



result, averaging the steps at which new teachers are hired resulted in a \$1,000 loss at each step. In FY 1989, they were able to do more hiring at an earlier date. By November 30, they had hired 499 teachers compared to 325 in FY 1988. They accomplished this primarily through extensive recruitment on campuses and offering early open contracts. They were able to attract many outstanding newly trained teachers to Montgomery County.

Dr. Smith said this year they had offered 132 open contracts in elementary, special education, and music. He explained that an open contract was given when they knew they would need people in a certain field but did not know where these teachers would be placed. It was a guarantee of employment. Dr. Pitt added that open contracts let them get out there early and compete with other school systems. Dr. Smith indicated that they hired at a higher rate in areas of special needs such as Spanish, mathematics, science, and music. They also hired at higher levels when principals presented a need for more experienced individuals in particular assignments. For FY 1989 they had almost the same percent of masters plus thirty candidates as they did in FY 1988. They came within one percent of the 19 percent goal for minority new hires, and they did that at a time when the minority applicant pool was decreasing nationally. They also increased the number of male teachers hired at the elementary level.

Dr. Smith pointed out that as they hired teachers they used a structured hire code with included four factors: test scores on the MCPS screening test, score on the structured interview, references, and graduate and undergraduate records. Experience per se was not a factor in the hiring code; however, the presumption was that experienced candidates would do well in interviews and in other circumstances in which they have to compete. They believed they continued to hire those with the best hiring codes, looking at the lower experienced applicant pool first when it was feasible to do so. Dr. Pitt stated that he had recommended and the Board had approved transferring funds in this present budget to hire at an average of BA5. They felt this was necessary to compete.

Dr. Cronin noted the difficulty they were having in hiring Spanish teachers and other foreign language teachers. In mathematics they were competing with the business world. In recruiting, they were anticipating a tighter environment; therefore, in some subject areas there would be shortages. He would like to propose a conference through personnel on how they did their outreach, particularly with the minority community.

Dr. James Shinn, director of the Department of Personnel Services, stated that the bind at the secondary level would not hit them this year. They were holding their own at the secondary level and anticipated having a significant number of applications for every position with the exception of special education. They were not in difficulty with science and math this year, but down the line there would be shortages in these areas. They had been looking at creating their own applicants by beginning to work with business to talk with retirees as well as military retirees. For elementary schools, they

were going to have a large number of applicants for each position. They could continue to select from the very best in the elementary area. Students going into education were enrolling in elementary education, and he did not anticipate shortages here over the next five years. Minority candidates were a nationwide problem.

Graduates at the universities continued to diminish. They were expanding their recruiting efforts by expanding their geographic area. They were now looking at more experienced teachers now working for other school systems. Dr. Cronin pointed out that this meant hiring levels would go up.

Mrs. Praisner noted that the focus of the memo was the difficulty in reaching the hiring levels imposed on them by the Council. The document supported the arguments made for previous budgets and why it would continue to be a problem. It seemed to her it would be appropriate to continue to gather statistics in the memo and to raise this issue with the Education Committee outside of the budget process. Dr. Pitt commented that last year before the budget process

he spent an hour and a half with the Education Committee. He agreed to make every effort to make these points again with the Council.

Mrs. Praisner agreed that they needed to continue the conversation. As they gathered more data, they had more information to justify the position that they were taking. They also needed to try and have those conversations not at budget time but at a time that would allow for an understanding of the rationale behind the Board's views and the implications of continued Council actions. She wanted to hear more about the complexities of hiring part-time individuals and the impact of that on hiring problems. They also had people in the community who had trained overseas as teachers. However, there were licensing and certification issues. She wondered whether they were doing anything here or planned to do anything on the state level.

Dr. Pitt reported that a teacher trained overseas had to come back and get teaching credits to teach in Maryland. In Virginia, they accepted the credits and gave some kind of test. For example, a graduate of the University of Barcelona would have to get credits in Maryland but would be allowed to teach in Virginia. Dr. Shinn added that it was a brighter picture at the state now. Dr. Skip Saunders was now in charge of the certification office and was interested in working with MCPS to find some ways of using these people. As far as getting involved at the state association level, he thought they needed to do everything they could. George Washington University was now working with MCPS on some programs where people could work while they were completing their requirements for teacher certification. They were continuing discussions with the University of Maryland. They also had a real problem in getting translations of foreign transcripts because there was only one licensed agency doing this in the United States. Many applicants got jobs outside of education because of the delay in translating their transcripts.

Dr. Shinn reported that the part-time issue was inversely

proportional to the economy. As the economy got good, the part-time staff dropped. They were going to have to be more innovative as the secondary population grew because they would need more part-time teachers. They were beginning to look at child care and some innovative ways of attracting the trained cadre out to work.

Mr. Ewing stated that his concern was what was happening at the elementary school level. Increasing numbers of elementary school teachers, in particular, were being hired at levels which reflected less and less experience and less and less education. He realized they were driven to reducing levels of education and experience by the Council's position. It seemed to him it was a serious mistake to reduce those levels of education and experience at the elementary level. They had evidence from the National Science Foundation funded study of science and math education that children fell behind at the elementary school level by the third grade. They had evidence from last fall's California Achievement Test that there was real danger in the early years to children's success. They heard testimony on June 26 about the problems of many children, not just minorities, in elementary school.

Mr. Ewing assumed that education and experience were benefits and normally resulted in better teachers. He thought that sometimes that got discounted in their hiring practices. He quoted from a letter from a teacher who had taught in MCPS for 10 years on the master's scale. She stopped teaching and two years ago put in an application for employment. A principal with whom she had interviewed had been told by Personnel that her salary was too high for her to be employed. She had been teaching since December as a long-term substitute for a first grade teacher who resigned because she was too inexperienced. Now as the most experienced first grade teacher in the school, she was a resource and advisor for the others. He felt there was something wrong with personnel practices that resulted in that kind of situation. He was worried about this situation and by other communications he had received over the years on this subject.

Mr. Ewing said they were giving people the wrong message if they were telling them they were too experienced, too expensive, and too well educated to teach in Montgomery County. He knew it was their policy to hire the best person in every case, but what was happening was the best person in every case had less and less education and less and less experience. This did not make sense to him. The whole foundation of American education rested on the proposition that more education was better than less education and more experience was better than less experience. Yet they were operating as if it were not true. He knew the Council had said they could not have more money, and he was glad the superintendent recommended and the Board agreed to put more money into this. He thought they should continue to do that, but he thought they should be honest about their personnel practices and say they were hiring less and less experienced people at the elementary school level. He did not think the community wanted that, and he certainly did not. He was very unhappy with this practice because the elementary school was extremely important and needed more experienced people who could deal

with the more complex problems they were facing at the elementary level.

Dr. Shinn did not disagree with Mr. Ewing. Their hire code did take account of experience because more experienced people did better on the interview and on the tests. There was research that stated if principals had as much hand as possible in the hiring process, there was more commitment to the staff and more commitment of the staff to the school and better education. He did disagree about what people were saying they heard. They were not being told they were too expensive or had too much experience. They were being told that the applicant pool with which MCPS was dealing was the BA and the earlier years of experience. However, later on, a principal could present a case for an experienced person or a specific person. They did get into the more experienced applicant pool in August.

Mr. Ewing asked why a principal had to make a special argument that a more experienced teacher was of benefit to a school. Dr. Shinn replied that the Personnel Department had to try to come as close to the BA5 as they could. They had to hire as many people on campus as possible. They tried to open contract about 70 percent of their anticipated needs now.

Dr. Pitt said they needed to hire experienced people, and he hoped they did. However, they also needed to hire some inexperienced people. They had an extremely experienced teaching staff, and it helped to put some new blood in schools. However, they should not put five inexperienced teachers in one school. He had had experienced teachers tell him that the most delightful thing was to have young people on their staff. Some of the young people were very outstanding candidates. On the other hand, they had not wanted to rule out experienced people. They had to have a balance, and for this reason he had asked for more money. However, there were people with experience who might not be the best person out there, and they might be too polite to tell someone that.

Dr. Pitt was concerned that they not hire too many beginning teachers. There needed to be balance, and they should not turn someone down who was an outstanding experienced teacher. On the

other hand, they did have to be concerned about the hiring level. Last year they ended up having to put a freeze on.

Dr. Smith commented that among principals there was great competition for the open contract candidates because the track record for those candidates had been very good. There were principals who had unique situations and wanted a particular person, and they did what they could to meet those requests.

Dr. Pitt stated that if a person was an outstanding person in the judgment of Personnel and someone they ought to have on board, whatever the cost was that person should be hired. If they went over the hiring rate, they went over the hiring rate. Dr. Smith added that they had done that.

Mr. Ewing was glad to hear them say that. His concern was that they were placed in a position by the Council in which they were not happy with what they had to spend on teachers. He hoped that they did not somehow convey that it was the best of all possible worlds because it was not. He worried not so much as whether principals were happy with the crop of new teachers but about how well the children were doing with inexperienced teachers. All they knew was that young minority children were not doing well in this school system.

Dr. Pitt explained that given the growth they were facing they were going to have to tap into new teachers. The other key was the kind of training they gave young people coming to their system. They had a pilot project on teacher mentoring which was a program where experienced teachers were selected to work with new teachers. In addition they brought new teachers in for additional training at the beginning of the year.

Mr. Goldensohn felt that it was extremely valuable to hire new teachers as well as experienced teachers. The critical factor was the balance. The system needed to have new blood coming in because the science of education was still evolving. If they were not going to hire substantial numbers of new teachers, they would go to another county system. When they had three or four years of experience, Montgomery County would not be able to get them to change employment. However, you did not want too much on either side. A new teacher could be the most invigorating thing in a school, for the staff as well as the students. It also fired up some of the teachers who might have been there too long. New teachers could deliver a quality education to the children.

Mr. Goldensohn stated that he found it a problem to be dictated to on what he considered an educational policy issue by someone else. Until he saw it graphically, he did not realize the jump at step 5. The average of 4.5 was crippling. A BA5 was probably too low, and he thought they should be shooting for a 5.5. He did not mind being told by the budget authority to conserve money, but the budget should not determine what kind of teacher they hired. The critical part of teaching was the teacher. They were going to have to work on that and educationally convince the Council of the need to keep that number at a higher level. He thought that staff had done a reasonable job of that this year. He wanted to hire the right teacher and liked what Dr. Pitt said about hiring a teacher if they needed that person regardless of the grade. He was not totally in agreement with Mr. Ewing that they had too many new hires. New hires might be a positive if they hired quality teachers.

Mrs. Hobbs commented that they heard so much about second and third careers for adults. She wondered about how successful they were in hiring someone who was entering the teaching profession for the first time but already had an extensive background in the work force. Dr. Shinn replied that it was almost impossible in the state of Maryland. A person coming out of the government or the military could not be certified unless they had had student teaching and some background in education courses. They were working on a program with George

Washington University where they could put that person to work as a substitute while they were taking courses. Dr. Pitt added that he would be meeting with the dean of education at the University of Maryland to see if they could pursue this topic. Dr. Smith reported that the state had moved tentatively in some of these areas and had provided some pilot programs to attract some people out of the military.

Mrs. DiFonzo commented that the 270 corridor was awash with master's and PhD's, and many employees had expressed a willingness and an interest to loan some employees to teach upper level math and science. It was very unfortunate that they could not take advantage of this expertise because of the certification requirements. She hoped that they might be able to work something out and make it relatively convenient for those people to be able to come into the classroom. They had great resources out there and the opportunity to provide a solid foundation in math, science, and computer science. She hoped that before the state of Maryland got into a real big bind that they would be able to work something through.

Dr. Cronin thanked staff for their review.

Re: BUDGET REVIEW PROCESS

Dr. Cronin explained that this was the first approach to the budget process, and the Board would be having more discussions on this subject.

Mrs. Praisner indicated that the memo on this issue came from her because it was her suggestion that the Board discuss this. They had received some preliminary feedback from the community, but their survey had generated considerable information from other jurisdictions. The whole objective was to review the process to see if there were changes that would expand and support decision-making on the Board. The ultimate goal was maximizing funds and the use of those funds in the budget process. She was interested in looking at more long-range goals and strategic planning that would support some of the things the superintendent had done in recent years including multiyear planning. They wanted to look at ways they could incorporate community comment, staff review, and Board discussion to maximize both an effective process and some objectives and long-term goals. She expected that in the future they might want to look at some specific changes or modifications to the process.

Dr. Cronin recalled that the original resolution was to examine the process upon receipt of the superintendent's recommended budget. Mrs. Praisner agreed, but it was important to talk about how the budget was developed and its relationship to the system's goals and priorities. In talking with other boards of education they had seen some interesting variations.

Mr. Larry Bowers, director of the Department of Management, Budget, and Planning, reported that one of the attachments to the Board item was an overview of the process they followed to develop the FY 1990

budget. His department sent out a budget guide to program managers to help them develop their requests. The directors began to put their resource pages together in early to mid-September. These were reviewed by the associate superintendents and submitted to Budget by October 1. At that time, his staff began to cost out some of the personnel data. They met with staff to make sure they followed the guidelines. They had to wait until they did the enrollment projections to do the key component of the budget which was the instructional budget. They were now using the tenth day enrollment, and early in October they had enrollment data to develop the instructional budget. Somewhere about October 20, the deputy superintendent started his review of the budgets with the associate superintendents. The superintendent's review began at the end of October. At that point the budget was reviewed by a committee made up of executive staff and principals. Last year the superintendent had completed his review by December 1, and the Budget Department made changes and prepared the document for printing. This year they were able to submit it to the Board on December 23. There was a public presentation in early January with public hearings three weeks later. This was followed by work sessions and action sessions, with final action at the all-day meeting in February. They were required by law to submit the document to the county executive on March 1, and the County Council had to take action by May 15.

Mr. Bowers reported that this year they had worked closely with staff from the county government to provide them with information and encourage them to raise questions early on. The FY 1990-91 budget would be a little different because they would be in the negotiations process. He indicated that they did receive several responses to the letter they had sent out and had included those in the Board packet. Dr. Cronin asked about the possibility of meeting with MCCPTA and doing an overview of the current budget process. There would be a number of new PTA presidents who were not familiar with this process. Dr. Pitt replied that he had done that last year. Mr. Bowers added that they had met with the Delegate Assembly on November 30.

Mrs. Praisner asked Ms. Melissa Bahr, staff assistant to the Board, to talk about what other counties did or did not do.

Ms. Bahr explained that she set up a survey with 15 questions, and in each case she interviewed the president of the Board for six Maryland districts and one in Virginia. The questions were on budget planning and on process. On budget planning, there were three districts that reported they had tied long-range goals into their operating budgets. One was Baltimore County which was starting today with a review of the FY 1991 budget planning at a Board meeting. They would conduct public hearings in each of their five geographic areas and then move to the superintendent's planning process. In Frederick County, the Board had tied its budget objectives to the effective schools movement. She planned to obtain more information on this process. Prince George's County had implemented a school-based management goal which caused the process to fall back on to the schools and the area offices. Schools were given a total budget, but they could trade staff based on individual school needs.

Ms. Bahr reported that Howard County was going through a strategic planning process which had not yet been tied to their budget. She indicated that six of the districts set multiyear objectives, and seven districts had budget standards, most typically class size and classroom materials. Three districts had goals for employee salaries, and Anne Arundel and Baltimore County had done pay equity studies. Fairfax did not have collective bargaining.

Ms. Bahr indicated that the most typical means of community input had been the public hearing. There were some school districts that used community meetings. Most frequent testifiers were PTAs, special interest groups, etc. The hearings varied from about 30 to 100 individuals testifying.

Ms. Bahr called attention to a chart she had done on the budget process. Other districts followed the Montgomery County sequence; however, Baltimore County had a lot more activity before they saw the superintendent's budget and the City of Baltimore had a number of preliminary meetings. Baltimore City had subcommittees and spent more time in review. All but one school district received individual school planning. Baltimore County asked schools to translate needs into countywide goals. Work sessions were usually done by the entire Board, and the sessions were most often organized by major program. Board action was typically to decrease or make minimum change in the budget, and six of the seven districts said that the changes were to reach Board goals or Board-endorsed targets.

Mrs. Praisner said they had learned about the very lengthy strategic planning process that Howard County was involved in, but it had not as yet transferred to the budget process. With extensive community involvement they were looking at where the county wanted to be in the year 2000 or beyond and the relationship of the school system to county goals. In this next year they hoped to convert those goals to current budget and long-term budget implications. This also spoke to something Montgomery County might want to talk about for future planning. Perhaps this would affect the budget review process and community input might need to be earlier.

Dr. Pitt remarked that he had developed some multiyear goals. Mr. Ewing had raised the issue of the time the superintendent had to develop the budget and the short time the Board had to review the budget. They had not looked at goals for a long time, and he thought this was where they should start. He thought they should look at the year 2000, and this was a good year to start looking at long-range goals. With community input, the Board needed to indicate where they wanted to go in terms of curriculum and program. It would be helpful to any superintendent to have the goals of the Board of Education. With those goals, the superintendent would develop a budget. He thought the Board should take the initiative and that this process might take six to 12 months to implement.

Ms. Praisner stated that if this worked right it would have an effect

on how they did business from an annual budget review. She assumed it would modify not only the community's input but also the Board's review process. It would have a program issue or status context to it rather than an introduction of different initiatives. They could discuss choices and implications of making midyear or radical changes as it related to where they wanted to be. It might be that the County Council would have to buy into multiyear implications and to the extent they could, multiyear budgets. Dr. Cronin explained that he had not moved on his proposal for a commission on the year 2000 because this item was up for discussion and that Dr. Muir was in charge of long-range planning.

Dr. Kenneth Muir, supervisor of management and planning services, stated that they had been engaged in long-range planning since about 1985, and the Board's priorities had been established in 1983. They continued to work on the priorities, but they had not been reexamined. In fact, there were questions about the meaning of two of the priorities. They had had some trouble in getting to think in more than one-year terms, although two years the superintendent had come up with multiyear program improvements. They had been largely successful in achieving those strategies, but the plan was almost at an end.

Dr. Muir was familiar with two districts which had engaged in a strategic planning process which meant looking at the future, trying to anticipate community needs, and planned to take steps now to be able to deal with those needs. San Diego started its process in 1986 by appointing a 17-member commission of prominent citizens who looked at what the school system should look like in the year 2000. After a year, they produced a statement of beliefs and values, a mission for the district, and identified major changes in the economy, technology and the population. They made some major recommendations, and now it was sitting there for other community and staff involvement.

Howard County began a process in May, 1985 which just concluded. They began with some open forums in which the superintendent presented information about future trends. This was summarized in a tabloid in local newspapers in the county, and there was a questionnaire asking for citizen input. They received almost 500 responses, and they appointed a strategic planning committee composed of the chairs of six task forces. The task forces worked for a year to come up with recommendations, goals, and strategies. The report was issued in September, 1987. It contained a mission statement, six objectives, 10 themes combining 85 different goals and objectives, and 150 different strategies. The staff was to put together an operational plan to be concluded in November, 1988, but it still was not translated into budget.

Dr. Muir stated that the two districts had started the process with some external analysis of trends and some internal analysis of where they were. They included some vision, goal setting, planning, and then a series of annual operational plans. He suggested it might be helpful to have the Howard superintendent in to discuss this with the Board. He personally was impressed with the way Howard County went

about the the process, but it might be possible to do this a little more quickly. He did think the Board and the superintendent ought to come up with a long range view for MCPS. Dr. Pitt thought this was the perfect time to start thinking through this process to give superintendents direction for future budgets. He was concerned about the length of time it took in Howard County. He thought it could be done in 12 to 18 months.

Dr. Cronin noted that this was a first opportunity to hear from Mrs. Praisner and staff. He asked that the Board be provided with a summary of what was going on in San Diego. The Board would schedule another discussion of this item with the opportunity for Board members to discuss with staff and put their concerns on the record. They would then discuss any kinds of actions and motions for the superintendent and staff. He thanked Ms. Bahr for a very professional job on the survey.

Re: EXECUTIVE SESSION

The Board met in executive session from 11:30 a.m. to 1:40 p.m. to discuss legal issues, personnel matters, and appeals.

Re: PUBLIC COMMENTS

Eliot Rosenheim, Sherwood High School Facilities Advisory Committee, appeared before the Board.

RESOLUTION NO. 398-89 Re: PROCUREMENT CONTRACTS OVER \$25,000

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

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

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

MCG  
80216-

AC-BC	Automotive Radiator Report	
	AWARDEES	
	Looper Servicecenter, Inc.	\$ 10,000
	S. Leonidas Correa T/A Rockville Radiator Shop and Auto Repair	20,000*
		-----
	TOTAL	\$ 30,000

149-89	Health Room Supplies and Equipment	
	AWARDEES	
	Amzura Enterprises, Inc.	\$ 10,356*
	Apothecary Products, Inc.	313

	Chaston Medical & Surgical Products	
	A Division of National Patent Development	
	Corporation	3,089
	Cole Medical, Inc.	9,344
	Foster/Murray-Baumgartner	220
	G. G. Medical Sales	543*
	Gamma Medical Systems, Inc.	9,040
	Marland Enterprises	372
	Medex Products Corporation	5,485
	Micro Bio-Medics, Inc.	26,425
	Mine Safety Appliances Company	240
	Monumental Paper Company	3,565
	National Health Supply Corporation	1,766
	Naytecom International Company	10,586*
		-----
	TOTAL	\$ 81,344
153-89	Science Equipment for Watkins Mill High School	
	AWARDEES	
	Baxter Scientific Products	\$ 3,162
	Carolina Biological Supply Company	7,519
	Central Scientific Company	21,172
	Cole-Parmer Instrument Company	711
	Connecticut Valley Biological Supply Company	75
	Curtin Matheson Scientific	3,988
	Fisher Scientific Company	16,293
	Frey Scientific Company	10,096
	LaPine Scientific Company	1,714
	Macalaster Bicknell Co. of N.J., Inc.	6,094
	Museum Products Company	151*
	Nasco	1,555
	Nystrom/Div. of Herff Jones	325
	Para Scientific Company	3,423
	Sargent-Welch Scientific Company	25,894
	Science Kit, Inc.	2,023
	Shimadzu Scientific Instruments, Inc.	47,669
	Southern Biological Supply Company	4,985
	Tech Line, Inc.	223
	Virginia Lab Supply Corporation	9,706*
	Wards Natural Science Est., Inc.	6,952
		-----
	TOTAL	\$ 173,730
156-89	Custodial Supplies	
	AWARDEES	
	A & B Textiles	\$ 552
	Airkem/Capitol Supply, Inc.	44,318
	Albright Company, Inc.	43,100
	Antietam Paper Company	11,622
	The Baer Group	21,107
	Joseph Gartland, Inc.	53,340

	Consolidated Maintenance Supply, Inc.	17,592*
	District Supply and Alco Standard Company	137,943*
	Fischer-Lang and Company, Inc.	1,384
	Fitch Company	14,601
	Huntington Laboratories, Inc.	11,920
	Institutional and Industrial Food Specialists	4,700
	J & K Distributors	1,114*
	Kessenich's, Ltd.	1,236
	Lynn Ladder and Scaffold Company, Inc.	1,238
	Mack's Hardware	109*
	Marland Enterprises, Inc.	8,513
	The Mat Works	5,488
	Monumental Paper Company	232,285
	Noland Company	20,141
	Frank W. Winne and Son, Inc.	2,524
	TOTAL	\$ 634,837
158-89	Power Mowers, Lawn and Garden Tractors AWARDEES	
	Cycle World Power Equipment Company	\$ 25,100
	Kohler Equipment, Inc.	24,680
	TOTAL	\$ 49,780
175-89	Canned Fruits and Vegetables, Soups and Juices AWARDEES	
	Carroll County Foods	\$ 28,723
	Kraft/Feldman	7,750
	Mazo-Lerch Company, Inc.	16,502
	TOTAL	\$ 52,975
	TOTAL OVER \$25,000	\$1,022,666

\* Denotes MFD vendors

RESOLUTION NO. 399-89 Re: BID NUMBER 171-89, COPYING MACHINES

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

WHEREAS, The Board of Education of Montgomery County advertised Bid Number 171-89 to purchase or lease/purchase certain copy machines for use in the public schools and offices; and

WHEREAS, The Board of Education has determined in accordance with Section 5-110 of Maryland's Public School law that Eastman Kodak Company is the lowest responsible bidder conforming to specifications to supply copy machines; and

WHEREAS, Eastman Kodak Corporation has offered to provide the necessary copy machines through a five-year lease/purchase

arrangement at preferred financing; and

WHEREAS, The Board of Education has determined that it is in the public interest to obtain the copy equipment and necessary maintenance through a lease/purchase arrangement with Kodak subject to cancellation in the event of nonappropriation; and

WHEREAS, Kodak has agreed to provide 123 machines in accordance with the lease/purchase terms and nonappropriation condition set forth in the bid specifications; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education of Montgomery County award \$1,504,708 for copy machines and financing in Bid Number 171-89 to Eastman Kodak Company and to Eastman Kodak Credit Corporation for the five-year lease/purchase of 123 copy machines, in accordance with the terms and conditions of the bid specifications; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education president and superintendent be authorized to execute the documents necessary for this transaction.

RESOLUTION NO. 400-89 Re: TELECOMMUNICATIONS/CABLE TV NETWORK  
INSTALLATIONS AT WATKINS MILL HS

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

WHEREAS, The following sealed bids were received on June 22, 1989, for the computer, telephone, and cable television network installations at Watkins Mill High School:

BIDDER	BID
1. Virginia Cable Specialities, Inc.	\$169,207.00
2. Netcom Technologies, Inc.	237,051.00
3. American Splicecco, Inc.	242,348.90
4. ETD Electronics & Security, Inc.	332,110.00

and

WHEREAS, The low bid is within the staff estimate of \$200,000, and sufficient funds are available to award the contract; and

WHEREAS, The low bidder is qualified for the work and has met all requirements of the specifications; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That a \$169,207 contract be awarded to Virginia Cable Specialities, Inc., for installation of telecommunication/cable TV networks at Watkins Mill High School.

RESOLUTION NO. 401-89 Re: AWARD OF CONTRACTS FOR VARIOUS  
MAINTENANCE PROJECTS

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 various dates for several maintenance projects in accordance with MCPS procurement practices; and

WHEREAS, Details of each bid activity are available in the Department of School Facilities; and

WHEREAS, All the low bids were within budget estimates, and sufficient funds are available to award these contracts; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That contracts be awarded to the low bidders for the projects and amounts listed below:

PROJECT	BID DATE	AMOUNT
Replacement of through-wall HVAC units at Whetstone Elementary School LOW BIDDER: Arey, Inc.	6/19/89	\$ 60,999
Replacement of heating systems in gymnasium and locker room at Montgomery Blair High School LOW BIDDER: Mantayo Construction Co., Inc.	6/20/89	\$ 80,000
Replacement of boiler and chiller at Somerset Elementary School LOW BIDDER: M & M Welding and Fabricators, Inc.	6/21/89	\$181,260
Replacement of boiler and chiller at Takoma Park Elementary School LOW BIDDER: Mantayo Construction Co., Inc.	6/22/89	\$100,200
Replacement of gymnasium lighting at Ridgeview Intermediate School LOW BIDDER: Bethesda Armature Co., Inc.	6/26/89	\$ 14,375
Replacement of doors and frames at Damascus, Garrett Park, and Piney Branch elementary schools, McKenney Hills Learning Center, Stephen Knolls School, Col. E. Brooke Lee Intermediate School, and Damascus and Kennedy high schools LOW BIDDER: Metro Metal Services, Inc.	6/27/89	\$248,080
Replacement of ceiling panels and grid assembly at Carl Sandburg Learning Center LOW BIDDER: Martin Contracting	6/29/89	\$ 21,708

RESOLUTION NO. 402-89 Re: AUTHORIZATION TO TRANSFER STATE FUNDS  
FOR VARIOUS CAPITAL PROJECTS

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

WHEREAS, The FY 89 Capital Budget included state funding for systemic renovations at various capital projects; and

WHEREAS, State participation was limited to 50 percent of the contract award; and

WHEREAS, Bids were received for systemic renovation work in the spring of 1988, work was completed, and state participation finalized; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the state fund reductions be recognized and state residual funds be returned to the state unliquidated surplus in accordance with the state (IAC) minutes of May 2, 1989, as follows:

SCHOOL	AMOUNT
1. Earle B. Wood Middle School	\$20,093
2. Candlewood Elementary School	2,515
3. Col. Zadok Magruder High School	80,384

and be it further

RESOLVED, That the county executive be requested to recommend to the County Council that these fund transfers be approved.

RESOLUTION NO. 403-89 Re: REDUCTION OF RETAINAGE AT ROCK CREEK FOREST ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

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

WHEREAS, Columbia Construction Co., Inc., general contractor for Rock Creek Forest Elementary School, has completed approximately 85 percent of all specific requirements as of June 30, 1989, and has requested that the 10 percent retainage, which is based on the completed work to date, be reduced to 5 percent; and

WHEREAS, The project bonding company, The American Insurance Company, has consented to this reduction; and

WHEREAS, The project architect, Arley J. Koran, recommended that this request for reduction be approved; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the 10 percent retainage withheld from periodic

payments to Columbia Construction Co., Inc., general contractor for Rock Creek Forest Elementary School, be reduced to 5 percent, with the remaining 5 percent to become due and payable after completion of all remaining requirements and formal acceptance of the completed project.

RESOLUTION NO. 404-89 Re: ADDITION - CRESTHAVEN ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

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

WHEREAS, The following bids were received on June 20, 1989, for the Cresthaven Elementary School addition:

BIDDER	BID
1. Northwood Contractors, Inc.	\$777,000
2. Corum Construction Co., Inc.	787,300
3. GMCL Building Construction	797,777
4. C. M. Parker & Co., Inc.	834,600
5. Bildon, Inc.	839,850
6. Ronald Hsu Construction Co., Inc.	875,700
7. C K S, Inc.	889,443
8. Adolf Phrauchs General Construction Co., Inc.	896,000

and

WHEREAS, The low bidder, Northwood Contractors, Inc., has completed similar projects satisfactorily for Montgomery County Public Schools, and the low bid is below the project architect's and staff estimate of \$800,000; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That a \$777,000 contract be awarded to Northwood Contractors, Inc., for the addition to Cresthaven Elementary School in accordance with the plans and specifications prepared by James Soyejima Associates.

RESOLUTION NO. 405-89 Re: ADDITION AND RENOVATION - BURNT MILLS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

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

WHEREAS, The following bids were received on June 29, 1989, for the Burnt Mills Elementary School addition and renovation:

BIDDER	BASE BID
1. Columbia Construction Co., Inc.	\$2,229,000
2. Ronald Hsu Construction Co.	2,291,000
3. Edmar Construction Co., Inc.	2,372,000
4. Northwood Contractors, Inc.	2,377,000

5. C. M. Parker & Co., Inc.	2,378,000
6. Bildon, Inc.	2,382,261
7. Henley Construction Co., Inc.	2,383,000
8. Kimmel & Kimmel, Inc.	2,418,000
9. N. S. Stavrou Construction Co., Inc.	2,423,000
10. Merando, Inc.	2,462,000
11. Keller Brothers, Inc.	2,476,000
12. CKS, Inc.	6,443,443

and

WHEREAS, The low bidder, Columbia Construction Co., Inc., has completed similar projects satisfactorily for Montgomery County Public Schools, and the low bid is below the project architect's and staff estimate of \$3,000,000; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That a \$2,229,000 contract be awarded to Columbia Construction Co., Inc., for the addition and renovation of Burnt Mills Elementary School in accordance with the plans and specifications prepared by Smolen/Rushing & Associates, Inc., Architects.

RESOLUTION NO. 406-89 Re: ADDITION - JOHN F. KENNEDY 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 following bids for the addition to John F. Kennedy High School were received on June 15, 1989:

BIDDER	BID
1. Bildon, Inc.	\$3,457,000
2. The McAllister-Schwartz Co.	3,522,615
3. Columbia Construction Co., Inc.	3,525,000
4. Ronald Hsu Construction Co., Inc.	3,559,400
5. Kettler Brothers Construction Co., Inc.	3,590,000
6. Northwood Contractors, Inc.	3,627,000
7. Donohoe Construction Co.	3,665,000
8. Dustin Construction, Inc.	3,723,000
9. N. S. Stavrou Construction Co., Inc.	4,050,000

and

WHEREAS, The low bid exceeds the project architect's estimate by approximately 10 percent; and

WHEREAS, Staff and the project architect have recommended that the architectural plans be modified and rebid to lower the project cost; and

WHEREAS, Rebidding will not affect the construction phasing or impact the program; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the bids be rejected, and the staff be directed to reduce the project cost and rebid the project.

RESOLUTION NO. 407-89 Re: ACCESSIBILITY MODIFICATIONS FOR THE  
HANDICAPPED - VARIOUS SCHOOLS

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

WHEREAS, The following bids were received on June 27, 1989, for accessibility modifications for the handicapped at various schools:

BIDDER	BASE BID
1. Ernest R. Sines, Inc.	\$178,800
2. Hanlon Construction Co., Inc.	182,626
3. Century Enterprises, Inc.	207,300
4. Kettler Brothers Construction Co., Inc.	210,000
5. Darwin Construction Co., Inc.	212,000
6. C K S Incorporated	221,443

and

WHEREAS, The low bidders, Ernest R. Sines, Inc., has performed similar projects satisfactorily for Montgomery County Public Schools, and the low bid is below the project architect's and staff estimate of \$190,000; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That a \$178,800 contract be awarded to Ernest R. Sines, Inc., to accomplish accessibility modifications for the handicapped at various schools in accordance with plans and specifications prepared by Arley J. Koran, Inc., Architect.

RESOLUTION NO. 408-89 Re: ARCHITECTURAL APPOINTMENT - NORTH  
SPRINGBROOK ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

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

WHEREAS, The Montgomery County Council has mandated that existing designs be used for new school projects whenever possible; and

WHEREAS, Staff and the community recommend that the Stone Mill Elementary School design be used for the North Springbrook Elementary School; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That Montgomery County Public Schools enter into a contractual agreement with the firm of Grimm and Parker, Architects, for design and construction administration services associated with adapting the Stone Mill Elementary School design to the new North Springbrook Elementary School site for a fee of \$294,000.

RESOLUTION NO. 409-89 Re: GRANT OF PUBLIC UTILITY EASEMENT TO THE  
POTOMAC ELECTRIC POWER COMPANY AND THE  
CHESAPEAKE AND POTOMAC TELEPHONE COMPANY  
AT LAYTONSVILLE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

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

WHEREAS, The Potomac Electric Power Company (PEPCO) and the Chesapeake and Potomac Telephone Company (C&P) have requested a public utility easement for the placement and maintenance of poles, guy wires, and anchors at the Laytonsville Elementary School; and

WHEREAS, This utility easement consists of a 10-foot wide easement running along the school site's Laytonsville Road (MD 108) frontage; and

WHEREAS, All construction, restoration, and maintenance will be performed at no cost to the Board of Education with PEPCO, C&P Telephone Company and their contractors assuming liability for all damages or injury; and

WHEREAS, This utility easement for placement of poles, guy wires, and anchors will benefit the school site; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the president and secretary be authorized to execute a utility easement to the benefit of PEPCO and C&P Telephone Company for the land required to place and maintain utility poles, guy wires, and anchors at the Laytonsville Elementary School.

RESOLUTION NO. 410-89 Re: UTILIZATION OF FY 1990 FUTURE SUPPORTED PROJECT FUNDS TO ESTABLISH A VOCATIONAL EXPLORATION PROGRAM FOR LIMITED-ENGLISH PROFICIENT STUDENTS WITH LITTLE OR NO PRIOR SCHOOLING

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

RESOLVED, That the superintendent of schools be authorized to receive and expend within the FY 1990 Provision for Future Supported Projects a grant award of \$16,431 from the Montgomery County Private Industry Council under the Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA) for a summer vocational exploration program for limited-English-proficient students with little or no prior schooling, in the following categories:

CATEGORY	AMOUNT
02 Instructional Salaries	\$12,840
03 Other Instructional Costs	2,500
10 Fixed Charges	1,091
	-----

TOTAL

\$16,431

and be it further

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

RESOLUTION NO. 411-89 Re: FY 1990 CATEGORICAL TRANSFER WITHIN THE EMERGENCY IMMIGRANT EDUCATION PROGRAM

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

RESOLVED, That the superintendent of schools be authorized to effect the following categorical transfer within the FY 1989 Emergency Immigrant Education Program in accordance with the County Council provision for transfers:

CATEGORY	FROM	TO
02 Instructional Salaries	\$ 9,000	
03 Other Instructional Costs		\$15,000
10 Fixed Charges	6,000	
	-----	-----
TOTAL	\$15,000	\$15,000

and be it further

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

RESOLUTION NO. 412-89 Re: UTILIZATION OF FY 1990 FUTURE SUPPORTED FUNDS TO ESTABLISH AN ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES PROGRAM

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

RESOLVED, That the superintendent of schools be authorized to receive and expend within the FY 1990 Provision for Future Supported Projects a grant award of \$5,000 from the Maryland State Department of Education (MSDE) under Environmental Education, to establish an environmental issues program in the following categories:

CATEGORY	AMOUNT
01 Administration	\$4,640
10 Fixed Charges	360

TOTAL

-----  
\$5,000

and be it further

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

RESOLUTION NO. 413-89 Re: SUBMISSION OF AN FY 1990 GRANT PROPOSAL  
UNDER THE NATIONAL SCHOOL VOLUNTEER  
PROGRAM TO EXPAND THE MONTGOMERY  
EDUCATION CONNECTION RESOURCE BANK

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

RESOLVED, That the superintendent of schools be authorized to submit an FY 1990 grant proposal for \$57,718 to the U.S. Department of Education under the National School Volunteer Program to fund a project to expand the Montgomery Education Connection Resource Bank; and be it further

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

RESOLUTION NO. 414-89 Re: SUBMISSION OF AN FY 1990 GRANT PROPOSAL  
TO EVALUATE THE MCPS FLEXIBILITY  
PROJECTS IN SCHOOL-SITE MANAGEMENT  
(PSAC)

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

RESOLVED, That the superintendent of schools be authorized to submit an FY 1990 grant proposal for \$190,107 to the United States Department of Education under the Secretary of Education's Fund for Innovation in Education (FIE): Innovation in Education Programs for Fiscal Year 1989 of the Elementary and Secondary School Improvements Amendments of 1988 (PL 100-297) to establish a program to evaluate MCPS flexibility projects in school-site management; and be it further

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

RESOLUTION NO. 415-89 Re: MONTHLY PERSONNEL REPORT

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Mr. Goldensohn seconded by Mrs. Praisner, 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. 416-89 Re: PERSONNEL APPOINTMENT

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

RESOLVED, That the following personnel appointment be approved:

APPOINTMENT	PRESENT POSITION	AS
Maria D. Montgomery	Asst. Principal Walt Whitman HS	Principal Takoma Park IS Effective: 7-12-89

RESOLUTION NO. 417-89 Re: PERSONNEL TRANSFER

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

RESOLVED, That the following transfer be approved:

TRANSFER	FROM	TO
Phinnize J. Brown	Principal Takoma Park ES	Principal Piney Branch ES Effective: 7-12-89

RESOLUTION NO. 418-89 Re: PERSONNEL TRANSFER

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Mrs. Praisner seconded by Mrs. DiFonzo, the following resolution was adopted with Dr. Cronin, Mrs. DiFonzo, Mr. Goldensohn, Mrs. Hobbs, and Mrs. Praisner voting in the affirmative; Mr. Ewing voting in the negative; and Ms. Serino abstaining#:

TRANSFER	FROM	TO
David L. Rotter	Supervisor of Elem. Instruct. Area 1 Admin. Office	Principal East Silver Spring ES Effective: 7-12-89

Mr. Ewing stated that he could not support this appointment based on his view that the North Chevy Chase experience was an unhappy one. Ms. Serino stated that she did not have enough background information about the situation Mr. Ewing had referred to.

Re: STATUS OF ELEMENTARY SCHOOL GYMS AND  
SIZE OF ALL-PURPOSE ROOMS

Dr. Pitt explained that this item was on the agenda because elementary gyms were not going to be built in the future. Dr. Phil Rohr, associate superintendent for supportive services, commented that gyms would be built on schools through 1990 and would be on all but one of the 1991 schools. For FY 1990 the Council approved the equivalent of one and a half per year for existing schools. The Council funded gyms for Olney and Whetstone.

Dr. Pitt understood that second gyms would be built at high schools, and the future of elementary school gyms would be questionable after 1990. They would have another opportunity to discuss this with the Council.

Dr. Rohr indicated that the paper gave the historical background. For the schools they were planning now they were designing them with larger all-purpose rooms and for future construction of a gym if it were approved later. However, he did not want to leave the impression that the larger all-purpose room was a substitute for the gymnasium.

Mrs. DiFonzo said the larger all-purpose rooms would have some safety features, but they would still have the stage, tile as opposed to some other floor, windows, etc. Dr. Rohr said that the only possible modification might be modifications in the windows depending on how the basketball court would be placed. Mrs. DiFonzo asked if the larger rooms could handle a full-sized basketball court. Dr. Rohr replied that they would not but they would have two backboards as opposed to six. Dr. Pitt added that it would be appropriate for elementary children for instructional purposes. Mr. Edward Masood added that this would not be appropriate for community, adult use.

Dr. Rohr commented that the issue instructionally was not so much the size of the room as the demands on the use of the room. The all-purpose room would be tied up for other purposes for much of the day. Dr. Pitt pointed out that students had lunch in the all-purpose room.

Mrs. Praisner had seen correspondence that the education committee might be reviewing this whole issue not to take back secondary gyms but to look at providing more elementary gyms. As she understood the proposal to complete the four high schools, the comment was made that they not stop completely with elementary gyms especially in areas where elementary gym space was not adequate from a recreational standpoint. From her perspective, she knew that the size of the all-purpose room was tied to the status of the elementary gym. She thought they needed to review the size of elementary facilities totally irrespective of the gym issue because of the size of the schools that they were constructing.

Dr. Rohr replied that the education committee had initiated discussions regarding their capital improvements program development process and the individual project planning process. It was a review of their general standards. He thought there was interest by some members of the Council to take another look at the gym instructional

issue particularly with the larger new schools. He thought the committee and the full Council would be discussing this during the fall and winter. The size of the all-purpose room had been mentioned many times by planning committees. They had designed the room to handle three lunch periods and to be able to accommodate one-third of the student body. Suggestions had been made to seat half the student body and the new ones being planned did this. They were continually looking at their standards, but they did try to keep the gross square footage down because it saved money. They stressed square footage for classrooms and other instructional spaces over ancillary spaces. If and when they built these 3,600 sq. ft. rooms, he thought they would hear satisfaction about the all-purpose room as a cafeteria and for drama purposes.

Mrs. Praisner pointed out that there was a cost savings to building a larger school than two smaller schools, but there were also some implications of larger space needed for certain things. They could not cut so many corners in these project so that they were not realistic about the number of students served in these larger schools. Staff and students had to function programmatically, safely, and reasonably. She said the third question had to do with building elementary gyms in the concept of the overall recreational space within the county. She recalled that about five years ago there was a master plan of recreational facilities, and there was the issue of the county's cutting back on gyms in areas of the county where there were no recreational facilities. Dr. Rohr replied that they were having discussions this summer with the ICB and the Department of Recreation to see if there were areas of the county they would identify that would link in with some new schools and some modernizations.

Mrs. Praisner called attention to Attachment 5 which listed buildings without gyms by the year of projected completion. It listed the modernizations, but did not include the 11 schools that would have additional projects. Dr. Rohr said he would provide this. Mrs. Praisner recalled that one of the schools was Galway. She noted that if they looked at the enrollment of schools without gyms, in some cases these schools were quite large.

Mr. Goldensohn said he continued to be concerned about the whole county policy on elementary school gyms. Although the recommendation was for larger all-purpose rooms, he found this a foolish way to proceed since those rooms did not replace gymnasiums. There was still the problem of breakfasts in some schools and multiple lunch periods. If there were 680 students in the school and you were a p.e. teacher, you might have an hour and a half in the room in the morning and the same amount of time in the afternoon. This was not enough time to run a proper p.e. program for almost 700 children. He thought the education committee was willing to reexamine this issue. This was not saying anything against moving ahead with the high school gymnasiums.

Mr. Goldensohn pointed out that the memo listed schools in the three areas, 17 in Area 1, 15 in Area 2, and 7 in Area 3. He asked if

these were all the elementary schools that did not have gyms. Dr. Rohr replied that it was with the exception of Whetstone and Olney because they were approved for funding. Mr. Goldensohn asked about how many of the 39 schools were on sites that could not have a gym. Dr. Rohr thought that for some it would be very difficult but still possible.

Mr. Goldensohn said he was concerned about the savings of money by not putting in gyms and putting in the larger all-purpose rooms. The memo stated that the all-purpose rooms would add \$150,000 to the cost of the building, and a gymnasium built on its own would be \$600,000. They were still spending 25 percent of the money just to have an all-purpose room which was not a replacement for the gymnasium. Then some years later when they put the gym in, the \$150,000 for the all-purpose room would be lost money. He hoped that the entire Board and the community would think about this issue a little bit more as they moved into next year's budget cycle.

Mrs. Praisner asked staff to provide her with a sense of the history of the Board's involvement in the setting of standards for space in schools at elementary, J/I/M, and the high school.

RESOLUTION NO. 419-89 Re: FORMAT FOR REPORT TO CITIZENS

On motion of Mrs. Praisner seconded by Mr. Goldensohn, the following resolution was adopted unanimously:

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education support the proposal for a report to citizens and authorize staff to proceed.

Re: STUDENT RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES

Mrs. Praisner moved and Mr. Ewing seconded the following:

WHEREAS, On June 13, 1989, the Board of Education by Resolution No. 352-89 gave tentative approval to the superintendent's recommendations in his memo of May 22 as amended by his memo of June 13 as follows:

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education give tentative approval to the superintendent's recommendations in his memo of May 22 as amended by his memo of June 13 as follows:

## XII. DISCIPLINE

### C. Other Disciplinary Standards

4. Nonschool-sponsored activities of students and activities unrelated to school, carried on outside school hours and away from school grounds, are not the responsibility of school authorities; and no student shall be penalized by the school for any participation in these activities UNLESS THERE IS A REASONABLE BELIEF THAT THE HEALTH OR SAFETY OF STUDENTS WILL BE COMPROMISED IN THE SCHOOL SETTING.

An abbreviated form of the document would be disseminated to students. If accepted, there will be a need to change XVI. DISTRIBUTION AND REVIEW OF THIS DOCUMENT, A. MCPS Regulation JOA-RA would be included in the Appendix of the Student Rights and Responsibilities document.

XVI. DISTRIBUTION AND REVIEW OF THIS DOCUMENT

B. THIS DOCUMENT SHALL BE REVIEWED ONCE IN EVERY THREE YEARS AS FOLLOWS: ...

New Section I - Right to Free Public Education Policy

All students who are 5 years old or older and under 21 shall be entitled to a free, public education, SUBJECT TO OTHER PROVISIONS OF STATE LAW AND THE BYLAWS, RULES, AND REGULATIONS OF THE MARYLAND STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION AND OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION OF MONTGOMERY COUNTY.

New Section III - Rights of Privacy Policy

Student privacy interests shall be respected. Therefore, to preserve legitimate expectations of privacy in the student's personal and home life, no student shall be required to reveal, as part of the instructional program, matters relating to his/her personal life, those of his/her family, or his/her status within the family.

Implementation Guidelines:

- o Classroom discussion should ordinarily be "external" in focus. That is, it should focus on student learning of subject content and skills as prescribed by the instructional objectives. When classroom management is involved, however, discussion will necessarily include student behavior although such discussion should be limited to the specific occasion. More difficult instructional decisions are required when the instructional objectives, themselves, focus on the internal, that is, on feelings, values, or attitudes. The goals of such a focus will always be carefully specified and will never require students to reveal family occurrences or personal habits, relationships, preferences, traits, decisions, or problems. Nor will students be called upon to make comparisons with themselves or their families. Discussion of feelings, values, or attitudes is NEVER engaged in for its own sake; it must always be strictly limited to teaching the explicit instructional objectives.
- o The greater the degree of personal and/or affective involvement called for by the instructional objectives, the greater the need for respecting the individual's privacy. Psychological sensitivity of the teacher is essential. Teachers must consider all instructional materials and activities for obvious invasions of privacy and for more

subtle, potential sources of embarrassment or psychological harm. The limits on personal involvement and the requirements of privacy are matters of social norms and taste. It is not, however, the TEACHER'S norms and/or taste which govern nor even those of the more vocal students in the class; the teacher must remember that it is the norms and taste of the school community which prevail.

- o If teachers adhere to the above two guidelines, the question of voluntary participation should not be an issue. If all discussions and materials to be shared with the class contain no references to the student and/or his/her family, then there should be no need for students to be offered alternative activities. Differentiation of materials and activities should reflect the student's instructional needs and there should be no social stigma attached. If, for any reason, a student's parent requests that his/her child not participate in a particular activity, the teacher should provide an alternative and equally attractive activity in a manner which does not call attention to the student's religion, values, or physical condition.
- o The above guidelines refer to the selection of instructional materials and activities. Information requested by the teacher for his/her own use in designing appropriate instruction for each child or work not intended for public display is of a different nature. However, teachers must still not pry into personal matters. The relationship between teachers and students is such that even asking a student to fill out a questionnaire voluntarily may be seen as coercive. Prying into past experiences, feelings, viewpoints, or home life which might create anxiety must be avoided. It is not a question of merely respecting the student and his/her family; teachers are prohibited from invading the privacy of students and their families. The use of survival games or other decision-making exercises in which participants are presented with hypothetical crises and asked to decide which members of a group should survive and which should perish are prohibited.

New Subsection

Section X - Student Records

- o Access to information contained in student's records shall be limited to those who have the consent of parents or eligible students, to officials specifically permitted in the law (such as MCPS officials), to officials of other schools in which students seek to enroll, to local, state, and federal officials under certain conditions and for specific purposes, and by court order.

and

WHEREAS, On June 22, 1989, the amendments to the Student Rights and

Responsibilities Policy were sent out for public comment; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the members of the Board of Education give final approval to the changes in the Student Rights and Responsibilities Policy tentatively adopted on June 13, 1989.

Board members agreed that the new sub-section on student records become "e" and the current "e" would become "f."

Re: A MOTION BY MRS. DiFONZO TO AMEND THE  
STUDENT RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES  
POLICY (FAILED)

A motion by Mrs. DiFonzo to amend the Student Rights and Responsibilities Policy by deleting "unless there is a reasonable belief that the health or safety of students will be compromised in the school setting" be deleted from XII.C.4 failed with Mrs. DiFonzo, Mr. Ewing, Mrs. Hobbs, and Ms. Serino voting in the affirmative; Dr. Cronin, Mr. Goldensohn, and Mrs. Praisner voting in the negative#.

Re: A MOTION BY MR. GOLDENSOHN TO AMEND  
THE STUDENT RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES  
POLICY

Mr. Goldensohn moved and Mrs. Hobbs seconded the following:

RESOLVED, That the student rights and responsibilities policy be amended by adding "unless there is a strong reasonable belief by the principal" to Section XII.C.4.

Ms. Serino asked that the question be divided.

Re: A MOTION BY MR. GOLDENSOHN TO AMEND THE  
STUDENT RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES  
POLICY (FAILED)

A motion by Mr. Goldensohn to amend the student rights and responsibilities policy by adding "strong" to Section XII.C.4 failed with Mr. Ewing, Mr. Goldensohn, and Mrs. Hobbs voting in the affirmative; Dr. Cronin, Mrs. DiFonzo, Mrs. Praisner, and Ms. Serino voting in the negative#.

RESOLUTION NO. 420-89 Re: AN AMENDMENT TO THE STUDENT RIGHTS AND  
RESPONSIBILITIES POLICY

On motion of Mr. Goldensohn seconded by Mrs. Hobbs, the following

resolution was adopted unanimously#:

RESOLVED, That the student rights and responsibilities policy be amended by the addition of "by the principal" after "reasonable belief" in Section XII C.4.

RESOLUTION NO. 421-89 Re: AN AMENDMENT TO THE STUDENT RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES POLICY

On motion of Mrs. DiFonzo seconded by Mr. Ewing, the following resolution was adopted with Dr. Cronin, Mrs. DiFonzo, Mr. Ewing, Mrs. Hobbs, and Ms. Serino voting in the affirmative; Mr. Goldensohn and Mrs. Praisner abstaining#:

RESOLVED, That the student rights and responsibilities policy be amended by the substitution of "of others" for "of students" in Section XII.C.4.

Re: A MOTION BY MR. EWING TO AMEND THE STUDENT RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES POLICY (FAILED)

A motion by Mr. Ewing to amend the student rights and responsibilities policy by changing "compromised" to "jeopardized" in XII. C.4 failed with Mr. Ewing and Mrs. Hobbs voting in the affirmative; Mrs. Praisner voting in the negative; Dr. Cronin, Mrs. DiFonzo, Mr. Goldensohn, and Ms. Serino abstaining#.

RESOLUTION NO. 422-89 Re: STUDENT RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES POLICY

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

WHEREAS, On June 13, 1989, the Board of Education by Resolution No. 352-89 gave tentative approval to the superintendent's

recommendations in his memo of May 22 as amended by his memo of June 13 as follows:

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education give tentative approval to the superintendent's recommendations in his memo of May 22 as amended by his memo of June 13 as follows:

## XII. DISCIPLINE

### C. Other Disciplinary Standards

4. Nonschool-sponsored activities of students and activities unrelated to school, carried on outside school hours and away from school grounds, are not the responsibility of school authorities; and no student shall be penalized by the school for any participation in these activities UNLESS THERE IS A

REASONABLE BELIEF THAT THE HEALTH OR SAFETY OF STUDENTS WILL BE COMPROMISED IN THE SCHOOL SETTING.

An abbreviated form of the document would be disseminated to students. If accepted, there will be a need to change XVI.

DISTRIBUTION AND REVIEW OF THIS DOCUMENT, A.

MCPS Regulation JOA-RA would be included in the Appendix of the Student Rights and Responsibilities document.

XVI. DISTRIBUTION AND REVIEW OF THIS DOCUMENT

B. THIS DOCUMENT SHALL BE REVIEWED ONCE IN EVERY THREE YEARS AS FOLLOWS: ...

New Section I - Right to Free Public Education Policy

All students who are 5 years old or older and under 21 shall be entitled to a free, public education, SUBJECT TO OTHER PROVISIONS OF STATE LAW AND THE BYLAWS, RULES, AND REGULATIONS OF THE MARYLAND STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION AND OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION OF MONTGOMERY COUNTY.

New Section III - Rights of Privacy Policy

Student privacy interests shall be respected. Therefore, to preserve legitimate expectations of privacy in the student's personal and home life, no student shall be required to reveal, as part of the instructional program, matters relating to his/her personal life, those of his/her family, or his/her status within the family.

Implementation Guidelines:

- o Classroom discussion should ordinarily be "external" in focus. That is, it should focus on student learning of subject content and skills as prescribed by the instructional objectives. When classroom management is involved, however, discussion will necessarily include student behavior although such discussion should be limited to the specific occasion. More difficult instructional decisions are required when the instructional objectives, themselves, focus on the internal, that is, on feelings, values, or attitudes. The goals of such a focus will always be carefully specified and will never require students to reveal family occurrences or personal habits, relationships, preferences, traits, decisions, or problems. Nor will students be called upon to make comparisons with themselves or their families. Discussion of feelings, values, or attitudes is NEVER engaged in for its own sake; it must always be strictly limited to teaching the explicit instructional objectives.
- o The greater the degree of personal and/or affective involvement called for by the instructional objectives, the

greater the need for respecting the individual's privacy. Psychological sensitivity of the teacher is essential. Teachers must consider all instructional materials and activities for obvious invasions of privacy and for more subtle, potential sources of embarrassment or psychological harm. The limits on personal involvement and the requirements of privacy are matters of social norms and taste. It is not, however, the TEACHER'S norms and/or taste which govern nor even those of the more vocal students in the class; the teacher must remember that it is the norms and taste of the school community which prevail.

- o If teachers adhere to the above two guidelines, the question of voluntary participation should not be an issue. If all discussions and materials to be shared with the class contain no references to the student and/or his/her family, then there should be no need for students to be offered alternative activities. Differentiation of materials and activities should reflect the student's instructional needs and there should be no social stigma attached. If, for any reason, a student's parent requests that his/her child not participate in a particular activity, the teacher should provide an alternative and equally attractive activity in a manner which does not call attention to the student's religion, values, or physical condition.
- o The above guidelines refer to the selection of instructional materials and activities. Information requested by the teacher for his/her own use in designing appropriate instruction for each child or work not intended for public display is of a different nature. However, teachers must still not pry into personal matters. The relationship between teachers and students is such that even asking a student to fill out a questionnaire voluntarily may be seen as coercive. Prying into past experiences, feelings, viewpoints, or home life which might create anxiety must be avoided. It is not a question of merely respecting the student and his/her family; teachers are prohibited from invading the privacy of students and their families. The use of survival games or other decision-making exercises in which participants are presented with hypothetical crises and asked to decide which members of a group should survive and which should perish are prohibited.

New Subsection

Section X - Student Records

- o Access to information contained in student's records shall be limited to those who have the consent of parents or eligible students, to officials specifically permitted in the law (such as MCPS officials), to officials of other schools in which students seek to enroll, to local, state, and federal officials under certain conditions and for specific purposes, and by court order.

and

WHEREAS, On June 22, 1989, the amendments to the Student Rights and Responsibilities Policy were sent out for public comment; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the members of the Board of Education give final approval to the changes in the Student Rights and Responsibilities Policy tentatively adopted on June 13, 1989, with the amended Section XII.C.4 to read as follows:

Nonschool-sponsored activities of students and activities unrelated to school, carried on outside school hours and away from school grounds, are not the responsibility of school authorities; and no student shall be penalized by the school for any participation in these activities unless there is a reasonable belief by the principal that the health or safety of others will be compromised in the school setting.

For the record, Mrs. DiFonzo stated that she still thought they were making a big mistake by leaving in XII.C.4.

Re: BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS

1. Mrs. Hobbs reported that she had been at Redland Middle School where she had visited with Dr. Sullivan and her staff. She had shared a copy of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD where Representative Morella referred to the award that Redland had received. Mrs. Hobbs distributed copies to Board members and staff.
2. Mrs. Hobbs called attention to the master calendar of Board meetings which showed six dates designated for cluster meetings. The Board had just completed a cycle of visiting every cluster. She asked the Board to consider visiting alternative programs and special schools such as RICA, Phoenix, and Bridge rather than visiting clusters. Board members considered her request, and Dr. Cronin indicated that he and Dr. Shoenberg would look at the calendar and consider adding one night this year and possibly one night next year to meet with some of these schools if they were not included in the cluster framework.
3. Mr. Ewing said the Board had received copies of the summer report of Interages for the year ending June 30, 1989. The executive director would be glad to discuss this report with members of the Board, and Mr. Ewing planned to introduce a motion under new business to schedule this.
4. Mr. Ewing thanked staff for the helpful memo on playground equipment. It was a clear and precise statement, and he was hopeful that the superintendent's budget and the Board action would support full funding to make sure all elementary schools measured up in terms of standards.

5. Mr. Ewing said he had raised questions about the level of staffing and funding for the preschool autism program. The latest memo indicated to him that they were increasing the amount of time that one of the University of Maryland staff members would be spending and not increasing the number of classes. He asked if he could have the opportunity to discuss this with Dr. Fountain.
6. Mrs. Praisner said it had been brought to her attention that there was a concern with the Clearspring Elementary School community about traffic and the need for a traffic light. It was a state road, and she wondered if Dr. Pitt and staff could bring to bear more support to make sure that a light was forthcoming.
7. Mrs. Praisner continued to hear from civic association people about their need to have greater understanding of process used for testimony during the capital budget hearings, given the role of cluster coordinators. Before they got to the next facility process, it might be useful if staff sat down with MCCPTA leadership and perhaps some people from the Civic Federation to review the process and see if there were additional materials that could be provided to the Civic Federation. Perhaps there could be materials the cluster coordinators could share so there would be the same understanding so that complaints could be minimized.
8. Mrs. Praisner reported that she had been invited to participate in the first forum on the review of the recommendations of the Professional Teachers Standards Board and would be in Chicago for three days next week. She hoped to bring back some of the materials from that.
9. Mr. Goldensohn said he had found some material he had collected at a recent conference from the Milwaukee school system about their effective schools program and from Dallas about minority language teaching and reaching out to minorities.
10. Mr. Goldensohn reported that the sign for Fields Road Elementary School on Muddy Branch Road had not yet been installed.
11. Mr. Goldensohn said that on southbound Route 28 as one approached Quince Orchard Road adjacent to Quince Orchard High School there was a driveway that went into the school athletic field facility. However, it looked like a fork in the road and there was no sign that said "high school only." He had seen cars starting to go down that split and making a quick left back into the main road. He asked staff to check with the State of Maryland about installing a sign.
12. Dr. Pitt reported that he and Dr. Vance had visited a few of the schools in the summer institute. This was a program to identify minority youngsters and others who could be supported and helped. He was impressed with the techniques, instructional materials, and support given the students. He was also impressed by the enthusiasm of the parents who were there. He suggested that if Board members

had an opportunity that they visit these schools.

13. Dr. Pitt said that he along with 21 other superintendents in the United States had been invited by the State of Israel for a six day trip to talk about educational technology. He would be taking personal leave, and the school system would not be paying for the trip or the leave.

RESOLUTION NO. 423-89 Re: EXECUTIVE SESSION - JULY 24, 1989

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 July 24, 1989, 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. 424-89 Re: MINUTES OF JUNE 8, 1989

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

RESOLVED, That the minutes of June 8, 1989, be approved as corrected.

RESOLUTION NO. 425-89 Re: INVOLVEMENT OF PARENTS IN THEIR CHILDREN'S EDUCATION

On motion of Mrs. Praisner seconded by Mrs. DiFonzo, the following resolution was adopted unanimously#:

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education schedule a discussion of MCPS practices, policies, and activities to involve parents directly in their children's education.

RESOLUTION NO. 426-89 Re: COORDINATION OF SERVICES WITH COUNTY GOVERNMENT

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

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education schedule a discussion to authorize the superintendent and senior staff to discuss with the county senior staff the coordination of services available to Montgomery County public school students.

Re: PROPOSED RESOLUTION ON RELEASE OF  
CAT SCORES

On June 26, 1989, Mr. Ewing moved and Mr. Goldensohn seconded the following:

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education direct that the superintendent release 1988 CAT test scores for MCPS by school, by grade, and by racial and ethnic group with the exception that scores would not be released by school in those schools where small numbers (10 or fewer of minority students) are enrolled.

RESOLUTION NO. 427-89 Re: AN AMENDMENT TO THE PROPOSED RESOLUTION  
ON RELEASE OF CAT SCORES

On motion of Mrs. DiFonzo seconded by Mr. Goldensohn, the following resolution was adopted# with Dr. Cronin, Mrs. DiFonzo, Mr. Goldensohn, Mrs. Hobbs, Mrs. Praisner, and Ms. Serino voting in the affirmative; Mr. Ewing voting in the negative:

RESOLVED, That the proposed resolution on the release of CAT scores be amended by the following:

substitute "(10 or fewer numbers of students from any racial or ethnic group) are enrolled, and for the purpose of this action, racial and ethnic group shall be defined as Caucasian, black, Asian, and Hispanic)" for "(10 or fewer of minority students) are enrolled)".

The following changes were made editorially. Add "and subsequent year" after "1988" and substitute "in those grades" for "in those schools."

RESOLUTION NO. 428-89 Re: RELEASE OF CAT SCORES

On motion of Mr. Ewing seconded by Mr. Goldensohn, the following resolution was adopted# with Dr. Cronin, Mrs. DiFonzo, Mr. Ewing, Mr. Goldensohn, Mrs. Hobbs, and Ms. Serino voting in the affirmative; Mrs. Praisner voting in the negative:

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education direct that the superintendent release 1988 and subsequent year CAT test scores for MCPS by school, by grade, and by racial and ethnic group with the exception that scores would not be released by school in those grades where small numbers (10 or fewer numbers of students from any racial or ethnic group) are enrolled, and for the purpose of this action, racial and

ethnic group shall be defined as Caucasian, black, Asian, and Hispanic.

For the record, Mrs. Praisner made the following statement:

"I did not support this motion because I have concluded that I cannot support the publication of more lists of test scores, the value of which I continue to question. We already report and record three year rolling averages, and I consider that more useful and less harmful to schools and students."

For the record, Dr. Pitt made the following statement:

"I had a problem with the resolution because to me it is discriminatory in terms of certain schools and others not being focused in on. Obviously I am going to carry out the Board's resolution, and as I said I don't have the same objection I had before because the ethical issue is not there. Also I want to make a point so that it is clear. We will continue to publish a three-year average for black and Hispanic kids for each school because that does give you enough numbers, and that will be published to try to see if schools are improving or going down or whatever in those areas. Of course, that goes along with a lot of other data we will publish on schools having to do with our goals."

Re: PROPOSED RESOLUTION ON ASSESSMENT OF  
MINORITY EDUCATION

On June 26, 1989, Mr. Ewing moved and Mr. Goldensohn seconded the following:

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education endorse the superintendent's suggestion that there be an assessment of minority student education in Montgomery County Public Schools; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the superintendent be directed to take two steps in this regard:

- 1) to develop a plan for such an assessment to be presented to the Board this summer, and
- 2) to develop a proposal listing experts who might conduct such an assessment, all of this for the Board's consideration.

The following editorial changes were made. Add "by outside consultants" after "assessment" and delete "this summer."

Mrs. DiFonzo assumed the chair.

Re: A MOTION BY DR. CRONIN TO AMEND THE  
PROPOSED RESOLUTION ON ASSESSMENT OF  
MINORITY EDUCATION

A motion by Dr. Cronin to amend the proposed resolution by adding a

third Resolved, "That the group be asked to consider in its discussion the 1987 Blueprint of Action II" failed for lack of a second.

Dr. Cronin assumed the chair.

RESOLUTION NO. 429-89 Re: ASSESSMENT OF MINORITY EDUCATION

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

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education endorse the superintendent's suggestion that there be an assessment by outside consultants of minority student education in Montgomery County Public Schools; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the superintendent be directed to take two steps in this regard:

- 1) to develop a plan for such an assessment to be presented to the Board, and
- 2) to develop a proposal listing experts who might conduct such an assessment, all of this for the Board's consideration.

For the record, Dr. Pitt said it was his intent to do this as rapidly as possible.

Re: PROPOSED RESOLUTION ON PLAN OF ACTION  
FOR MINORITY EDUCATION

On June 26, 1989, Mr. Ewing moved and Mr. Goldensohn seconded the following:

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education request that the superintendent be asked to review in detail the comments, suggestions, and recommendations offered at the Public Comments session on June 26, 1989, as well as those recommendations and suggestions from the Board's advisory committee on minority student education to be presented to the Board on July 24, and other recommendations that may come in on this subject in writing; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the superintendent be asked to present to the Board his summary review of these suggestions and recommendations; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the superintendent be asked to develop for the Board's consideration and approval a specific, comprehensive multiyear plan for minority student education that begins with the school year starting in September, 1989, and that:

- a) meets more fully and completely than present plans and actions do the educational needs of all minority students in

MCPS, taking account of differences among minority groups and providing for those differences;

- b) provides for new and creative approaches to the education of minority students, based on research findings, practices proven successful in Montgomery County and elsewhere, testimony and other proposals offered to MCPS this spring and earlier, the new approaches reflecting a determination to extend MCPS efforts well beyond existing efforts;
- c) focuses on changes needed in instruction, staff training, curriculum, and organization;
- d) addresses in the first three points the issues and proposals raised by community groups, individuals, parents, organizations of all kinds, teachers and other staff in public hearings, comments, written communications and other forms of testimony provided to MCPS and the Board over the last several years;
- e) includes cost estimates and budget proposals for the school year beginning in September, 1989, and beyond as appropriate; and
- f) includes provision for systematic and effective monitoring and evaluation of results, and the provision of findings to the Board and public on a continuing basis;

and be it further

RESOLVED, That the plan should include mechanisms for contacting, drawing on and fully utilizing the skills, abilities, and willingness to participate in solutions of the many citizens and groups in Montgomery County; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the plan should be designed in such fashion as to take account of whatever findings there may be in the future from future assessments that may be done by outside experts, assuming that kind of assessment does occur; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the superintendent present with the plan a proposed timetable for completion of and implementation of the plan. Mr. Ewing and Mr. Goldensohn agreed that "as soon as practicable following the completion of the assessment by the outside consultants" be substituted for "with the school year starting in September, 1989" in the third Resolved. They also agreed that "for the school year beginning in September, 1989, and beyond" would be deleted from e).

Mrs. DiFonzo assumed the chair.

Re: A SUBSTITUTE MOTION BY DR. CRONIN

Dr. Cronin moved and Ms. Serino seconded the following:

WHEREAS, The Board of Education has authorized the superintendent to proceed with the current plan on minority student education; and

WHEREAS, The Board of Education has directed the formation of a committee to assess the efforts at minority student education in Montgomery County Public Schools; and

WHEREAS, The Board of Education on June 26, 1989, took public testimony on minority education; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the Department of Personnel sponsor a conference in Fall 1989 to review our approach to minority hiring and promotion; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the Office of Instruction and Program Development sponsor a conference in Fall 1989 to focus on the effectiveness of the ESOL program; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the superintendent present a plan to the Board by November 1989 to expand our efforts of finding mentors for Montgomery County students, with particular emphasis upon minority student mentors; and be it further

RESOLVED, That funds for TESA training be expanded in the 1989-90 academic year to provide such training for every elementary school.

RESOLUTION NO. 430-89 Re: POSTPONEMENT OF TWO RESOLUTIONS ON PLAN OF ACTION FOR MINORITY EDUCATION

On motion of Mr. Goldensohn seconded by Mrs. DiFonzo, the following resolution was adopted with Dr. Cronin, Mrs. DiFonzo, Mr. Goldensohn, Mrs. Hobbs, Mrs. Praisner, and Ms. Serino voting in the affirmative; Mr. Ewing voting in the negative#:

RESOLVED, That the two resolutions on minority education be postponed until such time as the consultant has completed his recommendations. For the record, Mr. Ewing stated that he opposed it. He thought it was a wiser move to postpone both rather than to defeat either, and they would now be able to proceed until they got the consultant's recommendations. He hoped that there would be something more than what the Supreme Court spoke to in 1954 in the way of haste.

Re: PROPOSED RESOLUTION ON AMENDING  
EDUCATION ARTICLE ON PARENTAL  
PERMISSION FOR STUDENT WITHDRAWALS

On June 26, 1989, Mrs. DiFonzo moved and Mr. Park seconded the following:

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education adopt a resolution encouraging our Delegation to amend Section 7-301 of the Education Article to provide that written parental permission is required before a student may permanently withdraw from a Maryland school; and be it further

RESOLVED, That they encourage other Boards of Education, the Maryland Association of Boards of Education, and the State Board of Education to join them in this effort.

Mrs. DiFonzo said she would like to schedule a discussion of the item with the possibility that discussion would lead towards a resolution. She asked that the word "amend" be changed to read "initiate action to amend."

Re: A MOTION BY MRS. DiFONZO TO AMEND THE  
EDUCATION ARTICLE ON PARENTAL  
PERMISSION FOR STUDENT WITHDRAWALS

A motion by Mrs. DiFonzo to schedule a discussion to adopt a resolution encouraging the Delegation to initiate action to amend the Education Article to require written parental permission for student withdrawals failed with Dr. Cronin, Mrs. DiFonzo, Mrs. Praisner, and Ms. Serino voting in the affirmative; Mr. Ewing, Mr. Goldensohn, and Mrs. Hobbs voting in the negative#.

Re: PROPOSED RESOLUTION ON REQUEST FOR  
EMERGENCY FUNDS FOR NORTHWOOD

On June 26, 1989, Mrs. Hobbs moved and Mr. Ewing seconded the following:

RESOLVED, That emergency funds in an amount to be determined at our next meeting be requested by the superintendent and the Board to the county executive and the County Council for additional repairs and renovations at Northwood.

Mrs. Hobbs expanded her motion to obtain the costs of window air-conditioning units or two ceiling fans for every room that was not air conditioned. Dr. Cronin said that this would be scheduled for action on July 24.

Re: NEW BUSINESS

1. Mrs. Hobbs moved and Mr. Ewing seconded the following:

RESOLVED, That unless a construction project is ahead of schedule, MCPS will not reduce the general contractor's retainage from 10 percent to 5 percent unless 95 percent of the work has been completed.

2. Mrs. Hobbs moved and Mr. Ewing seconded the following:

RESOLVED, That MCPS initiate and coordinate landscaping projects at one school per cluster per year with appropriate county agencies, community groups, and PTA representatives.

3. Mr. Ewing moved and Mrs. Praisner seconded the following:

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education schedule a review of the annual report of Interages.

Re: ITEMS OF INFORMATION

Board members received the following items of information:

1. Items in Process
2. Construction Progress Report
3. Master Calendar of Board Meetings
4. Quarterly Change Order Report

Re: ADJOURNMENT

The president adjourned the meeting to executive session at 4:35 p.m.

-----  
PRESIDENT  
-----

SECRETARY

HP:mlw