting in the resolution is something reasonably simple, and that is that the superintendent should develop for us a set of specific system-wide strategies to approach the problem of minority improvement in achievement. I do that as a result of my discussion not with everybody in the community but in discussion with a number of Board members and a discussion of that subject with not everybody in the black community but a good many. I don't purport to speak for everybody, certainly not for the black leadership, but I can simply tell you that there have been a number in the black community who have said to me that they have reached a point where they have been very disturbed by the absence of sufficient specificity in their judgment.

"I say in the draft resolution memo that there has been improvement in minority achievement. Indeed, there has. That the superintendent and staff of the school system deserve great credit for that. That there is an intensive effort now to develop improved understanding of whatever efforts are effective and how to measure those efforts, and that the superintendent is to be commended for that initiative. But it is also true that to date minority student achievement remains lower than I think anybody on the Board would wish, and the improvements that one could wish for still have not been fully achieved nor do we have clear understanding of why that is nor do we have clear understanding of why the gains that have been made have, indeed, been made.

"The timing is simply an accident, and I say that with the understanding that that may not be believed by Dr. Floyd, but that is

so. I said sometime in the fall that I thought we needed to take action in this area. I have said several times prior that I thought we needed to address this issue. I said it at the last Board retreat, and I said it at the Board retreat before that. I have yet to see something that's coming. The fact that this draft memo generated a response from the superintendent who said this was in many respects the direction in which he was now moving with Paul Scott was very good news. Thus, the attention of the memo is only to suggest some direction if nothing more than a summary of what it is that the superintendent intends to suggest to the Board. I am not telling the superintendent precisely what, or the memo does not, what strategies ought to be pursued. I am suggesting that when he comes forward to us and he now clearly plans to do in January in any event, there should be a full and comprehensive statement of those strategies we ought to pursue.

"Let me say a word, since it has been brought up, about the election. I don't think it is accurate at all to suggest that my position in the election was in any sense designed to bring about the elimination of black leadership on the Board. Indeed, every single black candidate for the Board of Education I have supported. I have supported those people with my effort and my work and contributions of dollars, and I have done that with respect to other black candidates. During the time when the Board was run by people who were engaged in efforts to take steps which would do harm to black students, I spoke out as a Board member along with Elizabeth Spencer when there were only the two of us and, after Elizabeth Spencer, as the sole Board member who continued to pursue those issues. If Dr. Floyd thinks that my record shows that I have been well meaning but not truly supportive, then I guess I can only say that I have been told by others that that is not so. I am disappointed that that is his view. It does not change in any way my view of him, but it does disappoint me that he could so badly and so fully misunderstand what I have been about and what I am about here.

"I have to end by saying I do deeply regret, and I guess I resent, the attack on me as a person. I would be less than normal if I did not resent it. Nevertheless, that is not at issue here. What is at issue is the issue of what do we want to get done and how do we want to get it done for minority students. That is an issue I know Dr. Floyd holds close to his heart, and I suggested in my memo that I would be glad to work with other Board members to alter this draft in some fashion and I still would, but I still intend to offer it under new business."

4. Mrs. DiFonzo reported that she had attended the human relations liaison workshop yesterday which was held at the Gaithersburg Marriott. There were sessions on the rights of the handicapped, equity in the classroom, women in nontraditional occupations, and a session on human relations. The staff brought in a group of about ten MCPS youngsters who spoke very personally about their own experiences. In the two years she had been on the Board, she had attended conferences, conventions, and workshops that had been put on by national groups, state level organization, and by schools systems

in different parts of the country. The more workshops she attended done by MCPS people, the more she was convinced that the ones done by MCPS were head and shoulders above anything that she had seen anywhere else. She praised the efforts of Mrs. Bell and her staff for the excellent program.

5. Mrs. DiFonzo called attention to a recent issue of "It Starts in the Classroom." There was an article called "The New Volunteer" which talked about using volunteer job descriptions so that parents who had volunteered could use these job descriptions as part of a resume. She asked Sally Jackson to look into this article and see if MCPS could develop that kind of a proposal.

RESOLUTION NO. 621-86 Re: EXECUTIVE SESSION - NOVEMBER 24, 1986

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

WHEREAS, The Board of Education of Montgomery County is authorized by Section 10-508, State Government Article of the ANNOTATED CODE OF MARYLAND to conduct certain of its meetings in executive closed session; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education of Montgomery County hereby conduct its meeting in executive closed session beginning on November 24, 1986, at 7:30 p.m. to discuss, consider, deliberate, and/or otherwise decide the employment, assignment, appointment, promotion, demotion, compensation, discipline, removal, or resignation of employees, appointees, or officials over whom it has jurisdiction, or any other personnel matter affecting one or more particular individuals and to comply with a specific constitutional, statutory or judicially imposed requirement that prevents public disclosures about a particular proceeding or matter as permitted under the State Government Article, Section 10-508; and that such meeting shall continue in executive closed session until the completion of business.

RESOLUTION NO. 622-86 Re: MINUTES OF SEPTEMBER 22, 1986

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

RESOLVED, That the minutes of September 22, 1986, be approved.

RESOLUTION NO. 623-86 Re: MINUTES OF OCTOBER 14, 1986

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

RESOLVED, That the minutes of October 14, 1986, be approved.

RESOLUTION NO. 624-86 Re: RECOGNIZING MCPS STAFF AND STUDENT
ACHIEVEMENTS

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

WHEREAS, Many MCPS employees and students accomplished outstanding achievements, and thereby deserve recognition and praise from their peers, the superintendent and Board of Education, and the public; and

WHEREAS, On February 8, 1983, the Board of Education unanimously adopted a policy establishing the practice of recognizing students' and employees' outstanding achievements; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That a Recognition Evening be held on November 20, 1986, 8 p.m. at Julius West Middle School; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the following list of students and employees be so recognized and honored that evening:

HONOREES
STUDENTS

Jonathan Hamel and Phelan Wyrick, of Walter Johnson High School, both had work selected for a National Juried Youth Ceramics Exhibition, sponsored by School Arts Magazine, National Council of Education in the Ceramic Arts, and the National Art Education Association. They were the only students selected from the state of Maryland. Their teacher is Bonnie Collier, who also distinguished herself by having work selected for a national juried art show, "Alternatives 86," which will tour the country for a year.

Chris Oatway, also of Walter Johnson High School had a photograph receive a national award from the Scholastic Art Competition, sponsored by Kodak. His teacher is Bonnie Collier. MCPS students did very well in the 1986 Maryland State School Film Festival. Students from Stedwick Elementary School won two first place awards in the competition. Second grade students who placed first with their video tape, "The Toy Store," were: Ashley Barbaccia, Stephen Bevan, Dana Brinkman, Chrissy Clark, Lindsey Cole, Kelly Ellis, Kurt Gluck, Kevin Griffin, Megan Kelly, D'Vora Lovinger, Elizabeth Rowland, Tristan Snell, Jesse Thoresen, Christopher Valle, Matthew Vandover and Corrine Youngbar. Their teacher is Jacquita Swanby. Stedwick Elementary fourth grade students who received a first place award for their video tape, "Somebody Special," were: Colby Anderson, Melissa Anderson, Benjamin Bondoc, Meri Carris, Benjamin Caterbury, Nancy Chen, Shannon Clark, Charles DuFour, Edward Gardiner, Sean Gardiner, Robert Hamilton, Ariella Hillman, Nicholas Hunter, Ngoc Le, John Leache, Adriana Marquez, Leyla Mastroianni, Craig Meyers, Alex Mosenthal, Ryan O'Leary, Katherine Saunders, Heather Schenck, Paul Skees, Elizabeth Wenning, Huan Yang, and Lauren Zaugg. Their teacher is Ann McCarthy. Media Specialist Marie Dinsmore was also involved in the projects.

Mavis Vandegrift's fifth grade class at Damascus Elementary School won an award at the Maryland State School Film Festival for their video tape, "The Legend of I. M. Cold." The students were: Angela Abrams, Theresa Arnett, Amy Bertin, Maia Bielak, Danielle Bilyeu, James Dalton, Ronald Davis, Stacy Delph, Merle Dutrow, Tammy Evy, Marci Grover, Philip Hager, Billie Harrison, Jessica Heflin, Dylan Himmelfarb, Edward Jackson, Robert LaChance, Scott Lindberg, Jeremy Murphy, Carly Squeo, Brenda Sicotte, Michael Sulewski, Angela Tutton, Jason Urchasko, Colin Wells and Brandon Pendleton.

Tom Burrows, Greg Dildine, Rob Kitsos, and Dan Weintraub, of Bethesda-Chevy Chase High School, won an award from the Maryland State School Film Festival for their videotape, "I Should Have Known." Their teacher is Rose Mary Flint.

Eric Seltzer, of Cabin John Junior High School won a special merit award in the Maryland State School Film Festival for his film, "The Animate Gallery". Media Specialist Mabra Barge was his teacher. Tilden Intermediate School students Alyssa Archer and Kim Mansfield received an award at the Maryland State School Film Festival for their slide/tape presentation, "Pre Columbian Art of the Incas." Their teachers were Allen Trenum and Nancy Cottone.

Other MCPS students winning awards at the Maryland State School Film Festival in the photographic category were: Andrew Dickler, Woodward High School for his entry, "Where's the Beach"; Chrissy Levri, Richard Montgomery High School, for her entry, "Mandy and Jimmy"; Julianne Dodd, Lake Seneca Elementary School, for her entry, "Lovely Leaves"; and Lukas Graf, Rockville High School, for his entry, "Brian Returns."

Brian Yee, of Magruder High School, has been awarded the Hugh O'Brien Leadership Award, honoring a sophomore for leadership and citizenship.

Keith Brace, of Magruder High School, was elected State Comptroller for Boys State, sponsored by the American Legion.

Roopali Garg, of Magruder High School, received an award in the University of Maryland School of Mathematics competition and also received the George Washington University Award for excellence in science and math.

In the Odyssey of the Mind competition, Magruder High School students Thomas Meixner, Jeremy Lite, Wilbur Peng, Danny Address and Mark Green were state finalists in the category of creativity.

Arthur Chu, of Magruder High School, has received the Bausch and Lomb Award for high achievement in science.

Kenneth Le of Magruder High School won the Rensselaer Award for achievement in math and science.

Magruder High School students Brian Naranjo and Helen Dillon were honored by the American Field Service and, as a result, were chosen to attend school in Iceland and Sweden, respectively.

Wendy Peng, of Magruder High School, received the Maryland State Music Teachers Association Certificate of Achievement for Recognition of Private Piano Study for excellence in piano.

Magruder High School has won the First Place Yearbook Award from the Columbia Scholastic Press Association. Yearbook staff included: Jai Bae, Amy Graham, Barbara Jones, Martha Lam, Shannon Madine, Kelley Maurer, Steve Mendelsohn, David Parr, Jim Rosenthal, Paula Seymour, Allison Slater, Laura VanderHart. Michael Ritucci was the Yearbook sponsor.

Jehan Velji, of Whitman High School, was a Regional Winner in the recent National French Contest, Level V. His teacher was Estelle Stone.

Daniel Kraft, of Blair High School and Elke Baker, of Whitman High School, were winners in their division at the International Science Engineering Fair. This is the first time in several years that Montgomery County has had two division winners in this competition. Paige Butler, of Whitman High School, was a recipient of the National Council of Teachers of English Writing Award for 1986. Her teacher was Dina LaReau.

MCPS students Cathy Knapp and Krista Peterson, of Wheaton High School, and Wendy Hermach, Ellen Patrich and Dawn Raines of Richard Montgomery High School were recently named as Maryland Distinguished Scholar Finalists.

Michael Preston and Eric Gregory, of Wheaton High School, were recently named as Maryland Youth Senate Fellowship Finalists. Lynn Boiko, of Wheaton High School, was a recipient of the National Council of Teachers of English Writing Award.

Gladys Kaitell and Santiago Hernandez, both of Wheaton High School, won first and second places respectively in the Hood College Poetry Recitation Contest.

Gabriel Sunshine, of Bethesda-Chevy Chase High School, was a winner in both the National Math Olympiad and the Maryland State Math League.

Brian Primack, of Blair High School, as a result of his outstanding work in science, was selected to study at the Weizmann Institute in Israel.

A team of Wootton High School students, coached by LeRoy Allison, have been named as Sixth Circuit Mock Trial winners and Maryland State Champions in this competition. Team members are: Jennifer Blue, James Dailey, Matt Foreman, Anne Freeh, Jon Kaplan, Miriam Levine, Kalpana Parakkal, Kim Scearce, Wendy Shavell, and Jeff

Sparks.

STAFF

Christy Meyer, second grade teacher at Highland View Elementary School received the Washington Post's 1986 Agnes Meyer Outstanding Teacher Award.

Grace E. "Lyn" Hendry, social studies teacher at Walt Whitman High School, has received the 1986 University of Rochester Award for Excellence in Secondary School Teaching. This is the first time the award has been given outside the Rochester, New York area.

Barbara Covington, media specialist at Gaithersburg Elementary School, has been awarded a certificate from the Maryland Department of Education, Division of Library Development and Services for her many contribution of critical reviews to the Maryland Instructional Resources Network.

David Roos, resource teacher at Churchill High School, has been selected as the first recipient of the Maryland Foreign Language Association's award for excellence in foreign language administration.

Genevieve Maloney, French teacher at Walt Whitman High School, has been selected as one of the first recipients of the Greater Washington Foreign Language Association's award for excellence in foreign language teaching.

Regina Sclar, foreign language teacher at Hoover Junior High School, was awarded a certificate d'honneur as a professeur du laureat from the American Association of Teachers of French, for having winners again last year in Le Grand Concours, the national French contest. Joyce Pugh, instructional assistant at Rockville High School, was honored as an outstanding special needs paraprofessional by the Maryland Association of Vocational Education for Special Needs Persons.

Clark Dayhoff, project manager, Personnel System, Division of Systems Development, recently received the certified quality analyst designation by the Quality Assurance Institute, the national certification of excellence in developing high quality computerized information systems.

Marci Goldman-Frye, of Parkland Junior High School, was named "Outstanding Secondary School Math Teacher of the Year" by the Maryland Council of Teachers of Mathematics for 1986.

Ruth Gainer, art teacher at Whetstone Elementary School, has been selected as one of the art teachers in the State of Maryland to be honored for outstanding service in the field of art education by the Maryland Art Education Association.

Allen Currey, science teacher in the magnet program at Blair High School, was honored by the David Taylor Chapter of Sigma Xi, a

scientific research fraternity. The annual award goes to an outstanding educator dedicated to teaching science and encouraging research.

Walt Whitman High School was listed in a recent issue of Town & Country magazine as one of the top suburban high schools in the nation. Jerome Marco is the principal. In the same article, Bethesda-Chevy Chase High School and Churchill High School were among 26 others singled out as outstanding secondary institutions. Ann Meyer and Mary Helen Smith are the respective principals. College Gardens Elementary School was named a school of excellence in the U. S. Department of Education's Elementary School Recognition Program. Gerald Frick is the principal.

Richard Pioli, director of the Department of Aesthetic Education, was named Region 2 chairman of the Alliance for Arts Education, a component of the Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts devoted to establishing and improving arts education programs. He will oversee activities and monitor funding and expenditures of the New York, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Delaware, Maryland, Virginia and West Virginia state chapters.

Fran Fountain, sixth-grade teacher and Computer Club sponsor at Germantown Elementary School, won first prize in the 1986 Apple Computer Clubs Merit Competition. Her winning entry in the "Computers in the Curriculum" category for Grades 6-8 is an instructional unit which integrates computer use with social studies and reading/language arts.

The following MCPS staff members were recently named as semifinalists for the Maryland Presidential Award for Excellence in Science and Mathematics Teaching: Sharon Helling, Biology teacher at Walter Johnson High School; Melanie Hudock, Science teacher at Whitman High School; and Gregory Letterman and Stan Mordensky, Science teachers at Montgomery Village Junior High School.

Naomi Morton, Field Manager in the Division of Food Services, has been selected by the Maryland School Food Service Association as the 1986 Silver Success Grand Award winner, for her school food service accomplishments in increasing participation, increasing food quality and/or acceptability, public information and awareness, legislation, nutrition education, and professional growth. She will now represent Maryland in the American School Food Service Association competition. James Biedron, social studies teacher and "It's Academic" advisor, led the Bethesda-Chevy Chase High School team to the "It's Academic" Superbowl Championship for the Baltimore-Washington area. Evanthia Lambrakoupoulos, English resource teacher and "Chips" advisor, won four different awards from the Columbia Scholastic Press Association for the 1986 "Chips," Bethesda-Chevy Chase's literary magazine.

NATIONAL ACHIEVEMENT SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAM FOR OUTSTANDING NEGRO STUDENTS SEMIFINALISTS

BETHESDA-CHEVY CHASE HIGH SCHOOL

Shantel L. Blakely
Richard M. Shaw

MONTGOMERY BLAIR HIGH SCHOOL

Paul R. Johnson

CHURCHILL HIGH SCHOOL

David E. Moon

WALTER JOHNSON HIGH SCHOOL

Chad D. Clark

1987 NATIONAL MERIT SCHOLARSHIP SEMIFINALISTS

BETHESDA-CHEVY CHASE HIGH SCHOOL

Michael B. Bergsman
Anne L. Curzan
Eliza S. Engelberg
Daniel H. Foster
Judith N. Grossman
Priscilla J. Huff
Samuel M. Lasky
Michelle A. Parrish
Joseph P. Rhinewine
Michael P. Stavrianos
Gabriel B. Sunshine
Julie W. Vanneman
Michael S. Wiener
Michael T. Zapruder

MONTGOMERY BLAIR HIGH SCHOOL

Brendan C. Berry
John A. Delpino

CHURCHILL HIGH SCHOOL

Jeffrey A. Clites
Deborah B. Goldman
Katherine K. Hsu
Louis H. Kalikow
Michelle M. Kao
Ekwan E. Rhow
Daniel A. Rosenberg
Julie K. Schulman
Joshua M. Sharfstein
Ram C. Singh
Debbie A. Sprott
Frank J. Supik
David E. Toker

KENNEDY HIGH SCHOOL

Tanika J. Beamon

PAINT BRANCH HIGH SCHOOL

William R. Foman
Michael D. Kimbrough
Eric L. Robinson

SPRINGBROOK HIGH SCHOOL

Kima J. Taylor

WALTER JOHNSON HIGH SCHOOL

Robert L. Aung
Laurie F. Dixon
Jonathan E. Hamel
Yuval S. Rittenstreich
Ylann A. Schemm

KENNEDY HIGH SCHOOL

Steven Y. Quan
Michael L. Ross
Deborah J. Vagins

MAGRUDER HIGH SCHOOL

Laura A. Cohen
Roopali Garg
Peter D. Hinely
Karen A. Thurber

RICHARD MONTGOMERY HS

John A. Jordano
Christopher L. Tate

PAINT BRANCH HIGH SCHOOL

Jennifer L. Beaufort
John C. Kang
Paul A. Kramer
Diana E. Wofford

ROCKVILLE HIGH SCHOOL

Jeffrey R. Amspaugh
Barton F. Branstetter

Kristen J. Tucker
Richard J. Woodcock
Kenneth L. Young

DAMASCUS HIGH SCHOOL

Nicholas P. Harrigan

GAITHERSBURG HIGH SCHOOL

Dean S. Austin
Sheryl L. Blackstone
Jonathan M. Block
Jhemon H. Lee
Monica M. Shah
Angela G. Shope
Theresa E. Silliman

SPRINGBROOK HIGH SCHOOL

Heather W. Clague
Suzanne N. Cornell
Mark J. Friedman
Wayne A. Hoffman
David J. Smith
William W. Thomas

WALT WHITMAN HIGH SCHOOL

Jeremy J. Blum
Celeste Chang
Steve S. Chun
Frank J. Crary
Wingra T. Fang
Kim E. Goodman
Jessica A. Hamburger
Charles A. Hope
John J. Kasab
Venkateshwar Lal
Daniel E. Levine
Matthew J. MacKenzie
Angelo M. Maz
James D. Mendelsohn
David W. Miles
Waseem Noor
John E. O'Connell
Steven M. O'Keefe
Joshua R. Rich
Katherine M. Rourke
Jonathan R. Schwarz
Evan C. Sherbrooke
Geoffrey M. Silverton
Andrew P. Tagliabue
Neil V. Tangri

Ronn M. Daniel
Elaine M. Kasper
Jeanne M. Lyons
Judith M. Rosenberg
Knute J. Sears
Aryce D. Severson
Daniel J. Unger
Susan K. Wade
Michael C. Ward
Garth J. Zeglin

SENECA VALLEY HIGH SCHOOL

Grace S. Chou
Charlotte J. Kim
Deborah J. Mendelsohn
Darcy N. Ramisch
David H. Roberts
Eric L. Sandquist
William L. Willner

WOODWARD HIGH SCHOOL

Susan C. Athey
Todd O. Edmister
Lisa C. Hazard
Kathleen G. Human
Sonia S. Lee
Veronica M. Sauvain
Anat Shiloach

WOOTTON HIGH SCHOOL

Samuel J. Aronson
Theodore A. Chen
Danny Y. Chou
Lori A. Friedman
Helga B. Fuller
Steven L. Krauss
Jonathan L. Orwant
David B. Reiter
Bret R. Richey
Erika S. SAGRANICHINY
Kimberly A. Scearce
Robyn S. Seemann
Catherine C. Stetson

Harry I. Teplitz
Jehan N. Velji
Todd A. Waldman
Robert J. Weisberg
Leslie E. Weisz

1987 NATIONAL HISPANIC SCHOLAR AWARDS PROGRAM SEMIFINALISTS

MONTGOMERY BLAIR HIGH SCHOOL	RICHARD MONTGOMERY HS
John Del Pino	Michael Trujillo
WINSTON CHURCHILL HIGH SCHOOL	PAINT BRANCH HIGH SCHOOL
Anamaria Pintodasil Teresa Santiago	Cristina Cielo
DAMASCUS HIGH SCHOOL	SENECA VALLEY HIGH SCHOOL
Christina Boyle	Patricia Guarin
WALTER JOHNSON HIGH SCHOOL	SHERWOOD HIGH SCHOOL
Anouk Amzel Marcela Von Vacano John Paul Wheatcroft	James Downs
KENNEDY HIGH SCHOOL	SPRINGBROOK HIGH SCHOOL
Jeff Lunsford Claudia Molina	Demetrio Mamani Yvonne Valverde Craig Whiteside
MAGRUDER HIGH SCHOOL	WOOTTON HIGH SCHOOL
Brian Naranjo	Erika Sagranichiny

Re: NEW BUSINESS

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

WHEREAS, The Board of Education adopted in 1983 five priorities, the second of which committed the Board and the school system to substantial and continuing improvements in minority achievement; and

WHEREAS, Improvement has occurred for most minority students on standardized tests over the past three years; and

WHEREAS, Despite these gains, minority student test scores, and in particular scores for Black and Hispanic students, remain below those of white students, leaving the gap between those scores and the relationships unchanged; and

WHEREAS, Many actions have been taken which have been designed to improve minority student achievement, many of which have been

excellent in themselves and good examples for others to emulate; and

WHEREAS, There is a need to mount an even more intensive effort to assure that the goal the Board set can be achieved within a reasonable time frame for all minority students; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education directs the superintendent of schools to develop for the Board's consideration and approval a strategy or set of strategies for the improvement of minority student achievement which are system-wide, systematic, comprehensive, and are to be applied to each school; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the superintendent develop in conjunction with these strategies a method for assessing how well they are working to bring about the result desired; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the superintendent include within the proposals a formal mechanism for documenting, accumulating, and then disseminating effective, proven techniques for improving minority student achievement; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the superintendent develop these proposals by mid-January, 1987 for consideration by the Board by the end of January, in conjunction with the Board's review and adoption of the FY 1988 annual budget, so that any costs associated with the proposals can be considered in a timely way; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the Advisory Committee on Minority Student Education be asked to advise the superintendent and the Board on this matter in January, after the superintendent's proposals are available; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the Board also invite comments on the superintendent's proposals to the Board from the general public, prior to the Board's decision on this matter.

Re: ITEMS OF INFORMATION

Board members received the following items of information:

1. Items in Process
2. Construction Progress Report
3. PROGRAM OF STUDIES Revision of Fine Arts Requirement (for future consideration)

Re: ADJOURNMENT

The president adjourned the meeting at 4:50 p.m.

PRESIDENT

SECRETARY

WSC:mlw