



Resolved, That the Board of Education agenda for November 30, 1981, be amended to have Board member comments before facilities decisions.

\* Mr. Lipson joined the meeting at a later time.

Resolution No. 1097-81                      Re: Board Agenda -  
November 30, 1981

On motion of Mrs. Spencer seconded by Mrs. Zappone, the following resolution was adopted with Mr. Barse, Mr. Ewing, Dr. Greenblatt, and Mrs. Zappone voting in the affirmative; Mrs. Spencer and Mrs. Wallace abstaining:

Resolved, That the Board of Education approve its agenda for November 30, 1981, as amended.

Resolution No. 1098-81                      Re: Roof Modifications --  
Educational Services Center

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

WHEREAS, Sealed bids were received on November 10 for reroofing sections of the Educational Services Center as indicated below:

<u>Bidder</u>	<u>Lump Sum Bids</u>
1. R.D. Bean, Inc.	\$ 121,207
2. Orndorff & Spaid, Inc.	125,027
3. Colbert Roofing Corporation	159,853
4. United Cold Storage Specialties, Inc.	194,600

and

WHEREAS, The low bidder, R.D. Bean, Inc., has performed similar projects satisfactorily; and

WHEREAS, Low bid is within staff estimate and sufficient funds are available in account 999-42 to effect award; now therefore be it

Resolved, That a contract for \$121,207 be awarded to R.D. Bean, Inc., to accomplish a reroofing project at the Educational Services Center in accordance with plans and specifications covering this work dated November 5, 1981, as prepared by the Department of School Facilities.

Resolution No. 1099-81                      Re: Bid 31-82, Ice Cream Cups,  
Sandwiches, and Ice Milk

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Mrs.

Zappone seconded by Mrs. Spencer, the following resolution was adopted unanimously:

WHEREAS, Funds have been budgeted for the purchase of ice cream cups, sandwiches, and ice milk; now therefore be it

Resolved, That having been duly advertised October 28, 1981, the contract totaling \$331,000, for the furnishing of ice cream cups, sandwiches, and ice milk for the period of December 1, 1981, through November 25, 1982, under Invitation to Bid 31-82 be awarded to:

Embassy Ice Cream Co., Division of The Southland Corp.,  
Baltimore, Maryland,

low bidder meeting specifications.

Resolution No. 1100-81                      Re: Utilization of a Portion of  
the FY 1982 Appropriation for  
Projected Supported Programs  
to Conduct Two Guidance  
Workshops

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

Resolved, That the superintendent of schools be authorized to receive and expend \$6,000 under the FY 1982 Appropriation for Supported Projects of \$500,000 from the Maryland State Department of Education to conduct a guidance counselor training workshop in the following categories:

	<u>Category</u>	<u>Amount</u>
02	Instructional Salaries	\$ 917
03	Instructional Other	5,000
09	Fixed Charges	83
	Total	<u>\$6,000</u>

and be it further

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

Resolution No. 1101-81                      Re: Submission of an FY 1982  
Professional Development  
Center Grant

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

Resolved, That the superintendent of schools be authorized to

submit an FY 1982 grant to the Maryland State Department of Education for funds to establish selected observational centers of professional development for training for gifted and talented program refinement and supervision; and be it further

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

Re: Monthly Financial Report

The superintendent explained that they did have a couple of projected surpluses. One was in outgoing transfers because they had developed more programs locally. In transportation there was a \$961,000 projected deficit.

He thought that their utilities projections would be fairly accurate, and he said they expected about a \$50,000 shortage in that area. In summary they were projecting an overall deficit of \$770,000; however, they were not proposing any hiring freezes at this time.

Mr. Ewing pointed out that in Category 1 there was a projected deficit of \$53,000 for legal fees, and he wondered whether the projection took account of the likelihood that the Board would have a good many more legal fees. The superintendent replied that it was based on actions to date and actions they expected.

Mr. Barse inquired about the deficit in special education salaries. The superintendent replied that most of their hiring this year was in special education and many of these teachers were highly degreed; therefore, their average salary was higher.

Mrs. Spencer asked about the relationship between the surplus in the outgoing transfers and the necessity for hiring more teachers in special education. The superintendent replied that they were trying to keep more and more of their handicapped youngsters in the community. He said that they had tried to take a hard look at youngsters in special placements, and he felt that they were better off in special education than in any year since he had been in this chair.

Mr. Barse said there was a footnote in the revenue section about federal funds received through the state, and he wondered how firm these figures were. The superintendent replied that they thought this was very firm.

Resolution No. 1102-81

Re: Personnel Reassignments  
and Transfers

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

Resolved, That the following personnel reassignments and transfer be approved:

<u>Reassignment</u>	<u>From</u>	<u>To</u>
William P. Wilhoyte	Principal Wood Acres Elementary	Leave for Professional Improvement January 1, 1982 - June 30, 1982

<u>Transfer</u>	<u>From</u>	<u>To</u>
Joan H. Peck	Principal Brookmont Elementary	Principal Wood Acres Elementary Effective January 1, 1982

Temporary Reassignment for the 1981-82 School Year

<u>Name and Present Position</u>	<u>Position Effective December 1, 1981</u>	<u>Position Effective July 1, 1982</u>
Barron Stroud Assistant Principal on Leave for Unusual and Imperative Reasons	A&S Teacher	Assistant Principal

Re: Designation of the Montgomery  
County Association of  
Administrative and Supervisory  
Personnel as Exclusive  
Representative

Mrs. Spencer moved approval of the following which was seconded  
by Mr. Barse:

WHEREAS, On September 10, 1981, the Montgomery County Education  
Association complying with the requirements of The Public School  
Laws of Maryland, requested the opportunity to enter into  
negotiations with the Board of Education on the subject of  
redefining the composition of the bargaining unit; and

WHEREAS, The Montgomery County Federation of Teachers requested  
negotiations with the Board of Education on the subject of  
redesigning the composition of the bargaining unit; and

WHEREAS, The Montgomery County Association of Administrative and  
Supervisory Personnel requested negotiations with the Board of  
Education on the subject of redesigning the composition of the  
bargaining unit; and

WHEREAS, Separate negotiations have occurred between all  
organizations requesting negotiations on this issue and the  
representatives of the Board of Education; and

WHEREAS, On November 10, 1981, the Montgomery County Board of Education determined that there will be two units of certificated employees in Montgomery County; and

WHEREAS, One of these units consists of all positions on the F to K salary schedule as of November 10, 1981, except pupil personnel workers, social workers, psychologists, and specialists, and included in this unit are the positions of directors and assistant directors, supervisors and assistant supervisors, administrative assistants, coordinators, principals and assistant principals, and all other similarly situated positions now and in the future; and

WHEREAS, The superintendent, those persons designated by the Board of Education to act in a negotiations capacity pursuant to the public school laws, and temporary employees are excluded from any unit; and

WHEREAS, On November 23, 1981, the Montgomery County Association of Administrative and Supervisory Personnel submitted certification that it has a membership enrollment of the majority of the public school employees in the unit named in this resolution as provided under The Public School Laws of Maryland; and

WHEREAS, Proof of such certification has been properly forwarded to the Maryland State Department of Education; and

WHEREAS, No other employee organizations have certified that they have a membership enrollment of at least 10 percent of the total number of employees in such unit; and

WHEREAS, The Montgomery County Association of Administrative and Supervisory Personnel did not request an election under The Public School Laws of Maryland; now therefore be it

Resolved, That in accordance with the provisions of The Public School Laws of Maryland Section 6.405 (e) Designation without an election, the Montgomery County Board of Education hereby designates the Montgomery County Association of Administrative and Supervisory Personnel as the exclusive representative of all public school employees in the unit named in this resolution; and be it further

Resolved, That the superintendent, those persons designated by the Board of Education to act in a negotiations capacity consistent with Resolution 588-79 plus the positions of area director for educational services and temporary employees are excluded from this unit, pursuant to The Public Schools Laws of Maryland.

Resolution No. 1103-81

Re: An Amendment to the Proposed Resolution on Montgomery

County Association of  
Administrative and Supervisory  
Personnel

On motion of Mrs. Spencer seconded by Dr. Greenblatt, the following resolution was adopted unanimously:

Resolved, That the proposed resolution on the Montgomery County Association of Administrative and Supervisory Personnel be amended in the final Resolved clause to substitute "including" for "plus", deleting "and temporary employees" and adding at the end "temporary employees are excluded from any unit."

Resolution No. 1104-81                      Re: Designation of the Montgomery  
County Association of  
Administrative and Supervisory  
Personnel

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

WHEREAS, On September 10, 1981, the Montgomery County Education Association complying with the requirements of The Public Schools Laws of Maryland, requested the opportunity to enter into negotiations with the Board of Education on the subject of redefining the composition of the bargaining unit; and

WHEREAS, The Montgomery County Federation of Teachers requested negotiations with the Board of Education on the subject of redesigning the composition of the bargaining unit; and

WHEREAS, The Montgomery County Association of Administrative and Supervisory Personnel requested negotiations with the Board of Education on the subject of redesigning the composition of the bargaining unit; and

WHEREAS, Separate negotiations have occurred between all organizations requesting negotiations on this issue and the representatives of the Board of Education; and

WHEREAS, On November 10, 1981, the Montgomery County Board of Education determined that there will be two units of certificated employees in Montgomery County; and

WHEREAS, One of these units consists of all positions on the F to K salary schedule as of November 10, 1981, except pupil personnel workers, social workers, psychologists, and specialists, and included in this unit are the positions of directors and assistant directors, supervisors and assistant supervisors, administrative assistants, coordinators, principals and assistant principals, and all other similarly situated positions now and in the future; and

WHEREAS, The superintendent, those persons designated by the Board of Education to act in a negotiations capacity pursuant to the public school laws, and temporary employees are excluded from any unit; and

WHEREAS, On November 23, 1981, the Montgomery County Association of Administrative and Supervisory Personnel submitted certification that it has a membership enrollment of the majority of the public school employees in the unit named in this resolution as provided under The Public School Laws of Maryland; and

WHEREAS, Proof of such certification has been properly forwarded to the Maryland State Department of Education; and

WHEREAS, No other employee organizations have certified that they have a membership enrollment of at least 10 percent of the total number of employees in such unit; and

WHEREAS, The Montgomery County Association of Administrative and Supervisory Personnel did not request an election under The Public School Laws of Maryland; now therefore be it

Resolved, That in accordance with the provisions of The Public School Laws of Maryland Section 6.405 (e) Designation without an election, the Montgomery County Board of Education hereby designates the Montgomery County Association of Administrative and Supervisory Personnel as the exclusive representative of all public school employees in this unit named in this resolution; and be it further

Resolved, That the superintendent, those persons designated by the Board of Education to act in a negotiations capacity consistent with Resolution 588-79 including the positions of area director for educational services are excluded from this unit, pursuant to The Public School Laws of Maryland, and temporary employees are excluded from any unit.

Re: Designation of the Montgomery  
County Education Association  
as Exclusive Representative

Mr. Barse moved approval of the following which was seconded by Mrs. Zappone:

WHEREAS, On September 10, 1981, the Montgomery County Education Association complying with the requirements of The Public School Laws of Maryland, requested the opportunity to enter into negotiations with the Board of Education on the subject of redefining the composition of the bargaining unit; and

WHEREAS, The Montgomery County Federation of Teachers requested negotiations with the Board of Education on the subject of redesigning the composition of the bargaining unit; and

WHEREAS, The Montgomery County Association of Administrative and Supervisory Personnel requested negotiations with the Board of Education on the subject of redesigning the composition of the bargaining unit; and

WHEREAS, Separate negotiations have occurred between all organizations requesting negotiations on this issue and the representatives of the Board of Education; and

WHEREAS, On November 10, 1981, the Montgomery County Board of Education determined that there will be two units of certificated employees in Montgomery County; and

WHEREAS, One of these units consists of all positions on the A to D salary schedule as of November 10, 1981, plus pupil personnel workers, social workers, psychologists, specialists and substitutes; and

WHEREAS, The superintendent, those persons designated by the Board of Education to act in a negotiations capacity pursuant to the public school laws, and temporary employees are excluded from any unit; and

WHEREAS, On November 24, 1981, the Montgomery County Education Association submitted certification that it has a membership enrollment of the majority of the public school employees in the unit named in this resolution as provided under The Public School Laws of Maryland; and

WHEREAS, Proof of such certification has been properly forwarded to the Maryland State Department of Education; and

WHEREAS, No other employee organizations have certified that they have a membership enrollment of at least 10 percent of the total number of employees in such unit; and

WHEREAS, The Montgomery county Education Association did not request an election under The Public School Laws of Maryland; now therefore be it

Resolved, That in accordance with the provisions of The Public School Laws of Maryland Section 6.405 (e) Designation without an election, the Montgomery County Board of Education hereby designates the Montgomery County Education Association as the exclusive representative of all public school employees in the unit named in this resolution; and be it further

Resolved, That the superintendent, those persons designated by the Board of Education to act in a negotiations capacity consistent with Resolution 588-79 plus the positions of area director for educational services and temporary employees are excluded from this unit, pursuant to The Public School Laws of Maryland.

Resolution No. 1105-81

Re: An Amendment to the Proposed  
Resolution on the Montgomery  
County Education Association

On motion of Mrs. Spencer seconded by Mrs. Zappone, the following resolution was adopted unanimously:

Resolved, That the proposed resolution on the Montgomery County Education Association be amended in the final Resolved clause to substitute "including" for "plus", deleting "and temporary employees" and adding at the end "temporary employees are excluded from any unit."

Resolution No. 1106-81

Re: Designation of the Montgomery  
County Education Association  
as Exclusive Representative

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

WHEREAS, On September 10, 1981, the Montgomery County Education Association complying with the requirements of The Public School Laws of Maryland, requested the opportunity to enter into negotiations with the Board of Education on the subject of redefining the composition of the bargaining unit; and

WHEREAS, The Montgomery County Federation of Teachers requested negotiations with the Board of Education on the subject of redesigning the composition of the bargaining unit; and

WHEREAS, The Montgomery County Association of Administrative and Supervisory Personnel requested negotiations with the Board of Education on the subject of redesigning the composition of the bargaining unit; and

WHEREAS, Separate negotiations have occurred between all organizations requesting negotiations on this issue and the representatives of the Board of Education; and

WHEREAS, On November 10, 1981, the Montgomery County Board of Education determined that there will be two units of certificated employees in Montgomery County; and

WHEREAS, One of these units consists of all positions on the A to D salary schedule as of November 10, 1981, plus pupil personnel workers, social workers, psychologists, specialists and substitutes; and

WHEREAS, The superintendent, those persons designated by the Board of Education to act in a negotiations capacity pursuant to the public school laws, and temporary employees are excluded from any unit; and

WHEREAS, On November 24, 1981, the Montgomery County Education Association submitted certification that it has a membership enrollment of the majority of the public school employees in the unit named in this resolution as provided under The Public School Laws of Maryland; and

WHEREAS, Proof of such certification has been properly forwarded to the Maryland State Department of Education; and

WHEREAS, No other employee organizations have certified that they have a membership enrollment of at least 10 percent of the total number of employees in such unit; and

WHEREAS, The Montgomery County Education Association did not request an election under The Public School Laws of Maryland; now therefore be it

Resolved, That in accordance with the provisions of The Public School Laws of Maryland Section 6.405 (e) Designation without an election, the Montgomery County Board of Education hereby designates the Montgomery County Education Association as the exclusive representative of all public school employees in the unit named in this resolution; and be it further

Resolved, That the superintendent, those persons designated by the Board of Education to act in a negotiations capacity consistent with Resolution 588-79 including the positions of area director for educational services are excluded from this unit, pursuant to The Public School Laws of Maryland, and temporary employees are excluded from any unit.

Re: Board/Press/Visitor Conference

The following individuals appeared before the Board of Education:

1. Mr. Hanley Norment, Montgomery County Chapter NAACP
2. Rev. Clark Lobenstein, Interfaith Conference of Metropolitan Washington
3. Mr. Sam Abbott, City of Takoma Park
4. Mrs. Peggy Robinson, Lone Oak Elementary School PTA
5. Mr. Andrew Greenwald, Lake Normandy Elementary School PTA
6. Dr. Carol Crannel, Key Junior High School PTSA
7. Mrs. Doris Kramer, Georgetown Hill PTA
8. Mrs. Donna Wilcox, Newport Middle School PTSA
9. Mr. Jerry Combest
10. Mrs. Kathy Greenfield, Brookhaven Elementary School PTA
11. Mr. Alan Kranowitz, Radnor Elementary School PTA
12. Mr. Larry Lauber, counsel for Radnor Elementary School
13. Mr. Stan Ehrlich, Northwood High School PTSA
14. Mrs. Elaine Goldberg, Hungerford Park Elementary School
15. Mrs. Nancy Shaplin, Peary High School PTA
16. Mr. Larry Robinson
17. Mr. Wilbur Friedman, Pleasant View Elementary PTA

18. Mrs. Frances Green, Saddlebrook Elementary School

Mr. Lipson joined the meeting during the Board/Press/Visitor Conference.

Resolution No. 1107-81                      Re: An Amendment to the Agenda for  
November 30, 1981

On motion of Mrs. Spencer seconded by Mrs. Zappone, the following resolution was adopted unanimously:

Resolved, That the Board of Education amend its agenda for November 30, 1981, to allow more time for the Board/Press/Visitor Conference.

Re: Board/Press/Visitor Conference  
(continued)

19. Mr. Allen Hausman, Saddlebrook Elementary School
20. Dr. Tom Broadwater, Montgomery Blair PTSA
21. Mrs. Betsy Daniels Combs, individual
22. Dr. Timothy Lipman, Rosemary Hills Elementary School
23. Mrs. Judy Ackerman, Parkwood Elementary School PTA
24. Mrs. Elizabeth Hays, Belt Junior High School PTA
25. Mr. Bernard Gelb, Arcola Elementary School PTA
26. Mrs. Judy Tankersley, Parkland Junior High PTA
27. Mr. Kyle McDowell, Takoma Park Junior High School
28. Mrs. Jane Folsom, Newport Middle School

Resolution No. 1108-81                      Re: An Amendment to the Agenda for  
November 30, 1981

On motion of Mrs. Spencer seconded by Mrs. Zappone, the following resolution was adopted with Mr. Ewing, Dr. Greenblatt, Mrs. Spencer, Mrs. Wallace, and Mrs. Zappone, voting in the affirmative; Mr. Barse abstaining (Mr. Lipson voting in the affirmative):

Resolved, That the Board of Education amend its agenda for November 30, 1981, to take up executive session resolutions.

Resolution No. 1109-81                      Re: Executive Session -  
December 3, 1981

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Mrs. Spencer seconded by Dr. Greenblatt, the following resolution was adopted with Mr. Ewing, Dr. Greenblatt, Mrs. Spencer, Mrs. Wallace, and Mrs. Zappone voting in the affirmative; Mr. Barse abstaining (Mr. Lipson voting in the affirmative):

WHEREAS, The Board of Education of Montgomery County is authorized by Article 76A, Section 11(a) of the Annotated Code of Maryland to conduct certain of its meetings in executive closed session; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Board of Education of Montgomery County hereby conduct its meeting in executive closed session beginning on December 3, 1981, at 8 p.m. to conduct collective bargaining negotiations or consider matters and issues in connection therewith 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. 1110-81

Re: Executive Session -  
December 8, 1981

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Mrs. Spencer seconded by Dr. Greenblatt, the following resolution was adopted with Mr. Ewing, Dr. Greenblatt, Mrs. Spencer, Mrs. Wallace, and Mrs. Zappone voting in the affirmative; Mr. Barse abstaining (Mr. Lipson voting in the affirmative):

WHEREAS, The Board of Education of Montgomery County is authorized by Article 76A, Section 11(a) of the Annotated Code of Maryland to conduct certain of its meetings in executive closed session; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Board of Education of Montgomery County hereby conduct its meeting in executive closed session beginning on December 8, 1981, 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 conduct collective bargaining negotiations, and to comply with a specific constitutional, statutory or judicially imposed requirement protecting particular matters from public disclosure as permitted under Article 76A, Section 11(a) and that such meeting shall continue in executive closed session until the completion of business; and be it further

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

Re: Board Member Comments

Dr. Greenblatt read the following into the record:

"I have always conducted myself at this Board table under the premise that we are an elected body doing the public's business in open session. I do not intend to make these meetings good theater. I believe that we should be business-like and efficient, making decisions, voting, and not procrastinating because we are afraid to vote. I feel that by our actions we develop the respect and dignity our office deserves.

"Specifically, I have always confined my remarks to the substance of the issues and have not lowered myself to discuss the personalities of Board members or staff instead of issues. I believe the dignity of the Board and the school system needs to be maintained at a high level.

"However, recent comments at the Board table by certain members can no longer be excused due to the heat of the moment, or the lateness of the hour, or the frustration of being on the losing end of a vote. These comments and distortions lately have been repeated by the press. It is increasingly apparent that the time for silence and turning the other cheek has passed. I have decided, therefore, to speak out. I must summarize the Board's actions and explain my own decisions.

"Why close schools ? How did we get here ? We must not lose sight of why we have decided to close schools aggressively at this time. Since 1972, our school population has declined by over 31,000 students and is continuing to drop. When we run schools inefficiently, it results in large overhead in the form of high administrative and operating costs. By comparison, Fairfax County does a good job of educating its 126,247 students in 166 schools, an average of 760 students per school; Baltimore County has 92,538 students and 152 schools for an average of 609 students per school, with more closures pending. We have 95,587 students in 177 schools for an average of 540 students per school. Even with 29 schools closed, we will have 646 students per school, still well below Fairfax County !

"We cannot be held responsible for how many buildings were built in the past, or where they were located. Rather, we must address the sever fiscal and educational issues before us and take action now.

"The superintendent estimated at the beginning of this process that following his recommendations would save approximately \$8.5 million annually in our operating budgets. That is money saved from principal salaries, heating, maintenance, etc. For example, closing 29 schools eliminates the need for 29 principals at an average salary of \$44,000 per year, and saves \$1,276,000 without fringe benefits. That pays for 78 teachers ! This is one example of how we can redirect funds to pay for teachers and books rather than for bricks and heat.

"The superintendent estimated that if we did not close schools over the next 15 years, we would need \$100 million in capital construction costs for renovations (based on current costs). As a result of these closures, it is estimated that we will not need even one-fourth of that. That is a substantial savings -- even for Montgomery County.

"We have already turned over approximately 30 sites to the county government with a market values conservatively estimated at \$13.2

million. These properties can generate revenue for the county.

It is hoped that the children of the county will reap the benefits of all these sacrifices by having the recouped funds allocated for educational programs and for needed renovations in the remaining buildings.

"With rapid inflation and pending salary negotiations, we must be able to keep our expenditures under control. We can no longer afford to provide the educational programs in very small or underutilized schools. We are spreading our staff too thin -- 1/2 reading teacher, 1/3 librarian, 2/5 art teacher, 1/5 music teacher, 2/5 physical education teacher, etc. Obviously, that is not an effective way to run a school system. There are many other examples of the reduction of program and choice when a school becomes too small.

"Therefore, the Board established policy guidelines after which the superintendent developed his preliminary and final recommendations. There has been extensive public input in this process, in addition to this evening, with 90 hours of public hearings, correspondence, and numerous calls to Board members.

"There have been 28 closures and one deferred for 60 days. I have voted to close all 28 schools.

"The charges and distortions : comments have been made that we are being political. I deny this charge. The "wise" political decision would have been to make no closure decisions. That would have angered 'no one.' So we are in a no-win situation. After all, there are 28 communities which are very unhappy because their schools were closed. I, too, am very sad about having to vote to close schools, but if hadn't, it would have been all the children who suffered, and our responsibility is to all of them.

"Those communities which are most vocal are those whose schools were closed. The public is not hearing from those people in the county who are glad we are being fiscally responsible and are glad we have made these hard decisions so that we can continue to maintain the quality of education we have come to expect in this county. There are many who are relieved that the bulk of these decisions is over and that energies can now be devoted to helping the schools, the teachers, and the classes instead of trying to 'save our school.'

"Unfortunately, the press carried headlines announcing the 'Hit-List' and 'Doomed Schools.' They acted as if school closing is a purely negative or sadistic exercise. On the contrary, if we do not reduce the number of schools we operate, we will have little choice but to increase class size substantially. That would affect every child in the county, including those in non-declining enrollment areas. Is that fair? Put another way, if over the years Boards had not closed 34 schools, what would our teacher-pupil ratio be today?

"The most recent buzz word for those dissatisfied with a decision to close a school is 'race.' I will discuss that issue more fully later. But no amount of race-baiting is going to change the facts that this Board has acted fairly and has used its best collective judgment. No one and no group is perfect, but we did the best with the information we had and circumstances in which we found the school system.

"Criteria for closing -- There were many factors which were considered in deciding which schools to close. For example, enrollment, building utilization, quality of the facility, size of the site, potential reuse, impact on community, etc. No mathematical formula can remove the need for human judgment. The primary considerations are enrollment, building utilization, and plant rating.

Enrollment: One of the main reasons we close schools is low enrollment. When schools are too small, they are unable to provide quality education at a reasonable cost.

According to Board policy, there should be nor fewer than 200 students in an elementary school and there should be two or more classes per grade (about 350 students) to permit choice and desired grouping.

Of the 21 elementary schools closed, ten had fewer than 200 students or were projected to have that number in the near future. Although three are currently over 350, none were projected to have 350 students in the near future.

As a result of these 28 consolidations, there will remain very few small schools. It is projected there will be only seven elementary schools with an enrollment under 250 in the Fall of 1982.

Building Utilization: Another reason for consolidating schools is that we are using buildings which are half empty. Our guidelines call for 70-90 percent utilization.

Of the 28 schools closed, 14 are operating at less than 50 percent capacity. Twenty-five are currently functioning at less than 70 percent capacity and the remaining three are projected to decrease below that figure very soon.

By consolidating junior high school buildings so that there will be only one for each high school, we are able to improve the utilization and operate fewer buildings.

Plant Rating: Another important criterion for closure is the quality of the school building and whether it is need of costly renovation or repairs. It is fiscally responsible to avoid any major expenditures in the near future since there will always be some renovations needed in the future in the remaining buildings.

According to the superintendent's recommendations, those schools evaluated to be 66 or less in plant condition are in need of renovation within the next five years. Of the 28 schools closed, 11 have ratings of 66 or less. Six more have scores under 70. Nine are rated between 70-79 and two are over 80.

As a result of these actions, the Board has reduced the number of schools with ratings under 67 to 18 and between 67-70 to 14. Once we have determined which buildings will remain open, we can plan for the needed renovations in an orderly fashion.

Racial Balance: There have been charges that minority students have been adversely affected by these closure decisions. Let us examine that assertion. I believe that we can conclude that, to the contrary, Board actions have produced greater integration.

As a result of Board actions to date, eight schools out of the 28 closed, or 28.6 percent, had minority enrollments of over 40 percent. These were: Key Junior High School (47.8 percent), Takoma Park Junior High School (65.0 percent), Congressional (45.5 percent), Montrose (46.4 percent), Arcola (61.3 percent), Rosemary Hills (58.0 percent), Woodside (68.0 percent), and Brookview (79.4 percent).

Six schools were closed with minority percentages lower than the countywide average of 23.8 percent. These were: Cloverly (16.0), Peary High School (16.2), Brookmont (16.5), Lake Normandy (16.9), Lone Oak (17.9), and Georgetown Hill (20.9).

The number of schools with over 60 percent minority declined from ten to seven. The number of schools with 50-60 percent minority population declined from six to three. The number of schools between 40-50 percent minority enrollment declined from 14 to 11.

Overall, the number of schools over 40 percent minority has declined from 30 to 21 ! (see table A)

Table A

<u>Minority Population</u>	<u>Number of Schools at Present</u>	<u>Number of Schools after Board action</u>
over 60%	10	7
50%-60%	6	3
<u>40%-50%</u>	<u>14</u>	<u>11</u>
over 40%	30	21

Most of the decline in enrollment has occurred in the downcounty area and this is where we find a higher proportion of minority students. If we exclude from those seven high-school districts which have no closures (because of a growth in enrollment), the number of minority students in the remaining area is 18,190 out of 63,935, or 28.45 percent, of whom 9,554 (14.94 percent) are black. (see table B)

The 28 closures affect 11,690 students, of whom 3,888 (33.26 percent) are minority and 1,877 (16.06 percent) are black. In the 15 high-school districts in which closures have occurred, the black school population is 15 percent. Of the students affected by the 28 closures, 16 percent are black. This is hardly a pattern of adversely affecting black students ! In addition, in this same group of 15 high school districts 24 percent of the elementary schools with less than 30 percent minority enrollment were closed and 23 percent of the elementary schools with a minority percentage greater than 40 percent were closed and 30 percent of the elementary schools in the 30-40 percent range were also closed. Again, no pattern there of putting the closure burden on high minority schools.

Finally, when closing over 60 schools, the Board cannot avoid closing high-minority schools or else that would be considered reverse discrimination.

Table B

	<u>Total</u> <u>Children</u>	<u>#</u> <u>Minority</u>	<u>%</u> <u>Minority</u>	<u>#</u> <u>Black</u>	<u>%</u> <u>Black</u>
9/1981					
Total County	95,587	22,749	23.8	12,175	12.7
- 7 HS Districts without closures	31,652	4,559	14.4	2,621	.08
15 HS Districts	63,935	18,190	28.45	9,554	14.9
Children affected by school closures	11,690	3,888	33.26	1,877	16.1

Because we agreed on the overall urgent need to close schools, the Board voted to close roughly the number of schools recommended by the superintendent. Twenty-two of the 28 schools closed (78.57 percent) were recommended by the superintendent. I voted to close six alternates. These were: Saddlebrook, instead of Georgian Forest; Brookhaven, instead of Harmony Hills; Hungerford Park, instead of West Rockville; Radnor, instead of Bradley; Pleasant View instead of Rock Creek Palisades; and Rosemary Hills, instead of Rollingwood. Each of these decisions was fully discussed at the time of the vote.

I feel that the superintendent and staff did an excellent job in preparing the facilities plan. But I did not agree with every recommendation in the six-inch thick set of books involved. I am not a rubber stamp of the superintendent, nor is the Board. We take the advice of the superintendent and support him most of the time. However, as a member of a Board of Education, I use my own judgment on matters. So I voted for a few exceptions.

This represents citizen control of our schools. Otherwise there would be no need for a board of education.

There has been criticism of the Board's closing schools not recommended by the superintendent. These critics charge that high-minority schools especially were targeted for closure, but they conveniently forget that in three cases the Board closed the low minority school and consolidated it into a school which was over forty percent minority. This certainly was not the sole reason for our action, because there were many factors considered, including which was the better facility to keep in the long run. Obviously, one should be suspicious of criticism that this Board is placing the burden of closures on minority students and wonder why this charge is made. Specifically, we closed Saddlebrook Elementary (28.8 percent minority) and consolidated it with Glenallan (53.6 percent minority); Brookhaven (24.4 percent) and consolidated it with Harmony Hills (42.7 percent); and Hungerford Park (32.0 percent) and consolidated it with West Rockville (41.3 percent).

In another case we are criticized for closing Radnor Elementary and keeping open Bradley (which was recommended for closure by the superintendent). After all, Radnor has a 68 building rating and Bradley only 54 ! But the Board felt that we needed the space at Bradley to accommodate part of the extensive day-care program connected with N.I.H. or possibly the portion of the Whitman-bound students currently assigned to Bethesda Elementary. (That would make Bethesda able to send 100 percent of its students to Bethesda-Chevy Chase High School.)

No one noticed, however, that we replaced one school in great need of renovation with another. The closure of Hungerford Park with a 58 building rating instead of West Rockville with 75 made a lot more sense. Both Bradley and Hungerford Park were below the 66 rating, indicating the need for renovation.

One of several factors which tipped the balance in the decision to retain Rock Creek Palisades instead of Pleasant View was the fact that Rock Creek Palisades was a 100% walking school. We were fully sensitive to the unfortunate fact that either closure would require the displacement of a handicapped group of students.

Another school closed, which was not recommended by the superintendent, was Rosemary Hills. This action was discussed at length the evening of the decision. Suffice it to say that in the B-CC high school group the Board closed one low-minority school (Lynnbrook, with 25.2 percent minority students) and one high minority school (Rosemary Hills, with 58.0 minority students). We anticipate that the resulting consolidations and assignments in this high school group will result in better integration (with all receiving schools in the 30 percent minority range) greater stability and better education. There has been a great deal of comment about closing the high minority

school Rosemary Hills, but no comment at all about closing low minority Lynnbrook, and I wonder why.

Rosemary Hills has been used as the symbol of integration in this county. But I believe it is a myth. The school system tried an experiment which did not succeed. We must not be wedded to such an experiment. This is the time to try other ways. At the time of the decision we fully discussed the need to close buildings in the B-CC group, the condition of the facilities, and the many other factors which went into this decision which I will not repeat here.

One difficult decision involved Bells Mill Elementary in Potomac with its 31.5 percent minority enrollment; we decided to follow the superintendent's recommendation. In this case we agreed to consolidate Bells Mill with Georgetown Hill (20.9%). The Scotland community lives within the Bells Mill service area. This is an old black community for which the county has provided subsidized housing. We agreed with the staff not to close this school because of its importance to this community, as well as for many other reasons. Here is another example of how we did not put the burden of the closure decision on blacks.

"My neighborhood schools -- another set of distortions made at this table and seized upon by the press involved my support of a boundary change for my neighborhood elementary school, as if I act only out of self-interest. What is conveniently ignored by these parties is the fact that I also voted to close my local walking junior high, Key, to which my children can walk. This is proof that I am willing to share in the burden of school closures. But we should not close, and have not closed, all schools in a neighborhood with more than one school.

Following that principle, I fully expect the Board to ensure that the elementary school (Cresthaven) be made viable, and thus we would end the constant, annual uncertainty in this area dating back to 1975. With four schools closed in the region in the last five years (Hillandale, Burnt Mills, Brookview, and Key) the Cresthaven-Hillandale-Brookview communities deserved a viable school. With Cresthaven's building rate of 80 (as opposed to Jackson Road's 62 and Cannon Road's 82) it is reasonable to assume that there will someday be a consolidation between Jackson Road and Cannon Road (unless there is tremendous growth along New Hampshire Avenue). In any case, the children at the southern end of Jackson Road (who had formerly attended Hillandale before it closed and were split off by the Board) would be directed to Cresthaven. Since Brookview's children are coming to Cresthaven in September, it is reasonable and least disruptive to bring in all the new areas together. Jackson Road meanwhile remains a viable school with well over the 350 students guideline (about 400) and anticipates growth from a new development within its service area.

In conclusion, yes, I supported a boundary change bringing more

children to Cresthaven, but I also voted to close my neighborhood school (Key) which is something NO other Board member can say !

Finally, a word on Blair High School whose minority enrollment is currently 57.7% with 1763 students (34% black, 12.5% Hispanic, 10.3% Asian). The Board has reduced the service area of Blair High School by reassigning four elementary schools: Brookview and Broad Acres to Springbrook; Woodlin and Woodside to Einstein. This helps to reduce the concentration of minority students.

I would like to point out that twice in recent weeks there has again been a distortion about the enrollment at Francis Scott Key Junior High School and where the minority students would be going. It is my understanding from the memo coming from Dr. Andrews that of the 453 minority students, 118 students will be going to Eastern and Blair, whereas the remainder would be going on to White Oak and Springbrook and Banneker and Paint Branch. That is 26 percent of those students would be going to Blair. They had always attended the school. The resulting Blair High School enrollment at about 1400 will be comparable to the enrollment of 13 of our 22 high schools currently, i.e.:

<u>School</u>	<u>Enrollment</u> <u>9-30-81<sup>1</sup></u>	<u>Grade Level</u> <u>Organization</u>
Poolesville	727	7-12
Paint Branch	975	10-12
Einstein	1101	9-12
Wheaton	1116	10-12
Woodward	1124	9-12
Damascus	1126	9-12
Peary	1168	10-12
Magruder	1253	9-12
Richard Montgomery	1303	9-12
Walter Johnson	1320	9-12
Sherwood	1395	9-12
Northwood	1404	9-12
Rockville	1445	9-12 <sup>2</sup>
Gaithersburg	1447	10-12

<sup>3</sup> Regular and special enrollment

<sup>4</sup> Partial 9th grade

In addition, we have transferred and extended the popular French Immersion Program from Four Corners Elementary into Blair's

---

a

2

3

4

feeder schools, Oakview and Eastern, and are seriously planning a performing arts magnet program at Eastern and Blair. Furthermore, the Senior High School Policy helps to ensure equal course offerings of the core of courses at all county high schools. We can now consider the advisability of not renovating "C" buildings and avoiding an estimated \$3 million renovation as recommended by the Northwood community.

Looking to the future -- in conclusion, the Board of Education has made some very difficult decisions to close many schools over the next few years. We must keep in mind that our primary purpose is to give us the ability to redirect our scarce educational dollars for programs -- books instead of bricks, and teachers instead of administrative overhead and operating costs.

I am taking a lot of heat for closing these schools, but that is a price to pay for voting my convictions. I believe we owe it to our students now and in the future to have a sound educational system.

Mrs. Zappone read the following into the record:

The process of consolidating, closing, and making more efficient use of the facilities of MCPS has been an extremely difficult one for the Board of Education, a burden of great magnitude on the superintendent and staff, and a wrenching experience for the communities involved.

I want to thank the staff members particularly. There have been models of patience and endurance, having spent untold hours formulating, reviewing, and revising the recommendations, both preliminary and final. They continued to respond with equanimity to inquiries, permutations, and revised scenarios presented by the Board and community members.

Next I want to recognize the efforts and commitment to public education shown by community members. No other jurisdiction in the country can possibly match our parents and citizens for expertise and willingness to spend the time and energy involved in presenting their concerns and proposed solutions. Their next task will be to work cooperatively with their neighbors in transition committees to ensure that the best elements of the schools involved are maintained and enhanced for the benefit of all the children of the enlarged community.

Finally, I would like to address my fellow Board members. There have been accusations and allegations made by one segment of this Board against the other. I prefer to believe these statements were made in the heat and frustration of not seeing a particular point of view supported. The good will, integrity, and honest effort of each member of this Board cannot and should not be in question.

All of the decisions made over the past month may not be ideal.

We have come to consensus, adjusted to respond to particular concerns, and given latitude to the superintendent to allow for future contingencies. I believe we have done our work well and the children of the county will be the beneficiaries of an improved public school system.

Mr. Ewing read the following into the record:

I have a statement all of which I do not plan to read, but I do want to read some of it. Let me begin by saying when the Board had before it the policy under which these decisions were to be made I thought the policy was in many respects seriously defective, and I still believe that is so, and I believe the results have shown how seriously defective indeed it is.

Clearly the Board is unwilling to close schools in election years. It closed no schools in 1980, plans no closures in 1982, and anybody who wants to know why we are closing 28 schools in 1981 should understand that 1981 is not an election year. I think it is important to try to make as rational a set of decisions as possible nevertheless since it seems to me important for us to make some closures in order to engender some savings, in order to invest those savings in some improvements, and I have felt that all along, and I voted for most, but not all, of the closures that were presented to us.

I want to make it possible for us to make some more rational decisions by offering later this evening a series of reconsideration motions. Not in order necessarily to say to you that I have changed my mind on a lot of issues, but in order to say to you that I think it is clear that many communities feel a deep sense of injustice and a sense that the Board has not engaged in fair play and has not granted due process. I believe in many cases indeed there is some basis for that. Consequently I am going to suggest that the Board ought to have some further discussion of a series of these closure decisions. In particular I think we ought to discuss further the Georgetown Hill issue, the Lone Oak issue, the Woodside issue, the Hungerford Park issue, and Larchmont. Nor in order to raise again the choice between the schools that the Board have a chance to give those communities a clearer picture of what it is the Board is doing and what its reasons might be. there are also some issues that relate to some new data that are available to the Board. I would also be remiss if I did not call on the Board. I can't offer these motions in some of these cases because I was not on the prevailing side, but I will call on the Board to reconsider Takoma Park Junior High, the assignment of three schools that the superintendent proposed assigning to Blair, and the Pleasant View, Rosemary Hills, Key, Brookhaven, and Lake Normandy decisions. Again not with a view that I think all of these ought to be changed, but rather that I think in those cases in particular there is evidence that the Board did not make it clear what it was doing and why it was doing it, and I think Saddlebrook is another example. I voted to keep

Saddlebrook open, and I think Saddlebrook got shafted. Let me say furthermore, that I am deeply sorry that the Board is determined as I guess it is to keep secret the advice that it has had from its attorney. We have had both written and oral advice from our attorney on how nevertheless a secret. I leave you to draw your own conclusions from that, and I will go on with my statement.

The decisions about school closings in Montgomery County are now final, barring some last minute changes tonight, some finishing touches, etc., and a decision on Parkwood and Kensington. It is important to attempt to gain some perspective on what the Board has done.

The superintendent had originally proposed closing 31 schools. The Board has closed 28, and may close one more. Certainly before the process is over it will have closed very nearly 30 in this year in this fall. It did this because it wanted to save money, so that Board members said. Of all the Board members, only one, I, have said repeatedly that the primary purpose is not just to save money but to generate savings in order to reinvest that money in the improvement of educational programs in the county. Mrs. Greenblatt has fortunately begun to talk that way, too, and I am glad to hear that.

Another objective of school closings rarely noted in the discussions is to make those schools which are retained more viable educationally by assuring that they have enough students. You may have heard a little of that tonight, but you heard precious little of that during the course of the closings.

Still another objective, often noted by a few members of the Board, but very largely ignored in all the crucial decisions, is to assure that school closings do not worsen racial balance but improve it wherever possible and do not impose one-way busing on either minority or majority communities. That is part of our policy, believe it or not. While the other objectives have to do with fiscal and educational policy objectives, this one has to do with far more complex issues which involve the Board in legal and constitutional questions of great significance.

An objective finally which is not formally stated but which is of importance in any political decision-making process, and this is a political decision-making process, is that the decisions the Board makes should be understood by the citizens, even those adversely affected, to have been arrived at fairly and objectively. This objective requires a fair process, clearly stated reasons for each decision taken, and a rational basis that the public can understand for the decisions both individually and taken as a whole. I leave it to your judgment as to whether that has in fact been achieved. I think it has not.

What emerges from these decisions is this. The Board majority sees the need to save money and has based its decisions

explicitly on this need. Second, the Board majority has used the opportunity provided by school closings to take actions which are designed to convey a political message to the voters which is as follows. See how we have controlled and contained and isolated racial minorities, and in particular the blacks and incidentally also the poor. So long as we are in office says the Board majority, we will do everything in our power to protect all those we can, at least all those north of the Beltway and west of Connecticut from the blacks and the poor and other minorities. That is the political message. And, third, the Board majority will do its best to protect its home schools as evidenced by the outcomes for Somerset and Cresthaven and White Oak. The only member of the Board majority who does not have a home school to protect is Mrs. Peyser, who as everyone knows sends her children to private school.

Let me suggest to you that following this sort of introduction it is important to do some analytic thinking about what has happened both at the countywide level and also in some key areas, Rosemary Hills, Chevy Chase, Blair High School, Woodside/Woodlin and finally Springbrook.

This calendar year on a countywide basis the Board voted to close 28 schools in the fall and three junior high schools in the spring for a total of 31 this year thus far. Of those 31 many did not present racial balance issues of any significance. That is, many of the schools closed were paired for closure decisions with schools of roughly equivalent minority proportions. The issue which school closings present the countywide level is this.

When the Board had before it choices for closure which involved schools which differed substantially in proportions of minorities, what did the Board do? Did it choose in most cases to close the high minority school or not? If it did, then that indicates that the Board consciously chose to place the burden of closure and of consolidation disproportionately on minority communities, and I reason that way because that is the way the courts reason on this issue. It would be they, the minority communities, which would bear the burden of busing, and they would bear the stigma of living in neighborhoods good enough for them to live in, but not good enough for anyone else to go to school in at all. If that were the pattern, it would be evidence that the Board violated its own policy, which says it will avoid making decisions which result in one-way busing. That is in the policy.

Well, if one looks at the list, of the three junior high schools closed last spring, two were the higher minority schools by a substantial margin, and in the other case it was much more complicated and not clearly before the Board as a minority/majority issue. The two higher minority schools were Argyle and Leland, and I think most people know that story so I won't repeat it. Of the two high schools closed, we really did not have a substantial racial balance issue as between those high schools. In the one case of the two where there was a pairing

we didn't have an issue there of any great significance in my judgment, and it is a matter of judgment. In the case of Belt and Parkland, there is not a great difference in racial balance nor is there a great difference between Newport and Sligo. Again, no major issue is presented in these cases.

On the other hand, in the case of Key and in the case of Takoma Park Junior, in both those cases the higher minority school was closed and there is a substantial difference. There is a very substantial difference. Those were both significant choices. So what one has out of seven junior highs, four presented substantial difference in choice, and in all four cases the Board chose to close the higher minority school.

In the case of elementary schools, I won't go through the entire list as I have done in my statement. My judgment is that there are 10 and possibly 12 cases out of the 22 elementary schools where the issue of higher versus lower minority school was clearly presented to the Board, clearly before the Board. Of the 22, the score is that some eight out of the ten or twelve were clearly the high minority school, and I might say that I do not think that the minority issue was really at stake in the Georgetown Hill/Bells Mill closure decision. I don't see it that way.

Now there are some special cases. Woodside/Woodlin is a special case, and I would eliminate it from the list and treat it separately. Brookview is also a special problem, but I would suggest it could be left on the list because it is the higher minority school and Cresthaven could have been on the list for closure and for merger into Brookview, but it wasn't.