

RESOLVED, That the president and secretary be authorized to execute a permanent right-of-way and temporary access easement for the WSSC at the Briggs Chaney Future Junior High School site for the purpose of installing new water main service for the surrounding community; and be it further

RESOLVED, That a negotiated fee be paid by the WSSC for the subject right-of-way and easement, said funds to be deposited to the Rental of Property Account #32-108-1-13.

RESOLUTION NO. 52-86 Re: STORM DRAINAGE EASEMENT - OLNEY FUTURE
HIGH SCHOOL SITE (Area 1)

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

WHEREAS, The Montgomery County Department of Transportation has requested a right-of-way and storm water drainage easement across the proposed Olney Future High School site for the purpose of installing storm drainage; and

WHEREAS, The proposed storm drainage improvements will benefit both the site and community and will not affect any land now planned for school programming and recreational activities; and

WHEREAS, Montgomery County will assume all liability for damages or injury resulting from the installation and future maintenance of the subject improvements; and

WHEREAS, All construction, full restoration and any future repair activities will be performed at no cost to the Board of Education; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the president and secretary be authorized to execute a permanent right-of-way and temporary access easement for the Montgomery County Department of Transportation at the Olney Future High School site for the purpose of installing storm drainage.

RESOLUTION NO. 53-86 Re: PROPERTY EASEMENT - CHARLES W. WOODWARD
HIGH SCHOOL (AREA 2)

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

WHEREAS, The Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission (WSSC) has requested a right-of-way and temporary construction easement across the Charles W. Woodward High School site; and

WHEREAS, The proposed water improvements will benefit the school and community and will not affect any land now planned for school programming and recreational activities; and

10 Fixed Charges	38,142	-----

TOTAL	\$90,815	\$90,815

and be it further

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

RESOLUTION NO. 56-86 Re: HB 407 - COST OF EDUCATION INDEX

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

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education support HB 407, Cost of Education Index.

RESOLUTION NO. 57-86 Re: HB 482/SB 296 - PUBLIC EDUCATION - STATE AID

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

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education oppose HB 482/SB 296 - Public Education - State Aid as currently worded, but that the Board of Education would support the bill if its proposed changes were made in the bill.

RESOLUTION NO. 58-86 Re: SB 339/HB 580 - CREATION OF A STATE DEBT STATE PUBLIC SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION AND CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT LOAN OF 1986

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

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education support, with amendments, SB 339/HB 580 - Creation of a State Debt - State Public School Construction and Capital Improvement loan of 1986.

RESOLUTION NO. 59-86 Re: HB 365 EDUCATION - PUBLIC SCHOOLS - AGE OF ENTRANCE

On motion of Mrs. DiFonzo seconded by Dr. Floyd, the following resolution was adopted with Dr. Cronin, Mrs. DiFonzo, Dr. Floyd, (Mr. Foubert), Dr. Shoenberg, and Mrs. Slye voting in the affirmative; Mr. Ewing and Mrs. Praisner voting in the negative:

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education defer action on HB 365 Education - Public Schools - Age of Entrance until the bill goes to summer study.

RESOLUTION NO. 60-86 Re: SB 228 - VEHICLES - OVERTAKING AND
PASSING SCHOOL VEHICLES

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

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education support SB 228 - Vehicles - Overtaking and Passing School Vehicles.

Re: HB 465 - SCHOOL VEHICLES - SEAT BELTS

Board members deferred action on this bill until February 11, 1986

RESOLUTION NO. 61-86 Re: SB 235 - PUBLIC SCHOOLS - FUNCTIONAL
WRITING TEST REQUIREMENT

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

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education oppose SB 235 - Public Schools - Functional Writing Test Requirement.

RESOLUTION NO. 62-86 Re: PERSONNEL APPOINTMENTS

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

RESOLVED, That the following personnel appointments be approved:

APPOINTMENT	PRESENT POSITION	AS
Edith Robacker	Acting Coordinator of Interrelated ARTS Dept. of Aesthetic Ed.	Principal Travilah Elementary Effective 2-1-86
Carolyn Bailey	Assistant Professor School Psychology Grad. Program Howard University Washington, D.C.	School Psychologist Dept. of Special Ed. and Related Services Grade G Effective 1-28-86

Re: FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE WINSTON
CHURCHILL CLUSTER

Mrs. DiFonzo moved and Dr. Floyd seconded the following:

WHEREAS, The Board of Education in January 1985 requested a comprehensive plan for addressing program and facilities matters in Area 2 schools; and

WHEREAS, A procedure and time line for study, recommendations,

alternatives, community comment, and Board action were established so that the plan could be considered and action taken by December 1985; and

WHEREAS, That procedure and time line were completed except for the Churchill cluster; and

WHEREAS, Notice was provided to concerned citizens who submitted their views in writing and at public hearings on November 23 and January 22 on recommendations and Board-requested alternatives for addressing program and facilities matters in the cluster; and

WHEREAS, The Board of Education deferred action for secondary schools in the Churchill cluster and directed staff to develop a comprehensive review for Board study of a Hoover-Churchill two building campus plan for grades 9-12 students; and

WHEREAS, The Board of Education has requested and received public comment on the staff-developed campus plan at public hearings from potentially affected school communities; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That Cabin John Junior High School be closed in June 1987; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the attendance area of Cabin John Junior High School shall be consolidated with the attendance area of Herbert Hoover Junior High School as follows:

- o Send grades 7-9 students to Herbert Hoover Junior High School from Cabin John Junior High School in September 1987

and be it further

RESOLVED, That the Cabin John Junior High School facility be retained by MCPS for other program needs; and be it further

RESOLVED, That six relocatable classrooms be placed at Herbert Hoover Junior High School in FY 1988 (1987-88); and be it further

RESOLVED, That quality education programs be maintained at Cabin John and Herbert Hoover Junior High Schools until consolidation occurs; and be it further

RESOLVED, That annual and projected enrollments be assessed to determine:

- o When Winston Churchill High School can accommodate grades 9-12
- o When an addition/modernization project is to be undertaken at Winston Churchill High School

and be it further

RESOLVED, That the rationale for these actions and the anticipated impact of these actions as contained in the Board of Education

Re: STATEMENT BY MR. FOUBERT

"I feel very strongly that ninth graders belong in high school. I am therefore more than willing to support the superintendent's recommendation to reorganize Churchill into a four-year high school in 1990, if not sooner.

"I do not believe that it is fiscally or educationally responsible to operate two junior high schools which are quite close together when the students could function at one, particularly when the community is united at one high school. The question for me is which facility should function as a junior high school and which should not. I have listened to testimony carefully from affected communities as well as carefully studying the superintendent's recommendation. I can see that the junior high schools are very similar in capacity, condition, and transportation, costwise. Hoover has two more classrooms which reduces the need for portables. Cabin John and Hoover are relatively close so the impact on the student relocations will not be great. Hoover also has easy access to Churchill, given the location. The educational program at each school is strong, and racial composition will not be greatly affected. I am, therefore, in favor of sending the Cabin John students to Hoover and retaining Cabin John for other MCPS purposes.

"I am also not inclined to accept the campus plan. I do not feel comfortable enough that it could work. In addition, the students I have talked with at Churchill including the student government association president do not support the campus plan. Even though I favor a four-year high school setting, I do not think the campus plan is a good way to accomplish that goal. Although I am not sure whether or not the County Council will accept it, I would be willing to support six additional staff positions to maintain a viable program at Cabin John until a consolidation occurs. Under the circumstances, I believe it is appropriate."

Re: STATEMENT BY MRS. SLYE

"I find this evening that I have one of the most difficult votes I have cast, even given the context of difficult votes this Board has taken recently. I can't support the superintendent's alternative although I do strongly support the need to address Cabin John's underenrollment and related programmatic difficulties through a facilities decision.

"The Churchill cluster itself is an excellent example of the combined factors which led the Board of Education to discuss a complete Area 2 facilities review this year. We had underenrolled schools adjacent to overenrolled schools, programmatic difficulties deriving from too few students in some instances and too little space in other instances. We have newly developing areas with an unknown impact yet on the demographics of the whole area. Of these factors, the superintendent's plan does resolve one issue and that is the issue of Cabin John's underenrollment. That is a key factor. And it does establish a clear and stable secondary articulation pattern for all

students in the Churchill cluster which is highly desirable, but the plan leaves Churchill crowded, and although as we have amended it this evening it stands a better chance of meeting Churchill's space needs, I feel that we need a guarantee of sufficient short-term relief for Churchill to accommodate the Bridge program successfully, and I think we need to know in the short term that Hoover will be able to accommodate students perhaps at those overprojected levels. At present we don't have a relief mechanism that has been articulated in the plan for either one of these situations, and that poses great difficulties for me.

"We have Seven Locks Elementary School left in the Churchill cluster underenrolled both in terms of student opportunities and in terms of facilities utilization. We haven't even discussed this issue. When we enter into the planning process normally in the course of facilities review we address ourselves to each school in the cluster in a top-down fashion. We haven't done that in this instance. As a result I feel that we have had two proposals on the table, both of which are significantly flawed and do not meet the other facilities issues and enrollment needs that exist within the Churchill cluster. Unfortunately when we have taken short-term approaches to problems like this in the past, the long-term costs have been excessive, both in terms of facilities and in terms of budget costs and in terms of student opportunities lost. For those reasons, I cannot support the superintendent's recommendation that is before us tonight."

Re: STATEMENT BY DR. SHOENBERG

"I find myself concerned about the dilemma that Mrs. Slye very well articulated. You have your choice between the comparatively expensive process of maintaining additional facilities and the lost opportunities of smaller programs in smaller schools, and yet you can't combine facilities comfortably without overcrowding. In this particular case, we have the additional problem of being right on the edge of having no place to go without being terribly overcrowded or terribly crowded. Yet when given those choices in other situations, it seems to me that it is better for students to have programs and to accept the overcrowding than not to have the programs and program opportunities and have the space.

"The campus plan offered an attractive, at least conceptually, notion to try on, and we have tried it on. Staff has done a very good job of developing that option, and yet as we start to look at it, it seems to me to have a couple of fairly major drawbacks and a number of minor ones. The major ones are two. The first is the anomalous structure which leaves us with what is the second and more significant one for me, and that is a school building that is inhabited entirely by ninth graders with the exception of a few tenth graders who will migrate there on occasion for a class or two. That seems to me to take away some opportunities for ninth graders even though they would have some of the opportunities of the high school

after school hours. They don't have those opportunities during the school day, and they lose an opportunity for leadership that comes from being ninth graders in a three-grade school, and that seems to me significant. They might have that opportunity as eighth graders. It isn't the same opportunity. Those things might be acceptable except, as we look closer at the campus plan, a lot of little things all of which are awkward keep raising themselves as really irreducible problems. It is certainly going to cost us more, exactly how much more is not clear, but over a three or four year life span of a program, it is going to cost us more to operate the campus plan than to go with the consolidation as the superintendent recommends. Then we have the problems of travel time between the buildings. What happens when the weather changes radically in the course of the day? What about ill or temporarily injured or disabled students travelling between one building and another? What are the students who are not moving doing while the others are moving? Not large things in and of themselves, but together they add up to something that is at least ponderable and considered.

"I think that once one got into operating under those conditions, one would find that the discomforts start to matter. Unlike other consolidations which are consolidations that leave us with established structures, this one leaves us with an anomalous structure and one in which I think the small problems will start to loom somewhat larger. There is a need obviously to vote for some plan. This is the plan we have on the table. We don't have another plan on the table. The superintendent's recommendation is the plan we have on the table. We don't have another plan on the table because nobody likes the other plan. None of the Board members at least appear to like the other plan better. Therefore, I think since we have to do something I will support this one as being certainly better than the best alternative anybody could think of."

Re: STATEMENT BY MR. EWING

"I want to associate myself with comments that both Mr. Foubert and Dr. Shoenberg have made, not that I don't agree with many of the reservations that Mrs. Slye has expressed. I do. In addition, let me say as I have considered what I thought we ought to do about this problem, it has been increasingly clear to me that if we don't make the decision now to move to consolidation, we will certainly be faced with it again in a few years. And if there is a great deal of disagreement and unhappiness over both plans now, if we don't decide now to move to a consolidated situation, I believe we will have a virtually equal amount of pain to go through in a few years hence because then I think there will be no more eagerness in all likelihood to make changes than there is now. That is a point that seems to me to be extraordinarily important. Having spent now nine plus years on the Board and gone through lots of people's pain including my own, I would rather get on with it.

"In that connection it seems to me important to remember that what we have committed to in the way of public policy is a system of schools that includes a 9-12 high school and a 7-8 intermediate school or a

6-7-8 middle school, and while that issue is not before us, thank heaven, the other issue is. My view is that we ought to get on with that and make as much progress as we can as rapidly as we can.

"The two amendments that we have made to the superintendent's recommendation are for me extraordinarily important ones because they make it clear that we will be pressing earlier than perhaps we had previously thought for consideration at least of a permanent addition to the school. Secondly, in the interim we will place enough capacity at Churchill to permit it to handle the enrollment more effectively. I think those are both very important kinds of actions to take. My view is that we ought to move to make the high school accommodate in a permanent kind of way, whether through modular or permanent construction, but in a permanent way the number of students and the kinds of students whom they expect to attend that school.

"If we adopt the campus plan, I think that retards and does not advance the real movement to a 9-12 school. It gives some temporary support to that notion, and it has many attractions. Those are noted in the superintendent's brief memo to us of January 24. Obviously it gives Churchill access in the short term to a second gym. It gives added space at Churchill. It does get us to a 9-12 school, but it is a peculiar 9-12 school as Dr. Shoenberg has said, and I won't repeat that. I have already associated myself with his comments.

"I have not mentioned costs. The superintendent's recommendation of the campus plan shows the campus plan as more costly. I am not sure that if we move rapidly to put an addition on Churchill that that cost advantage will remain. That's a consideration for me, but not a primary consideration. The primary consideration in my judgment ought to be an educational one. The superintendent has argued, I think forcefully and effectively, that while there are some educational advantages for the campus plan, the educational advantages in his own recommendation are greater. He, of course, has a particular interest in supporting his own recommendation. I, therefore, am inclined also to look for other kinds of evidence. I am, I must say, greatly impressed with the comments the public has made, granted that they are very divided, but also with those that came to us in a letter addressed to Dr. Cronin dated January 23 from the Hoover faculty which talks about their reservations at some length on an educational basis and a management basis with the campus plan. It is not necessary to repeat all of those, and it is not that I agree with every one of them wholeheartedly, but I do think that they are impressive, and I have mentioned some of them as I have talked. The hope that I have with respect to this is that we will be willing if the six portables at Hoover do not turn out to be adequate to reconsider that number of portables and to consider whether there is another way to expand the capacity of that school in the short term. The resolution before us says six portables at Hoover, but I would hope that all of us would recognize that that is a number that could be changed as we review enrollment. We are not locked into that presumably forever. I guess I would have been happier if the language had said 'at least' six portables rather than just six, but I am assuming that the annual review of enrollment projections will

take care of that issue, and if it doesn't, certainly the Board can. "It is not easy I think for anybody to come to a simple conclusion on this matter, and I hope the Board will make a decision and get on with it as quickly as possible."

Re: A STATEMENT BY DR. FLOYD

"Mr. President, this matter of the Area 2 facilities plan has been in print since October of '85 and the particular matter that we are addressing tonight, the superintendent's recommendation, has been before us since late November '85, a period of about two months. Admittedly when we received this recommendation it was based on some trendy data. The Board deferred action on the matter at the time and asked that a comprehensive feasibility study be made which addressed a number of factors.

"Dr. Shoenberg has already referred to the fact that the executive staff did a fine job in providing us with information that we requested on matters of scheduling, this is related to the campus plan, the composition of the academic and other program offerings, the matter of safety, and the famous path that leads between those two distinguished Potomac institutions, and I do not mean Tuckerman Lane, costs, and staffing patterns. The study was complete and as I said a good job, and it showed that the campus plan is, indeed, feasible. There were a number of advantages that were outlined in that paper dealing with the campus plan, and those advantages were considerable, and it was brought out both by the paper and also by people who favored it as they testified in the public hearings. There were also a number of disadvantages, and they, too, were brought out by people who testified at the public hearings as well as coming out in the professional paper.

"Now it seems to me it becomes the Board's responsibility to perform its democratic function and make a decision in this particular matter. The fundamental question for me is not 'shall Cabin John Junior High School be closed,' rather it is 'when.' There is the fact that Cabin John and Hoover will both be underutilized as brought out in the projections paper if both stay open regardless of which plan we use. There is a fact brought out in the paper that the campus plan is temporary and that Cabin John closes eventually, whether we use the campus plan or whether we endorse the superintendent's recommendation. While some advantages accrue to the campus plan, and both plans are somewhat costly, neither will be implemented without considerable disruption affecting not only Cabin John, Hoover, and Churchill but also it will affect three of the five elementary feeder schools as well.

"I have, therefore, concluded that on balance the superintendent's judgment about the disadvantages were too great to warrant recommending the campus plan, particularly in the sense that it is only a temporary solution to the problem, the Churchill cluster's facilities problem needs. My record of the votes that I have taken around this table are quite clear that I hate portable classrooms or relocatables or whatever you want to call them with a passion as a

remedy for overcrowding, but I hate overcrowding worse. After careful review of the feasibility study and listening to the voices of the people through the public hearings and personal contacts with them, I have concluded that we will simply have to do with some

overcrowding and I shall reluctantly support the superintendent's plan in this case and cast my vote accordingly."

Re: A STATEMENT BY MRS. PRAISNER

"I will try to be brief and not repeat what other Board members have said, yet share some of my thinking. I agree with Mr. Ewing that now is the time to act in the Churchill cluster at the junior/intermediate/middle level. Closure and consolidation at this level now would address declining enrollment and, I believe, would insure greater program opportunities for students at this level. It would reduce operating costs and would by consolidating Churchill's two schools into one have minimal impact on the community and the students.

"In this case obviously reviewing the factors before a Board in considering closure, capital improvements or minority enrollment implications are not a factor. Using Hoover as opposed to Cabin John permits greater access to Churchill for students, seventh, eighth, and ninth graders and also because Hoover has, as has been stated, two additional classrooms. Certainly there is an impact to the Cabin John community in having their intermediate level school closed, but I also think it is important to note that it is being retained by the school system and would be available for community use.

"Therefore, on the junior and intermediate level issue, I would support reluctantly the closure of Cabin John Junior High. At this point I think it is also important to discuss the campus plan and as Dr. Floyd said how we got here. When the Board was reviewing and heard testimony on the closure of Cabin John, it became obvious to us, I think I can speak for Board members at this point, that what we thought had occurred as far as a review of the campus plan had not been done to, I guess, to our satisfaction and to the comprehensiveness that I think was necessary in order to fully address this option, to explore its positive and negative factors, and that basically was behind my rationale for introducing that consideration, and I think behind the rationale for Board members in wanting to explore that as a possibility. When we go through this comprehensive a review, when we go through this painful a process, I think the community has a right to see options and alternatives before them, especially ones that they have raised themselves.

"When I did so, I had some doubts about the campus plan myself. I had raised those earlier, and I think other Board members have. I must say that what I saw was much more creative than I thought was possible, and I think as has been said earlier Audrey Leslie and other members of the staff and Mary Helen Smith and those who were involved deserve a lot of credit for putting together something that is in my view extremely creative. I must also say that I was very

disappointed that some people did not wait until the alternative was in front of them to draw conclusions about what it would be and what it would not be. Although the questions raised were very good questions, it seems to me that some of them would have found answers in reviewing the plan rather than raising the questions and concerns before the plan was developed.

"With all that though I think that there still are some significant questions and issues involved with the campus plan option, some lingering doubts for me, doubts that include movement between buildings, impact on programs, and concerns about - shall I call them - 'extended time' or free time on the part of students. Things that might be overlooked or weighed as being not as significant if there was strong community support for this option. For this option or any option that is creative and different to work it requires 100 percent, or very close to it from my view, of community support to overlook and to work with and to address the obstacles that are involved in it. Clearly, that support is not there, and to move that kind of an option before a community that does not support it is, I think, inappropriate on the part of a Board. So, therefore, tonight I will support the superintendent's recommendation."

Re: A STATEMENT BY MRS. DiFONZO

"I have a prepared statement that I would like to read into the record, but before that I would simply like to comment that unless I had wanted to go into a copious sermon-length statement, I could not have begun to have covered all of the factors that went into my decision on this issue.

"I have been philosophically opposed to a split campus concept here in Montgomery County since it was first proposed in 1981 in the case of Wheaton and Belt. I did not support the split campus provision at Woodward and Walter Johnson. I supported the development of the split campus plan for Churchill and Hoover to enable me to make the most informed decision I could. I wanted to know exactly what I was voting for or exactly what I was rejecting.

"Frankly, I was surprised when I saw the proposed plan developed by the Area 2 office. Much to my surprise it was a lot more workable and doable than I would have anticipated.

"Unfortunately, I still cannot support the implementation of the Hoover-Churchill split campus plan. I had always imagined a split campus configuration would be a logistical and administrative nightmare; this plan, in my opinion, would merely be a bad dream. In some situations a bad dream would be preferable to a nightmare. But given the option of peaceful rest over a mere bad dream, I would choose the former. That is my decision tonight.

"Accordingly, I will be supporting the superintendent's recommendation for the following reasons after having taken into consideration the eight factors spelled out in state by-law.

"In this instance, racial balance is not an issue. Neither school is racially impacted and whether all the youngsters are put into one building or the other makes no difference since we are talking about a totality of consolidation.

"Condition of building is not a major consideration. One building is slightly older than the other but does have a few more classrooms. Neither school is in need of major renovations.

"The campus plan is more expensive over the duration of the plan and beyond. The cost of relocatables has been cited as a factor which flip-flops the financial impact in favor of the campus plan. But without trying to sound cold or crass, I have to consider this not a major factor since I would consider the purchase of relocatables as an investment for the school system, not merely an expense of this closure/consolidation decision. Once purchased but no longer on the site, relocatables could indeed be, well, relocated.

"Transportation is a consideration, but also in my mind not a major one. Youngsters are going to be bused no matter what the decision. The transportation cost issue is a weighted one for me when I take it into consideration with the remaining factors of enrollment, community impact and educational program.

"I am the first guy to admit a quarter mile is nothing for a healthy teenager to walk. I flatly reject the notion of all the horror stories I have heard the Hoover community conjuring up with regard to youngsters walking along the now famous 'path.' Yes, there are trees, but it is not exactly Sherwood Forest we would be asking these youngsters to walk through. The weather is a factor in my mind. A spring day walk might be pleasant. A stroll in the snow might be invigorating. A schlep in a rain storm with or without appropriate weather gear is a whole 'nother story. Especially when it is not necessary and can be avoided. And in this case it can be avoided by not implementing the campus plan.

"The campus plan would indeed allow for more ninth graders to take additional sections of high school level courses. No one can deny that. But I have to ask myself if those very short term advantages to the educational program outweigh the many negative components of the campus plan. And my answer always comes up a resounding 'no.'

"The advantages to the superintendent's recommendation to the alternative campus plan are many and varied. The superintendent's plan allows for closure of one school and full utilization in one facility. It avoids a tri-campus split program for the Bridge program. It avoids the isolation of the ninth grade at Hoover. In that instance, those youngsters would be neither fish nor fowl. It avoids the problems real, imagined or perceived of youngsters moving back and forth between two buildings during the course of the school day. It avoids what I would imagine to be a nightmare of administrative staff in terms of scheduling of both teachers and students spread out over two buildings and the logistics of same.

"One further point that looms overwhelmingly large in my mind. No one enjoys closing a school. No one enjoys moving kids around in big yellow school buses. No one enjoys creating, causing or being a party to community instability. But when I look at the campus plan and when I look at this year's sixth graders, I see adolescent youngsters being educated in four different buildings in five school years. Furthermore, this would be the case for as many years as the campus plan would be in effect. That to me is the ultimate in administratively created instability. In this case it need not be. It can be avoided, and I intend to do that.

"I am grateful for the opportunity to have been able to see the full-blown plan on the campus concept. I am glad to have had the opportunity to peruse and study it. Having done so, I am even more grateful to have the opportunity to vote for something I believe is better.

"The relatively few educational benefits of the campus plan do not in my mind outweigh the many negative aspects of it.

"The Hoover/Churchill option may not be perfect and indeed it is not, but it is way ahead of what is in second place."

Re: A STATEMENT BY DR. CRONIN

"I would like to thank Audrey Leslie for the work she did on this program. It was a thankless task. We knew that in Area 2 there were professional staff capable of doing excellent work, and you demonstrated that capability. Thank you.

"I, too, am prepared to vote for the closure of Cabin John into Hoover in September 1987. I am not persuaded that to couple that closure with the campus plan for Churchill is a wise decision. Many of the reasons why I would support the closure of Cabin John have already been stated. I will only highlight three of them. First I believe that the Hoover facility is a larger facility and, therefore, provides us with more space for the program rather than closing Hoover into Cabin John. I believe the ninth grade at Hoover will have educational opportunities available to them at Churchill that would not be available were they put into the Cabin John site. I believe there also is a consolidation of savings which also may be used within the educational program to provide better services for our children at Hoover.

"I am not persuaded to couple this closure with the campus plan. It is a short-term solution of such complexity and cost that I would question the wisdom of doing so. I don't believe the program offerings for ninth graders are substantially improved. Only 60 to 80 students from Hoover will be over at Churchill for courses while 460 students from Churchill will be over at Hoover for at least one period during the day. I wonder how many classes from the Churchill building will drop in enrollment with the move over to Hoover. Will students not choose to eliminate those electives rather than to cross

over to another building, particularly when I note the number of classes and what they are. They are not required classes. Therefore, as electives, I am afraid I am dooming some electives. I also believe I will be isolating the ninth graders further because much of this is predicated on bringing tenth grade students to Hoover.

"We have dealt, I believe, with the problem that Churchill will face of overcrowding, and I will not comment further on that. I believe as the need arises we will provide the space at Churchill. I am also not persuaded, although staff says it can be done, that a workable master schedule will easily evolve. I don't wish to put staff and students through such a major complexity for a four-year solution. I am unwilling to impact the starting and closing times for Wayside, Potomac, and Bells Mill to accommodate this plan. The times may be brief but for parents of elementary school children those times are very important. I am concerned also of the effect the plan might have upon the faculty. I believe it would be detrimental to try to juggle two faculties in two buildings and put together a comprehensive, completely integrated school.

"For that reason I will close simply Cabin John into Hoover and support the motion before us. I would like, however, to make one further comment about the needs of the Bridge School. I am hoping that the discussion we have had recently will not isolate the Bridge School, nor make it feel that it is somehow responsible for any action that is taking place here or for the community to isolate that school and feel somehow that it caused something. I believe given the Cabin John and Hoover situation that consolidation had to take place regardless of the handicapped students present. I believe the space we are putting at Churchill will give us the opportunity to integrate our handicapped students into our population, in other words, to mainstream and to make them part of our life as fully as we can. Therefore, I would hope that any of the questions raised about either the Bridge School or other handicapped students in the course of this discussion now is put aside, and we pull the schools back together. Thank you."

RESOLUTION NO. 65-86 Re: WINSTON CHURCHILL HIGH SCHOOL CLUSTER

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Mrs. DiFonzo seconded by Dr. Floyd, the following resolution was adopted with Dr. Cronin, Mrs. DiFonzo, Mr. Ewing, Dr. Floyd, (Mr. Foubert), Mrs. Praisner, and Dr. Shoenberg voting in the affirmative; Mrs. Slye abstaining:

WHEREAS, The Board of Education in January 1985 requested a comprehensive plan for addressing program and facilities matters in Area 2 schools; and

WHEREAS, A procedure and time line for study, recommendations, alternatives, community comment, and Board action were established so that the plan could be considered and action taken by December 1985; and

WHEREAS, That procedure and time line were completed except for the Churchill cluster; and

WHEREAS, Notice was provided to concerned citizens who submitted their views in writing and at public hearings on November 23 and January 22 on recommendations and Board-requested alternatives for addressing program and facilities matters in the cluster; and

WHEREAS, The Board of Education deferred action for secondary schools in the Churchill cluster and directed staff to develop a comprehensive review for Board study of a Hoover-Churchill two building campus plan for grades 9-12 students; and

WHEREAS, The Board of Education has requested and received public comment on the staff-developed campus plan at public hearings from potentially affected school communities; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That Cabin John Junior High School be closed in June 1987; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the attendance area of Cabin John Junior High School shall be consolidated with the attendance area of Herbert Hoover Junior High School as follows:

- o Send grades 7-9 students to Herbert Hoover Junior High School from Cabin John Junior High School in September 1987

and be it further

RESOLVED, That the Cabin John Junior High School facility be retained by MCPS for other program needs; and be it further

RESOLVED, That six relocatable classrooms be placed at Herbert Hoover Junior High School in FY 1988 (1987-88); and be it further

RESOLVED, That quality education programs be maintained at Cabin John and Herbert Hoover Junior High Schools until consolidation occurs; and be it further

RESOLVED, That annual and projected enrollments be assessed to determine the earliest possible date at which Winston Churchill High School can be made to accommodate Grades 9-12 by the addition of classrooms; and be it further

RESOLVED, That annual and projected enrollments be assessed to determine the number of relocatable classrooms needed for placement at Winston Churchill High School to achieve as close as possible 90 percent utilization at that high school starting in FY 1988; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the rationale for these actions and the anticipated impact of these actions as contained in the Board of Education minutes of today's date and the documents comprising the Board's

consideration of this matter are hereby incorporated by reference as a part of these decisions; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the Cabin John and Herbert Hoover Junior High School communities be notified of the right to appeal in writing the closing decisions affecting its junior high school to the State Board of Education within 30 days of these decisions; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the state superintendent of schools, County Council, and county executive be made aware of these actions.

Re: BOARD/PRESS/VISITOR CONFERENCE

The following individuals appeared before the Board of Education:

1. Myron Fleigal, Area 3 Coalition for Highly Gifted
2. Bryan Baker

Re: COMMISSION ON EXCELLENCE IN TEACHING

Dr. Cronin stated that the interim report of the commission was before the Board, and they appreciated the effort the commission had put in on it.

Mr. Michael O'Keefe said they were pleased to have been invited to present their interim report. Their charge was to address the question of how MCPS could find, recruit, hire, train, retrain, and retain teachers as capable and qualified as those who now teach in the schools but during a period likely to have a large number of vacancies and a time in which the number of talented young people coming into education was likely to decrease.

Mr. O'Keefe stated that they saw themselves carrying out this assignment in four major phases. The first, the past September through December, was the identification of the issues they wanted to address. They sought the views of those closest to those issues, teachers, administrators, staff, involved parents, and other community groups. They educated themselves about the issues, and they identified resource people across the nation who were most knowledgeable and experienced with these same issues. They intended to meet with those people during the next several months. The results of the first phase were represented in the report before the Board.

Mr. O'Keefe said that the next phase would be January through April. The staff would be engaged in a collection of information. They would undertake necessary analysis and research. The commission would consult with some of the national scholars and experts on the detailed issues they had identified. In April through August, they expected to engage in a discussion of the issues based on that collection of information and on strategies being implemented elsewhere in the nation. The result of that would be the recommendations they wished to make to the Board in their final report. The final phase of their work would take place during

September through December when they would discuss issues among their membership and attempt to reach recommendations and prepare the final report.

Mr. O'Keefe explained that the interim report identified six major issue areas they intended to explore. The first was the question of the likely qualifications of future applicants and the needs the recruiting process must address when both the numbers and overall qualities of candidates were likely to decline. The second was the issue of retention which was not of concern for MCPS presently, but it was one that research suggested was likely to become an issue in the next five to ten years. The third issue was the question of

compensation for teachers, salary and other benefits, as it related to the overall issue of recruiting and retaining the most qualified teachers.

Mr. O'Keefe reported that the fourth issue was the question of training for MCPS teachers, both collegiate preservice as well as in-service training the system now made available to teachers. The fifth major issue was the question of the environment in which the teachers carry out their tasks. The sixth issue was the role of evaluation in identifying and rewarding excellence as well as helping teachers and administrators identify areas in need of improvement.

Mr. O'Keefe noted that the question they had been asked to address contained within it a large number of complex issues. They did not regard the issues identified in the interim report as final. They fully expected to find that some of these issues were more important in Montgomery County and others less important. He pointed out that they had taken no firm position on any of these issues as yet. He thanked Dr. Cody and Dr. Kenneth Muir for their full and cooperative support.

Dr. Shoenberg commented that the summary promised some really significant things to come. He said that because of the great care in the way in which the issues were framed and organized. That promise was further attested to by the quality of the minutes they had sent to the Board. This gave a very clear picture of a committee going about things in a systematic and intelligent way. He remarked that it was difficult to comment because it seemed to him the quality of what they had was so fine.

Dr. Floyd commented that the committee had given them in very precise language a series of questions. The issues were put sharply so that the Board knew what it was the committee was looking to try to answer. He would expect that the final report would be equally precise. He thanked the Commission for this.

Mrs. Praisner asked that copies of the California commission report on the teaching profession be provided to Board members. She noted that the Commission would be inviting resource people and meeting with them in Montgomery County. She suggested that they consider the possibility of inviting others including Board members to these

discussions. She asked if the Commission anticipated any budget implications for the study or for the research that the Board needed to accommodate within its budget. She thought that the budget might need to reflect some minimal costs for the research. Mr. O'Keefe replied that as they had identified the need for outside resource people they had talked with the superintendent about the possibility of paying expenses and modest honorariums. He indicated that the superintendent had been most generous with setting up a reasonable amount of resources to fit their current plans. With regard to the research, they were preparing a set of questions to work through with the staff. They needed to engage in a discussion with staff to come to a conclusion about research needs. He said that he would come back to the Board if there were items on there requiring some outside assistance.

Dr. Cody explained that they wanted to support the committee. He said that if the school system could not provide support with the resources they had, they would try to support the committee.

Mr. Ewing commented that they would not want the work of the committee to fall short because of a lack of funds. They might want to consider placing an amount in the budget. He noted that one of the things that happened to the Board was that the County Council compared them to other Maryland jurisdictions or to the metropolitan area for the purpose of appropriating the least amount of money. His interest in comparisons was quite different. He said they had a great deal to learn from other places, but there was a tendency in Montgomery County to be very insular. He said that as the Commission phrased the questions, they phrased them in terms of what MCPS could do which was appropriate, but he would hope they would be able to bring the Board some of that comparative flavor in their analyses and recommendations. Mrs. Nancy Wiecking commented that one of the things she found rewarding was attending the meetings of the Maryland Association of Boards of Education because there were some marvelous things going on across the state.

Dr. Shoenberg reported that he had been attending a meeting of Board members from all over the country who were lobbying the Senate and Congress on educational matters. He noted that the Commission had a rather ecumenical collection of resource people. The people he had encountered today were feeling a good deal less than ecumenical.

They were perceiving some attitudes on the part of those who shape policy in the Congress and the administration that might or might not be of long term concern. He said that the issue the Commission was addressing had to be addressed within a context, and he wondered what their thoughts had been about the kind of context in which they wanted to look at these issues. Mr. O'Keefe replied that they had not discussed the broader context of federal policy issues and the general attitude toward education. For them, the context had been the national figures regarding supply and demand and what were other districts doing about similar problems. He said that they would take Dr. Shoenberg's remarks under consideration.

Dr. Cronin thanked the Commission.

Re: E2 POLICY RESOLUTION

On January 14, 1986, Mr. Foubert introduced the following:

WHEREAS, There is current dissatisfaction with the current class attendance policy (E2); and

WHEREAS, Article XII, Section D of the Student Rights and Responsibilities Handbook states, "Reduction of grades shall not be used as a punitive or disciplinary measure"; and

WHEREAS, Montgomery County Public Schools' grading policy IKA-RA states that "teachers are to grade on mastery of objectives"; and

WHEREAS, The aforementioned policy states further that "letter grades are not to be adjusted by personality factors, social achievement or deportment"; and

WHEREAS, Current class attendance policy is not consistent with the three aforementioned policies; and

WHEREAS, The Board of Education of Montgomery County disapproves of and believes there should be some sanctions for class cutting; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the portion of the policy regarding automatic failure and loss of credit due to lack of attendance (E2) be rescinded; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education of Montgomery County reaffirms current policy with regard to the first four steps for unexcused absences (See Appendix attached); and be it further

RESOLVED, That the fifth step of the E2 policy be replaced with the following:

"With the fifth unexcused absence the student shall receive a loss of credit. In addition, the report card and transcript shall show the grade the student had at the time credit was lost. This grade shall not be computed into the grade point average or class rank. An indication will be made that the student lost credit due to excessive unexcused absences."

and be it further

RESOLVED, That class tardies shall not be accumulated toward an unexcused absence and therefore may not be linked to a loss of credit or a reduction in grades; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the superintendent be directed to develop and bring to

the Board of Education for its review and approval a policy statement containing a set of criteria and guidelines for school principals to use in determining what constitutes an excused or unexcused absence which criteria and guidelines shall be such that permit reasonable judgment to prevail and give principals more flexibility than the present policy allows; and be it further

RESOLVED, That an analysis and evaluation report be provided to the Board after the policy has been in place for two semesters.

Re: A MOTION TO AMEND THE PROPOSED
RESOLUTION ON THE E2 POLICY

Mr. Foubert moved and Mr. Ewing seconded the following:

RESOLVED, That the proposed resolution on the E2 policy be amended by deleting the RESOLVED clause in regard to class tardies and substitute the following:

RESOLVED, That administrators may assign in-school suspension for excessive class tardies; and be it further

RESOLVED, That if a student is five or more minutes late, the unexcused tardy may be accumulated towards an unexcused absence; and be it further

RESOLVED, That if a student is less than five minutes late, administrators may use disciplinary measures such as detention and in-school suspension to combat the problem.

Re: A MOTION BY MR. EWING TO DEFER ACTION
ON THE E2 PROPOSAL

Mr. Ewing moved that the Board defer action on the proposal as it stands at least until the next business meeting of the Board and invite MCCPTA to comment and the superintendent to help the Board to think through the problem.

RESOLUTION NO. 66-86 Re: A SUBSTITUTE MOTION BY MRS. PRAISNER
ON THE E2 POLICY

On motion of Mrs. Praisner seconded by Dr. Shoenberg, the following resolution was adopted with Dr. Cronin, Mrs. DiFonzo, Mr. Ewing, Mrs. Praisner, Dr. Shoenberg, and Mrs. Slye voting in the affirmative; Dr. Floyd and (Mr. Foubert) voting in the negative:

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education direct the superintendent to create a committee of students, teachers, principals, and parents to review the E2 policy and bring recommendations on this issue by May.

RE: PROPOSED RESOLUTION ON WEIGHTED RANK
IN CLASS

On January 14, 1986, Dr. Shoenberg moved and Mr. Foubert seconded the

students enrolled in more than five honors courses will have the five highest honors grades (A or B) automatically weighted by computer per semester; and be it further

and be it further

RESOLVED, That effective for the fall of 1986 the third Resolved clause of the April 9, 1985 resolution on weighted rank in class is hereby rescinded.

Re: REPORT ON FOREIGN LANGUAGE INSTRUCTION

This report was deferred to the next available agenda.

Re: BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS

1. Mrs. DiFonzo reported that last Friday she had officiated at the commencement of one young man from the Lynnbrook Alternative Center. She said that having attended that commencement continued to reinforce for her what a super job the staff working in the alternative programs were doing. At each graduation there was another student who had been saved. She said that no matter what the size of the budgets were, if they were able to save just one kid a year, that money was well spent.

2. Mrs. DiFonzo pointed out that the practical writing course, while counting as a credit in the English curriculum, was not accepted by the University of Maryland. She asked about what counselors were telling students and parents about that course and whether people were being warned up front that it was not accepted as an entrance requirement by the University.

3. Mrs. Praisner said that they had received a copy of some testimony that would have been delivered at Board/Press/Visitor conference which was not because of the weather. She also had some questions in a memo about the renovation of New Hampshire Estates Elementary School. She requested a staff response to the testimony and her memo.

4. Mr. Ewing reported that the research and evaluation committee had met on January 21 with staff and the superintendent. They were interested in reviewing the work plan and seeing it in another format which included dollars and a timetable. He thought this was a very useful meeting.

5. Mr. Ewing thought there was a need for the Board to consider a follow-up to the January 14 breakfast in terms of keeping in touch with all the attendees and deciding how to work with them in the future.

6. Mr. Ewing said he had met on January 16 with the Head Start Parent Advisory Committee. Present at the meeting were federal government evaluators of the program. It was their judgment that the MCPS Head Start program was outstanding, and he was told that the

Board should be congratulated for being so supportive of the program.

7. Mr. Ewing reported that he had heard from the chairperson of the Richard Montgomery High School PTSA who expressed extreme dissatisfaction with the first meeting on planning for the future program there. The implication was that the Richard Montgomery community was demanding this special program which they were not, and one staff member suggested it would be a great idea to have even more special students than regular students. He thought that something needed to be done about that situation.

8. Mr. Ewing said that the Board had a copy of a proposal on intergenerational programming for getting older and younger people to work together. He thought this was an interesting link to the notion of community service programs and the ideas put forth by Coleman McCarthy. Mr. Ewing said he was trying to put these all together for the Board.

RESOLUTION NO. 69-86 Re: EXECUTIVE SESSION - FEBRUARY 11, 1986

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 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 February 11, 1986, 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 protecting particular proceedings or 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.

RESOLUTION NO. 70-86 Re: MINUTES OF SEPTEMBER 23, 1985

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

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education approve the minutes of September 23, 1985.

RESOLUTION NO. 71-86 Re: MINUTES OF NOVEMBER 23, 1985

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

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education approve the minutes of November 23, 1985.

RESOLUTION NO. 72-86 Re: MINUTES OF JANUARY 6, 1986

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

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education approve the minutes of January 6, 1986.

RESOLUTION NO. 73-86 Re: LETTER TO POST OFFICE ON IMPACT OF NEW FEDERAL FACILITY ON POTOMAC ELEMENTARY

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

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education send a letter to the Post Office endorsing the position taken by the superintendent and the Planning Board on the new post office federal facility in Potomac.

Re: NEW BUSINESS

Dr. Shoenberg noted that the Board had received correspondence from Ken Kaplan and Carole Gelfeld. He thought that the officers of the Board would work out some kind of appropriate response to that.

Re: ADJOURNMENT

The president adjourned the meeting at 11:55 p.m.

President

Secretary

WSC:mlw