

NUMBER: 29-1990
STATUS: APPROVED
PLACE: ROCKVILLE, MARYLAND
DATE: JUNE 25, 1990
TEXT:

RESOLVED, That the superintendent of schools be authorized to receive and expend within the FY 1991 Provision for Future Supported Projects a grant award of \$18,741 from the Montgomery County Department of Social Services, Workfare Program, under the Refugee Act of 1980 (PL 96-212), for English as a Second Language Program in the following categories:

CATEGORY	AMOUNT
1 Administration	\$ 40
2 Instructional Salaries	16,333
3 Other Instructional Costs	1,070
10 Fixed Charges	1,298

Total	\$18,741

and be it further

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

RESOLUTION NO. 400-90 Re: UTILIZATION OF FY 1991 FUTURE
SUPPORTED PROJECT FUNDS TO
ESTABLISH A VOCATIONAL EXPLORATION
PROGRAM FOR SPECIAL EDUCATION
STUDENTS

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

RESOLVED, That the superintendent of schools be authorized to receive and expend within the FY 1991 Provision for Future Supported Projects a grant award of \$31,883 from the Montgomery County Private Industry Council under the Job Training Partnership Act for a summer vocational exploration program (Project VIEW) in the following categories:

CATEGORY	AMOUNT
4 Special Education	\$ 29,700
10 Fixed Charges	2,183

Total	\$ 31,883

and be it further

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

June 25, 1990

RESOLUTION NO. 401-90 Re: FY 1990 CATEGORICAL TRANSFER WITHIN
THE MARYLAND'S TOMORROW PROGRAM

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

RESOLVED, That the superintendent of schools be authorized, subject to County Council approval, to effect the following FY 1990 categorical transfer of \$44,134 within the Maryland's Tomorrow Program as funded by the state of Maryland and federal JTPA:

CATEGORY	FROM	TO
2 Instructional Salaries	\$ 5,434	
3 Instructional Other		\$44,134
7 Student Transportation	1,700	
10 Fixed Charges	37,000	
	-----	-----
Total	\$44,134	\$44,134

and be it further

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

RESOLUTION NO. 402-90 Re: PROCUREMENT CONTRACTS MORE THAN
\$25,000

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Mr. Goldensohn seconded by Dr. Cronin, 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 following contracts be awarded to the low bidders meeting specifications as shown for the bids as follows:

131-90	Microcomputer Equipment	
	AWARDEES	
	Automation Wonders Technology, Inc.	\$ 1,661 *
	Basicomputer	113,195
	Club American Technologies	3,120 *
	Comark, inc.	59,875
	Computerland of Rockville	8,945
	Computerland/Mid Atlantic	86,708
	Computerware, Inc.	1,835 *

	Consolidated Computer Investors	1,315 *
	Copley Systems Corporation	8,919
	Data Connect Enterprises	130
	Inacomp Computer Center	1,540
	Landon Systems Corporation	8,122
	Marva Data Services, Inc.	35,720
	Matrix Data Corporation	3,745 *
	Office Technology System, Inc.	9,595
	Printer's Plus	8,100
	Software Store Inter Business Center	78,635
	Spectrum Computer and Business	8,410
	TEC-Connecting Point	7,025 *
	Valcon Computer Center	4,830
	Westwood Computer Corporation	6,887

	Total	\$458,312
142-90	Computer Supplies	
	AWARDEES	
	Allstate Office Products, Inc.	\$ 96
	Carolina Ribbon	36,360
	Data Systems Supply Company	371
	DK & R Company	7,380 *
	Future Computer Systems, Inc.	707 *
	Gaithersburg Office Supply Center	1,097
	IBS Corporation	42,493 *
	Instant Media	4,200 *
	Landon Systems Inc.	223
	Martin Associates, Inc.	853 *
	Matrix Data Corporation	3,739 *
	Metropolitan Ribbon and Carbon, Inc.	329
	Misco, Inc.	476
	NRI Data and Business Products, Inc.	1,176
	PS Data Supply	480
	Potomac Enterprises	186 *
	Virginia Impression Products Company	477
	Word Technology Systems, Inc.	8,682

	Total	\$109,425
159-90	Safety Supplies and Equipment	
	AWARDEES	
	Baltimore Washington Insulation	\$ 49,216
	Chesapeake Optical Company, Inc.	113
	Gichner	230
	Graves-Humphreys, Inc.	256
	Lab Safety Equipment	735 *
	Metco Supply, Inc.	135
	Mine Safety appliances Company	6,441
	Municipal Supply Company	14,318
	Safeware, Inc.	6,641

	Total	\$ 78,085

TOTAL MORE THAN \$25,000

\$645,822

* Denotes MFD vendors

RESOLUTION NO. 403-90 Re: CHANGE ORDERS OVER \$25,000

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

WHEREAS, The Department of School Facilities has received change order proposals for two capital projects that exceed \$25,000; and WHEREAS, Staff and the project architects have reviewed these proposals and found them to be equitable; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education approve the following change orders for the amounts and contracts indicated:

ACTIVITY 1

Project: Laytonsville Elementary School PEPCO service credit

Description: The contract for this project contained an allowance to relocate a PEPCO electrical service pole on Route 108. During construction it was determined that this pole did not have to be relocated. The deletion of this work resulted in a credit to MCPS for the allowance in the contract.

Contractor: Kimmel and Kimmel, Inc.
Amount: \$30,000

ACTIVITY 2

Project: Richard Montgomery High School window installation

Description: This activity is for the replacement of windows in 18 classrooms that are scheduled for interior renovations at the school.

Contractor: Northwood Contractors, Inc.
Amount: \$80,927

WHEREAS, All maintenance will be performed at no cost to the Board of Education with the Lakewood Country Club assuming liability for all damages or injury in connection with its use; and

WHEREAS, In exchange for the grant of said easement, Lakewood Country Club will permit the continued use of its golf course to Thomas S. Wootton High School Golf Team for instructional purposes without charge; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the president and secretary be authorized to execute an easement agreement permitting the use of 9,500 square feet of land, more or less, at the Robert Frost Middle School by the Lakewood Country Club for use as a tee area for its golf operations.

RESOLUTION NO. 409-90 Re: NAME FOR MAGRUDER CLUSTER SCHOOL

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

WHEREAS, The 1990 Magruder cluster elementary school was given the name of Bowie Mill; and

WHEREAS, A committee representing the future school community was established to recommend a permanent name for the new school in accordance with MCPS Regulation FFA NAMING OF SCHOOLS, as amended on April 17, 1990; and

WHEREAS, The committee submitted lists of names for the Board of Education's consideration; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the new Magruder cluster elementary school officially be named Sequoyah Elementary School.

RESOLUTION NO. 410-90 Re: NAME FOR QUINCE ORCHARD CLUSTER SCHOOL

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

WHEREAS, The 1990 Quince Orchard cluster elementary school was given the name of Kentlands; and

WHEREAS, A committee representing the future school community was established to recommend a permanent name for the new school in

Robert H. Hacker	Acting Admin. Asst. Area 1 Admin. Office	Exec. Asst. to Area 2 Assoc. Supt., Area 2 Admin. Office Effective: 7-1-90
James T. Terrill	Supervisor of Sec. Instruc. Area 3 Admin. Office	Exec. Asst. to Area 3 Assoc. Supt., Area 3 Admin. Office Effective: 7-1-90
Jerome E. Lynch	Acting Supervisor of Sec. Instruc. Area 1 Admin. Office	Exec. Asst. to Area 4 Assoc. Supt., Area 4 Admin. Office Effective: 7-1-90

RESOLUTION NO. 413-90 Re: PERSONNEL APPOINTMENT

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

RESOLVED, That the following personnel appointment be approved:

APPOINTMENT	PRESENT POSITION	AS
Annette C. Hall	Principal Trainee Chevy Chase ES	Principal Wood Acres ES Effective: 7-1-90

Re: PRACTICAL ARTS CREDIT FOR COMMUNITY
SERVICE COURSE

Mrs. Praisner moved and Dr. Shoenberg seconded that the Community Service Course not be one of the courses designated as meeting the practical arts requirement and that it be given elective credit status, effective February 1, 1991.

RESOLUTION NO. 414-90 Re: POSTPONEMENT OF DECISION ON
PRACTICAL ARTS CREDIT FOR COMMUNITY
SERVICE COURSE

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

RESOLVED, That a decision on practical arts credit for the Community Service Course be postponed until after the Board has acted on the superintendent's recommendations with regard to criteria for practical arts courses.

Re: SECONDARY LEARNING CENTERS

Dr. Thomas O'Toole, director of the Department of Special Education, introduced Mr. David Litsey, director of the Secondary Learning Centers, and Dr. Mary Canary, center resource specialist at Kennedy High School.

Dr. O'Toole said that the Secondary Learning Centers program started in 1975, and Mr. Litsey was instrumental in getting the program started. It had been a very successful program because it combined special and regular education in a regular school setting. Teachers from the Secondary Learning Centers taught regular education classes, and regular education teachers taught the Secondary Learning Center classes. All of the teachers in the Learning Centers had to be certified in special education and in a regular academic area. In 1980, they started a training program to help regular education teachers to be trained as special educators.

Dr. O'Toole reported that about a third of the students moving through the program would leave the Centers and go back to regular education classes. It was an excellent example of how a special program could be integrated into a regular school setting with the cooperation of regular and special education teachers. They had learned a lot from the Centers and were doing more integration of special education students into regular education, and a lot of what they had learned went back to experiences they had had with the Centers.

Dr. Pitt stated that one of the goals of the Secondary Learning Center was to get the youngster back into the regular program if at all possible. He commended Mr. Litsey and his staff for their efforts. Now they were serving youngsters with greater problems than they had five or six years ago, and yet their rate of return was high.

Mrs. Hobbs recalled that her purpose in asking for this discussion was her concern about the elimination of the assistant director position. Some background research had been done for her, and she discovered that there had not been any true discussion of the goals and objectives of the Secondary Learning Centers. She was still concerned about the elimination of the assistant director position. It seemed to her that originally Mr. Litsey was supervising Walter Johnson and Tilden, and the assistant director was responsible for Watkins Mill, Montgomery Village, Kennedy, and Lee. There was some division of responsibility. She wondered how Mr. Litsey would be able to supervise all six programs and handle evaluation, enrollment, placement, and budget.

Dr. O'Toole reported that when the Secondary Learning Centers were established they had added an assistant director to help with instruction and curriculum development for the program. They now had the curriculum, and they had a lot of good program elements in place. As a result, the assistant director position was able to pick up some administrative tasks. However, at the same time these centers were integral parts of the schools. The message they wanted to give was that the building principal and the administrators at the school were part of this program. While it was important for the program to have a central identification, there was a stronger need to have the regular education staff more involved with this program.

Mrs. Hobbs asked whether in the future they would have more administrators overseeing special programs. For example, would the principal at Sherwood High School be doing more teacher evaluations of teachers in special programs. Dr. O'Toole replied that this was the direction they were going in. With the Secondary Learning Centers, they had center resource specialists assigned at every school. The principal was not running the program by him or herself because they had a well qualified special education staff member at that school who played a very important role. When they had programs involving 75 to 100 students, they did need a representative of special education on site.

Mrs. Hobbs asked what the resource specialist would do if he or she had a problem with the principal about space, for example. Dr. Hiawatha Fountain, associate superintendent, replied that problems would be solved just as they would be if the English Department had a problem with space. If they were going towards a more inclusive role for special education students, all programs located within the school should be managed by the building principal. If problems had to be resolved, they would work with the area office and the director of special education, but the special education programs should not be separated as they once were. If they had a separate program, it would be as if they were renting space from the school rather than having the program as an integral part of the school.

Dr. Pitt commented that they had just cut \$2 million out of the central office and \$1.5 million out of the area offices. Therefore, a lot more of the support would have to be done at the school level. They would not have the support they had in the school system a year ago. People had argued that there should be more opportunity for local schools to make decisions, and they had made a deliberate decision not to cut staff at the local school level. In fact, most of the improvements were at the local school level.

Mr. Ewing was pleased to hear Dr. O'Toole speak about the direction in which the programs were headed and the lessons they had been able to learn from the Secondary Learning Centers. He thought the Secondary Learning Centers had done a magnificent job in both dealing with students in the program and in teaching teachers in the regular program about how to work with students with disabilities. He wondered where they were headed in the future. He was asking about direction and goal rather than organization and structure although he thought that was important.

It seemed to Mr. Ewing that a question of importance was the one raised by Mrs. Hobbs. What happened when there was conflict? He thought there needed to be a very strong advocate for students with disabilities and for the teachers who taught them, just as he thought that schools needed to take responsibility for the education of students with disabilities. He would not want them to end up with a structure that diminished the enthusiasm, ability, and integrity of those who spoke for children with disabilities. He did not want every argument settled in favor of the principal and his or her objectives. They could not simply say that the building principal was going to make all the decisions. He did not think the case could be made that they had always had principals sympathetic to programs for children with disabilities. This was not because they were bad folks but because it took time to learn about what was in the best interests of those students. In most cases they did not have principals who were trained in special education; therefore, they had to educate those principals. He wanted to be sure that in the interests of making principals responsible that they made them so dominant that the interests of other people in the building got left out.

Dr. Pitt explained that it was for this reason he retained the supervisory responsibility at the area offices. Mr. Litsey and Dr. O'Toole had that responsibility, and Dr. O'Toole could say to the area superintendent and the deputy superintendent that students were not being supported the way they should. What they were losing throughout the system was a teacher specialist coming to the schools and providing help. He also pointed out that they were getting principals who were trained in special education. He commented that part of the problem had been that with special education programs they had almost ignored the principal. When he had been principal of Sherwood High School, there were 15 special education programs in that school and the principal had no responsibility for these programs. He had assumed responsibility for those programs, and he agreed that principals should have supervisory responsibility for these programs.

Dr. Fountain reported that they did have local school plans, and each plan included an objective for special needs students. The

area associate monitored these plans as he or she went out to the schools. It was a way of saying that the students would be dealt with in a consistent way in line with the direction they were taking with special education.

Mr. Ewing stated that there was a view on the part of an increasingly vocal group of parents that MCPS had not done enough to integrate students with special needs into the regular program. He asked whether it was their objective to continue to take the lessons they had learned from the Secondary Learning Centers and expand them and apply them to children with all kinds of disabilities. He asked how far and how fast they were moving in that direction. Dr. O'Toole replied that this was their objective, and there was clear evidence that they were moving in that direction. Several years ago they had talked about the cluster concept and having several classes in some schools. In this way, they would have several teachers available so that they could share their views. This was one of the things they had learned about having a critical mass of students in the Secondary Learning Centers. They had gone to the cluster concept at the secondary and elementary level where they tried to have at least two classes in an elementary school. When Clearspring had opened, they had taken students out of the Taylor Learning Center and moved them into Clearspring where the principal was special education trained. They had trained the staff ahead of time, and they had a half-time person to work with staff. They were going to do the same thing with two new schools this year. He was pleased with the direction in which the system was going, but at times it was frustrating because progress was slow.

In regard to Sherwood High School, Mrs. DiFonzo said there was a difference between responsibility and authority. They could give people all kinds of responsibility, but if they did not give them authority they were receiving only half the deck that they needed. She asked if Dr. Pitt was assuming that authority went with responsibility, and he replied that he was. Mrs. DiFonzo asked how they worked out the authority and responsibility of the principal into all the chains of command, IEPs, etc.

Dr. Fountain replied that in this particular program they had started out small in 1975. Out of that came the Blueprint for Study Strategies which was used widely in the school systems and was an outstanding piece of educational support for youngsters. Once they had a program at a maintenance stage, they looked at the research and national efforts. At the local school level, it was their responsibility to find staff and select staff jointly with the principal. Therefore, the building principal could feel that the teachers were well qualified and capable of handling what had to be done. The teachers in that school had to feel some allegiance to the school. Some years ago, special education teachers felt that they were renting space in the school and did

not feel they were part of that school community. He thought that the building principal was the person responsible for the programs in that school which meant that authority went along with responsibility. When he visited schools, he reminded principals that they were expected to have the authority as well as the responsibility of managing programs in their schools. His duty was to make sure the programs were quality programs and along with the area associate to monitor these programs.

Dr. Canary commented that the answer to this was the teamwork that existed in a school. When behavior problems occurred with regular education students, those students saw the principal. If these students were special education, they would also see the principal; however, in her role as special education advocate, she would also see the principal. If there was something having to do with the student's IEP, she would call Mr. Litsey. After the issue had been resolved, she and Mr. Litsey would talk with the principal. When she was involved with the principal about a student's behavior, she would inform Mr. Litsey.

Mrs. DiFonzo asked if giving authority/responsibility to the principal took away Mr. Litsey's authority and responsibility. Mr. Litsey replied that the building principal had all the authority. The only authority he had was the authority of suggestion, and he felt this was the way it had to be. The student had to believe that he or she was a student at a particular high school and would graduate from that school. Therefore, they started with the assumption that the principal had all the authority. The key to this was the concept of collegial administration and joint sharing and talking out of problems. Now they were doing the things they originally set out to do, and they were now trying some new things. They were working with colleges and employers, and they were training students for what they could do after high school. They had learned from their successes and failures because they had had students going through the program that had not made it. The research on what they were doing was good, and he believed they were headed in the right direction.

Mrs. DiFonzo thought that the change the Board made some years ago to include special youngsters as part of school programs and facilities was probably one of the more positive things that the Board had done. This had added mental and physical stability to the minds and hearts of parents of youngsters in these programs. Dr. Cronin agreed that they were now reaching beyond the public school mandate. The needs of these students did not end when they graduated. He thought that the next level of public agency and community agency had to be cooperation through Montgomery College. He wanted to work with the people at the College to get those commitments for cooperation.

Mrs. Hobbs asked about appropriate placement of students into the Secondary Learning Centers. She asked whether the IEP would be followed and whether the principal could not place a student inappropriately. Dr. O'Toole replied that this would not happen. Dr. Fountain added that they were now serving a large number of students with special education personnel. There were cases where students did not have an IEP but were served by special education staff. There were students now in the Secondary Learning Centers who might not be identified as special education. They now had regular and special educators working with both regular and special education students. As far as placing a youngster into the Secondary Learning Centers without an IEP, this would not happen. The integrity of the CARD process would remain as well.

Dr. Shoenberg remarked that this was obviously a very successful program, and he was pleased they were able to share information about the program. Dr. Pitt commended Mr. Litsey for the design of the program and the intense interest he had in students.

Re: BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS

1. Dr. Cronin was concerned about bus drivers and their need for child care. He said MCPS had a responsibility like employers in the county to investigate the issue of child care for employees. He suggested they might deal with the county government in putting portables on site to accommodate the children of employees. Dr. Shoenberg recalled that child care was part of the negotiated agreement. Dr. Pitt thought they could not separate out a group of employees and provide child care for them. He had been unaware of the initiative taken by Transportation and Personnel to allow bus drivers to bring their children on the bus with them. It was decided that the experiment did not work. The real issue went beyond these bus drivers and was child care for all employees. Dr. Philip Rohr, associate superintendent, added that the child care for bus drivers was difficult to manage because of split shifts and children being on the various bus lots. They were working with the Department of Family Resources on child care issues, and this was part of the negotiated agreement. Dr. Cronin noted that some people might lose their jobs because of lack of child care.

2. Dr. Cronin reported that he had asked for a discussion of how they went about the priorities of training and coordination of training through Staff Development. He thought this was even more important now because of cuts in positions which provided training within the schools. Dr. Pitt said they would respond to this. They had looked into these issues and would be responding to them. They would make every effort to provide staff training, but there would be cuts in services. It was incumbent upon him as superintendent to do the best he could with what was available

to provide staff training; however, they could not maintain the same level of services.

3. Mrs. Praisner stated that she had attended the ACT-SO breakfast on Saturday and had met some talented young men and women who would be representing Montgomery County in Los Angeles. She complimented the NAACP for the program and wished the young people the best of luck.

4. Mrs. Praisner said that some Board members had an opportunity to attend the Secondary Administrators conference this last week. It was an excellent and comprehensive program with an opportunity to share experiences. She complimented Mrs. Gemberling for her excellent overview of state issues that would be impacting the school system.

5. Mrs. Praisner had attended the MCARC awards dinner, and she understood there was an article in the WASHINGTONIAN Magazine on Bannockburn Elementary School. She asked that copies be provided to Board members.

6. Mrs. Praisner asked about staff monitoring of the Council's efficiency committee. She understood the committee was meeting weekly on Tuesday evenings, and she wondered whether MCPS staff members were in attendance or if materials and assistance were provided to the group. She thought the group might find the paper on construction cost overruns informative. She also understood that staff would be making presentations to the group. Dr. Pitt replied that they had been asked to make a presentation on the capital budget on July 24. In regard to her first question, he would like to have an observer present at the committee meeting. He planned to ask someone from OMB to attend.

7. In regard to the MCARC awards dinner, Mr. Ewing mentioned that community education awards were presented to Bannockburn, Bethesda, Barnsley, and Whitman for the work they had done in integrating regular and special education. He hoped that MCPS could give that some further publicity in its own publications. In addition, several parents had come to him and told him that the year at Cabin John had been absolutely marvelous because of the efforts of the principal to integrate children from the autism program into regular education. He hoped that Dr. Pitt would share these comments with the principal.

8. Mr. Ewing said the Board had received the affirmative action report as an item of information. He hoped the Board would have an opportunity to schedule this for discussion. He was distressed that they were missing targets. Dr. Pitt agreed that the report should be discussed; however, he pointed out that they had achieved 12 of their 13 objectives but were not achieving the goal of 19 percent teacher hiring. Dr. Vance suggested that they

talk about this issue when they discussed minority education on July 10. Mr. Ewing agreed as long as they had time to spend on this issue, and Dr. Pitt said they would schedule another discussion if enough material wasn't covered on July 10.

9. Mr. Goldensohn reported that he had also attended the Secondary School Administrators Conference. He had sat in on a session on middle schools, and principals and assistant principals had had an opportunity to talk about programs they had implemented in their schools. He had picked up some materials which he would share with the Board.

10. Mr. Goldensohn offered best wishes to Magruder High School which was competing for the third time in the National Thespian Festival in Muncie, Indiana.

11. Ms. Serino made the following comments for the record:

"There are many issues that either I brought up or my fellow Board members brought up this year that I wanted to raise to keep them in your minds since I will not be here, and who knows what is going to happen over the next year.

"The first is class rank, and unfortunately I wasn't there when it was being beaten to death over the last however many years, but that is one that I think is important to students, and that I hope you will keep in mind.

"We spoke a little bit tonight about the practical arts credit, and I know that that will come back to you.

"The third is the pregnancy pilot at Blair High School. There are some questions about that program that hopefully will be answered just for my own piece of mind before I leave.

"The fourth is the human relations committee that I had brought to the Board in executive session, and then I spoke about it once during new business. I have been in touch with Dr. Smith about it, and I have made up a plan for what I envision as a help to enhance the Sensitivity Awareness Programs. The students at the schools would actually have input as to what programs and assemblies and speakers and awareness that goes on at the schools. For instance, the learning center was a fine example because the learning center student should feel a part of that school, and that is the type of sensitivity that we need to promote.

"The fifth is the vote for the student Board member. Fortunately for me, we didn't pilot it; it actually worked. We actually had it in place this year. I thank you for giving me that privilege because it has been one that I very much enjoyed and very much

thought that it was very important not only to the students but everyone who is affected by the Board of Education action. Of course, my push would be for the full vote. As a Board member who has been treated as a full Board member by all of you and all the staff, I really think the vote on budget items and negotiations is important because it is all related and intertwined. So I just leave that as my last request.

12. Ms. Serino reported that during the last year about 100 people had had an effect on her. These included community leaders, elected officials, student leaders, teachers, counselors, administrators, sponsors, coaches, associate superintendents, secretaries, executive staff, deputy superintendent, and the ombudsman. The seven Board members had been the nucleus of her second family this year, and she wanted to thank everyone for making this an incredible year.

RESOLUTION NO. 415-90 Re: EXECUTIVE SESSION - JULY 10, 1990

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 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 10, 1990, at 9 a.m. to discuss, consider, deliberate, and/or otherwise decide the employment, assignment, appointment, promotion, demotion, compensation, discipline, removal, or resignation of employees, appointees, or officials over whom it has jurisdiction, or any other personnel matter affecting one or more particular individuals and to comply with a specific constitutional, statutory or judicially imposed requirement 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; and be it further

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

RESOLUTION NO. 416-90 Re: MINUTES OF MAY 15, 1990

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

RESOLVED, That the minutes of May 15, 1990, be approved.

RESOLUTION NO. 417-90 Re: MINUTES OF MAY 21, 1990

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

RESOLVED, That the minutes of May 21, 1990, be approved.

RESOLUTION NO. 418-90 Re: ATHLETIC DIRECTORS

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

RESOLVED, That the Board set a time to review the roles, responsibilities, workload, schedules and school system expectations of athletic directors to determine if actions are needed to ensure that these positions are appropriately defined by MCPS; and be it further

RESOLVED, That this review would be informed by a request to principals, central office officials, and athletic directors to comment on this matter, and to the extent that the issues involve contractual agreements, these would need to be addressed in an appropriate fashion with appropriate comment from affected employee organizations.

RESOLUTION NO. 419-90 Re: AN AMENDMENT TO THE SCHOOL NAMING POLICY

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

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education amend its School Naming Policy to change from four years to permanently the use of generic area names as school planning names.

RESOLUTION NO. 420-90 Re: AN AMENDMENT TO THE SUPERINTENDENT'S CONTRACT

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

June 25, 1990

WHEREAS, The Board of Education of Montgomery County and Dr. Harry Pitt, Superintendent of Schools, wish to amend the agreement between them dated March 31, 1987, and amended on June 13, 1989; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That in consideration of the agreements hereinafter set forth, and other good and valuable considerations, the receipt and sufficiency of which are hereby acknowledged, the Board of Education of Montgomery County and Dr. Harry Pitt, Superintendent of Schools, do hereby agree as follows:

1. Amend paragraph 5 of the Agreement to read as follows:

5. The Board shall provide One Hundred Fifty Dollars (\$150.00) monthly to the Superintendent to defray the Superintendent's local expenses in connection with his duties.

2. Amend paragraph 6 of the first Amendment to the Agreement between the Montgomery County Board of Education and Dr. Harry Pitt, Superintendent of Schools, and substitute in its place the following:

6. The Board will contribute for the last year of the Contract an annual amount of Six Thousand One Hundred Fifty-Seven Dollars and Forty Cents (\$6,157.40) payable monthly to a Tax Sheltered Annuity as determined by the Superintendent.

3. In all other respects, which are not inconsistent with the terms of the Second Amendment to Agreement and Amendment to the Agreement, the Parties do hereby ratify and confirm each and every other term of the Agreement dated March 31, 1987.

Re: ITEM OF INFORMATION

Board members received the Affirmative Action Report for FY 1990 as an item of information.

Re: ADJOURNMENT

The president adjourned the meeting at 11 p.m.

PRESIDENT

SECRETARY

HP:mlw

