



receiving a grant from the government's Title IV-C program which enabled them to review research on strong reading programs and to develop revisions in the reading/language arts curriculum. In 1981, the Board approved a reading and listening curriculum, and in 1983 the writing and speaking part of that curriculum was approved.

Ms. Kuehnle pointed out that the intent of the curriculum was to provide a consistent countywide program that would increase the proficiency of all students in reading, listening, speaking, writing and thinking. This was a research-based curriculum because research had told them that all the language arts were constructive processes. Students must be able to construct meaning as they read and listen, and they must be able to construct and communicate meaning as they write and speak. Therefore, the instructional program was meaning-centered and process-based. They wanted students to be aware of what they were doing, why they were doing it, and how they were doing it. This would result in their becoming independent learners and lifelong learners. The previous curriculum was based on minimum competency objectives set by the State Department of Education. Teachers used basal readers and the guides to the readers. If they had asked a teacher about the curriculum at that time, the teacher would have replied by citing the reading series he or she was using in the school.

Ms. Kuehnle reported that as far as writing and speaking, there was literally no curriculum. To be an effective reader, you must be flexible, able to handle different types of materials, and be motivated. The current curriculum was strategy-centered as opposed to skills-centered. Students were provided instruction in a wide variety of different kinds of texts. They were motivated because reading instruction was based on good literature, and they had many opportunities to read interesting and informative materials, thereby encouraging them to become lifelong readers.

Ms. Kuehnle stated that to be effective members of society, students must be able to use language and to reason. Both of these were crucial to achievement and inherent in the curriculum. The reading and listening component consisted of objectives in a variety of discourse--narration, exposition, persuasion and procedure. For each of these types of discourse, teachers had student performance objectives for fables, folk tales, biographies, novels, textbooks, newspapers, reference materials and recipes. The writing and speaking objectives paralleled reading and listening so that students were able to integrate instruction. They learned to write for purpose and in a variety of forms. They taught students how to develop language fluency, both orally and in writing.

Ms. Kuehnle emphasized that there were objectives at each grade level for the conventions of English including usage, grammar, spelling, capitalization, punctuation, and handwriting, K through 6. They had used summer workshops to develop support materials and a teacher's guide for each grade level containing units with many choices to allow for differentiation of instruction and for integrating language arts with content areas. They had spoken sequence charts

showing the development of objectives across grade levels, showing developmental as well as cognitive sequences. In addition, they had a handbook for new teachers which gave an overview of the program and some teaching tips. They also had a "core book list" showing library books approved for use as textbooks in the curriculum.

Ms. Kuehnle observed that another important element was training. In conjunction with Staff Development, the Department of Academic Skills offered 17 reading/language arts modules which supported Board Priorities 1 and 2. These were taught by teachers, and the teachers attending received stipends. For the past four years they had provided two days of training in August for teachers new to MCPS. Last year they trained two teachers in every school to help other teachers develop writing prompts that would help prepare students for the Maryland Functional Writing Test. They had four in-service courses that teachers could take, and they also offered a demonstration teacher model so that every elementary school would receive four half-days of substitute time to permit teachers to visit other schools and classrooms. At present, every school had either a half- or full-time reading specialist to provide ongoing support and training for implementation of the curriculum. Curriculum specialists also assisted in this effort, and at the area level there were reading/language arts specialists to help with training at the area and school level.

Mr. Schuder said that progress in such a curriculum was not going to be measured by any single instrument. At the classroom level they had informal measures and tests provided by publishers, and at system-wide levels they had standardized tests in grades 3, 5, and 8, with minimal competency tests in grades 7 and 9. In addition, they had the criterion-referenced reading tests which were a higher level measure of critical reading comprehension skills. These tests were available for reading in narration story forms for grades 1 to 8, and they were pilot testing them for reading exposition, social studies, science textbook materials, and encyclopedias. If they looked at the array of measures from minimal competency to standardized to criterion-referenced, they could say that students were doing very nicely in MCPS in this curriculum.

Ms. Fleming reported that in four years Diamond Elementary had moved from a basal approach to one implementing the reading/language arts curriculum. Instead of giving unit and placement tests, they were using the criterion-reference tests to plan and to gear up teaching strategies appropriate for the curriculum. She had seen teachers reluctant to change and to give up their basal reading, but with support from the area office reading specialists and the school-based reading teacher they had made the transition. She felt that teachers were more creative and were using stories to illustrate character traits or for conflict resolution. They were now creating their own resource matters on their own time and sharing with other teachers.

In terms of the students, Ms. Fleming said there had been stories that this curriculum was not for the low achieving student, but she

felt the program was a motivating force for all children. Children were finding joy in reading which showed up in terms of library circulation at Diamond. She added that they were constantly educating their community as to the intent of the reading/language arts program because parents were accustomed to having a basal reader coming home with the child.

Ms. Fleming found the program renewing in terms of teachers and their creativity. This was reflected in their criterion-reference test scores as well as in the California Achievement Test results.

Ms. Doores explained that she was one of those receiving the initial training in the program who took the training back to the staff. Last year she had taught a third and fourth grade classroom using the program. Now she was working with a staff that had been using the program for four years, and she was working with them to redefine their delivery of services and do more integration of curriculum. She thought the program made students feel good about reading. Reading was no longer a separate subject. It was unified with social studies, science, math, and all the curriculum areas. Motivation of students had improved, and while some could not read the materials they were exposed to materials at their level of interest and were able to listen to the story. She saw students reading more and discussing more because they were exposed to more. As a result of this interest, there was a great drain on the media center as students sought out books by the same author or books in a content area. Children did more reading to each other, sharing their reading knowledge and skills.

Ms. Doores saw more emphasis on higher order intellectual skills. Students were able to do more analysis, synthesis, and they were making predictions and becoming risk-takers. There was also a greater reading/writing connection and a larger variety of activities on a more creative level. Because of the strong writing component, she saw the program as enhancing work in science and social studies because students were using critical thinking skills. Children were selecting books on a more difficult level, and she felt the program complemented Priority 1 and Priority 2 because it was challenging, allowed children to be risk-takers, and gave children an opportunity to share information with each other.

Ms. Kreitman informed the Board that as a first grade teacher she had started her career using basal readers and a teacher's guide. She found that she and the students were bored with lessons from the basals. She felt that the publishers did not know her and the needs of her students, but rather they prepared material for all classrooms. As a consequence, she started using the library for materials to give students a chance to read from a variety of sources on all the topics they were studying. Now with the new program, she had control over what happened in her classroom and did her planning based upon the objectives that she must teach. She reported that textbook language was very contrived because publishers wanted to make books readable, and as a consequence they distorted the language

and failed to make language rich and exciting. Previously skills were taught in isolation, and there was no connection of skills to content to subject matter. Now she was in control of her classroom. Ms. Kreitman reported that yesterday her students had read a folk tale and had developed four questions about the story. Today they were to exchange these questions with another student and answer questions their partner had written. There was a lot of discussion, because the first graders had to ask the writer of the question to explain what was meant if they did not understand. This fostered involvement and a commitment to learning. As a classroom teacher, she felt she had to be more responsible than she used to be for knowing what she needed to teach. The basal reader did not hold her responsible.

Ms. Kreitman felt there was now a strong emphasis in the classroom on using language skills to understand the gist of a text through discussion and questioning. Meaning was sought through listening and thinking and examining language in the text. She was able to use fine, high quality children's literature, and students were motivated and enchanted by the materials. This freedom to choose what was appropriate for her students was to her one of the most exciting things she had done in a long time. Minority children were allowed to bring to the learning experience their own background and experience and relate it to that which was to be learned. For these children, the natural tendency was to make sense of the world around them as a foundation for learning language skills. They could participate, interact, produce language and internalize new language skills in a relevant manner.

Ms. Collins indicated that she was a sixth grade teacher and had been teaching in Montgomery County for over 15 years. Over the years she had seen many innovations, but the current reading/language arts program was one of the best she had ever seen. It was good for teachers and students, and it allowed integration into other parts of the curriculum. They had novels and units for using the newspaper, textbooks, poetry and fables. They had a wealth of material, and the teacher was given the flexibility to decide on the time frame and the emphasis.

Ms. Collins recalled that when she was a child and was given a new book twice a year there was great excitement in the classroom. Now students had new books every six to eight weeks which was highly motivating. The curriculum guides had excellent initiating activities to get children involved from the beginning, and the novels were well chosen for the grade and age of the child. In addition, she could go back to fifth grade books or ahead to seventh and eighth grade books. She felt that the program was excellent to use with science and social studies. For example, they could use fables when they were learning about Africa or myths when they were studying Greece and Rome.

Ms. Collins explained that children could now write about characters in a novel or come up with a different ending to a story. They could

write letters to newspapers and to embassies. Children were taught the purpose for writing and were taught to appreciate their audience. They learned to view writing as a process and not simply a product. As far as developing critical thinking skills, they asked children to evaluate and analyze what they had read. She then read several papers produced by children in her classroom. She found there was excellent discussion and interaction going on between children and between children and teacher. She was proud to be a teacher in Montgomery County because of what was going on in the classrooms. Ms. Norment cited a first grader who asked if they were going to read the new way or the old way today. The student liked the new way better because he was excited about reading. The curriculum provided an opportunity for the children to ask questions about what was going to take place in a story. The children were able to discuss the story among themselves with the teacher facilitating the conversation.

Ms. Norment explained that she had been a reading teacher at Rolling Terrace which was a unique school with 476 students representing 36 countries. The staff faced the challenge of educating such a diverse population effectively. They needed to be sure they were assessing and educating their children to the fullest; therefore, they accepted the change from the basal readers to an open-ended, flexible, comprehensive curriculum that was very good for teachers and for students. With the new curriculum, they were able to help children regulate their own learning and to be in control of that learning. Research told them that strategic learning was a goal that should be fundamental to education and that strategic problem solving developed somewhere between the ages of five to 12. The curriculum provided them with a variety of reading materials and resources. The children and teachers were excited because it was such a colorful, stimulating, and exciting environment with so many books to read.

Ms. Norment reported that science and social studies had always been hard areas for their children. The curriculum offered expository training with techniques for teachers to use to teach children to handle different materials. They found it was a matter of adjusting instructional methods to help their children understand science and social studies. In addition, they found that children became more aware of their own learning styles. They became aware that they could improve. They saw redirection in the thinking of teachers. They were very open to helping children and gaining from the experience of the children. Teachers worked in teams, sharing materials, and sharing ideas. They set up some very structured schedules of teacher observations of each other, and they were able to get substitute time to let teachers pair activities that were going on from classroom to classroom. If the Board visited their classrooms, they would find children sharing a novel, doing book reports, evaluating each other's writing, and discussing.

Ms. Norment felt that the new curriculum was the best thing that had happened to the county in the 16 years she had been teaching. She was elated about the program and quoted the Rolling Terrace principal as saying, "We are teaching a reading and thinking process. The

children are not going to forget the way they are thinking. Long after they may have forgotten the names of characters and actions and solutions to the problem, they would have established a pattern, a structure, and an awareness of purpose."

Mr. Clark stated that the next question was where they were going from here. He thought they had a very rich curriculum that, with some fine tuning, would be in place for the next decade. The curriculum was based on recent findings and research, and it was on the cutting edge of what was going on with reading and language arts in the country. They would need to continue to train teachers to understand the curriculum and to use it, and they would have to continue this training program. At present they were using some technology in the program, and in the future they would have to look at other technologies as they emerged.

Mr. Goldensohn commented that he had enjoyed the discussion. His wife was an elementary school language arts teacher, and he had seen the changes in the reading/language arts program. He thought the curriculum was excellent, and he hoped that it would last for the next decade.

Mrs. Praisner remarked that when she had introduced the idea of a monthly curriculum discussion she wasn't sure how this would develop. She was especially glad to see the practitioners and the classroom participants as part of the discussion. She, too, wondered where they were going in the future with implementation, training, and new technologies. Dr. Pitt saw the use of technology as an instrument for learning rather than learning technology.

Dr. Cronin asked how they could assure a community educated with basal readers that their children were still learning form and that form was not being sacrificed in the name of understanding. How did they make sure children were learning to spell, punctuate, and capitalize. Ms. Kuehnle replied that in the traditional setting, grammar and usage were taught in isolation. There was little carry-over to real writing. Now they were saying writing was a process and that process should be emphasized. When the student was able to proofread, that was the ideal time to get into the usage, the grammar, and the mechanics because then it had some real meaning for the child. Mr. Schuder added that they were teaching writing and reading as a functional repertoire of strategies and not in isolation.

Dr. Cronin asked what they did with a sixth grade student reading at the eighth or ninth grade level. Ms. Collins replied that certain novels were identified for the gifted and talented and set aside for children above grade level. In addition, some novels were identified as simple sixth grade novels.

Ms. Kreitman reported that every year parents attended back-to-school night and asked if she was still teaching phonics. Her answer was yes. They had not discarded phonics objectives. Those objectives were to be taught to students at all grade levels; however, they now

had a different way of addressing them.

Mr. Ewing said that parents frequently asked a question which they had not talked about explicitly. They wanted to know what it was that students should know when they had finished with six or seven years of instruction and skills and strategies they should have mastered by that time. Mr. Schuder replied that they wanted to have students become independent learners, readers, writers and thinkers. The second level was stated in the PROGRAM OF STUDIES. They wanted children to understand what they had read, and they had defined a wide array of reading materials and a wide variety of purposes for doing so. They wanted students to become purposeful writers who wrote things that others could understand. The same thing was true with speech habits. The third level was specific to the PROGRAM OF STUDIES. This listed what the objectives themselves were and how they were organized.

Dr. Vance suggested that the only person missing from the panel today was a parent. He would like to play that role because he had two children in elementary school who had been in different schools. He had shared with Dr. Martin his wife's pleasure with the reading/language arts program. He was amazed at how well his second grader and fifth grader wrote and how well they wrote independently. For example, on Sunday morning he had to rush to get the sports pages away from his fifth grade son. These were demonstrable things that impacted his household, and he would imagine other parents in the county saw the same things.

Mr. Ewing recalled that when his children were young he had to spend a vast amount of time teaching the form and structure of the English language to them. He wondered how they were doing in this area now. He continued to hear students saying they didn't learn much about the structure of English until they studied a foreign language. Ms. Kuehnle replied that the rich literature in the curriculum served as a model for student writing. Students were constantly looking at different structures and the different ways that authors expressed themselves. She felt they were getting far more exposure than they had previously where the instruction came mostly from a grammar book.

Dr. Pitt remarked that they still had a concern here because of performances on basic writing tests. However, children did not write outside of the formal school situation as much as they once did. For example, people used the telephone rather than write a letter. Therefore, the schools had a great responsibility here. Mr. Schuder added that research had shown that isolated instruction in grammar was actually detrimental to the quality of writing produced by students. Now they were taking these competencies and putting them in a functional repertoire where they would end up with better grammar and better writing.

Dr. Shoenberg stated that many people were concerned about what children knew, particularly children from disadvantaged backgrounds or language-poor backgrounds. He had heard them talk about students' responses to function and to human conflicts and problems that arose



in that fiction. However, they had not talked about biographies or newspapers, and he wondered where there was some tendency in the reading/language arts program to scant the skills involved in reading nonfictional works. He noted that all the people at the table had been well trained in the curriculum and were enthusiastic about it. However, about a year ago they received a report from DEA which noted that many people were not comfortable with the curriculum and liked the basal readers. He said he was encouraged by the response he had heard from principals and teachers this morning, but he was concerned about what else they needed to do. He asked if there were anything the Board needed to do to promote the further spread and acceptance of this curriculum.

Mr. Schuder replied that the data in the report was almost three years old and had been collected at the time when they were beginning the training. Dr. Shoenberg asked if every school had adopted the curriculum de facto. Mr. Schuder replied that they had made great progress. As they involved more teachers in the training modules and the training program, they would see a higher degree of implementation of the curriculum as it was written. Dr. Shoenberg asked if new teachers were prepared to deal with the curriculum. Ms. Kuehnle replied that in recent years new teachers were much better prepared, especially in the area of writing. New teachers had nothing to give up, and therefore they were doing very well with the new curriculum.

Dr. Shoenberg asked if he could have a response to his first question. It might be that students received sufficient practices in dealing with nonfictional materials across the curriculum. Ms. Collins replied that she did use nonfiction, and they spent a lot of time working with research skills and using textbooks and encyclopedias. She explained that it was hard to divorce reading/language arts from the rest of the curriculum because they were really teaching these skills all day long.

Mr. Herscovitz reported that he had not learned about construction of the English language until he was in junior high school and had started with a foreign language course. He was concerned that students were learning to read but were not sure about construction. He wondered what was going on now that was different from what he had learned ten years ago in elementary schools. Ms. Kuehnle said she could give him a quick response. Teachers were incorporating those objectives in their lessons and students were learning these skills. They had a process called peer conferencing where students look at each other's writing and help with proof reading. She also noted that test scores were improving in this area.

Mrs. Rafel expressed her appreciation to the staff for a very productive hour. She hoped that future discussions on curriculum issues would have the same kind of exposition before they got to Board questions.

Mrs. DiFonzo noted that she had heard from parents that private schools provided reading lists to students. She thought they could

do a great service to youngsters if schools could provide reading lists for summer reading. Staff assured her that schools did have reading lists and offered to provide samples of the lists. Mrs. DiFonzo thanked staff for an enlightening discussion.

Re: BOARD/PRESS/VISITOR CONFERENCE

Mr. Dustin Ferris, Gaithersburg High School student, appeared before the Board.

Re: A MOTION BY MR. HERSCOWITZ ON SMOKING  
(FAILED)

The following motion by Mr. Herscowitz failed for lack of a second:

WHEREAS, The surgeon general of the United States has determined that smoking is injurious to personal health; and

WHEREAS, The Montgomery County Board of Education recognizes and accepts the overwhelming evidence of the health hazards inherent to the use of tobacco and condemns the practice; and

WHEREAS, The Board of Education banned tobacco use on school premises by students for the aforementioned reasons; and

WHEREAS, The Board of Education's educational practice of condemning tobacco use contradicts its administrative practice of tolerating staff use of tobacco; and

WHEREAS, In MCPS' attempts to employ staff that will serve as role models for its students, smoking staff members may unconsciously serve as negative role models for students in regard to tobacco use, particularly during school hours and on school premises; and

WHEREAS, Tobacco use by some staff members poses a potential health threat to other staff members and students; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education adopts as its policy a prohibition on use of tobacco on school premises, central office, and area offices; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the date for implementation of the ban on use of tobacco shall be as of the first day of school in September 1988, assuming Board of Education approval of the superintendent's plan of action which addresses at a minimum the following issues in practical terms showing how they will be resolved:

- a) What penalties would be appropriate and be employed for violation of the tobacco ban by staff, including any gradation of penalties for multiple violations and what degree of violation will be required for suspension and/or fine
- b) What specific plans for enforcing the ban including which

categories of employees will be required to enforce it, for example, department directors, principals, resource teachers, etc.

- c) The total estimated cost of extending the student tobacco education cessation and enforcement programs to the staff, and
- d) The possibility of establishing a student/staff support relationship program;

and be it further

RESOLVED, That a copy of this resolution be sent to all employee units, student government organizations, the State Board of Education, and the Montgomery County Council.

RESOLUTION NO. 178-88 Re: TOBACCO PROHIBITION IMPLEMENTATION PLAN

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

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education endorse the superintendent's tobacco prohibition implementation plan; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education request the superintendent actively to pursue development of a plan to ban staff tobacco use in MCPS facilities and that he bring the Board his findings or recommendations or both at an appropriate time but not later than the fall of 1989; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education encourage local schools to institute voluntary staff bans on the use of tobacco for the next school year and direct the superintendent to provide support to those schools that do and to report back the status of that in one year.

Re: EXECUTIVE SESSION

The Board of Education met in executive session from 12:20 to 1:55 p.m. to discuss personnel and legal issues.

Re: BOARD/PRESS/VISITOR CONFERENCE  
(CONTINUED)

The following individuals appeared before the Board of Education:

- 1. Sonia Beekman
- 2. Laurie Palmer, Takoma Park ES PTA
- 3. Mavis Ellis, Takoma Park ES PTA
- 4. Stan Gordon, Citizens Advisory Committee for Career and Vocational Education

RESOLUTION NO. 179-88 Re: PERSONNEL APPOINTMENT

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

unanimously:

APPOINTMENT	PRESENT POSITION	AS
Robert E. Hatchel	Principal Piney Branch ES	Principal Designate E. Brooke Lee MS Effective: 5-1-88

RESOLUTION NO. 180-88 Re: INTRODUCTION TO ALGEBRA A AND B AND  
PRINCIPLES OF GEOMETRY AND ALGEBRA A  
AND B

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

\*Dr. Cronin temporarily left the meeting after making the motion and before the vote was taken.

WHEREAS, The public school laws of Maryland specify that the county superintendent shall prepare courses of study and recommend them for adoption by the county Board (ANNOTATED CODE OF THE PUBLIC GENERAL LAWS OF MARYLAND, EDUCATION, SEC. 4-205); and

WHEREAS, The public school laws of Maryland also state that the county Board, on the written recommendation of the county superintendent, shall establish courses of study for the schools under its jurisdiction (IBID., Sec. 4-110); and

WHEREAS, The PROGRAM OF STUDIES is the document which contains the prescribed curriculum elements, including instructional objectives, of all MCPS curriculum programs and courses (MCPS Regulation IFB-RA: Development and Approval of Curriculum and Supporting Materials); and

WHEREAS, Excellence in curriculum can be maintained only by paying continuing attention to the need for curriculum change; and

WHEREAS, The MCPS Mathematics Task Force Report called for the improvement of the mathematics program for all students and included recommendations to review and modify curriculum content and instructional strategies to reflect current trends and to train staff in these modifications; and

WHEREAS, The Council on Instruction, charged by the superintendent with considering recommendations for curriculum change, has recommended approval of the curricula for Introduction to Algebra A and B and Principles of Geometry and Algebra A and B, based on the results of pilot testing; and

WHEREAS, The superintendent recommends that the Board approve these new courses presented on March 9, 1988; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education approve Introduction to Algebra A and B and Principles of Geometry and Algebra A and B for inclusion

in the Grades 9-12 mathematics section of the MCPS PROGRAM OF STUDIES as basic core Category 1 courses effective for the 1988-89 school year, replacing Algebra 1, Parts 1A and B, and Algebra 1, Parts 2A and B.

RESOLUTION NO. 181-88 Re: PROCUREMENT CONTRACTS OVER \$25,000

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

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

WHEREAS, It is recommended that the bids received in response to Bid No. 14-88, Computer Scheduling System, be rejected due to insufficient funds; and

WHEREAS, This scheduling system has been budgeted in FY 1989 and, if approved, will be rebid later; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That Bid No. 14-88 be rejected; and be it further

RESOLVED, That having been duly advertised, the contracts be awarded to the low responsive bidders meeting specifications as shown for the bids as follows:

COG NO. Gasoline Fuel 80143

AWARDEES	
Discount Oil Company	\$ 168,975 *
J. E. Meintzer and Sons, Inc.	957,525
	-----
Total	\$ 1,126,500

GSA NO. Comdial Telephone Equipment OOK86AHD0016

AWARDEE	
Calso Communications, Inc.	\$ 415,000

84-88 Ceiling Board and Grid System Materials

AWARDEES	
The Walter E. Campbell Co., Inc.	\$ 74 *
Hudson Supply and Equipment Co.	14,033
J. B. Acoustical Supply	16,023
	-----
Total	\$ 30,130

88-88 Industrial Arts Lumber

AWARDEES	
Allied Plywood Corporation	\$ 12,324
The Mann and Parker Lumber Co.	57,293

Northeastern Lumber Co.		6,914
		-----
Total	\$	76,531

90-88 Physical Education Supplies and Equipment

AWARDEES		
Allied Recreation Co.	\$	13,706
Aluminum Athletic Equipment Co.		488
American Institutional Sales Corp.		7,831
Anaconda-Kaye Sports, Inc.		5,300
BSN Corp.		9,108
CMG/Cannon Sports		645
Dekan Athletic Equipment Corp.		406
The Dugout Sporting Goods Co.		14,394
DVF Sporting Goods Co.		27,007
E & S Recreation		5,862 *
Eagle Sports Co.		1,400 *
Fitness Industries		739
Flaghouse, Inc.		960
Bill Fritz Sports		1,350
Gibson, Inc.		515
Gopher Activewear and Sports Equip.		1,502
Graves-Humphreys Co.		2,845
Kaplan School Supply Corp.		1,044
LIC, Inc.		3,634 *
McKillen Sports		651
Marlow Sports, Inc.		23,215
The Mini-Gym Co.		2,745
Mitchell & Ness		992 *
Passon's Sports		750
J.A. Preston Corp.		3,200
Priceless Installations		24,904 *
Rock Terrace High School		4,305
George Santelli		5,098 *
Sportmaster		7,826
Sport-Tech		1,623
Tiffin Athletic Mats, Inc.		2,975 *
U.S. Games, inc.		2,043
Wolverine Sports		117
		-----
Total	\$	179,180

92-88 Furnish and Install Cosmetology Equipment

AWARDEE		
Davidson Supply Co., Inc.	\$	30,830

95-88 Floor Maintenance Supplies

AWARDEES		
District Supply, Inc.	\$	97,560 *
Huntington Laboratories, Inc.		22,691
		-----

Total \$ 120,251

99-88 Duplicating Supplies

AWARDEES	
Chaselle, Inc.	\$ 3,404
Globe Office Supply Co., Inc.	10,637 *
I.E.S.S.	25,624 *
Landon Systems Corp.	8,867
J.S. Latta, Inc.	532
Martin Associates, Inc.	2,116 *
Metropolitan Ribbon & Carbon	2,028
Nashua Corp. O.P. Div.	67,265
Nicholas P. Pipino Associates	6,012
Repeat-O-Tyne Mfg. Corp.	5,995
Rudolph's Office Supply, Inc.	89 *
Virginia Impression Products Co., Inc.	4,335
Visual Systems Co., Inc.	15,700 *
-----	
Total	\$ 152,604

104-88 Athletic Uniform Bid

AWARDEES	
Champion Products, Inc.	\$ 16,538
Marlow Sports, Inc.	10,360
The Neff Company	1,134
Shipley's Sporting Goods	1,930
Team Distributors, Inc.	16,834
-----	
Total	\$ 46,796

\* Asterisk denotes MFD vendors

RESOLUTION NO. 182-88 AMENDMENTS TO THE FY 1989 CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PROGRAM

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

WHEREAS, Based on the County Council's tentative action on the Board of Education's FY 1989 Capital Budget, there is a need to modify the appropriations requested for several projects; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education amend its FY 1989 Capital Budget as follows:

	ORIGINAL REQUEST	AMENDED REQUEST
Planned Life Cycle Asset Replacement (PLAR) & Local Capital Improvements	\$ 5,972	

Planned Life Cycle Asset		
Replacement		\$ 1,588
Mechanical Systems Rehab.		1,592
Roof Replacement		1,792
Future School Modern/Renov		1,000
	-----	-----
Subtotal	\$ 5,972	\$ 5,972
Monocacy ES Modernization	2,343	2,343 *

\* Appropriation for a larger community-size gymnasium must be requested by the Board of Education as Montgomery County Public Schools will be awarding the construction contract. Expenditures will be considered part of the Department of Recreation budget.

RESOLVED, That the FY 1989 Capital Improvements Program be amended accordingly.

For the record, Mrs. Praisner stated that it was her understanding that (1) if they found that the funds for mechanical and roof replacement, etc. for those specific items are not adequate they could adjust within those items them, and (2) although their capital budget would be increased to accommodate the money for Monocacy Elementary School's larger gym, this would carry the asterisk that indicates those were not MCPS funds but Recreation Department funds.

RESOLUTION NO. 183-88    Re:    TRANSFER OF FUNDS - VARIOUS CAPITAL PROJECTS

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

WHEREAS, Surplus funds are in the budget appropriation for the S. Christa McAuliffe Elementary School project; and

WHEREAS, Additional funds are required to finish the site work and furnish and equip the new Phoenix II facility; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That surplus funds of \$120,000 be transferred from the S. Christa McAuliffe Elementary School project No. 110-01 to the local unliquidated surplus account No. 999; and be it further

RESOLVED, That \$80,000 be transferred from the local unliquidated surplus account No. 999 to the Phoenix II project No. 514-01; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the county executive be requested to recommend approval of these transfers to the County Council.

RESOLUTION NO. 184-88    Re:    WORKS OF ART FOR STRAWBERRY KNOLL ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Mrs. Praisner seconded by Dr. Shoenberg, 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 as required by law; and

WHEREAS, Funds have been appropriated for this purpose in the FY 1988 Capital Improvements Program; and

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

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

ARTIST	WORK	COMMISSION
Marcia Billig	Sculpture	\$20,000
Craig English	Murals	15,000
Jerry Carter	Mosaic	9,000
Maureen Melville	Stained Glass	7,000
Guy Fairlamb	Mural	6,000
Tom Wheeler	Stained Glass	3,200

and be it further

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

RESOLUTION NO. 185-88 Re: WORKS OF ART FOR MOYER ROAD ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Mrs. Praisner seconded by Dr. Shoenberg, 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 as required by law; and

WHEREAS, Funds have been appropriated for this purpose in the FY 1988

Capital Improvements Program; and

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

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

ARTIST	WORK	COMMISSION
Walter Kravitz	Mobiles	\$16,000
Lorraine Vail	Relief	15,000
Lilli Ann Rosenberg	Mosaic Mural	14,000
Rosalie Sherman	Sculptures	12,000

and be it further

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

RESOLUTION NO. 186-88 Re: ASBESTOS INSPECTION AND MANAGEMENT PLAN SERVICES

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

WHEREAS, In accordance with appropriate Montgomery County Public Schools procedures, bids have been received to provide federally mandated asbestos inspection and asbestos management plan development services for all Montgomery County Public Schools facilities; and

WHEREAS, The lowest responsible bidders have proposed to provide required services for a total amount that is less than earlier estimates; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education enter into the following contractual agreements subject to approval of funds by the Montgomery County Council:

FIRM	MCPS FACILITIES GROUP	ASBESTOS INSPECTION AND MANAGEMENT PLAN	AMOUNT
Professional Service Industries	1		\$87,376
806 Barkwood Court, Suite K	2		88,589
Linthicum, MD 21090	3		88,401
Apex Environmental, Inc.	4		85,405
7930 Old Georgetown Road	5		87,305
Bethesda, MD 20814			

and be it further

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education amend its request of January 12, 1988, for an emergency appropriation of \$934,000 for asbestos-testing and management plan development and related costs by reducing the amount to \$634,000.

RESOLUTION NO. 187-88 Re: ADJUSTMENT TO ARCHITECTURAL CONTRACT FOR QUINCE ORCHARD HIGH SCHOOL

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

WHEREAS, The County Council has tentatively approved architectural planning funds for a 16-classroom addition to Quince Orchard High School, which will increase the student capacity to 2,000 students; and

WHEREAS, Staff has negotiated a fee with the Quince Orchard High School project architect to complete these plans; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education approve an increase of \$98,000 to the contract with Grimm and Parker Architects to provide architectural services for the new addition, contingent upon final County Council approval of this project, as part of the Board's FY 1989 Capital Budget.

RESOLUTION NO. 188-88 Re: ARCHITECTURAL ADJUSTMENT FOR LAYTONSVILLE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

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

WHEREAS, The architectural contract for Laytonsville Elementary School was negotiated to provide plans for the modernization of the existing building; and

WHEREAS, The contract requires modifications to provide additional services; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education approve an amendment to the contract with Smolen/Rushing Associates to provide architectural services for Laytonsville Elementary School modernization, increasing the fee from \$160,000 to \$225,000.

RESOLUTION NO. 189-88 Re: ARCHITECTURAL APPOINTMENT FOR BRIGGS CHANEY MIDDLE SCHOOL

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

WHEREAS, It is necessary to appoint an architectural firm to provide

professional technical services during the design and construction phases of the proposed Briggs Chaney Middle School; and

WHEREAS, Funds for architectural planning have been appropriated as part of the FY 1988 Capital Budget for this project; and

WHEREAS, The architectural selection committee, in accordance with procedures approved and adopted by the Board of Education on May 13, 1986, identified the firm most qualified to provide the necessary professional architectural and engineering services; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the Montgomery County Board of Education enter into a contractual agreement with the architectural firm of SHWC, Inc., to provide professional services for the proposed Briggs Chaney Middle School for a fee of \$578,750.

\*Dr. Cronin rejoined the meeting at this point.

RESOLUTION NO. 190-88 Re: FY 1988 SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION FOR SPECIAL PROJECTS IN SCIENCE AND MATHEMATICS

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

RESOLVED, That the superintendent of schools be authorized, subject to County Council approval, to receive and expend an FY 1988 supplemental appropriation of \$59,268 from the Maryland State Department of Education under the Education for Economic Security Act, Title II, for the mathematics and science training of selected K-12 teachers in the following categories:

	CATEGORY	AMOUNT
1	Administration	\$56,234
10	Fixed Charges	3,034
		-----
	Total	\$59,268

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. 191-88 Re: FY 1988 SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION FOR INTENSIVE VOCATIONAL ENGLISH AND SKILLS PROGRAM

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

RESOLVED, That the superintendent of schools be authorized, subject to County Council approval, to receive and expend an FY 1988 supplemental appropriation of \$31,533 from the Montgomery County Department of Social Services, Division of Family Resources, under Title IV of the Refugee Act of 1980 (P.L. 96-212) to extend the Intensive Vocational English and Skills Program in the following categories:

CATEGORY	AMOUNT
2 Instructional Salaries	\$26,317
3 Other Instructional Costs	3,111
10 Fixed Charges	2,105
	-----
Total	\$31,533

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. 192-88 Re: UTILIZATION OF FY 1988 FUTURE SUPPORTED PROJECT FUNDS FOR THE SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT THROUGH INSTRUCTIONAL PROCESSES (SITIP) LEARNING STYLES PROJECT

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

RESOLVED, That the superintendent of schools be authorized to receive and expend within the FY 1988 Provision for Future Supported Projects a grant award of \$1,000 from MSDE under the Chapter 2, ECIA program in Category 1, Administration;

and be it further

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

RESOLUTION NO. 193-88 Re: PRESENTATION OF PRELIMINARY PLANS HADLEY FARMS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL (AREA 3)

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

WHEREAS, The architect for the new Hadley Farms Elementary School has prepared the schematic design in accordance with the educational specifications; and

WHEREAS, The Hadley Farms Elementary School Planning Committee has approved the proposed schematic design; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the Montgomery County Board of Education approve the preliminary plan report for Hadley Farms Elementary School, prepared by Thomas Clark Associates.

RESOLUTION NO. 194-88 Re: WEIGHTED C GRADES

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

RESOLVED, That starting in September 1988, C's in those advanced placement and advanced level courses which have no regular level would be weighted; and be it further

RESOLVED, That this be approved for the following courses:

ADVANCED PLACEMENT COURSES

ART

Studio Art AP A & B (single period)

Studio Art AP A & B (double period)

COMPUTER SCIENCE

Computer Science AP A & B

ENGLISH

English AP A & B

MATHEMATICS

Calculus A & B

SCIENCE

Biology AP A & B (single period)

Biology AP A & B (double period)

Chemistry AP A & B (single period)

Chemistry AP A & B (double period)

Physics AP A & B

SOCIAL STUDIES

American Government and Politics AP

Comparative Government and Politics AP

European History AP A & B

U. S. History AP A & B

ADVANCED LEVEL COURSES

FOREIGN LANGUAGES

Modern Foreign Languages, Levels 5A & B, 6 A & B

MATHEMATICS

Algebra 2 with Trigonometry A & B

Elementary Functions

Analytic Geometry

SCIENCE

Anatomy and Physiology

BLAIR MAGNET COURSES

INTERNATIONAL BACCALAUREATE COURSES

Re: A LONGITUDINAL STUDY OF CHILDREN IN  
PRESCHOOL SPECIAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Dr. Patricia Edmister, coordinator of Child Find/CEDS/Early Childhood Handicapped Unit, reported that this was the first group of results from a very exciting study that DEA was doing on preschool special education programs. They were excited because it was a landmark approach to research in this area because for many years research was done by universities with selected samples. This study took all the preschoolers who had been referred to special education, regardless of the handicapping condition, tested them prior to their entrance in a special education program, and followed them for a period of time. The children would continue to be followed to see how they were progressing. As educators, they had thought that early intervention would make a difference, but they did not have the efficacy research for say for certain. Now MCPS had that information to build its own programs and also to help other school systems. This was critical because of the new federal legislation, P.L. 99-457, which will go into effect by 1990-91. For several years, Maryland has mandated that schools serve a younger population, but the new law would mandate this federally.

Dr. Pitt remarked that the critical point was that MCPS was already doing what the federal law mandated. Dr. Edmister added that Dr. Hiawatha Fountain, associate superintendent for special education, was serving on a governor's task force to look at the new legislation because it did make some changes from P.L. 94-142. Now they were at the beginning stages at the state level to identify service delivery models and interagency cooperation; however, they were ahead of other states and the federal government was using Maryland as a model. In addition, Channel 7 was doing a story on the preschool program at Stephen Knolls.

Mrs. DiFonzo asked if there would be an increase in federal monies, and Dr. Edmister replied that they would receive more but not as much as other systems because Montgomery County had been doing this for some time.

Dr. Joy Frechtling introduced Dr. Joy Markowitz, who was the principal author of the study and who would continue with the study over the next two and a half years. She also introduced Dr. John Larson who had helped with the data analyses of the study. Dr. Frechtling reported that they had started studying infants and young children as soon as they had been identified as being in need of special education. They tried to get a comprehensive and consistent picture of every child entering special education and follow them through their service years. They had tried to be consistent in the data obtained about every child. They had used the Battelle Developmental Inventory (BDI) to get a profile of every child, and every child had been tested each year they were in the program. This gave them a baseline along with progress each year, although the instruments used changed as the child got older. She explained that they looked at the kinds of services and programs received by the students to see if there were any systematic patterns. They also spent a lot of effort in dealing with parents to find out their views of the program and the effect on the families themselves of having a

special education child. There is a lot of documentation about stress on families with handicapped children. At the time the report was developed they had a sample of 600 plus students, more male than female, but with a distribution comparable to that of MCPS regarding racial and ethnic groups.

Dr. Shoenberg wondered how they could test the cognitive development of an 11-month-old baby. Dr. Markowitz replied that an 11-month-old had the concept that objects were permanent. Therefore, they might hide an object under a handkerchief to see whether the child would try to remove the handkerchief to get at the object. Dr. Shoenberg asked if Down Syndrome children were included, and Dr. Frechtling replied that they were including with most of them in the multi-handicapped program. Dr. Edmister added that typically these children were picked up early, usually from birth because Down Syndrome was easily identified medically. The study also included blind children, auditorily impaired children, children with cerebral palsy, but not usually the emotionally disturbed. Dr. Frechtling commented that the handicapping code at the time of initial placement gave them an idea of the diagnosis at the time of placement with the largest number in speech, language and multi-handicaps.

Dr. Frechtling reported that as they looked at the students on a yearly basis they drew up developmental profiles on the changes in their skill levels over time with service. They did their analyses separately by handicapping condition because very early on they saw different patterns of effects depending upon the initial handicapping condition. They might have a group of students showing good progress in the cognitive area but not necessarily in other areas measured by the Battelle. They had also used a new technique in the first year of the program to separate out changes due to maturation from those due to the program. However, this was only valid for the first year the child was in the program regardless of the child's age upon entering the program.

Dr. Frechtling reported that they were excited about the growth that was attributable to participating in the program. It appeared that the earlier the student was identified and started receiving services, the greater the gains. Dr. Cronin asked about a control group for purposes of comparison, and Dr. Frechtling replied that they did not have a control group because that would mean having an untreated group of handicapped children. Mrs. Praisner asked if, with the new law, it might be possible to have some states administer tests to handicapped students before they were admitted to a program. Dr. Larson replied that they might be able to shop around the country with their colleagues. Dr. Markowitz explained that several years ago they tried to get federal funding to work with the State of Virginia because they did not mandate services from birth, but Montgomery County was uncomfortable with not serving children identified as handicapped.

Dr. Pitt asked if they were assuming the gains from the program would continue throughout the school life of the youngster. Dr. Frechtling replied that their data indicated that while the program gave the



child a boost there was some leveling off. Dr. Pitt assumed there would be some gain because MCPS was doing a skilled job with the youngsters; however, they might have a different program if children ended up catching up after four or five years of schooling. Dr. Shoenberg pointed out that with Head Start there was an initial effect and then a damping effect over time. Dr. Frechtling pointed out the changes in their ability over the past 15 years to treat children with Down Syndrome. Whereas 15 years ago some of these students would have been institutionalized, they were now able to operate with minimal support and in some cases were in mainstreamed classrooms.

Dr. Steven Frankel, director of the DEA, noted that they now had the only data base like this in the United States which would enable people to trace growth from birth to see the effects of maturation and program interventions. Dr. Frechtling called attention to the graph on parent satisfaction. With seven public and private programs, they had an extremely high level of parent satisfaction from both the survey and from parent comments. Dr. Frankel pointed out that in addition to this, they had the only code model to rapidly and accurately compute the cost of services for preschool handicapped youngsters. Both studies would provide valuable information to MCPS and to other school districts.

Dr. Hiawatha Fountain, associate superintendent, reported that this year they had placed ten youngsters in regular kindergarten out of the PEP program and other programs. Three or five years ago these youngsters would have stayed in special education. They were watching this to see if this would multiply. Dr. Edmister added that as a result of their research and programs they had received additional federal money to establish a preschool autistic program. Dr. Frechtling said that they would be using the Battelle in the autistic program to get additional data.

In regard to the Battelle, Dr. Markowitz explained that they started using it in 1983, and people around the country were now starting to use it. One of the greatest things they could offer to the professional community was information about this instrument. While the publisher suggested it could be used up to age eight, MCPS would not be using it beyond age six because they felt they were not getting the full range of children's abilities beyond that point. For example, the speech-impaired and language-impaired youngsters were ceiling out on the test. The test was not being used for screening and placement decisions. It was, however, being used for research purposes although Minnesota had chosen it as a statewide test to use to determine if preschool age youngsters were handicapped. Mrs. Praisner inquired about the norm group used on the test, and Dr. Markowitz replied that the test was in development for ten years had started with the U.S. Department of Education. She would provide all of the background on the test to Board members. Dr. Edmister recalled that it also included handicapped children in certain categories in the norm group. They had pulled items from other valid instruments to come up with a test across all developmental areas to give a profile of the child.

Mr. Ewing commented that the report was excellent and he was delighted with the results. He asked if they had anything planned to focus on longer term benefits of early intervention. Dr. Edmister replied that they had another two and a half years of this study. They were looking to document improvement in the quality of the lives of the children, the lives of their families, and students' capability as young adults and on into the world of work. For example, they knew more about the medical problems of Down Syndrome children and it was hard to ferret out the cause for the gains they were seeing in these children. In addition, they did not have good data about the Down Syndrome youngsters in the schools 20 years previously.

Dr. Frankel observed that from these studies they were learning techniques to study all children. He saw 80 to 90 percent of this as application anywhere on the educational spectrum. Dr. Markowitz pointed out that even if they didn't have a control group in the strict sense, by the end of the study their oldest children would be in fifth grade and they would have more opportunities for comparisons.

Mr. Ewing stated that they had talked about long-term research which might be expensive and complex. He hoped that they would think not just big but creatively about how they could go about providing the funding and the long-term sustained support for this kind of work. Dr. Fountain said that he wanted to follow these students through graduation and perhaps get some cooperation with universities and other agencies to trail them for 25 or 30 years. He thought this information would be usable in many ways that they hadn't even considered yet as they developed greater uses of technology. Mrs. DiFonzo thought they might be able to interest some group like the Kennedy Foundation to continue this if federal funds did run out. As a member of the Board of Education, she was pleased and proud to see a group doing this kind of study and working with those kind of professionals achieving these results for students. She thought it was a tremendous compliment to Montgomery County.

Mrs. Praisner remarked that the Board had had two exciting discussions today about curriculum and this study; however, they had discussed these issues in front of a nearly empty press table. She hoped that the system would be able to publicize these very positive presentations.

Re: REPORT ON LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mrs. Lois Stoner, legislative aide, stated that this year they did not have a lot of fiscal issues which usually took up a lot of time. They did have a lot of bills of importance to the school community, however. She reported that of the 42 bills on which the Board had taken positions, only four did not go their way this year. This was an incredible average, and she commented that a lot of it was due to the Green Street Coalition. She would report on six bills that were still active at the end of the session.

HB 386 involved notification of attorneys by the local coordinating counsel. They succeeded to getting that somewhat restricted to notification only of court-appointed attorneys rather than all attorneys for children going for residential placement. HB 664 started as a bill for Worcester County and ended up as a transportation funding bill. Beginning in 1990 MCPS would get 3 percent additional funding plus \$500 per additional handicapped rider. HB 834 involving the right of parents to compel witnesses never managed to get voted on in the Senate, and this was a bill that the Board had opposed. HB 870 through the efforts of Mrs. Joan Karasik was modified to include eligibility for tuition aid for physical and occupational therapist assistants. HB 889 was the professional standards board, and she complimented Mrs. DiFonzo on her attempt to testify on this bill. The bill had failed at the last minute on the floor of the Senate.

Mrs. Stoner reported that HB 1069 had to do with the 180 day limit for the State Circuit Court of Appeals from the placement decision of the State Hearing Board. This bill was adopted, and she hoped that the federal courts would look at this. She said that it was an interesting year and thanked Dr. Stan Sirotkin, Mrs. Dottie Nenstiel, Mr. Fess, and Dr. Muir for their assistance. On behalf of the Board, Mrs. DiFonzo thanked Mrs. Stoner for all of her efforts on behalf of the Board and the Montgomery County Public Schools.

Re: BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS

1. Mr. Ewing noted that the Board would be discussing the report of the working group on the half-day kindergarten/extended day child development program which the Council had just received. It seemed to him that it was not clear in the report that the Board had to agree to do this because of the impact of the plan on facilities, staff, and education. He hoped that when they discussed the report they would make a determination about at least the educational part of the report.
2. Mr. Ewing inquired about when the Board would be receiving a status report on the progress they were making on minority achievement and related issues. He pointed out that this was the fifth anniversary of Priority 2. Dr. Vance expected that the report would be ready in early June.
3. Mrs. Praisner indicated that she would copy an article from the SCHOOL BOARD NEWS on Toffler's discussion on smokestack schools and demathification.
4. Mrs. Praisner stated that for some time she had been concerned about the increase in drug activity and drug trafficking within the county. She had read that the high school principals had made some proposals to the superintendent about this community issue, and she wanted to know when the Board would see something from that along with a strong statement on behalf of the Board and MCPS about cooperative efforts with other agencies. Dr. Pitt reported that he had asked Dr. Vance to get together a small group of people to look into issues. The principals did not see more drug use on the campus or students selling drugs, but they were concerned about increased

drug use and sales in the community. They had talked about ways in which they could work with the county government on these issues. Mrs. Praisner asked about relationships with the police and what could be done about drug trafficking in proximity to schools. Dr. Pitt replied that he would get that information. Dr. Vance added that they had good cooperation with the police and did stay in touch with the chief of police. In addition, the executive staff met annually with the chief and his staff.

5. Dr. Cronin said that he would provide the Board with copies of a letter the president of Montgomery College was sending to the parents of eighth graders. Dr. Parilla encouraged parents to supervise course selections children would be making for high school because of college requirements. He urged that students go into higher level English, foreign languages, mathematics, biology, chemistry, and physics.
6. Mr. Herscovitz asked if students would be allowed to reselect courses because of the Board's action today on weighting C's in honors courses.

RESOLUTION NO. 195-88 Re: EXECUTIVE SESSION - APRIL 25, 1988

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Mrs. Praisner seconded by Mr. Goldensohn, 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 April 25, 1988, 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. 196-88 Re: NATIONAL SECRETARIES' WEEK, APRIL 25-29, 1988

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

WHEREAS, A well-qualified and dedicated staff of secretarial and clerical employees is an integral part of an effective school system; and

WHEREAS, The Montgomery County public school system is extremely fortunate in having such a staff; and

WHEREAS, The Board of Education wishes to recognize publicly the competency and dedication of this group of employees and express its appreciation for their efforts in the effective, courteous, and economical operation of our school system; and

WHEREAS, The week of April 25 through April 29, 1988, has been designated as National Secretaries' Week; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That National Secretaries' Week be observed by the school system during the week of April 25 through 29, 1988; and be it further

RESOLVED, That Friday, April 29, 1988, be designated as Secretaries' Day for the Montgomery County Public Schools.

RESOLUTION NO. 197-88 Re: MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 9 AND MARCH 1, 14, 15, and 16, 1988

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

RESOLVED, That the minutes of February 9 and March 1, 14, 15, and 16, 1988, be approved.

Re: ITEMS OF INFORMATION

Board members received the following items of information:

1. Items in Process
2. Construction Progress Report
3. Evaluation of Programs for Gifted and Talented Elementary Students: Replication of the 1984 Classroom Observations
4. Quarterly Change Order Report

RESOLUTION NO. 198-88 Re: EXECUTIVE SESSION

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

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education continue its executive session as permitted by Section 10-508, State Government Article of the ANNOTATED CODE OF MARYLAND.

Re: ADJOURNMENT

The president adjourned the meeting at 4:15 p.m. to executive session.

-----  
PRESIDENT

-----  
SECRETARY

HP:mlw